

Practice of Hyperglycaemia Control in Intensive Care Units of the Military Hospital, Sudan - Needs of a Protocol

1. **Ghada Omer Hamad Abd El-Raheem**, Intensive Care Unit, Military Hospital, Khartoum, Sudan.

& University of Medical Sciences and Technology UMST, High Diploma in Research Methodology and Biostatistics, Khartoum, Sudan. P.O. Box 12810, Mecca street, Khartoum, Sudan, E-mail: ghadaomer90@gmail.com. Phone numbers: +249922572830 / + 249902623636

2. **Mudawi Mohammed Ahmed Abdallah** Intensive Care Unit, Military Hospital, Medical Manager of Critical Care Department. Military Hospital, Omdurman, Khartoum, Sudan. E-mail: mudawi81@gmail.com. Phone: +249 123229555

3. **Mounkaila Noma**. University of Medical Sciences and Technology, P.O. Box 12810, Mecca street, Khartoum, Sudan. E-mail: mounkailanoma@gmail.com / noma.mounkaila@umst-edu.sd. Phone: +249 91 647 5305

*Corresponding author: ghadaomer90@gmail.com.

28 **Abstract**

29 Hyperglycaemia is a major risk factor in critically ill patients as it leads to adverse outcomes and
30 mortality in diabetic and non-diabetic patients. The target blood glucose remained controversial; this
31 study aimed to contribute in assessing the practice of hyperglycaemia control in intensive care units
32 of Khartoum Military Hospital. Furthermore, it proposed a protocol for hyperglycaemia control
33 based on findings. A hospital-based cross-sectional study assessed the awareness and practice
34 towards hyperglycaemia management in a sample of 83 healthcare staff selected through stratified
35 random sampling technique. In addition, 55 patients were enrolled, through quota sampling, after
36 excluding those with diabetic ketoacidosis, hyperosmolar-hyperglycaemic state and patients < 18
37 years. A self-administrated questionnaire enabled to collect data from healthcare staff, patients data
38 were extracted from medical records. SPSS 23 was used to analyse the collected data. Chi-square
39 and ANOVA tests assessed the association among variables. All statistical tests were considered
40 statistically significant when $p < 0.05$. The training on hyperglycaemia control differed statistically
41 ($p= 0.017$) among healthcare staff. The target glycaemic level (140-180 mg/dl) was knew by 11.1%
42 of the study participants. Neither the knowledge nor the practice of hyperglycaemia control methods
43 differed among staff ($p> 0.05$). The use of sliding scale was 79.3% across the ICUs with a
44 statistically significant difference ($p= 0.002$). 31.5% of patients had received glycaemic control
45 based on different methods and 11.8% were in the targeted blood glucose level. Sliding scale was the
46 prevalent method used by doctors (71.4%) and nurses (81.6%). A patient benefited from insulin
47 infusion method, which achieved the NICE-SUGAR target. The poor knowledge and lack of
48 awareness towards hyperglycaemia monitoring led to inappropriate implementation of glycaemia
49 control methods across the Military Hospital ICUs. Sustained training programs on hyperglycaemia
50 control to ICU staff and the availability of a protocol on glycaemia control are highly required.

51 **Keywords:** Local protocol, Hyperglycaemia control, Intensive Care Unit, critically ill, Sudan.

52

53

54 **Introduction**

55 Hyperglycaemia is a major risk factor affecting critically ill patients leading to adverse outcomes and
56 a high mortality in diabetic and non-diabetic patients [1-4]. Stressful situations, as acute illness and
57 surgery in particular neurosurgery, elevate the levels of stress hormones and increase hepatic glucose
58 production, lipolysis and insulin resistance [5-7]. The stress cascade increases by 7-8 folds in patients
59 undergoing surgery [8, 9] leading to more than three folds increase in post-surgical complications
60 and by six folds for mortality [7]. The target blood glucose (BG) had been controversial. Leuven 1
61 study was the first landmark clinical trial that revealed the benefits of reduced morbidity and
62 mortality related to intensive insulin therapy (IIT) in surgical critically ill patients [3, 10]. However,
63 the second Leuven trial with a higher hypoglycaemia rate, pointed out that in medical intensive care
64 unit (ICU) patients, there was a no statistically significant difference in mortality rate between tight
65 blood glucose group (80-110 mg/dl) and control group [2, 3, 10]. In 2009, the practice changed
66 following the publication of the Normoglycaemia in Intensive Care Evaluation (NICE) and Survival
67 Using Glucose Algorithm Regulation (SUGAR) trial [11]. It revealed that the mortality and the
68 hypoglycaemia increased in the intensive insulin therapy group compared to the conventional group.
69 Furthermore, a subgroup analysis indicated a no difference in outcomes between medical, surgical,
70 diabetic, non-diabetic and septic patients [2, 3, 7]. With respect to these results, conventional target
71 of < 180 mg/dl was acceptable for most ICU patients [4] and adopted by various professional
72 organizations [2, 3, 12, 13], except the American College of Physicians (ACP) which proposed a
73 higher target of BG (< 200 mg/dl) [14]. These controversial benefits from intensive insulin therapy
74 should not shadow the reduction of complications and length of hospitalization in hepatobiliary-
75 pancreatic surgical patients [15]. Intravenous insulin through infusion pump is the method applied
76 for ICU patients [11, 13]. The concomitant use of sub-cutaneous insulin glargine remains more
77 efficacious than insulin infusion alone, in particular in patients with coronary artery bypass graft [16,
78 17].

