CGM PAYER INSIGHTS

Optimize Outcomes in Insulin-Treated T1 and T2D via Evidence-Based Coverage Criteria with **Real-Time CONTINUOUS GLUCOSE MONITORING**

The new standard of care for members with insulin-treated T1 and T2D. real-time continuous glucose monitoring (rtCGM) enhances member outcomes, safety, and experience, with cost-savings across the lifespan.¹⁻⁹



68% and 100%, respectively





An expert panel representing the ADA, Endocrine Society, and AACE determined that current payer CGM coverage criteria through the DME benefit can be overly restrictive and may not be supported by scientific evidence.

treating hypoglycemia

According to the panel, basic steps can be taken to remedy overly restrictive criteria that delay or deny access in clinically appropriate member demographics, such as the following:¹¹⁻²⁰

Eliminate Intensive Insulin F Regimen Requirements for T2D

Use of CGM in T2D patients confers significant benefit in HbA1c, TIR, TBR, and hospitalizations regardless of insulin regimen.

Streamline Documentation 昆 for Coverage

Most physicians cite that prior authorizations delay patient treatment and negatively impact clinical outcomes. Many patients who would benefit from CGM do not meet current coverage criteria.



Access the full article: https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/pdf/10.1089/dia.2021.0107

TIR-time in range; TBR-time below range; SH-severe hypoglycemia; DKA-diabetic ketoacidosis; LOS-length of stay; SMBG=self-monitoring of blood glucose; DTT=Diabetes Technology & Therapeutics



MANAGED CARE

- ↓ Fewer diabetes-related
- ED visits over 2.5 years with early initiation of rtCGM
- ↓ 50% reduction in NICU costs in pregnancy with fewer admissions and shortened LOS
- ↓ Associated with 35% fewer hospitalizations and 52% fewer ER visits compared to SMBG over 6 months
- Associated with an average PMPM cost savings of \$41710

Provided by: Impact Education

The panel proposed new, evidence-based criteria for the coverage of CGM in insulin-treated T1 and T2D regardless of insulin regimen:^{1-7, 11-19}

PROPOSED CRITERION	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
Diagnosed with T1D	 CGM use confers: ✓ Significant reductions in HbA1c severe hypoglycemia events %TBR diabetes-related hospitalizations ✓ Significant improvements in %TIR treatment satisfaction with less diabetes distress
Diagnosed with T2D and treated with any insulin therapy	CGM use confers: ↓ Significant reductions in • HbA1c • %TBR • diabetes-related hospitalizations ↑ Significant increases in %TIR
Diagnosed with T2D and documented problematic hypoglycemia regardless of diabetes therapy	 CGM use confers: ✓ Significant reductions in diabetes-related hospitalizations, including severe hypoglycemia events hypoglycemia fear and ↑ Increased patient confidence in avoiding/treating hypoglycemia, thereby supporting treatment adherence
Chronic kidney disease (CKD)	 CGM use facilitates: More frequent treatment changes and improved glycemic control without increased risk of hypoglycemia Effective monitoring and managing of glycemic levels in nondiabetes patients with ESRD undergoing dialysis
In-person or telemedicine consultation with the prescribing healthcare provider prior to CGM initiation and every 6 months thereafter while	 Use of telemedicine consults: ↓ Significantly reduces the incidence of severe hypoglycemia events diabetes-related distress ↑ Significantly improves medication adherence Effectively addresses the obstacles caused by the COVID-19 pandemic Are more effective for patients who are residents of cities and using the websites as their intervention method Use of downloaded CGM data into standardized reports:
continuing CGM therapy	 Supports patient education Enhances patient engagement in their self-management

Payers can confer an immediate positive impact on their member populations with insulin-treated T1 and T2D by streamlining coverage criteria for rtCGM and facilitating access via the pharmacy channel to maximize efficiencies for both patients and providers.







Days vs weeks of wait time, saving providers and patients valuable time

- 1. Šoupal J, Petruželková L, Grunberger G, et al. Glycemic Outcomes in Adults with T1D Are Impacted More by Continuous Glucose Monitoring Than by Insulin Delivery Method: 3 Years of Follow-Up from The COMISAIR Study. Diabetes Care 2020 Jan; 43(1): 37-43.
- 2. Šoupal J, Petruželková L, Flekač M, et al. Comparison of different treatment modalities for type 1 diabetes, including sensor-augmented insulin regimens, in 52 weeks of follow-up: a COMISAIR study. Diabetes Technol Ther. 2016;18(9):532-538.
- 3. Dunkley, AJ, Fitzpatrick C, Gray LJ, et al. Incidence and severity of hypoglycaemia in type 2 diabetes by treatment regimen: A UK multisite 12-month prospective observational study. Diabetes Obes Metab 2019;21:1585-1595
- 4 Charleer S Mathieu C Nobels E et al. Effect of Continuous Glucose Monitoring on Glycemic Control. Acute Admissions, and Quality of Life: A Real-World Study. *Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2018;103(3):1224–1232.
- 5. Bergenstal RM, Layne JE, Zisser H, et al. Remote Application and Use of Real-Time Continuous Glucose Monitoring by Adults with Type 2 Diabetes in a Virtual Diabetes Clinic, Diabetes Technol Ther, 2021;23(2):128-132.
- Hirsch IB, Kerr MSD, Roberts GJ, et al. Utilization of Continuous Glucose Monitors is Associated with Reduction in Inpatient and Outpatient Emergency Acute Diabetes Events Regardless of Prior Blood Test Strip Usage. Diabetes 2020 Jun: (Supplement 1):875-P.
- 7. Mullinacci et al. Diabetes Technol Ther. 2019;21(1):6-10

- 8. Feig et al. Lancet 2017;390(19119):2347-2359.
- 9. Puckrein et al. Diabetes 2020:69(Suppl 1):68-LB
- 10. Isaacson B, Kaufusi S, Sorensen J, et al. Demonstrating the Clinical Impact of Continuous Glucose Monitoring Within an Integrated Healthcare Delivery System. Journal of Diabetes Science and Technology. September 2020. 11. Galindo RJ, Parkin CG, Aleppo G, Carlson AL, Kruger DF, Levy CJ, Umpierrez GE, McGill JB, What's Wrong with This
- Picture? A Critical Review of Current Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Coverage Criteria for Continuous Glucose Monitoring. Diabetes Technol Ther. 2021 Apr 27. doi: 10.1089/dia.2021.0107. 12. Beck RW et al. Ann Intern Med 2017;167:365–374.
- 13. Vigersky RA et al. Diabetes Care. 2012;35(1):32-38. 14. Majithia AR et al. J Med Internet Res. 2020; 22(8): e21778.
- 15. Haak T et al. Diabetes Ther. 2017;8:573-586.
- Haak T et al. Diabetes Ther. 2017;8(1):55–73.
 Gehlaut RR et al. J Diabetes Sci Technol. 2015; 9(5)999–1005.
- Hollander PA et al. Diabetes Obes Metab. 2019;21(11):2413-2421.
- Huynh P et al. Endocrine Practice. 2018;24(5):489-491.
 20. 2017 AMA Prior Authorization Physician Survey. American Medical Association (AMA) website. Published 2018.
- Accessed April 2021. https://www.ama-assn.org/sites/ama-assn.org/files/corp/media-browser/public/arc/