



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Time in range: A best practice guide for UK diabetes healthcare professionals in the context of the COVID-19 global pandemic*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/166081/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Wilmot, EG, Lumb, A, Hammond, P et al. (5 more authors) (2021) Time in range: A best practice guide for UK diabetes healthcare professionals in the context of the COVID-19 global pandemic. *Diabetic Medicine*, 38 (1). e14433. ISSN 0742-3071

<https://doi.org/10.1111/dme.14433>

© 2020 Diabetes UK. This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Wilmot, EG, Lumb, A, Hammond, P et al. (5 more authors) (2020) Time in range: A best practice guide for UK diabetes healthcare professionals in the context of the COVID-19 global pandemic. *Diabetic Medicine*. ISSN 0742-3071, which has been published in final form at <http://doi.org/10.1111/dme.14433>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Time in Range – a best practice guide for UK diabetes healthcare professionals in the context of the COVID-19 global pandemic

Emma G. Wilmot^{1,2}, Alistair Lumb^{3, 12}, Peter Hammond⁴, Helen R. Murphy^{5,6}, Eleanor Scott⁷, Fraser Gibb^{8,9}, Julia Platts¹⁰, Pratik Choudhary¹¹

Running title: Time in Range: a best practice guide for UK diabetes HCPs

1. Diabetes Department, Royal Derby Hospital, University Hospitals of Derby and Burton NHS Foundation Trust, Derby, UK
2. Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK
3. Oxford Centre for Diabetes, Endocrinology and Metabolism, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
4. Diabetes Resource Centre, Harrogate District Hospital, Harrogate and District NHS Foundation Trust, Harrogate, UK.
5. Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich.
6. Women's Health Academic Centre, Division of Women's and Children's Health, King's College London, London, UK
7. Leeds Institute for Cardiovascular and Metabolic Medicine, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK
8. Edinburgh Centre for Endocrinology & Diabetes, Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, UK
9. Centre for Cardiovascular Science, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
10. Diabetes Centre, University Hospital Llandough, Cardiff and Vale University Health Board, Penarth
11. Department of Diabetes, School of Life Course Sciences, King's College London, London, UK.
12. NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre

Corresponding author: Dr Emma G Wilmot. Email: emma.wilmot2@nhs.net

Keywords: Time in range, Time below range, Time above range, Type 1 diabetes, Type 2 diabetes, continuous glucose monitoring, flash glucose monitoring, glycaemic control, glycaemic variability, glycaemic stability, hypoglycaemia, hyperglycaemia, clinical practice

Number of words in article: 6990

Number of words in abstract: 242

Number of tables: 3

Number of figures/boxes: 5

Number of references: 57

What's new?

- The aim of this best practice guide is to clarify the intent and purpose of international consensus recommendations on Time in Range (TIR) and to provide practical insights for their implementation in UK diabetes care.
- We highlight the unmet need for awareness of the consensus recommendations on TIR in UK diabetes care and the benefits of improved application of TIR targets for people with diabetes.
- The strengths of TIR are clearly identified along with important checks and balances for understanding and using TIR in UK clinical practice.
- Challenges for implementation in UK clinical practice are discussed, including the need for education both of healthcare professionals and people with diabetes.
- Evidence-based learnings from the provision of diabetes care at a distance during the period of COVID-19 social distancing are identified.
- This best practice guide covers type 1 diabetes and type 2 diabetes, including those at increased risk from hypoglycaemia and pregnant women with type 1 diabetes.

Abstract

The emergence of continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) has driven improvements in glycaemic control and in quality of life for people with diabetes. Recent changes in access to CGM systems within UK health services have increased the number of people able to benefit from these technologies. The COVID-19 pandemic has created an opportunity for diabetes healthcare professionals (HCPs) to use CGM technology to remotely deliver diabetes services to support people with diabetes. This opportunity can be maximised with improved application and interpretation of CGM-generated glucose data. Amongst the diverse measures of glycaemic control, time in range is considered to be of high value in routine clinical care, because it is actionable and is visibly responsive to changes in diabetes management. Importantly, it is also linked to the risk of developing complications associated with diabetes and can be understood by people with diabetes and HCPs alike. The 2019 International Consensus on Time in Range has established a series of target glucose ranges and recommendations for time spent within these ranges that is consistent with optimal glycaemic control. These cover people with type 1 diabetes or type 2 diabetes with separate targets indicated for elderly people or those at higher risk from hypoglycaemia, as well as for women with type 1 diabetes during pregnancy. The aim of this best practice guide is to clarify the intent and purpose of these international consensus recommendations and to provide practical insights into their implementation in UK diabetes care.

Introduction

Continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) has emerged as a powerful tool in helping people with diabetes achieve better glucose control. Two types of CGM systems are currently available: real-time CGM (rtCGM) and intermittently scanned CGM (isCGM), also called flash glucose monitoring, each of which measure glucose in the interstitial fluid. rtCGM systems measure glucose every few minutes and actively transmit data wirelessly from the sensor to a reader or smartphone app, whereas isCGM systems transmit data only when the user scans their sensor with a reader or smartphone app.

A key benefit of CGM systems is the ability to transmit data to the cloud. This can be done automatically from a mobile phone or uploaded from a dedicated reader. In either case, it allows data to be simultaneously viewed by people with diabetes and HCPs, supporting virtual consultations. As diabetes services emerge from the COVID-19 pandemic in the UK,

there is a realisation that it will be necessary to mould and adapt our services to the ‘new normal’. People with diabetes appear to be particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of COVID-19 and, as such, social distancing will remain desirable for some time. Virtual consultations remove the need for face-to-face contact. Shared access to detailed glucose data during these consultations will support goal setting and planning, leading to improved outcomes. **More importantly, evidence clearly shows that remote consultations and availability of rtCGM or isCGM data can maintain or improve glycaemic control for many people with type 1 diabetes who use rtCGM or isCGM systems during a period of restricted access to regular diabetes services (see later).**

Numerous studies have proven the clinical benefits of rtCGM and isCGM in people with type 1 diabetes or type 2 diabetes treated with different intensive insulin regimens, including multiple daily injections with insulin (MDI) and continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion (CSII) or insulin pump therapy [1–9]. In recent years, the improved accuracy of a number of these systems (Dexcom G5 and G6, FreeStyle Libre) means that they can be used safely to make therapeutic decisions, including decisions about insulin dosing, without the need to confirm readings using an adjunct self-monitored blood glucose (SMBG) fingerprick test [10,11].

CGM systems allow a different understanding of glycaemia from that previously established. Historically, HbA1c has been considered the gold standard measurement for assessing glycaemia in clinical practice. It is widely available and is clearly associated with the risk of developing complications associated with diabetes, both in **type 1 diabetes and type 2 diabetes** [12,13]. However, HbA1c also has limitations since it can be affected by external factors unrelated to blood glucose [14]. Furthermore, it does not provide information about clinically important measures, such as day-to-day glycaemic variability and the frequency of hyper- and hypoglycaemia which impact on the health and wellbeing of people with diabetes. The glucose data reported by rtCGM and isCGM systems provides a means of expressing these important measures for standardised reporting and analysis. This is reflected in international consensus recommendations that endorse a move beyond HbA1c as the most useful marker of individual glycaemia [11,15]. Currently available rtCGM and isCGM systems are able to report on a large number of glycaemic variables, summarised in Table 1. At the heart of these measures is Time in Range.

The International Consensus on Time in Range – aims, scope and purpose

Each rtCGM and isCGM system requires that the user specifies the upper and lower limits of a target glucose range, within which they should aim to maintain their glucose readings across the day. It is important to note that this target range may differ from the target range set in a bolus calculator or an insulin pump. The target range set within each CGM device is not intended to manage targets for glucose corrections but to allow comparative data analysis on overall glycaemic control. As use of rtCGM and isCGM systems becomes widespread, it is clear that standardisation of this target glucose range is necessary in order to provide consistent and effective reporting of outcomes in routine clinical care and for clinical research. A number of metrics have been adopted for interpreting the wealth of data provided by rtCGM systems (Table 1), and from these an international consensus panel has concluded that 'Time in Range' is a glycaemic measure that has high value in routine clinical care [14]. This is a measure that is easily understandable by people with diabetes and by HCPs, whilst also being rapidly responsive to changes in diet, lifestyle and medication in day-to-day diabetes management.

The percentage Time in Range refers to the proportion of each day that a person with diabetes spends with glucose readings in each of three defined glucose ranges (Table 1). The %TIR reports on the amount of time each day that glucose readings are within the upper and lower limits of the target glucose range 3.9-10 mmol/L (or 3.5-7.8 mmol/L during pregnancy). The %TBR reports on the amount of time that readings are below the target glucose range of 3.9 mmol/L (3.5mmol/L during pregnancy) and %TAR refers to the amount of time that glucose readings are above the target glucose range 10.0 mmol/L (>7.8 mmol/L during pregnancy). As will be discussed later, TBR and TAR can be divided further into low/very low and high/very high ranges, depending on the profile of the person with diabetes.

