

Supplementary Information – Online Resource 5

Evaluating cost-utility of continuous glucose monitoring in individuals with type 1 diabetes: a systematic review of methods and quality of studies using decision models and/or empirical data.

de Jong LA^{1*} (ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8814-0670), Li X² (ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0225-6937), Emamipour S³, van der Werf S⁴ (ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5856-7657), Postma MJ^{1,5}, van Dijk PR⁶ (ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9702-6551), Feenstra TL² (ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5788-0454)

¹ Department of Health Sciences, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands

² Unit of Pharmacotherapy, -Epidemiology & -Economics, University of Groningen, Groningen Research Institute of Pharmacy (GRIP), Groningen, the Netherlands

³ Department of Clinical Pharmacy and Pharmacology, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands

⁴ Central Medical Library, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands

⁵ Department of Economics, Econometrics and Finance, Faculty of Economics & Business, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands

⁶ Department of Endocrinology. University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

*Corresponding author: t.l.feenstra@rug.nl

Table 1. Summary of type of interventions and comparators used in the studies.

Publication (author year, country)	Intervention(s)		Comparator(s)	
	Method of insulin administration	Method of CGM	Method of insulin administration	Method of CGM
Emamipour 2022, The Netherlands [1]	MDI	is-CGM (Freestyle Libre)	NR	NR
Ly 2014, Australia [2]	SAP (MiniMed Paradigm Veo)	rt-CGM	CSII	SMBG
Wan 2018, US [3]	MDI	rt-CGM (Dexcom G4 and G5)	MDI	SMBG
Bilir 2018, Sweden [4]	MDI or CSII	is-CGM (Freestyle libre)	MDI or CSII	SMBG
Chaugule 2017, Canada [5]	MDI	rt-CGM (Dexcom G5)	MDI	SMBG
Conget 2018, Spain [6]	SAP (MiniMed VEO)	rt-CGM	CSII	SMBG
Gomez 2016, Colombia [7]	SAP	rt-CGM (Enlite®Sensor)	MDI	SMBG
Isitt 2022, Australia [8]	MDI	rt-CGM (Dexcom G6)	MDI	SMBG and is-CGM
Jendle 2017, Sweden [9]	SAP (MiniMed™ 640G)	rt-CGM	CSII	SMBG
Jendle 2019, Sweden [10]	HCL (MiniMed 670 G in auto mode)	rt-CGM (Guardian 3)	CSII (MiniMed 670G in Manual mode)	SMBG
Jendle 2021, Sweden [11]	HCL (MiniMed 780G system)	rt-CGM (Guardian 3)	CSII or MDI	isCGM (FreeStyle Libre) or SMBG
Kamble 2012, US [12]	SAP (MiniMed Paradigm)	rt-CGM (Guardian REAL-Time Glucose)	MDI	SMBG
Lambadiari 2022, Greece [13]	HCL (MiniMed 780G)	rt-CGM	1) SAP (MiniMed 640G) 2) MDI	1) rt-CGM 2) is-CGM
Nicolucci 2018, Italy [14]	HCL (MiniMed 640G)	rt-CGM (Guardian™ Sensor SmartGuard™)	CSII	SMBG
Riemsma 2016, UK [15]	SAP (MiniMed Paradigm Veo and Animas Vibe)	rt-CGM (Enlite®Sensor and Dexcom G4)	MDI or CSII	SMBG or rt-CGM
Roze 2015, Sweden [16]	SAP	rt-CGM	CSII	SMBG
Roze 2016, France [17]	SAP	rt-CGM	CSII	SMBG
Roze 2016, UK [18]	SAP	rt-CGM	CSII	SMBG
Roze 2017, Denmark [19]	SAP	rt-CGM	CSII	SMBG
Roze 2019, The Netherlands [20]	SAP	rt-CGM	CSII	SMBG
Roze 2019, Turkey [21]	SAP	rt-CGM	CSII	SMBG
Roze 2020, UK [22]	MDI	rt-CGM (Dexcom G6)	MDI	SMBG

