# CGM offers tighter glucose control for type 2 diabetes on dialysis

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 4 August 2026 · Edited by William Lopes

Managing type 2 diabetes in patients with end-stage kidney disease (ESKD) undergoing hemodialysis presents a unique and persistent clinical challenge. Traditional glucose monitoring methods are often inadequate, leading to significant glycemic variability and increased risk of both hypoglycemia and hyperglycemia. This patient population faces a heightened risk of cardiovascular events and mortality, making effective glucose management a critical, yet often elusive, goal.

**KEY TAKEAWAYS**

- The Pivot: Continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) provides a more accurate and comprehensive picture of glycemic fluctuations in hemodialysis patients than traditional methods.
- The Data: CGM use is associated with improved time in range and reduced glycemic variability in this complex patient group.
- The Action: Clinicians should consider integrating CGM into the diabetes management plans for their type 2 diabetes patients undergoing hemodialysis.

Patients with type 2 diabetes who also require hemodialysis represent a particularly vulnerable and complex subgroup. The interplay between impaired renal function, the dialysis process itself, and the metabolic derangements of diabetes creates a volatile glycemic environment. Standard glucose monitoring, typically involving intermittent finger-prick blood glucose measurements, provides only snapshots of glucose levels, often missing critical episodes of hypoglycemia or hyperglycemia that occur between readings or during dialysis sessions. This incomplete picture hinders effective treatment adjustments and contributes to suboptimal glycemic control.

The unmet need for better glucose management tools in this population is substantial. Glycemic variability, characterized by wide swings in blood glucose, is independently associated with adverse outcomes in ESKD patients, including increased cardiovascular morbidity and mortality. Hypoglycemia, a common and dangerous complication, is particularly problematic in dialysis patients due to altered drug pharmacokinetics, reduced renal gluconeogenesis, and the potential for delayed symptom recognition. Conversely, persistent hyperglycemia contributes to microvascular and macrovascular complications, even in the context of ESKD.

## The limitations of conventional monitoring

Conventional self-monitoring of blood glucose (SMBG) relies on patient adherence and provides only discrete data points. For patients on hemodialysis, these measurements are often taken at inconvenient times, such as before or after dialysis, and may not capture the dynamic changes that occur during the dialysis procedure itself. Dialysis can influence glucose levels through various mechanisms, including glucose diffusion across the dialyzer membrane, changes in insulin clearance, and alterations in fluid balance. A single pre- or post-dialysis reading offers little insight into these fluctuations.

Glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c) is also a less reliable indicator of long-term glycemic control in ESKD patients. Factors such as anemia, erythropoietin-stimulating agent use, and shortened red blood cell lifespan can artificially lower HbA1c values, making it difficult to accurately assess average glucose levels. This unreliability means clinicians often lack a clear, consistent metric to guide therapeutic decisions, leading to a trial-and-error approach that can expose patients to unnecessary risks.

## How continuous glucose monitoring works

Continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) systems offer a more comprehensive approach by measuring interstitial glucose levels every few minutes, providing a continuous stream of data. These devices consist of a small sensor inserted under the skin, typically on the arm or abdomen, which transmits data wirelessly to a receiver or smartphone. The data can then be reviewed by both the patient and the clinician, revealing trends, patterns, and specific events that would be missed by intermittent finger-prick tests.

CGM provides several metrics beyond simple glucose values. Time in Range (TIR), defined as the percentage of time glucose levels remain within a target range (e.g., 3.9-10.0 mmol/L), has emerged as a crucial endpoint for assessing glycemic control. Other valuable metrics include Time Below Range (TBR) and Time Above Range (TAR), which quantify exposure to hypoglycemia and hyperglycemia, respectively. CGM also calculates the Glucose Management Indicator (GMI), an estimate of average glucose that can be more reliable than HbA1c in populations with altered red blood cell turnover.

## The clinical utility in dialysis patients

The application of CGM in type 2 diabetes patients undergoing hemodialysis has shown clear benefits. By providing real-time and retrospective data, CGM empowers both patients and clinicians to make more informed decisions about insulin dosing, oral antidiabetic agents, and dietary adjustments. The ability to visualize glucose trends throughout the day and night, including during and between dialysis sessions, allows for targeted interventions to mitigate glycemic excursions.

For instance, CGM can identify post-dialysis hypoglycemia, a common and often asymptomatic event. It can also detect nocturnal hypoglycemia, which is particularly dangerous as patients may not wake up to symptoms. Armed with this information, clinicians can adjust insulin regimens to prevent these episodes, improving patient safety and quality of life. The detailed glucose profiles also help to identify patterns of hyperglycemia, allowing for more precise titration of glucose-lowering medications.