In terms of implementing these metrics in day-to-day clinical practice, the International Consensus on Time in Range[14] has defined a series of clinical targets for %TIR, %TBR and %TAR that can be applied to people with type 1 diabetes or type 2 diabetes. Separate recommendations have also been made for women with type 1 diabetes during pregnancy and for people with type 1 diabetes or type 2 diabetes who are at higher risk of hypoglycaemia because of age, duration of diabetes, duration of insulin therapy or impaired

awareness of hypoglycaemia (IAH). These consensus recommendations also emphasise the importance of setting individual goals for time spent within any defined glycaemic range, which is an essential part of implementing %TIR, %TBR and %TAR in clinical practice.

It is important to state that, for the purposes of this guide, we are focusing only on time in range as measured by rtCGM or isCGM systems. Although the principles of %TIR, %TBR and %TAR can apply to glucose readings taken by multiple daily SMBG tests [16,17], the accuracy of SMBG tests is dependent on individual technique and the timing of testing, so %TIR outcomes based on SMBG may not be comparable with those generated by rtCGM or isCGM [18].

The International Consensus on Time in Range – current UK status

To date, awareness of %TIR amongst UK diabetes HCPs has been low [8]. Reimbursement and access both to rtCGM and isCGM technologies has been restricted to a small number of qualifying individuals with **type 1 diabetes**. NICE guidance NG17 for type 1 diabetes in adults and NG18 for treatment of diabetes in children and young people, both recommend the use of rtCGM in certain defined circumstances when SMBG testing is unable or unlikely to meet the need for safe and effective glucose monitoring [19,20].

In recent years, the UK has seen increased access to CGM, in particular isCGM, with almost one third of people with **type 1 diabetes** in England now having access to this technology [21]. Consequently, there is an immediate need for diabetes HCPs to apply time in range and associated glycaemic measures as part of routine clinical practice. In order to make the most of this opportunity, there is a need for increased awareness on how HCPs and people with diabetes can use this measure, how to understand the targets and implications of changes in time in range, and how to agree strategies to improve the health and wellbeing of people with diabetes by supporting the attainment of these targets. This guideline is part of this drive.

Time in Range: definitions, outcomes and relationship with HbA1c

TIR refers to the amount of time that a person with diabetes spends within the target glucose range. TBR and TAR are also important measures that quantify the periods when glucose levels are not in range, and are critical to assessing the overall glycaemic profile. The time spent in any of these ranges can be described either as the percentage of glucose

values recorded each day or as the number of minutes or hours per day spent in that range. Throughout this guide we will provide both points of reference for time in range.

Time in range 3.9–10 mmol/L

The international consensus recommendations on time in range have proposed that a target glucose range of 3.9–10 mmol/L is an appropriate standard against which to assess %TIR for people with **type 1 diabetes or type 2 diabetes**, both in clinical practice and in clinical trials [14]. Overall, the target that people with **type 1 diabetes or type 2 diabetes** should aim for is TIR >70% (16 h 48 mins/day). This is modified for those aged <25 years with type 1 diabetes when the HbA1c goal is **58 mmol/mol (7.5%)**, in which case the TIR target should be set to approximately 60% [Table 2a, Figure 1]. Achieving mean %TIR of >70% is comparable to the ADA / EASD glycaemic HbA1c target of **53 mmol/mol (7.0%)**.

In moving towards a standard of care that emphasises %TIR, it is important to maintain the connection with long-term outcomes. Although HbA1c is a more abstract and hard-to-visualize measure of individual glycaemic control, it remains the gold-standard for understanding population based risks for developing macrovascular and microvascular complications [12,13]. SMBG data from the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT) in **type 1 diabetes** [12] has been reanalysed to calculate the %TIR 3.9-10 mmol/L of participants with and without microvascular complications in the DCCT [16]. 7-point SMBG testing was performed by 1440 DCCT participants on 1 day every 3 months during more than 6 years of the DCCT, allowing the SMBG-based %TIR to be calculated. This showed a significant difference in TIR of 10-12 percentage points (2.5-3.0 hours/day) between participants who did and did not developed complications. For each 10% fall in TIR (2 hours 24 mins less each day with glucose levels in the target range), the risk of progression of retinopathy was increased by 64% and risk of developing microalbuminuria was increased by 40% [Fig 2]. In a separate study that used retrospective CGM to measure glucose control in 3,262 people with **type 2 diabetes**, %TIR was again inversely correlated with the prevalence and severity of diabetic retinopathy, so that a higher %TIR was associated with less or less-severe retinopathy [22]. Subsequently, further analyses of blinded CGM in 2983 people with **type 2 diabetes** have also demonstrated a relationship between %TIR and carotid intimal thickness [23].

These reports demonstrate that %TIR is directly correlated with risk of retinopathy, microalbuminuria or coronary artery disease, which aligns with the association between HbA1c and risk of complications in the DCCT [12] and UKPDS [13]. However, some caution must be exercised in this regard. An analysis from the REPLACE-BG study in **type 1 diabetes** has shown that the correlation between %TIR and outcomes reported for DCCT based on SMBG may be different for data generated by rtCGM [18]. Similarly, targets for %TIR based on SMBG data may need to be different than those indicated by recommendations based on rtCGM or isCGM, which underscores that this current guide is centred only on interpretation of rtCGM and isCGM data.

Time below range <3.9 mmol/L

Hypoglycaemia is a major limiting factor in the glycaemic management of people with **type 1 diabetes** or **type 2 diabetes** [24]. Reducing both the occurrence of hypoglycaemia and the risk of hypoglycaemia is a central tenet of optimal diabetes care. Minimizing hypoglycaemia includes: acknowledging the problem; considering each risk factor; and applying the principles of intensive glycaemic therapy, including education, drug selection and selective application of diabetes treatment technologies [24].

rtCGM and isCGM data have been used to define two objective measures of time in hypoglycaemia, each of which indicates different degrees of urgency for clinical action [11,14]: Level 1 hypoglycaemia, with glucose 3.0–3.9 mmol/L (54–69 mg/dL); Level 2 hypoglycaemia, with glucose < 3.0 mmol/L (54 mg/dL). Level 1 hypoglycaemia is clinically important, independent from any acute symptoms, and HCPs and people with diabetes should monitor time spent in Level 1 hypoglycaemia in order to minimize the risk of severe hypoglycaemia episodes and/or development of IAH. Level 2 hypoglycaemia, with a glucose level of < 3.0 mmol/L (54mg/dL), with or without symptoms, is considered clinically significant and likely to trigger counterregulatory responses. As such, Level 2 hypoglycaemia is deemed as requiring immediate attention.

In cases of Level 1 or Level 2 hypoglycaemia, the episode is considered relevant if it lasts 15 minutes or more before returning above 3.9 mmol/L. People meeting glucose control targets (HbA1c **48 mmol/mol [6.5%]** or TIR>70%/16 h 48 mins) may experience mild hypoglycaemic events. However, more-extended periods of hypoglycaemia, more than 4% (1 h/day) below 3.9mmol/L or more than 1% (15 min/day) below 3.0mmol/L, should be

avoided as this can impair the counterregulatory hormonal response to low glucose [25] and increase the risk of severe hypoglycaemia requiring third-party intervention. To date, studies have shown a link between TBR and severe hypoglycaemia [26], and more recently an association between TBR and IAH has been demonstrated in rtCGM users [27]. A recent study has shown that people with good awareness of hypoglycaemia may be unaware of up to 60% of low sensor-glucose events [28], but the clinical significance of these asymptomatic episodes, especially overnight, is unclear. This emphasises that the sensor data must always be interpreted in the wider context.

The International Consensus on Time in Range[14] therefore proposes that people with **type 1 diabetes** or **type 2 diabetes** should spend < 4% (1 hr/day) of time in Level 1 hypoglycaemia each day and <1% (15 mins/day) of time in Level 2 hypoglycaemia (Table 2a, Figure 1). Recommendations for pregnancy in **type 1 diabetes** and for people at high-risk of hypoglycaemia are discussed separately below.

Time above range >10.0 mmol/L

Exposure to high glucose is a major risk factor for microvascular and macrovascular complications of diabetes, as confirmed in the DCCT[12] and UKPDS[13] trials. To date, these risks have been correlated with HbA1c as a long-term marker of glucose exposure, but the impact of short-term hyperglycaemia is not well understood. rtCGM and isCGM data provide the opportunity to look at both long-term and short-term hyperglycaemia.