Roze 2021, Canada [23]	MDI	rt-CGM (Dexcom G6)	MDI	SMBG
Roze 2021, UK [24]	HCL (MiniMed 670G in auto mode)	rt-CGM (Guardian 3)	CSII (MiniMed 670G in Manual mode)	SMBG
Roze 2021, France [25]	MDI	rt-CGM (Dexcom G6)	MDI	SMBG
Serné 2022, The Netherlands [26]	HCL (MiniMed 670 G)	rt-CGM (Guardian 3)	MDI or CSII	is-CGM (FreeStyle Libre)
Zhao 2021, China [27]	-	is-CGM (FreeStyle Libre, FreeStyle Libre H)	-	SMBG
Garcia-Lorenzo 2018, Spain [28]	MDI or CSII	rt-CGM	MDI or CSII	SMBG
Health Quality Ontario 2018, Canada [29]	MDI, SAP, and CSII	rt-CGM	MDI or CSII	SMBG
Huang 2010, US [30]	MDI and CSII	rt-CGM (Abott Diabetes, DexCom, Medtronic)	MDI or CSII	SMBG
McQueen 2011, US [31]	Not specified	Not specified (though CGM costs suggest rt-CGM)	Not specified	SMBG
Pease 2020, Australia [32]	HCL (MiniMed 670G)	rt-CGM (Guardian 3)	MDI	SMBG
Pease 2022, Australia [33]	HCL (MiniMed 670/780)	rt-CGM (Guardian 3)	MDI or CSII	SMBG
Rotondi 2022, Canada [34]	-	rt-CGM or is-CGM	-	SMBG

Abbreviations: CGM, continuous glucose monitoring; CSII, continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion; HCL, hybrid closed loop; is-CGM, intermittently-scanned continuous glucose monitoring; MDI, multiple daily injections; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported; rt-CGM, real-time continuous glucose monitoring; SAP, sensor-augmented pump; SMBG, self-monitoring of blood glucose.

References

1. Emamipour S, van Dijk PR, Bilo HJG, Edens MA, van der Galiën O, Postma MJ, et al. Personalizing the Use of a Intermittently Scanned Continuous Glucose Monitoring (isCGM) Device in Individuals With Type 1 Diabetes: A Cost-Effectiveness Perspective in the Netherlands (FLARE-NL 9). *J Diabetes Sci Technol*. 2022 Jul 9:19322968221109841.
2. Ly TT, Brnabic AJM, Eggleston A, Kolivos A, McBride ME, Schrover R, et al. A cost-effectiveness analysis of sensor-augmented insulin pump therapy and automated insulin suspension versus standard pump therapy for hypoglycemic unaware patients with type 1 diabetes. *Value Health*. 2014;17(5):561–9.
3. Wan W, Skandari MR, Minc A, Nathan AG, Winn A, Zarei P, et al. Cost-effectiveness of Continuous Glucose Monitoring for Adults With Type 1 Diabetes Compared With Self-Monitoring of Blood Glucose: The DIAMOND Randomized Trial. *Diabetes Care*. 2018 Jun 1;41(6):1227–34.

