Study rationale

• The MiniMed™ 780G System has shown to be safe and to significantly improve glycemic control, compared to baseline or control treatment group in clinical trials and in real life\(^1\)\(^3\).
• Carb counting is an essential component of diabetes management in both adults and children and associated with lower HbA1c and is still very important in automatic insulin delivery systems as per system design.
• Carb counting is very burdensome, and frequently done inconsistently and with poor accuracy especially in adolescents.

About the MiniMed™ 780G system

• The MiniMed™ 780G system contains an advanced hybrid closed loop (AHCL) algorithm that automates the delivery of both basal and correction insulin boluses every 5 minutes based on sensor glucose values, adapting to the individual’s unique insulin needs.
• The AHCL algorithm targets a glucose level which can be adjusted by the user to be 100 (5.5), 110 (6.1) or 120 (6.7) mg/dL (mmol/L), based on individuals’ needs.

Study objectives

• To compare glucose control in adolescents with Type 1 Diabetes (T1D) on MiniMed™ 780G system who used simplified meal announcement to those who used precise carbohydrate counting.

Key points

• 6.8% TIR difference in favor of the flex group
• No difference in the other glycemic metrics
• Double the proportion of autocorrection boluses in fix group
• Simplified meal announcement is a valuable alternative

Study type

• Randomized Controlled Trial
• Fix meal vs Flex meal announcements
• 12 weeks
• 36 subjects:
  • Type 1 diabetes ≥ 12 months
  • Aged 12-18
  • MDI or pump therapy

Parameters assessed

• Time spent in the glycemic ranges
• HbA1c
• Insulin use
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Study design and methods

• This is a randomized controlled trial at 1 site, Sidra Medicine, Qatar, enrolling patients aged 12-18 years, with T1D duration ≥1 year and using multiple daily injections (MDI) or pump therapy.

• The study consists of a 7-day run-in period to assess carb counting skills and carb intake using a food diary. After randomization, the subjects of both groups followed a 10-day initiation protocol4 on the MiniMed™ 780G system and continued with a 12-week study phase. (Figure 1)

• Subjects were randomly assigned to the Fix group (simplified meal announcement by preset of 3 personalized fixed carbohydrate amounts) or the Flex group (precise carbohydrate counting).

• The 3 fixed-carbohydrate amounts were set as follows and personalized based on the 7-day run-in food diary:
  • regular meal at 40 to 70 grams
  • large meal at 60 to 90 grams
  • snack at 15 to 20 grams

• The primary endpoint was the between-group difference in TIR (70-180 mg/dL - 3.9-10.0 mmol/L) in the 12-week study phase. Secondary endpoints were between-group differences in HbA1c, other CGM derived metrics for glycemic control, metrics for meal announcement and insulin use, metrics for system settings, and safety.

Figure 1: Study design

Prof. Petrovski’s Initiation protocol4
10 days

* no insulin delivered by the MiniMed™ 780G system

Study results

• Subjects were recruited between November 2021 and February 2022, and 34 subjects were randomly allocated to either the Fix group (N=17) or the Flex Group (N=17); all subjects completed the 12-week study period.

Glycemic control

• Subjects in both groups spent a significantly greater proportion of time in range during the study phase compared to baseline (run-in phase), with a significant 6.8% TIR difference in favor of the flex group during the study phase (TIR: 80.3% and 73.5%, respectively, P<0.043, 95% CI 4.1-9.2) (Figure 2).

• No difference was shown between groups in the other glycemic parameters except for time above 250 mg/dL (13.9 mmol/L). (Figure 2)

• HbA1c decreased in both groups compared to baseline; from 8.0 ± 2.1% to 6.8 ± 0.3% in the Fix group and from 7.9 ± 1.5% to 6.6 ± 0.5% in the Flex group, without a group difference (P=0.168).

• In the Fix group and in the Flex group, most of the subjects achieved the glycemic targets of HbA1c <7% (70% vs 75%, respectively), of TIR >70% (67% vs 72%, respectively), and of TBR <4% (82% vs 86%, respectively).
**Insulin delivery**

- Subjects in the Fix group announced fewer meals per day compared with the Flex group ($P = 0.003$), but the total daily announced carbohydrates did not differ between the groups. (Figure 3)
- While the total daily insulin dose did not differ, the proportion of insulin delivered by autocorrection was doubled in the Fix group versus the Flex group ($P = 0.003$). (Figure 3)
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**Figure 2: Glycemic control outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean SG, mg/dL</th>
<th>Mean SG, mmol/L</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Mean SG, mg/dL</th>
<th>Mean SG, mmol/L</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Group Δ ( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>174 ± 26</td>
<td>9.7 ± 1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>168 ± 29</td>
<td>9.3 ± 1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>147 ± 23</td>
<td>8.2 ± 1.3</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>145 ± 18</td>
<td>8.1 ± 1</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time in ranges, %</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Time in ranges, %</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Δ ( p )</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                          |                  |                  |       |                  |                  |       |                  |       |
| Baseline                 |                  |                  |       |                  |                  |       |                  |       |
| Study                    |                  |                  |       |                  |                  |       |                  |       |
| Group Δ \( p \)          |                  |                  |       |                  |                  |       |                  |       |

---

**Figure 3: Insulin delivery outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fix Weeks 9-12</th>
<th>Flex Weeks 9-12</th>
<th>Group Δ ( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meals, n per day</td>
<td>3.7 ± 0.9</td>
<td>5.1 ± 1.1</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbs, g/day</td>
<td>165 ± 66</td>
<td>178 ± 65</td>
<td>0.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDD, u/day</td>
<td>60.8 ± 10.2</td>
<td>60.1 ± 8.8</td>
<td>0.813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
System use

- No group difference was observed in the sensor and pump use nor in the number of exits.
- The optimal settings, active insulin time of 2 hours and glucose target of 100 mg/dL (5.6 mmol/L), were both used by 94% of the subjects.

Safety

- No episodes of severe hypoglycemia nor DKA were reported in either group.

Conclusion

- Precise carbohydrate counting reaches to better TIR in adolescents using the MiniMed™ 780G system users when compared to simplified meal announcement, but HbA1c and mean SG were comparable.
- Simplified meal announcement on average reached the international target criteria and is therefore a valuable alternative in those adolescents that cannot or do not want to count carbohydrates.
- Lower precision in carb counting is overcome by increased automated insulin delivery.
- Meal management with precise carbohydrate counting further improves outcomes, and thus carbohydrate estimation skills remain important.
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