In common with the classification of hypoglycaemia, CGM-defined hyperglycaemia has been set at two levels that indicate different degrees of urgency for clinical action [11,14]. Level 1 hyperglycaemia: glucose 10.0–13.9 mmol/L (180-250 mg/dL); Level 2 hyperglycaemia: glucose >13.9 mmol/L (250 mg/dL). The percentage of time at Level 1 hyperglycaemia again cautions the user to monitor their glucose and take action only if needed, whereas Level 2 urges immediate action to lower the high glucose and to minimise risk of diabetic ketoacidosis (DKA) in people with **type 1 diabetes**.

Time in Level 1 hyperglycaemia is only moderately correlated with HbA1c and an individual %TAR can be associated with a wide range of HbA1c levels. An analysis by Beck and colleagues[29] suggests that a 10% decrease (2 h 24 min/day) in TAR 10-13.9 mmol/L is

associated with an average HbA1c reduction of approximately 7 mmol/mol (0.6%). Also, the higher the baseline HbA1c, the more benefit comes with reducing TAR.

The International Consensus on Time in Range[14] recommends that people with type 1 diabetes or type 2 diabetes should aim to spend <25% of time in Level 1 (10 – 13.9 mmol/L) or Level 2 (>13.9 mmol/L) hyperglycaemia of which <5% should be in Level 2 hyperglycaemia (Table 2a, Figure 1). Recommendations for pregnancy in type 1 diabetes and for people at high risk of hypoglycaemia are discussed separately.

Time in Range and HbA1c

It is important to emphasise that %TIR is not a surrogate for HbA1c and has a clinical utility that is different from HbA1c, since %TIR reflects the combined influence of glucose exposure and the degree of glycaemic variability [30]. The correlation between %TIR and HbA1c is therefore important to understand in this context. Using the retrospective rtCGM data from 4 randomised controlled trials (RCTs) in type 1 diabetes, Beck and colleagues examined a variety of CGM metrics and their correlation with long-term glycaemia as measured by HbA1c [29]. They included 6-months of CGM data from 545 participants from the following trials; JDRF CGM [31]; DIAMOND [3]; REPLACE-BG [2] and HypoDE [32]. Despite a moderate correlation between %TIR and HbA1c, it was clear that a given %TIR could be associated with a wide range of HbA1c levels and vice versa. However, the established place of HbA1c in diabetes management means that it is helpful to create a rule of thumb for long-term glycaemia that correlates %TIR with HbA1c. Thus, on average, a TIR of 50% (12 h/day) is associated with an HbA1c of approximately 63 mmol/mol (7.9%), a TIR of 60% (14 h 24 min/day) is associated with an HbA1c of 57 mmol/mol (7.4%) and a TIR of 70% (16 h 48 min) is associated with an HbA1c of 53 mmol/mol (7.0%) (Table 3a). The 95% confidence intervals shown in Table 3 reiterate that a given TIR can be associated with HbA1c values that differ widely between individuals. Although a TIR of 50% (12 h/day) is associated with an average HbA1c of 63 mmol/mol (7.9%), the true value for any person with diabetes may lie anywhere between 49 mmol/mol (6.6%) and 77 mmol/mol (9.2%).

A separate analysis by Vigersky and McMahon[33] looked at paired %TIR and HbA1c data from participants with either rtCGM (n=1137) or SMBG (n=1440) glucose measurements, from 22 studies, including 18 in people with type 1 diabetes and 4 in people with type 2 diabetes. These data across type 1 diabetes and type 2 diabetes suggested a slightly lower

HbA1c for a given %TIR as compared with Beck et al in type 1 diabetes. These two analysis also differ in that the study by Beck [29] used individual subject level data to calculate the link between TIR and HbA1c, whereas Vigersky [33] used study level data. However, overall, both studies show that a TIR of 60-70% (14 h 24 min-16 h 48 min/day) should correlate to an average HbA1c of between 48-58 mmol/mol (6.5-7.5%).

These %TIR targets are broadly aligned with national guidelines for glycaemia in adults and children with type 1 diabetes [19,20]. However, for someone with a starting HbA1c ≥ 64 mmol/mol (8.0%), each 10% (2 h 24 min/day) increase in TIR is associated with an approximate 11 mmol/mol (1%) reduction in HbA1c, whereas a person with a baseline HbA1c of 53-63 mmol/mol (7.0-7.9%) will see on average a 4 mmol/mol (0.4%) reduction in HbA1c with each 10% (2 h 24 min/day) increase in TIR [29]. Since a therapeutic intervention is considered effective if the reduction in HbA1c is ≥ 4 mol/mol (0.4%), the importance of setting small, achievable goals for improvements in %TIR is underlined. For someone with an HbA1c ≥ 64 mmol/mol (8.0%), even a 5% (1 h 15 min/day) increase in TIR can potentially result in a clinically relevant reduction in HbA1c of 9 mmol/mol (0.85%) [29]. The much greater impact of change in %TIR for individuals with higher starting HbA1c may reflect that each 5% or 10% incremental improvement in TIR can be a result of reductions in TAR, whereas those with a lower starting HbA1c will also need to improve TBR. Estimates of change in HbA1c for different incremental improvements in %TIR at different baseline HbA1c values are indicated in Table 3b, based on the analysis by Beck et al [29]. Again, note the important 95% confidence intervals.

Both HbA1c and %TIR will continue to be important markers of glycaemic health with important roles to play in clinical decision making. However, %TIR is more meaningful for understanding day-to-day glycaemia and is responsive to changes in diabetes management.

A recent ABCD audit of %TIR measures for people with diabetes using the FreeStyle Libre system has shown substantial variation in target glucose ranges used by clinicians [8], with only 15% of 2191 cases using the recommended 3.9-10 mmol/L range. As remote consultations become the 'new normal', access to TIR measures which do not require a face-to-face visit may replace laboratory HbA1c measurements [19]. Thus, the need to standardise our approach to the interpretation of rtCGM/isCGM data has never been greater.

Time in Range in elderly people with diabetes and those at high-risk from hypoglycaemia

Some people with diabetes are at higher risk for severe hypoglycaemia due to age, duration of diabetes, duration of insulin therapy and/or greater prevalence of hypoglycaemia unawareness[34–39]. This increased risk of severe hypoglycaemia can be exacerbated by cognitive and physical impairments, as well as other comorbidities (e.g. renal disease, joint disease, osteoporosis, fracture, and/or cardiovascular disease), and people requiring assisted care[36,39].

The International Consensus on Time in Range recommendations for high risk and elderly people emphasise the need to be conservative and to individualize targets for %TIR, with a clear focus on reducing the %TBR <3.9 mmol/L (<70 mg/dL) while preventing excessive hyperglycaemia [Table 2a, Figure 3]. Thus, the recommended target range for high-risk and elderly individuals is still 3.9-10 mmol/L, but the daily goal is for >50% (>12 h/day) TIR, rather than >70% (>16 h 48 min/day). Because of the need to closely manage the risk of hypoglycaemia in this group, the recommendation is to keep %TBR (<3.9 mmol/L) below 1% or less than 15 minutes per day. Similarly, the recommendations for %TAR are streamlined to focus on keeping levels >13.9 mmol/L to <10% (2 h 24 min/day; Table 2a, Figure 3].

Time in Range in pregnancy

During pregnancy, the goal for women with diabetes is to safely increase %TIR as quickly as possible, while reducing %TAR, %TBR and glycaemic variability. Early studies using rtCGM in women with pregestational **type 1 diabetes** or **type 2 diabetes** show that, during the critical stages of early pregnancy, women with diabetes on average spend only 50% (12 h/day) with glucose levels in a target range of 3.9-7.8 mmol/L[40]. This rises to almost 60% (14 h 24 min/day) during the third trimester for women with **type 1 diabetes** and to almost 80% (19 h 12 min/day) for women with **type 2 diabetes**. Women with **type 1 diabetes** spend 40% (9 h 36 min/day) of time in hyperglycaemia (TAR >7.8 mmol/L) at the end of the first trimester, falling to 33% (7 h 55 min/day) at the end of the third trimester. For women with **type 2 diabetes**, TAR was 33% (7 h 55 min/day) at the end of the first trimester falling to 12% (2 h 53 min/day) at the end of the third trimester. However, it should be noted that at 8 weeks gestation, women with **type 1 diabetes** or **type 2 diabetes** spend 40% (9 h 36 min/day) of

the time with a glucose level >7.8 mmol/L[39]. Women with **type 1 diabetes** also spent more time (approximately 4% or 1 h/day) with CGM glucose levels below 3.9mmol/L than women with **type 2 diabetes** [40].