4. Bilir SP, Hellmund R, Wehler B, Li H, Munakata J, Lamotte M. Cost-effectiveness Analysis of a Flash Glucose Monitoring System for Patients with Type 1 Diabetes Receiving Intensive Insulin Treatment in Sweden. *Eur Endocrinol*. 2018 Sep 1;14(2):73–9.
5. Chaugule S, Graham C. Cost-effectiveness of G5 Mobile continuous glucose monitoring device compared to self-monitoring of blood glucose alone for people with type 1 diabetes from the Canadian societal perspective. *J Med Econ*. 2017 Nov 2;20(11):1128–35.
6. Conget I, Martín-Vaquero P, Roze S, Elías I, Pineda C, Álvarez M, et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of sensor-augmented pump therapy with low glucose-suspend in patients with type 1 diabetes mellitus and high risk of hypoglycemia in Spain. *Endocrinol Diabetes Nutr*. 2018 Aug 1;65(7):380–6.
7. Gomez AM, Alfonso-Cristancho R, Orozco JJ, Lynch PM, Prieto D, Saunders R, et al. Clinical and economic benefits of integrated pump/CGM technology therapy in patients with type 1 diabetes in Colombia. *Endocrinol Nutr*. 2016 Nov 1;63(9):466–74.
8. Isitt JJ, Roze S. Long-term cost-effectiveness of Dexcom G6 real-time continuous glucose monitoring system in people with type 1 diabetes in Australia: Response to letter from Hellmund, Richard and Welsh, Zoe. *Diabet Med*. 2023 Feb 1;40(2).
9. Jendle J, Smith-Palmer J, Delbaere A, de Portu S, Papo N, Valentine W, et al. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Sensor-Augmented Insulin Pump Therapy with Automated Insulin Suspension Versus Standard Insulin Pump Therapy in Patients with Type 1 Diabetes in Sweden. *Diabetes Ther*. 2017 Oct 1;8(5):1015–30.
10. Jendle J, Pöhlmann J, De Portu S, Smith-Palmer J, Roze S. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of the MiniMed 670G Hybrid Closed-Loop System Versus Continuous Subcutaneous Insulin Infusion for Treatment of Type 1 Diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther*. 2019 Mar 1;21(3):110–8.
11. Jendle J, Buompiersiere MI, Holm AL, de Portu S, Malkin SJP, Cohen O. The Cost-Effectiveness of an Advanced Hybrid Closed-Loop System in People with Type 1 Diabetes: a Health Economic Analysis in Sweden. *Diabetes Ther*. 2021 Nov 1;12(11):2977–91.
12. Kamble S, Schulman KA, Reed SD. Cost-effectiveness of sensor-augmented pump therapy in adults with type 1 diabetes in the United States. *Value Health*. 2012 Jul;15(5):632–8.
13. Lambadiari V, Ozdemir Saltik AZ, De Portu S, Buompiersiere MI, Kountouri A, Korakas E, et al. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of an Advanced Hybrid Closed-Loop Insulin Delivery System in People with Type 1 Diabetes in Greece. *Diabetes Technol Ther*. 2022 May 1;24(5):316–23.
14. Nicolucci A, Rossi MC, D’Ostilio D, Delbaere A, de Portu S, Roze S. Cost-effectiveness of sensor-augmented pump therapy in two different patient populations with type 1 diabetes in Italy. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis*. 2018 Jul 1;28(7):707–15.
15. Riemsma R, Ramos IC, Birnie R, Büyükkaramikli N, Armstrong N, Ryder S, et al. Integrated sensor-augmented pump therapy systems [the MiniMed® Paradigm™ Veo system and the Vibe™ and G4® PLATINUM CGM (continuous glucose monitoring) system] for managing blood glucose levels in type 1 diabetes: a systematic review and economic evaluation. *Health Technol Assess* 2016 Feb 1;20(17):1–252.
16. Roze S, Saunders R, Brandt AS, de Portu S, Papo NL, Jendle J. Health-economic analysis of real-time continuous glucose monitoring in people with Type 1 diabetes. *Diabet Med*. 2015 May 1;32(5):618–26.
17. Roze S, Smith-Palmer J, Valentine W, Payet V, De Portu S, Papo N, et al. Cost-Effectiveness of Sensor-Augmented Pump Therapy with Low Glucose Suspend Versus Standard Insulin Pump Therapy in Two Different Patient Populations with Type 1 Diabetes in France. *Diabetes Technol Ther*. 2016 Feb 1;18(2):75–84.
18. Roze S, Smith-Palmer J, Valentine WJ, Cook M, Jethwa M, De Portu S, et al. Long-term health economic benefits of sensor-augmented pump therapy vs continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion alone in type 1 diabetes: a U.K. perspective. *J Med Econ*. 2016 Mar 3;19(3):236–42.
19. Roze S, de Portu S, Smith-Palmer J, Delbaere A, Valentine W, Ridderstråle M. Cost-effectiveness of sensor-augmented pump therapy versus standard insulin pump therapy in patients with type 1 diabetes in Denmark. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract*. 2017 Jun 1;128:6–14.