The data generated by CGM can also facilitate patient education and engagement. When patients can see the immediate impact of their food choices, physical activity, or medication adherence on their glucose levels, they are often more motivated to make lifestyle changes. This direct feedback loop is a powerful tool for self-management, particularly in a complex condition like diabetes compounded by ESKD. For a deeper understanding of diabetes management, the Oxford Handbook of Endocrinology and Diabetes offers a practical reference.

## Addressing the practical considerations

Implementing CGM in hemodialysis patients is not without its practical considerations. The cost of devices and sensors can be a barrier, although increasing evidence of clinical benefit may lead to broader reimbursement. Patient education is paramount to ensure proper sensor insertion, data interpretation, and device maintenance. Some patients may experience skin irritation at the sensor site, though modern sensors are generally well-tolerated.

Another consideration is the potential for interference from the dialysis process itself. While most modern CGM systems are designed to be robust, clinicians must be aware of any potential artifacts or inaccuracies that could arise. However, studies have generally shown CGM to be accurate and reliable in this population, providing clinically meaningful data that outweighs these minor concerns.

The integration of CGM data into electronic health records and clinical workflows is also important. User-friendly software that presents glucose data in an actionable format can streamline the review process for busy clinicians. Training for healthcare providers on how to interpret CGM reports and translate them into therapeutic adjustments is essential to maximize the benefits of this technology.

## The path forward

The evidence supporting CGM use in type 2 diabetes patients on hemodialysis points towards a clear advantage over traditional monitoring methods. While specific trial data with hard endpoints like cardiovascular events or mortality are still evolving, the improvements in glycemic control, reduction in glycemic variability, and increased time in range are compelling. These intermediate outcomes are strongly associated with better long-term prognosis in diabetes.

The shift towards a more proactive and data-driven approach to diabetes management in ESKD patients is overdue. CGM offers the tools to achieve this, moving beyond reactive adjustments based on limited data. It provides the granularity needed to navigate the unique challenges of glucose control in this complex population, ultimately aiming to reduce complications and improve patient outcomes. The widespread adoption of CGM in this setting would represent a significant step forward in personalized diabetes care.

### CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

For too long, diabetes management in hemodialysis patients has been a frustrating exercise in approximation. The unreliability of HbA1c and the inherent limitations of intermittent glucose checks have left clinicians flying blind, making educated guesses about insulin adjustments in a patient group highly susceptible to both hypo- and hyperglycemia. CGM finally offers a way out of this predicament.

The data from CGM provides a level of detail that fundamentally changes the conversation with patients. Seeing the real-time impact of a meal or a missed insulin dose can be far more impactful than abstract advice. This visual feedback loop can significantly enhance patient engagement and adherence, which are critical for effective diabetes management in any population, but especially in those with complex comorbidities.

Integrating CGM into routine practice for these patients should become standard. While there are initial costs and a learning curve for both patients and staff, the potential to reduce dangerous glycemic excursions and improve overall control outweighs these hurdles. This is not merely a convenience; it is a necessity for providing optimal care to a high-risk group.

Payers and healthcare systems must recognize the long-term benefits of preventing complications associated with poor glycemic control. Investing in CGM for hemodialysis patients with type 2 diabetes is a proactive

> measure that could ultimately reduce hospitalizations, emergency department visits, and the overall burden of diabetes-related complications.

## EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used solely to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. No AI-generated conclusions appear in The Life Science Feed without editor verification against the primary source.

## REFERENCES

1. 1. Accili D, Deng Z, Liu Q. Insulin resistance in type 2 diabetes mellitus. Nat Rev Endocrinol. 2025;21(7):413-426. doi:10.1038/s41574-025-01114-y
2. 2. Toi PL, Anothaisintawee T, Chaikledkaew U, Briones JR, Reutrakul S, Thakkinstian A. Preventive Role of Diet Interventions and Dietary Factors in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: An Umbrella Review. Nutrients. 2020;12(9). doi:10.3390/nu12092722
3. 3. Javeed N, Matveyenko AV. Circadian Etiology of Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. Physiology (Bethesda). 2018;33(2):138-150. doi:10.1152/physiol.00003.2018
4. 4. Milenkovic T, Bozhinovska N, Macut D, et al. Mediterranean Diet and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A Perpetual Inspiration for the Scientific World. A Review. Nutrients. 2021;13(4). doi:10.3390/nu13041307
5. 5. Wang L, Li L, Liu J, et al. Associated factors and principal pathophysiological mechanisms of type 2 diabetes mellitus. Front Endocrinol (Lausanne). 2025;16:1499565. doi:10.3389/fendo.2025.1499565
6. 6. Churuangsuk C, Hall J, Reynolds A, Griffin SJ, Combet E, Lean MEJ. Diets for weight management in adults with type 2 diabetes: an umbrella review of published meta-analyses and systematic review of trials of diets for diabetes remission. Diabetologia. 2022;65(1):14-36. doi:10.1007/s00125-021-05577-2

## LICENCE & RIGHTS



## MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.