Data from the CONCEPTT trial [41] in pregnancy in **type 1 diabetes** used the target glucose range of 3.5-7.8 mmol/L, but confirmed that TIR increased by approximately 10% (2 h 24 min/day) from the first to the third trimester. It also showed that use of rtCGM helps women with **type 1 diabetes** improve their %TIR during pregnancy compared to a control group using SMBG (68% vs 61%; 16 h 19 min vs 14 h 38 min/day), as well as reducing %TAR (27% vs 32%; 6 h 29 min vs 7 h 41 min/day) at 34-35 weeks. The improvement in glycaemia was achieved without increased maternal hypoglycaemia. Indeed, the %TBR at 4% (1h/day) was lower in the CONCEPTT study than previously reported during **type 1 diabetes** pregnancy [40], even accounting for the lower 3.5 mmol/L threshold for low glucose. This indicates that the international consensus recommendation of <4% (1 hr/day) time below 3.5 mmol/L for women with **type 1 diabetes** during pregnancy [14] is safely achievable. The CONCEPTT trial was not powered to examine whether the use of rtCGM impacted on either TBR or the number of episodes of severe hypoglycaemia.

Another important observation from CONCEPTT and other recent studies in **type 1 diabetes** pregnancy [41,42] is that a 5-7% (72-100 mins/day) increase in TIR during the second and third trimester is associated with significantly improved neonatal health outcomes, with lower incidence of large for gestational age (LGA) and other complications, such as neonatal hypoglycaemia, and neonatal intensive care admissions lasting more than 24 hours.

The International Consensus on Time in Range recommends a target glucose range of 3.5-7.8 mmol/L for women with **type 1 diabetes** during pregnancy and a %TIR of >70% (16 h 48 min/day; Table 2b, Figure 4). However, data from CONCEPTT and real-world data from Sweden suggest that this was only achieved in the final 3–4 weeks of pregnancy in **type 1 diabetes**, which is too late for optimal neonatal outcomes [41,42]. In practice, women with **type 1 diabetes** should therefore be encouraged to aim for a TIR of >70% (16 h 48 min/day) and a daily TAR >7.8 mmol/L of <25% (6 h/day; Table 2b), from as early as possible during pregnancy. Accepting that this target for TIR of >70% (16 h 48 min/day) in the second and early third trimester may not be realistic for all women, it is important to reiterate that even a 5% increase in TIR during this important part of the pregnancy is associated with clinically

relevant improvements in neonatal health[43]. This means a target of an extra 72 minutes per day in range, which is worth striving for.

On a practical level it can be productive to document: average glucose, %TIR, %TBR and %TAR, and a one-line summary of what their profile is showing for women with diabetes during pregnancy each time they are reviewed. This provides additional structure in the notes to easily assess progress against targets for all MDT members who may be responsible for a review.

In order to manage the risk of low glucose during pregnancy, the International Consensus on Time in Range recommends that women with **type 1 diabetes** should aim for a %TBR <3.5 mmol/L of <4% (1 h/day), and <1% (15 min/day) for TBR <3.0 mmol/L [Table 2b, Figure 4]. The observations from the CONCEPTT study indicate that these should be achievable[41].

The International Consensus on Time in Range recommendations for %TIR, %TBR and %TAR are for pregnancy in women with **type 1 diabetes**. Women with **type 2 diabetes** spend one-third less time in hyperglycaemia during pregnancy than women with **type 1 diabetes** and can achieve up to 20% (4 h 48 min/day) higher %TIR throughout pregnancy[40]. Because of the lack of evidence on CGM targets for women with **type 2 diabetes** or with gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM), no firm recommendations for %TIR, %TBR or %TAR for these two groups have been established. However, because of the data on neonatal health outcomes, a target glucose range of 3.5-7.8 mmol/L is recommended for women with **type 2 diabetes** or GDM during pregnancy.

The practicalities of using CGM data in pregnancy, including the value of meeting targets for %TIR within the range 3.5-7.8 mmol/L, are covered extensively in a series of educational videos created by the UK Diabetes Technology Network (DTN-UK) [<https://abcd.care/dtn/CGM>].

Strengths of Time in Range

%TIR is a dynamic measure of short-term and medium-term glycaemic control. Compared to established markers of glycaemic health, such as HbA1c or frequency of symptomatic hypoglycaemia, %TIR is easy to track, can be visualized in a meaningful way and can be personalized. Importantly, in contrast to HbA1c, %TIR provides information that is directly actionable and responsive to changes in diabetes management that can be viewed on

demand by the person with diabetes or their healthcare team. Consequently, using %TIR allows SMART objectives to be agreed when goal setting, each of which can be more accessible and achievable than targets set for improvements in HbA1c.

As previously discussed, %TIR can be visualised and interpreted either as a % figure or as an absolute number of hours per day. This increases accessibility for patients, who can choose the format that best suits their own preference for interpreting their %TIR targets and performance. This also improves the quality of the conversation between a person with diabetes and their HCP during a review, since %TIR better reflects the day-to-day experience of living with diabetes than does HbA1c.

From a clinical perspective, %TIR is influenced by all of the known factors that affect daily glucose patterns. These include: glucose excursions and peaks associated with mealtimes; carbohydrate counting and carbohydrate content and glycaemic index of food; insulin doses and timings throughout the day, especially around mealtimes; stress and anxiety; exercise and physical health. This means that all of the established clinical behaviours for managing unwanted high or low glucose can be brought to bear in making decisions about how best to improve %TIR in line with agreed targets.

An important strength is that %TIR provides for different and more positive messaging for people with diabetes, a key objective in effective diabetes consultations. Awareness and understanding of %TIR allows day-by-day monitoring of the achievement of glycaemic goals. By including %TBR as an active measure, the focus can also be directly moved to the risk of hypoglycaemia and objective management of low glucose. This is not possible with HbA1c, which masks the reality of glucose variability and potential hypoglycaemia.

The consensus target of 70% (16 h 48 min/day) TIR also makes it explicit that readings may stray above or below the target range for around 7 hours (approx. 30% of time) each day and still be considered a 'good' performance. Equally, in a real-world setting, a 70% (16 h 48 min/day) target for TIR may be unrealistically aspirational, but %TIR also allows for incremental improvements that have real impact. For example, depending on their current HbA1c, a 10% (2 h 24 min/day) step change in TIR for a person with diabetes can result in a 4-11 mmol/mol (0.4-1.0%) fall in HbA1c, a change that can be directly linked to a genuine reduction in risk of microvascular and macrovascular complications[29,33].

Each of these attributes is summarised in Box 1.

Learning from COVID-19: the role and impact of remote monitoring and care

As a consequence of strategies to prevent the spread of COVID-19, ABCD has issued guidance for the management of people with diabetes during the pandemic that minimizes attendance at clinics and encourages remote consultations in secondary/primary care [44]. This has been accompanied by guidance that recognises the need to reorganise diabetes services to provide advice and support at a distance, whilst ensuring proactive care for people with diabetes at high risk. This ultimately means using telehealth and digital services for consultations, self-management and remote monitoring [45]. In this context, both rtCGM and isCGM technologies have allowed many clinicians and people with diabetes to view and discuss glucose downloads together. In the absence of routine laboratory HbA1c testing, several studies since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic have shown the value of TIR and other CGM-derived metrics in demonstrating that glucose control need not suffer while access to regular diabetes clinical services is interrupted.

In the largest of these studies, Dover and colleagues [46] evaluated sensor-glucose data from 572 people in Scotland with type 1 diabetes between early March, prior to shielding, and May 2020. %TIR over this period increased from 53% to 56%, with associated improvements in glycaemic variability and eA1c. Importantly, these differences were not seen for the comparable period in 2019. A similar study on 307 adults with type 1 diabetes in Spain [47] compared data from 14-day periods before the start of shielding and 8 weeks afterwards. In this case %TIR increased from 58% to 62% and eA1c declined from 7.4% to 7.1%. In both these studies, %TBR increased slightly. Further studies on smaller groups of people with type 1 diabetes across Europe have shown improvements or no change in %TIR during enforced shielding [48-50], and either improvement or no change in %TBR over the same period, including for groups at higher risk of hypoglycaemia [51,52].

These studies confirm that, despite the lack of access to regular diabetes services, glycaemic control can improve for many people with type 1 diabetes who are using rtCGM or isCGM systems. It may be that having more time for diabetes self-management may help improve glycaemic control in the short term. Given that a future return to so-called 'normal' services cannot be predicted or guaranteed, the need for wider application and interpretation of

remote glucose monitoring seems clear. However, the Scottish study [46] also showed that deterioration in TIR and eA1c was more likely in people with higher levels of socio-economic deprivation. This must be included in learnings from the COVID-19 lockdown in order to ensure that a care gap does not emerge as we optimise the value of diabetes care that emphasises technology and treatment at a distance, even after the COVID-19 pandemic is over.