79 For policy development, it is crucial to assess the current practice by surveying both healthcare staff
80 and patients to identify barriers and facilitators through a gap analysis to establish the best practice

81 [18]. Regarding hyperglycaemia control policy, the major safety issue remained hypoglycaemia,
82 especially in ICU patients, as the usual symptoms might not be noticed [19]. Hypoglycaemia defines
83 as blood glucose level < 70 mg/dl and severe life threatening when it is < 40 mg/dl [11, 20, 21].

84 Protocols were developed as written instructions to prevent the fluctuation in BG due to changes of
85 interventions as administering steroids, vasopressors or parenteral quinine or due to changes in
86 nutrition support [22]. As hyperglycaemia is more prevalent in patients receiving parenteral nutrition
87 [9], BG levels did not differ among eating and non-per oral (NPO) patients [23]. The protocols had
88 differences in their target BG, monitoring frequencies, infusion rates and use of boluses [24]. Hence,
89 they must be customized to suit local resources, staff competency [25] and the needs of patients [25-
90 27]. Examples of these protocols are Portland I, Washington University, and Yale University
91 protocols. Yale Protocol had more difficult calculations than the other protocols [28], however, its
92 hypoglycaemia rate was lower than Leuven protocol [22]. The Nottingham University Hospitals
93 (NUH) protocol adopted BG target levels, which were consistent with the NICE-SUGAR target [13].

94 Alternative approaches to written policies are computerized protocols such as glucommanders [28],
95 star protocol [4] and space glucose control (SGC) system [29]. Although, they reduced the nursing
96 workload and had lower hypoglycaemia rates [21], they had not changed the general practice [27].

97 This study assessed the practice of healthcare staff on hyperglycaemia control in intensive care units
98 of Khartoum Military Hospital and proposed a protocol for hyperglycaemia control from lessons
99 learnt.

100 **Materials and Methods**

101 A hospital- based cross-sectional study assessed the awareness, and practice of healthcare staff
102 towards hyperglycaemia management and the burden of hyperglycaemia control based medical
103 records of critically ill patients in the intensive care units of the Military Hospital of Khartoum State,
104 Sudan. The Military Hospital is a complex of seven specialized hospitals totalizing 722 beds and 8
105 ICUs. A multistage sampling technique was used. At first level, five ICUs were systematically
106 included in the study after excluding the neonatal, the maternity and the medical ICUs the last being

107 under reconstruction. At second level, a stratified random sampling technique enabled to select 83
108 health professionals (doctors and nurses) proportionally to the size of each ICU after excluding the
109 administrative staff. Regarding the patients included in the study, a quota of 12 patients was fixed to
110 randomly recruit participants from each of the five ICUs. This led to an estimated sample of 60
111 patients. Fifty-five patients were enrolled in the study after excluding those with either diabetic
112 ketoacidosis (DKA) or hyperosmolar hyperglycaemic state (HHS) and patients < 18 years. Data were
113 collected through a standardized questionnaire comprising two parts. Part one was a self-
114 administrated questionnaire filled by the healthcare staff working in ICUs to collect their
115 sociodemographic characteristics, their number of years of working experience, their knowledge and
116 practice on hyperglycaemia control methods and levels as well as the management of
117 hyperglycaemia. Part two extracted data from the medical records of ICU patients hospitalized at the
118 time of the data collection. The characteristics of the patients: age, gender, status (medical or
119 surgical), type of hyperglycaemia (diabetes type 1, 2 or non-diabetic), associated comorbidities,
120 methods of blood glucose measurement and levels were recorded. The statistical package for social
121 sciences (SPSS version 23) was used to describe and analyse the data. Statistical analysis performed
122 were chi-square tests and analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine association among variables.
123 All tests were considered statistically significant when $p < 0.05$.