20. Roze S, Smith-Palmer J, De Portu S, Delbaere A, De Brouwer B, De Valk HW. Cost-effectiveness of sensor-augmented insulin pump therapy vs continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion in patients with type 1 diabetes in the Netherlands. *Clinicoecon Outcomes Res.* 2019;11:73–82.
21. Roze S, Smith-Palmer J, De Portu S, Özdemir Saltik AZ, Akgül T, Deyneli O. Cost-Effectiveness of Sensor-Augmented Insulin Pump Therapy Versus Continuous Insulin Infusion in Patients with Type 1 Diabetes in Turkey. *Diabetes Technol Ther.* 2019 Dec 1;21(12):727–35.
22. Roze S, Isitt J, Smith-Palmer J, Javanbakht M, Lynch P. Long-term Cost-Effectiveness of Dexcom G6 Real-time Continuous Glucose Monitoring Versus Self-Monitoring of Blood Glucose in Patients With Type 1 Diabetes in the U.K. *Diabetes Care.* 2020 Oct 1;43(10):2411–7.
23. Roze S, Isitt JJ, Smith-Palmer J, Lynch P. Evaluation of the Long-Term Cost-Effectiveness of the Dexcom G6 Continuous Glucose Monitor versus Self-Monitoring of Blood Glucose in People with Type 1 Diabetes in Canada. *Clinicoecon Outcomes Res.* 2021;13:717–25.
24. Roze S, Buompiensiere MI, Ozdemir Z, de Portu S, Cohen O. Cost-effectiveness of a novel hybrid closed-loop system compared with continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion in people with type 1 diabetes in the UK. *J Med Econ.* 2021;24(1):883–90.
25. Roze S, Isitt JJ, Smith-Palmer J, Lynch P, Klinkenbijn B, Zammit G, et al. Long-Term Cost-Effectiveness the Dexcom G6 Real-Time Continuous Glucose Monitoring System Compared with Self-Monitoring of Blood Glucose in People with Type 1 Diabetes in France. *Diabetes Ther.* 2021 Jan 1;12(1):235–46.
26. Serné EH, Roze S, Buompiensiere MI, Valentine WJ, De Portu S, de Valk HW. Cost-Effectiveness of Hybrid Closed Loop Insulin Pumps Versus Multiple Daily Injections Plus Intermittently Scanned Glucose Monitoring in People With Type 1 Diabetes in The Netherlands. *Adv Ther.* 2022 Apr 1;39(4):1844–56.
27. Zhao X, Ming J, Qu S, Li HJ, Wu J, Ji L, et al. Cost-Effectiveness of Flash Glucose Monitoring for the Management of Patients with Type 1 and Patients with Type 2 Diabetes in China. *Diabetes Ther.* 2021 Dec 1;12(12):3079–92.
28. García-Lorenzo B, Rivero-Santana A, Vallejo-Torres L, Castilla-Rodríguez I, García-Pérez S, García-Pérez L, et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of real-time continuous monitoring glucose compared to self-monitoring of blood glucose for diabetes mellitus in Spain. *J Eval Clin Pract.* 2018 Aug 1;24(4):772–81.
29. Continuous Monitoring of Glucose for Type 1 Diabetes: A Health Technology Assessment. Ontario; 2018 Feb.
30. Huang ES, O’Grady M, Basu A, Winn A, John P, Lee J, et al. The cost-effectiveness of continuous glucose monitoring in type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care.* 2010 Jun;33(6):1269–74.
31. McQueen RB, Ellis SL, Campbell JD, Nair K V., Sullivan PW. Cost-effectiveness of continuous glucose monitoring and intensive insulin therapy for type 1 diabetes. *Cost Eff Resour Alloc.* 2011 Sep 14;9.
32. Pease A, Zomer E, Liew D, Earnest A, Soldatos G, Ademi Z, et al. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of a Hybrid Closed-Loop System Versus Multiple Daily Injections and Capillary Glucose Testing for Adults with Type 1 Diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther.* 2020 Nov 1;22(11):812–21.
33. Pease A, Callander E, Zomer E, Abraham MB, Davis EA, Jones TW, et al. The Cost of Control: Cost-effectiveness Analysis of Hybrid Closed-Loop Therapy in Youth. *Diabetes Care.* 2022 Sep 1;45(9):1971–80.
34. Rotondi MA, Wong O, Riddell M, Perkins B. Population-Level Impact and Cost-effectiveness of Continuous Glucose Monitoring and Intermittently Scanned Continuous Glucose Monitoring Technologies for Adults With Type 1 Diabetes in Canada: A Modeling Study. *Diabetes Care.* 2022 Sep 1;45(9):2012–9.