Important checks and balances for understanding and using Time in Range

The strengths of implementing %TIR in daily practice are accompanied by some important caveats. The first is to accept that there is a need for more rigorous data regarding the relationship between %TIR and health outcomes for people with diabetes. In contrast to HbA1c, data that link improved %TIR with reduced occurrence of complications of diabetes are only starting to emerge. This is why HbA1c and the link with %TIR continues to be an essential part of assessment of the longer-term risk of diabetes complications.

Using %TIR in conjunction with the ambulatory glucose profile (AGP)

Understanding %TIR is fundamental to assessing the overall glycaemic profile for a person with diabetes. However, it is important to acknowledge that %TIR is a summary statistic, and not on its own sufficient for managing therapy and making treatment decisions. It needs to be used in conjunction with information on blood glucose patterns, such as the ambulatory glucose profile (AGP). The AGP is an internationally agreed standard for summarising and interpreting CGM data in a visually impactful format, that allows diabetes HCPs and people with diabetes to identify patterns and trends in daily glucose control, including those that raise clinical concerns [53]. When used properly, the AGP can be used to target changes to daily diabetes care and to aspects of lifestyle that can improve overall glucose control and optimise the health and wellbeing of someone with diabetes [54]. Understanding %TIR is an important part of this wider process. Concerns raised by analysis of %TIR should always be checked with a review of the AGP data and daily traces for the period in question[54].

Equally, it is important to keep each element of the time in range picture in focus. Achieving a good %TIR outcome for 3.9-10 mmol/L is to be encouraged, but it should not come at the cost of an increase in %TBR. Avoidance of hypoglycaemia is central to optimising outcomes in diabetes, so minimising %TBR must be a key focus of all consultations.

Lastly, %TIR has high value for people with diabetes who have a level of glycaemia that can be assessed realistically using the measures that accompany CGM data management tools. For anyone with diabetes who has persistent hyperglycaemia at a level that is above the visualisable limits of TIR, with chronically high glucose well above 13.9 mmol/L (250 mg/dL), there is little benefit in setting %TIR goals. In such cases, HbA1c remains the principal measure to focus on, along with managing the risks for the adverse consequences of hyperglycaemia, such as diabetic ketoacidosis (DKA).

Each of these key recommendations are summarised in Box 1.

Challenges for implementation in UK clinical practice

Implementation of %TIR as standard across all diabetes healthcare services will require several strands of activity and awareness. Frequent face-to-face HbA1c blood tests are not desirable when alternative, easily accessed and remotely viewed surrogate markers such as %TIR and eA1c/GMI are available to view in the cloud. Potential barriers include technical issues and data management, and the requirement to change the knowledge, attitudes and behaviours of HCPs as they move away from the familiar approach of supporting consultations using HbA1c.

The technical issues start with setting up the rtCGM or isCGM device in line with the target range agreed with the person with diabetes. The International Consensus on Time in Range recommends a target glucose range of 3.9-10 mmol/L in **type 1 diabetes** and **type 2 diabetes**[14]. However, at first time of use, different CGM devices have default target glucose ranges that do not necessarily reflect this standard. As newer or updated CGM systems are launched into the market, the default target range settings should start to adopt the 3.9-10 mmol/L consensus range. Some systems currently do not allow target setting below 3.9 mmol/l which presents challenges to their use in pregnancy with a recommended target glucose range of 3.5-7.8 mmol/L.

The next key barrier to overcome is ensuring data sharing with the clinic has been established, assuming the individual is happy to share their data. This process is quickest and easiest using smartphone apps that are able to act both as the data reader and the data upload system. This requires the device to link to the cloud through an appropriate connection, and where this does not occur the data will not be available in the cloud for

review at future consultations. It is also common that device-specific hand-held readers are used to upload glucose data to a data-management interface using a micro-USB cable connected to a computer. Data collection in this way happens only when the user chooses to do so, which can have an impact on the completeness of the glucose data available for review. Appropriate data governance needs to be followed. For example, according to GDPR regulations, multidisciplinary teams should have individual log-ins rather than team log-ins. A common theme in services caring for users of rtCGM/isCGM and insulin pump systems is the need for integrated in-clinic software and data visualisation tools that can be adopted as standard across diabetes services. These should provide data capture and management capability without the need for complex systems administration support or end-user training. Interoperability of systems is critical, able to accept data from rtCGM/isCGM and insulin pump systems, without the need for device-specific interfaces or third-party support. This need is paramount, given that the number of different devices available for rtCGM, isCGM and insulin pump management for people with diabetes is proliferating, along with the number of possible product-specific user interfaces. Currently, it is not uncommon for a diabetes clinic to have up to 5 data management systems open at one time to enable effective download of data.

Education, awareness and behaviour

Along with the technical aspects of working in a data-heavy clinical space, there is the need both for clinical education on each aspect of emerging diabetes technologies and also the greater need for skills that enable HCPs to help each person using rtCGM or isCGM to optimise their own diabetes self-management. Ultimately, the emerging emphasis on %TIR will make assessing and managing glucose control easier, not harder.

As sensor-augmented care becomes widespread, it is evident that use of rtCGM/isCGM can be used to improve %TIR and reduce the occurrence of hypoglycemia as measured by %TBR. However, these important outcomes can be further improved with additional education that can optimise the benefits of rtCGM and isCGM technologies. A study across 26 secondary-care centres in Germany showed that a structured education and treatment programme for people on an intensive insulin regimen and using isCGM can improve HbA1c and %TIR at 6 months, compared to users of isCGM who did not undertake the education

[55]. This educational programme was designed both to provide skills and knowledge to make use of the glucose data provided by the isCGM system, and also to address the psychosocial issues that are associated with the use of isCGM technology, such as coping with the sheer amount of glucose information generated and the exaggerated expectation it can create about glucose management [56]. The need for more-widespread educational programmes with this focus is underscored by at least one study that has shown that adolescents may be unable to make full use of rtCGM data systematically to problem solve or reduce the frequency of hypoglycemic events[57].

Therefore, along with their established clinical skills involved in managing unwanted high or low glucose, HCPs must learn how improvements in %TIR can be driven by better use of the technology itself, and deploy these insights in support of their patients. This will mean understanding the most impactful use of trend arrows, daily scan rates, % data capture and the various reporting tools that filter and distil the large amounts of glucose data that are generated by CGM and isCGM systems.

In clinical practice, it will become important to include mean glucose, %TIR, %TBR and %TAR into our clinical consultation templates. Post COVID-19, as many appointments become remote, we must learn to rely more on %TIR and mean glucose or eA1c/GMI to assess and monitor progress of our patients.

More fundamentally, HCPs must learn how to have a confident and constructive consultation with each person with diabetes, that constructively uses each aspect of %TIR, %TBR and %TAR. This will mean both education and a change in culture. Ultimately, as much as reviewing objective numbers for %TIR, there is a need to empower people with diabetes to use these new concepts and targets effectively in their daily life with diabetes.

Summary

The aim of this best-practice guide to %TIR is to assist clinicians and other HCPs to support people with diabetes in achieving and maintaining glucose levels that minimize their risk of complications and also improve their wellbeing and quality of life. This need is more pressing given that remote consultations will be an established feature of diabetes care in the future and experience from the period of COVID-19 shielding has demonstrated their efficacy. We have interpreted the recommendations provided by the International

Consensus on Time in Range and provided relevant practical insights that clarify the derivation and rationale for using the different time in range measures in a safe and effective manner for the growing number of people with diabetes who use rtCGM or isCGM technology. In a clinical practice setting, time in ranges are emerging as important outcome measurements that can be monitored in day-to-day diabetes care. Because of what it offers in addition to HbA1c and mean glucose, Time in Range is now an integral component of diabetes risk assessment and therapy.

Acknowledgements

Conflict of interest disclosures

EGW: speaker honoraria from Abbott Diabetes Care, Diasend, Dexcom, Eli Lilly, Minimed Medtronic, Novo Nordisk, Sanofi Aventis; has served on advisory panels for Abbott Diabetes Care, Eli Lilly, Medtronic and Sanofi Aventis; received grants to attend educational meetings from Boehringer Ingelheim, Diasend, Novo Nordisk, Roche and Sanofi Aventis. PH: personal fees from Abbott Diabetes Care, Medtronic, Insulet, Lilly, Novo Nordisk, Sanofi Aventis. HRM reports having received speaker honoraria from Novo Nordisk, Roche, Medtronic and Abbott Diabetes Care. HRM sits on the Medtronic European Scientific Advisory Board and has received research support from Dexcom, Medtronic, Abbott Diabetes Care and Johnson & Johnson outside the submitted work. ES: speaker honoraria from Abbott Diabetes Care and Eli Lilly. FG: speaker fees from Abbott Diabetes Care and advisory board fees from Dexcom. PC: personal fees from Abbott Diabetes Care, Dexcom, Medtronic, Insulet, Roche, Novo Nordisk, Lilly, Sanofi and Novartis.