124 **Results**

125 **Characteristics of the Healthcare Staff and their training on** 126 **hyperglycaemia control** 127

128 The majority (74.1%, 60/81) of the participants were nurses and the remaining 25.9% (21/81) were
129 doctors. 77.8% (63/81) of the participants were aged 25-30 years with no statistical association
130 ($p=0.05$) between the age of the participants and their occupation as indicated by table 1. The years
131 of working experience of the participants ranged between 0.1 year and 12 years with median of 1
132 year; while, working years in intensive care unit ranged from 0.01 years to 8 years with a median of
133 working years of 0.5 years. 66.7% (14/21) of the doctors received training on hyperglycaemia

134 control and 36.7% (22/60) of the nurses were trained with a statistically significant difference ($\chi^2 =$
 135 5.67, $p=0.017$) between the status and being trained on hyperglycaemia.

136 **Table 1: Characteristics of the healthcare staff and training on glycaemic control (n=81)**

Characteristics	Status of the staff				Total	Likelihood ratio	p-value
	Doctor	%	Nurse	%			
Age:							
25-30 years	13	20.6	50	79.4	63	77.8	
> 30 years	8	44.4	10	55.6	18	22.2	3.835
Total (%)	21	25.9	60	74.1	81	100.0	
Gender:							
Female	19	28.8	47	71.2	66	81.5	
Male	2	13.3	13	86.7	15	18.5	1.697
Total (%)	21	25.9	60	74.1	81	100.0	0.193
ICU working experience:							
<1year	11	20.4	43	79.6	54	66.7	
1-3 years	9	45.0	11	55.0	20	24.7	4.849
>3 years	1	14.3	6	85.7	7	8.6	0.089
Total (%)	21	25.9	60	74.1	81	100.0	
Training about Glycaemic control:							
Trained	14	38.9	22	61.1	36	44.4	
Untrained	7	15.6	38	84.4	45	55.6	5.67*
Total (%)	21		60		81	100.0	0.017

137 *chi-square test

138 Awareness of healthcare staff towards the target blood glucose level

139

140 The 81 healthcare staff were asked if they knew the target blood glucose (BG) level, 88.9% (72/81)
 141 replied yes, 27.8% (20/72) of them were doctors and 72.2% (52/72) were nurses. They were 11.1%
 142 (9/81) who did not know, 11.1% (1/9) were doctors and 88.9% (8/9) were nurses. There was a no
 143 statistically significant association (Likelihood ratio=1.349, $p= 0.245$) between the awareness about
 144 target BG level and the staff status. However, when prompted to provide the exact level of the target
 145 blood glucose, they were 11.1% (8/72) who provided the correct level (140-180 mg/dl) and 88.9%
 146 (64/72) reported incorrect levels. Of the eight participants who reported the correct level, 62.5%
 147 (5/8) were doctors and 37.5% (3/8) were nurses. A statistically significant difference (Fisher's Exact
 148 Test, $p= 0.033$) was found between the reported level of blood glucose and the status of the
 149 healthcare staff.

150 **Awareness of healthcare staff about Basal-Bolus and Insulin infusion**
 151 **methods**

152 Regarding the hyperglycaemia control methods, Basal-Bolus and Insulin Infusion, there was no
 153 statistical significant association between having training or not on hyperglycaemia control methods
 154 and health profession with a *p-value* of respectively 0.591 and 0.371 (table 2).

155 Of the 27 staff members (6 doctors and 21 nurses) who did not know about *Basal-Bolus method*, the
 156 main reason was the lack of knowledge reported by 96.3% (26/27) of the staff. There was no
 157 statistically significant difference (Likelihood ratio=3.147, *p*=0.076) between the reasons of lack of
 158 awareness and the profession of healthcare staff (table 2). Regarding *Insulin Infusion method*, of the
 159 67 staff members (16 doctors and 51 nurses) who did not know about it, the main reason was also the
 160 lack of knowledge reported by 97 % (65/67) of the staff. There was a no statistically significant
 161 difference (Likelihood ratio=5.929, *p*=0.52) between the reasons for lack of awareness and the status
 162 of staff pas revealed by table 2.

