CGM PAYER INSIGHTS

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





OUTCOMES

- Significant improvements across a wide range of glycemic measures
 - **↑** TIR
- **↓** HbA1c
- **↓** TBR
- Demonstrated HbA1c reduction in alignment with current HEDIS quality measures



SAFFT\

- Problematic hypoglycemia has been reported in T2D patients treated with less intensive and non-insulin regimens
- TtCGM significantly reduces the incidence of hospitalizations associated with SH
- Reduced 3-yr rates for SH and DKA in adults by 68% and 100%, respectively



EXPERIENCE

- Remote application of rtCGM with less intensive treatment regimens offers significant glycemic improvements, creates valuable teaching opportunities, promotes desired self-care behaviors
- • Increases patient confidence in avoiding/ treating hypoglycemia



MANAGED CARE

COST

- 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

Expert Panel Recommendations



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.

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 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 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



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:
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 continuing CGM therapy	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: · 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.



No prior authorization requirements



Point-of-sale adjudication via automated step edits



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.
- 6. 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.

 - 16. Haak T et al. *Diabetes Ther*. 2017;8(1):55-73. 17. Gehlaut RR et al. *J Diabetes Sci Technol*. 2015; 9(5)999-1005.
- 18. Hollander PA et al. *Diabetes Obes Metab.* 2019;21(11):2413-2421.
- Huynh P et al. Endocrine Practice. 2018;24(5):499-491.
 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/