Funding support

The authors acknowledge writing support from Bite Medical Consulting, through an educational grant from Abbott Diabetes Care, who were not otherwise involved in the development of this manuscript.

Table 1. Objective measures of glycaemic control derived from rtCGM and isCGM data

Metric	What does it measure?
% of sensor data captured	The proportion of possible readings captured by the rtCGM or isCGM device. Provides a measure of confidence in the other data-derived outcomes.
Time in Ranges	
Time in Range (TIR)	Measures the % of time spent in the target glucose range set on the rtCGM or isCGM system – defined as 3.9-10.0 mmol/L
Time Below Range (TBR)	Measures the % of time spent below the target glucose range set on the rtCGM or isCGM system – defined as below 3.9 mmol/L
Time Above Range (TAR)	Measures the % of time spent above the target glucose range set on the rtCGM or isCGM system – defined as above 10.0 mmol/L
eA1c/Glucose Management Indicator (GMI)	Measure of short-term glucose exposure that can be used in conjunction with long-term HbA1c in setting goals
Mean Glucose	A measure of the average glucose level calculated across the recorded glucose readings over a defined period
Standard deviation (SD)	A measure of variability. Highly influenced by the mean glucose
Coefficient of Variation (CV)	A measure of variability that is less influenced by the mean glucose. Expressed as %CV, calculated as $100 \times (SD/\text{mean glucose})$

Each of these measures of glycaemia can be derived and reported by isCGM or rtCGM systems. They are all endorsed by international consensus guidance on use of CGM systems in management of diabetes [11,14,15]

isCGM, intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring (flash glucose monitoring); rtCGM, real-time continuous glucose monitoring

Table 2a. Consensus recommendations for %TIR, %TBR and %TAR for adults, children and young people with type 1 diabetes or type 2 diabetes, and people at high risk of hypoglycaemia

Diabetes group	Time in Range (TIR)		Time Below Range (TBR)		Time Above Range (TAR)	
	Target range	% of readings: time per day	Below target level	% of readings: time per day	Above target level	% of readings: time per day
Type 1 / Type 2	3.9-10.0 mmol/L (70-180 mg/dL)	>70%: >16 h 48 min	<3.9 mmol/L (70 mg/dL)	<4%: < 1 h	>10.0 mmol/L (>180 mg/dL)	<25%: <6 h
			<3.0 mmol/L (54 mg/dL)	<1%: < 15 min	>13.9 mmol/L (>250 mg/dL)	<5%: <1 hr, 12 mins
Older/high-risk Type 1 or Type 2*	3.9-10.0 mmol/L (70-180 mg/dL)	>50%: >12 h	<3.9 mmol/L (70 mg/dL)	<1%: < 15 min	>13.9 mmol/L (>250 mg/dL)	<10%: <2 h 24 min

* People with type 1 diabetes or type 2 diabetes at high-risk of hypoglycaemia because of age, duration of diabetes, duration of insulin therapy or impaired awareness of hypoglycaemia (IAH). § %TIR in pregnancy are based on limited evidence. No consensus recommendations for %TIR, %TBR or %TAR in pregnancy in type 2 diabetes or in gestational diabetes are available.

Table 2b. Consensus recommendations for %TIR, %TBR and %TAR for diabetes during pregnancy

Diabetes group	Time in Range (TIR)		Time Below Range (TBR)		Time Above Range (TAR)	
	Target range	% of readings: time per day	Below target level	% of readings: time per day	Above target level	% of readings: time per day
Pregnancy, Type 1 [§]	3.5-7.8 mmol/L (63-140 mg/dL)	>70%: >16 h 48 min	<3.5 mmol/L (63 mg/dL)	<4%: < 1 h	>7.8 mmol/L (>140 mg/dL)	<25%: <6 h
			<3.0 mmol/L (54 mg/dL)	<1%: < 15 min		
Pregnancy, Type 2 and GDM	3.5-7.8 mmol/L (63-140 mg/dL)		<3.5 mmol/L (63 mg/dL)		>7.8 mmol/L (>140 mg/dL)	
			<3.0 mmol/L (54 mg/dL)			

* %TIR in pregnancy are based on limited evidence. Consensus recommendations are provided for %TIR, %TBR and %TAR for women with type 1 diabetes during pregnancy or planning pregnancy. During pregnancy, the %TIR should be considered in conjunction with mean daily glucose, aiming for a mean glucose of 6.0-6.5mmol/L. No consensus recommendations for %TIR, %TBR or %TAR in pregnancy in type 2 diabetes or in GDM are available.

GDM, gestational diabetes mellitus

Table 3a. Predicted HbA1c for a specified %TIR*

TIR	Predicted HbA1c [¶]	
	%	mmol/mol
90%	6.0 (4.7, 7.3)	42 (28, 56)
80%	6.5 (5.2, 7.8)	48 (33, 62)
70%	7.0 (5.6, 8.3)	53 (38, 67)
60%	7.4 (6.1, 8.8)	57 (43, 73)
50%	7.9 (6.6, 9.2)	63 (49, 77)
40%	8.4 (7.1, 9.7)	68 (54, 83)
30%	8.9 (7.6, 10.2)	74 (60, 88)
20%	9.4 (8.0, 10.7)	78 (64, 93)

Table 3b Predicted change in HbA1c for incremental improvements in %TIR* for different baseline HbA1c values in type 1 diabetes

Increase in %TIR	Starting HbA1c [¶]					
	<7.0%	7.0-7.9%	≥8%	<53 mmol/mol	53-63 mmol/mol	≥64 mmol/mol
+5.0%	-0.06% (-1.06, 0.93)	-0.26% (-1.25, 0.73)	-0.85% (-1.84, 0.14)	-0.7 (-11.7, 10.2)	-2.9 (-13.8, 8.0)	-9.4 (-20.2, 1.5)
+10.0%	-0.21% (-1.20, 0.79)	-0.40% (-1.39, 0.59)	-0.99% (-1.99, 0.00)	-2.3 (-13.2, 8.7)	-4.4 (-15.3, 6.5)	-10.9 (-21.9, 0.0)


* Correlations of %TIR with HbA1c for target glucose range 3.9-10 mmol/L. Analysis by Beck et al [29] is based on data in type 1 diabetes only. ¶ Data are presented as change in HbA1c (95% confidence interval). The 95% CI for the predictive value represents the range within which the true value for an individual's value is likely to be. For example, a TIR of 50% (12 h/day) is associated with an average HbA1c of 63 mmol/mol (7.9%), the true value for any individual with diabetes may lie anywhere between 49 mmol/mol (6.6%) and 77 mmol/mol (9.2%).

TIR, Time in Range

Box 1. Using %TIR in clinical practice: checks and balances

Strengths	Key considerations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• %TIR is a dynamic measure of short-term and medium-term glycaemia.• Easy to track.• Can be visualized in a meaningful way.• Can be personalized.• Provides information that is directly actionable.• Responsive to changes in diabetes management that can be viewed in real-time.• Allows SMART objectives to be agreed when goal setting.• Can be visualised and interpreted either as a % figure or as an absolute number of hours/minutes per day.• Better reflects the day-to-day experience of living with diabetes than HbA1c.• Provides for different and more-positive messaging for people with diabetes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited data to link improved %TIR with reduced risk of microvascular and macrovascular complications of diabetes.• It is important to acknowledge that small improvements of 5-10% in TIR can deliver significant glycaemic benefits.• Women with type 1 diabetes who are pregnant or planning a pregnancy must be supported to reach %TIR targets as early as possible during pregnancy.• During pregnancy the %TIR should be considered in conjunction with mean daily glucose, aiming for a mean glucose of 6.0-6.5mmol/L.• %TIR should be used in conjunction with AGP data for a fuller picture of glycaemic health and as a basis for managing therapy and making treatment decisions.• Achieving a good %TIR outcome for 3.9-10 mmol/L should not come at the cost of an increase in %TBR.

Figure 1 Time in Ranges: targets for people with type 1 or type 2 diabetes



* Readings >13.9 mmol/L are also included in the <25% target

† Readings <3.0 mmol/L are also included in the <4% target

Thinking about individualised targets

A person with HbA1c of 53-63 mmol/mol (7.0-7.9%) will see on average a 4 mmol/mol (0.4%) reduction with each 10% (2 h 24 min) increase in TIR


A person with HbA1c of ≥64 mmol/mol (≥ 8.0%) can see on average a 11 mmol/mol (1.0%) reduction in HbA1c with each 10% (2 h 24 min) increase in TIR

A 10% (2 h 24 min) decrease in TAR can be associated on average with a reduction in HbA1c of approx 7 mmol/mol (0.6%).