163 **Table 2: Awareness of health care staff towards hyperglycaemia control methods and the reasons for**
 164 **lack of awareness (n=81)**

Training	Topic	Status of the staff				Total	%	Likelihood ratio	<i>p</i> -value
		Doctor	%	Nurse	%				
Awareness about Basal-Bolus method									
Trained	Aware	11	42.3	15	57.7	26	72.2	0.471	0.493
	Unaware	3	30	7	70	10	27.8		
	Total	14	38.9	22	61.1	36	44.4		
Untrained	Aware	4	14.3	24	85.7	28	62.2	0.09	0.764
	Unaware	3	17.6	14	82.4	17	37.8		
	Total	7	15.6	38	84.4	45	55.6		
Total n (%)	Aware	15	27.8	39	72.2	54	66.7	0.289*	0.591
	Unaware	6	22.2	21	77.8	27	33.3		
	Total	21	25.9	60	74.1	81	100		
Awareness about Insulin Infusion method									
Trained	Aware	4	50	4	50	8	22.2	0.525	0.469
	Unaware	10	35.7	18	64.3	28	77.8		
	Total	14	38.9	22	61.1	36	44.4		
Untrained	Aware	1	16.7	5	83.3	6	13.3	0.006	0.936
	Unaware	6	15.4	33	84.6	39	86.7		
	Total	7	15.6	38	84.4	45	55.6		
Total n (%)	Aware	5	35.7	9	64.3	14	17.3	0.801	0.371
	Unaware	16	23.9	51	76.1	67	82.7		
	Total	21	25.9	60	74.1	81	100		

Reasons for lack of awareness about Basal-Bolus method

Medical training (lack of knowledge)	5	19.2	21	80.8	26	96.3	3.147	0.076
Information overload (unable to keep up with the guidelines updates)	1	100	0	0	1	3.7		
Total n (%)	6	22.2	21	77.8	27	100		
Reasons for lack of awareness about Insulin Infusion method								
Risk of formal complaint (afraid of responsibility)	1	100	0	0	1	1.5	5.929	0.52
Not standards of practice (unusual routine)	1	100	0	0	1	1.5		
Medical training (lack of knowledge)	14	21.5	51	78.5	65	97		
Total n (%)	16	23.9	51	76.1	67	100		

165 *Chi-square test

166 Practice of healthcare staff towards glycaemic control

167 Practice towards blood glucose monitoring frequency

168 The practice of staff towards blood glucose (BG) measurement was assessed as either more
169 frequently (< 6 hourly) or less frequently (≥ 6 hourly).

170 Regarding doctors, 47.6% (10/21) measured BG more frequently, among them, 80% (8/10) were
171 trained on hyperglycaemia control and 20% (2/10) were not. The remaining 52.4% (11/21) measured
172 BG level less frequently, 54.5% (6/11) were trained and 45.5% (5/11) were untrained. There was no
173 statistically significant association (Likelihood ratio=1.567, $p=0.211$) between the training status of
174 doctors and their practice toward BG monitoring frequency.

175 With regard to nurses, 35.0% (21/60) measured BG more frequently, among them, 42.9% (9/21)
176 received training on hyperglycaemia control and 57.1% (12/21) did not. The remaining 65.0%
177 (39/60) measured BG level less frequently, 33.3% (13/39) were trained and 66.7% (26/39) were
178 untrained. A non-statistically significant association ($\chi^2=0.533$, $p=0.465$) was found between the
179 training status of nurses and their practice toward BG monitoring frequency.

180 In the overall, a no statistically significant association was found ($\chi^2=2.197$, $p=0.138$) between the
181 training of staff and their practice towards BG monitoring frequency.

182 Management of diabetic ketoacidosis

183 In the overall, the appropriate management of diabetic ketoacidosis (DKA), consisting of
184 overlapping the I.V and S.C insulin was performed by 29.6% (24/81) of the participants. The
185 remaining 70.4% (57/81) either they stopped the I.V insulin then start the S.C insulin (56.8%, 46/81)

186 or they did not know what to do (13.6%, 11/81); with a statistically significant difference between
 187 doctors and nurses as revealed by table 3.