For age <25 years with type 1 diabetes, if the HbA1c goal is 58 mmol/mol (7.5%), set TIR target to approx 60%




Figure 2. Time in range is associated with risk for microvascular complications



Adapted from: Beck RW et al. *Diabetes Care* 2018;42:400–405; Lu J et al. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:2370–2376.

Figure 3 Time in Ranges: targets for older people with type 1 or type 2 diabetes and those at high-risk from hypoglycaemia



* Readings >13.9 mmol/L are also included in the <50% target


Thinking about individualised targets

Emphasise the need to **prioritise hypoglycaemia avoidance, reducing the %TBR <3.9 mmol/L**

Recommendation is to keep %TBR <3.9 mmol/L to <1% or 15 min per day.



Figure 4 Time in Ranges: targets for women with type 1 diabetes who are pregnant or planning pregnancy*



* %TIR, %TBR and %TAR are based on limited evidence. More research is needed.

¶ Readings <3.0 mmol/L are also included in the <4% target

Thinking about individualised targets

Women with T1D should aim for a **daily TIR of >70% (16 h 48 min)** from **as early as possible during pregnancy**.

Women with T1D should aim for a **daily TAR >7.8 mmol/L of <25% (<6 h)**, from **as early as possible during pregnancy**.

A **5% (1 h 12 min) increase in TIR** during the **2nd and early 3rd trimester** is associated with **clinically relevant improvements in neonatal health**

During pregnancy the %TIR should be considered in conjunction with mean daily glucose, aiming for a **mean glucose of 6.0-6.5mmol/L**.



References

1. Lind M, Polonsky W, Hirsch IB, Heise T, Bolinder J, Dahlqvist S, et al. Continuous Glucose Monitoring vs Conventional Therapy for Glycemic Control in Adults With Type 1 Diabetes Treated With Multiple Daily Insulin Injections: The GOLD Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2017;317:379–387. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.19976.
2. Aleppo G, Ruedy KJ, Riddlesworth TD, Kruger DF, Peters AL, Hirsch I, et al. REPLACE-BG: A Randomized Trial Comparing Continuous Glucose Monitoring With and Without Routine Blood Glucose Monitoring in Adults With Well-Controlled Type 1 Diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:538–545. doi:10.2337/dc16-2482.
3. Beck RW, Riddlesworth T, Ruedy K, Ahmann A, Bergenstal R, Haller S, et al. Effect of Continuous Glucose Monitoring on Glycemic Control in Adults With Type 1 Diabetes Using Insulin Injections: The DIAMOND Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2017;317:371–378. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.19975.
4. Beck RW, Riddlesworth TD, Ruedy K, Ahmann A, Haller S, Kruger D, et al. Continuous Glucose Monitoring Versus Usual Care in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes Receiving Multiple Daily Insulin Injections. *Ann Intern Med* 2017;167:365. doi:10.7326/m16-2855.
5. Bolinder J, Antuna R, Geelhoed-Duijvestijn P, Kröger J, Weitgasser R. Novel glucose-sensing technology and hypoglycaemia in type 1 diabetes: a multicentre, non-masked, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2016;388. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(16)31535-5.
6. Haak T, Hanaire H, Ajjan R, Hermanns N, Riveline J-P, Rayman G. Flash Glucose-Sensing Technology as a Replacement for Blood Glucose Monitoring for the Management of Insulin-Treated Type 2 Diabetes: a Multicenter, Open-Label Randomized Controlled Trial. *Diabetes Ther* 2017;8:55–73. doi:10.1007/s13300-016-0223-6.
7. Evans M, Welsh Z, Ells S, Seibold A. The Impact of Flash Glucose Monitoring on Glycaemic Control as Measured by HbA1c: A Meta-analysis of Clinical Trials and Real-World Observational Studies. *Diabetes Ther* 2019;11:83–95. doi:10.1007/s13300-019-00720-0.
8. Deshmukh H, Wilmot EG, Gregory R, Barnes D, Narendran P, Saunders S, et al. Effect of Flash Glucose Monitoring on glycaemic control, hypoglycaemia, diabetes-related

- distress and resource utilization in the Association of British Clinical Diabetologists (ABCD) nationwide audit. *Diabetes Care* 2020 (accepted for publication)
9. Campbell FM, Murphy NP, Stewart C, Biester T, Kordonouri O. Outcomes of Using Flash Glucose Monitoring Technology by Children and Young People With Type 1 Diabetes in a Single Arm Study. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2018; 19:1294-1301. doi: 10.1111/pedi.12735
 10. Kovatchev BP, Patek SD, Ortiz EA, Breton MD. Assessing sensor accuracy for non-adjunct use of continuous glucose monitoring. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2014;17:177–186. doi:10.1089/dia.2014.0272.
 11. Danne T, Nimri R, Battelino T, Bergenstal RM, Close KL, DeVries JH, et al. International Consensus on Use of Continuous Glucose Monitoring. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1631–1640. doi:10.2337/dc17-1600.
 12. The Diabetes Control and Complications Trial Research Group. The Effect of Intensive Treatment of Diabetes on the Development and Progression of Long-Term Complications in Insulin-Dependent Diabetes Mellitus. *New Engl J Medicine* 1993;329:977–986. doi:10.1056/nejm199309303291401.
 13. UKPDS (1998). "Intensive blood-glucose control with sulphonylureas or insulin compared with conventional treatment and risk of complications in patients with type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 33). UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) Group." *Lancet* 352(9131): 837-853.
 14. Battelino T, Danne T, Bergenstal RM, Amiel SA, Beck R, Biester T, et al. Clinical Targets for Continuous Glucose Monitoring Data Interpretation: Recommendations From the International Consensus on Time in Range. *Diabetes Care* 2019:dci190028. doi:10.2337/dci19-0028.
 15. Agiostratidou G, Anhalt H, Ball D, Blonde L, Gourgari E, Harriman KN, et al. Standardizing Clinically Meaningful Outcome Measures Beyond HbA1c for Type 1 Diabetes: A Consensus Report of the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists, the American Association of Diabetes Educators, the American Diabetes Association, the Endocrine Society, JDRF International, The Leona M. and Harry B. Helmsley Charitable Trust, the Pediatric Endocrine Society, and the T1D Exchange. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1622–1630. doi:10.2337/dc17-1624.

16. Beck RW, Bergenstal RM, Riddlesworth TD, Kollman C, Li Z, Brown AS, et al. Validation of Time in Range as an Outcome Measure for Diabetes Clinical Trials. *Diabetes Care* 2018;42:dc181444. doi:10.2337/dc18-1444.
17. Sivasubramaniyam S, Amiel SA, Choudhary P. Proportion of daily capillary blood glucose readings required in the target range for target glycaemic control: shift of focus from target range to proportion in range. *Diabet Med.* 2017; 34:1456-1460.
18. Avari P, Uduku C, George D, Herrero P, Reddy M, Oliver N. Differences for Percentage Times in Glycemic Range Between Continuous Glucose Monitoring and Capillary Blood Glucose Monitoring in Adults with Type 1 Diabetes: Analysis of the REPLACE-BG Dataset. *Diabetes Technol Ther.* 2019;22:222–227. doi:10.1089/dia.2019.0276.
19. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Type 1 diabetes in adults: diagnosis and management: NICE guideline [NG17] Published date: 26 August 2015 Last updated: 15 July 2016
20. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Diabetes (type 1 and type 2) in children and young people: diagnosis and management: NICE guideline [NG18]. Published date: 01 August 2015 Last updated: 08 November 2016
21. NHS England, Tens of thousands given life changing diabetes monitors thanks to the NHS Long Term Plan, 21st October 2019. <https://www.england.nhs.uk/2019/10/tens-of-thousands-given-life-changing-diabetes-monitors-thanks-to-the-nhs-long-term-plan/> last accessed May 2020
22. Lu J, Ma X, Zhou J, Zhang L, Mo Y, Ying L, et al. Association of Time in Range, as Assessed by Continuous Glucose Monitoring, With Diabetic Retinopathy in Type 2 Diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:dc181131. doi:10.2337/dc18-1131.
23. Lu J, Home PD, Zhou J. Comparison of Multiple Cut Points for Time in Range in Relation to Risk of Abnormal Carotid Intima-Media Thickness and Diabetic Retinopathy *Diabetes Care* 2020 Jun; dc200561 doi:10.2337/dc20-0561
24. International Hypoglycemia Study Group. Minimizing Hypoglycemia in Diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1583–1591. doi:10.2337/dc15-0279.

25. Davis MR, Mellman M, Shamon H. Further Defects in Counterregulatory Responses Induced by Recurrent Hypoglycemia in IDDM. *Diabetes* 1992;41:1335–1340. doi:10.2337/diab.41.10.1335.
26. Henriksen MM, Andersen HU, Thorsteinsson B, et al. Hypoglycemic Exposure and Risk of Asymptomatic Hypoglycemia in Type 1 Diabetes Assessed by Continuous Glucose Monitoring. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2018; 103:2329-2335. doi: 10.1210/jc.2018-00142.
27. Lin YK, Hung M, Sharma A, Chan O, Varner MW, Staskus G, Fisher SJ. Impaired awareness of hypoglycemia continues to be a risk factor for severe hypoglycemia despite the use of continuous glucose monitoring system in type 1 diabetes. *Endocr Pract.* 2019; 25: 517-525
28. Henriksen MM, Andersen HU, Thorsteinsson B, et al. Asymptomatic hypoglycaemia in Type 1 diabetes: incidence and risk factors. *Diabet Med.* 2019; 36:62-69. doi: 10.1111/dme.13848. Epub 2018 Nov 19.
29. Beck RW, Bergenstal RM, Cheng P, Kollman C, Carlson AL, Johnson ML, et al. The Relationships Between Time in Range, Hyperglycemia Metrics, and HbA1c. *J Diabetes Sci Technol.* 2019:1932296818822496. doi:10.1177/1932296818822496.
30. Lu J, Ma X, Zhang L, Mo Y, Lu W, Zhu W, et al Glycemic variability modifies the relationship between time in range and hemoglobin A1c estimated from continuous glucose monitoring: A preliminary study. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract.* 2020; 161: 108032. doi: 10.1016/j.diabres.2020.108032
31. The Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation Continuous Glucose Monitoring Study Group. Continuous glucose monitoring and intensive treatment of type 1 diabetes. *N Engl J Med.* 2008;359:1464-1476.
32. Heinemann L, Freckmann G, Ehrmann D, et al. Real-time continuous glucose monitoring in adults with type 1 diabetes and impaired hypoglycaemia awareness or severe hypoglycaemia treated with multiple daily insulin injections (HypoDE): a multi-centre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2018; 391:1367-1377.

33. Vigersky RA, McMahon C. The Relationship of Hemoglobin A1C to Time-in-Range in Patients with Diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2018;21:81–85. doi:10.1089/dia.2018.0310.
34. Weinstock RS, DuBose SN, Bergenstal RM, Chaytor NS, Peterson C, Olson BA, et al. Risk Factors Associated With Severe Hypoglycemia in Older Adults With Type 1 Diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2015;39:603–610. doi:10.2337/dc15-1426.
35. Bremer JP, Jauch-Chara K, Hallschmid M, Schmid S, Schultes B. Hypoglycemia Unawareness in Older Compared With Middle-Aged Patients With Type 2 Diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:1513–7. doi:10.2337/dc09-0114.
36. Punthakee Z, Miller ME, Launer LJ, Williamson JD, Lazar RM, Cukierman-Yaffee T, et al. Poor cognitive function and risk of severe hypoglycemia in type 2 diabetes: post hoc epidemiologic analysis of the ACCORD trial. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:787–793. doi:10.2337/dc11-1855.
37. Giorda CB, Ozzello A, Gentile S, Agliandolo A, Chiambretti A, Baccetti F, et al. Incidence and risk factors for severe and symptomatic hypoglycemia in type 1 diabetes. Results of the HYPOS-1 study. *Acta Diabetol* 2015;52:845–853. doi:10.1007/s00592-015-0713-4.
38. Cariou B, Fontaine P, Eschwege E, Lièvre M, Gouet D, Huet D, et al. Frequency and predictors of confirmed hypoglycaemia in type 1 and insulin-treated type 2 diabetes mellitus patients in a real-life setting: results from the DIALOG study. *Diabetes Metab* 2014;41:116–125. doi:10.1016/j.diabet.2014.10.007.
39. Abdelhafiz AH, Rodríguez-Mañas L, Morley JE, Sinclair AJ. Hypoglycemia in Older People - A Less Well Recognized Risk Factor for Frailty. *Aging Dis* 2015;6:156. doi:10.14336/ad.2014.0330.
40. Murphy HR, Rayman G, Duffield K, Lewis KS, Kelly S, Johal B, et al. Changes in the Glycemic Profiles of Women With Type 1 and Type 2 Diabetes During Pregnancy. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:2785–2791. doi:10.2337/dc07-0500.
41. Feig DS, Donovan LE, Corcoy R, Murphy KE, Amiel SA, Hunt KF, et al. Continuous glucose monitoring in pregnant women with type 1 diabetes (CONCEPTT): a multicentre

international randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2017;390:2347–2359.

doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(17)32400-5.

42. Kristensen K, Ögge LE, Sengpiel V, Kjölhede K, Dotevall A, Elfvin A, et al. Continuous glucose monitoring in pregnant women with type 1 diabetes: an observational cohort study of 186 pregnancies. *Diabetologia* 2019;62:1143–1153. doi:10.1007/s00125-019-4850-0.
43. Murphy HR. Continuous glucose monitoring targets in type 1 diabetes pregnancy: every 5% time in range matters. *Diabetologia* 2019;62:1123–1128. doi:10.1007/s00125-019-4904-3.
44. Clinical guide for the management of people with diabetes during the coronavirus pandemic, 19 March 2020 Version 2
https://abcd.care/sites/abcd.care/files/site_uploads/speciality-guide-diabetes-19-march-v2-updated.pdf
45. Wake DJ, Gibb FW, Kar P, Kennon B, Klonoff DC, Rayman G et al. Endocrinology in the time of COVID-19: Remodelling diabetes services and emerging innovation. *Eur J Endocrinol.* 2020; 183:G67-G77. doi: 10.1530/EJE-20-0377.
46. Dover AR et al. Assessment of the effect of the COVID-19 lockdown on glycaemic control in people with type 1 diabetes using flash glucose monitoring. *Diabet Med.* 2020 Aug 2. doi: 10.1111/dme.14374
47. Fernández E et al. Impact of COVID-19 lockdown on glycemic control in patients with type 1 diabetes *Diabetes Res Clin Pract.* 2020;166 doi: 10.1016/j.diabres.2020.108348
48. Beato-Vi-bora PI et al. No deleterious effect of lockdown due to COVID-19 pandemic on glycaemic control, measured by glucose monitoring, in adults with type 1 diabetes *Diabetes Technol Ther.* 2020; May 12. doi: 10.1089/dia.2020.0184
49. Bonora BM et al. Glycaemic Control Among People with Type 1 Diabetes During Lockdown for the SARS-CoV-2 Outbreak in Italy. *Diabetes Ther.* 2020; May 11 doi: 10.1007/s13300-020-00829-7
50. Capaldo B et al. Blood Glucose Control During Lockdown for COVID-19: CGM Metrics in Italian Adults With Type 1 Diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2020; doi.org/10.2337/dc20-1127

51. Maddaloni E et al. Effects of COVID-19 Lockdown on Glucose Control: Continuous Glucose Monitoring Data From People With Diabetes on Intensive Insulin Therapy. *Diabetes Care* 2020; doi.org/10.2337/dc20-0954
52. Mesa A, Viñals C, Pueyo I, Roca D, Vidal M, Giménez M, Conget I. The impact of strict COVID-19 lockdown in Spain on glycemic profiles in patients with type 1 Diabetes prone to hypoglycemia using standalone continuous glucose monitoring. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract.* 2020; Jul 30;167:doi: 10.1016/j.diabres.2020.108354
53. Bergenstal RM, Ahmann AJ, Bailey T, Beck RW, Bissen J, Buckingham B, et al. Recommendations for Standardizing Glucose Reporting and Analysis to Optimize Clinical Decision Making in Diabetes: The Ambulatory Glucose Profile. *J Diabetes Sci Technol.* 2013;7:562–578. doi:10.1177/193229681300700234.
54. Gibb F, Jennings P, Leelarathna L and Wilmot EG. AGP in daily clinical practice: a guide for use with the FreeStyle Libre flash glucose monitoring system. *Br J Diabetes* 2020; 20:32-40. doi: 10.15277/bjd.2020.240
55. Hermanns N, Ehrmann D, Schipfer M, Kröger J, Haak T, Kulzer B. The impact of a structured education and treatment programme (FLASH) for people with diabetes using a flash sensor-based glucose monitoring system: Results of a randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract.* 2019;150:111–121. doi:10.1016/j.diabres.2019.03.003
56. Gonder-Frederick L, Shepard J, Peterson N. Closed-Loop Glucose Control: Psychological and Behavioral Considerations. *J Diabetes Sci Technol.* 2011;5:1387–1395. doi:10.1177/193229681100500610.
57. Lim STJ, Huang F, Lek N, Pereira K. Flash Continuous Home Glucose Monitoring to Improve Adherence to Self-Monitoring of Blood Glucose and Self-Efficacy in Adolescents With Type 1 Diabetes. *Clin Diabetes* 2020; 38:152–158. doi:10.2337/cd19-0051.