188 **Table 3: Management of diabetic ketoacidosis (DKA) by the participants according to their status of**
 189 **training on glycaemia control (n=81)**

DKA Management	Doctor	%	Nurse	%	Health Staff	%	Likelihood ratio	P-value
<i>Trained</i>								
Stop the I.V insulin then start the S.C insulin	4	21.1	15	78.9	19	52.8	6.627	0.036
Overlap the I.V and S.C	9	56.3	7	43.8	16	44.4		
Do not know	1	100	0	0	1	2.8		
Total	14	38.9	22	61	36	100		
<i>Untrained</i>								
Stop the I.V insulin then start the S.C insulin	4	14.8	23	85.2	27	60	5.663	0.059
Overlap the I.V and S.C	3	37.5	5	62.5	8	17.8		
Do not know	0	0	10	100	10	22.2		
Total	7	15.6	38	84	45	100		
<i>Trained and untrained</i>								
Stop the I.V insulin then start the S.C insulin	8	17.4	38	82.6	46	56.8	10.229	0.006
Overlap the I.V and S.C	12	50	12	50	24	29.6		
Do not know	1	9.1	10	90.9	11	13.6		
Total	21	25.9	60	74.1	81	100		

190

191 **Practice of healthcare staff towards glycaemia measurement and control methods**
 192 **used in the different Intensive care units**

193 Across the three types of intensive care units, *HbA1c measurement* was requested by 69.5% (57/82)
 194 of the health staff and the remaining 30.5% (25/82) did not. In cardiac care unit (CCU), the request
 195 was from all (8/8) the staff; while in mixed and surgical ICUs it was respectively from 71.9% (46/64)
 196 and 30% (3/10) of the staff. There was a statistically significant association (Likelihood
 197 ratio=12.584, $p=0.002$) between ICU type and the request of HbA1c measurement.

198 *Sliding scale method* was used by 79.3% (65/82) of all the ICU staff, 90% (9/10) of the surgical ICU
 199 staff, 84.4% (54/64) of the mixed and 25% (2/8) of the cardiac ICUs. In the overall, across these
 200 three types of ICU, sliding scale method was used by 79.3% (65/82) of the staff and they were 20.7%
 201 (17/82) who used other methods. These other methods used by the remaining 17 staff members were
 202 Basal-Bolus method (82.3%, 14/17), mixed insulin method (11.8%, 2/17) and insulin infusion (5.9%,

203 1/17). There was a statistically significant association (Likelihood ratio=12.728, $p=0.002$) between
204 the use of sliding scale method and the type of the ICU.

205 **Hyperglycaemia control methods used by health care professionals**

206 Figure 1 revealed the distribution of staff by hyperglycaemia method used. The sliding scale was the
207 prevalent method used by both doctors and nurses with respectively 71.4% (15/21) and 81.6%
208 (49/60). The other control methods (basal bolus, insulin Infusion and mixed insulin) were used by
209 respectively 28.6% (6/21) and 18.3% (11/60) of the doctors and nurses. A no statistically significant
210 difference (Likelihood ratio=0.938, $p=0.333$) was found between hyperglycaemia control method
211 used and the position of healthcare staff.

212 **Figure 1: Hyperglycaemia control methods used among health care professionals**

213 When asked to provide reasons for using either sliding scale or other hyperglycaemia control
214 methods, 80.5% (66/82) of the staff reported that it was the usual practice, 18.3% (15/82) because it
215 was instructed by the first level supervisor, information overload was provided as the main reason by
216 a participant (1.2%, 1/82).

217 Of the sixty-six participants who reported standard practice as their main reason, the majority 97.0%
218 (64/66) used sliding scale and the remaining 3.0% (2/66) used other glycaemia control methods. A
219 statistically significant association (Likelihood=65.778, $p=0.000$) was found between the reasons of
220 using a particular control method and glycaemia control methods.

221 The staff were requested to provide their opinion on the control methods used, their opinion was
222 recoded as satisfied (yes), not satisfied (no) and no opinion (do not know). More than half (53.7%,
223 44/82) were not satisfied with the control method they were using, they were 41.5% (34/82) who
224 were satisfied and 4.9% (4/82) could not provide a justification. A no statistical significant
225 association (Likelihood=2.018, $p=0.365$) was found between the control method used and the
226 satisfaction towards the method used.

227 **Number of infusion pumps per ICU**

228 The number of infusion pumps available per ICU patient ranged from 0 to 6 with a statistically
 229 significant mean infusion pumps of 2.95 ± 1.33 ($p= 0.001$) across the five ICUs (3 mixed, 1 cardiac
 230 and 1 surgical). This average varied across the ICUs, the lowest mean was recorded in the surgical
 231 unit with a mean of $1.70 \text{ pumps} \pm 0.82$ [range: 0-3]. The cardiac unit had an average of 2.25
 232 $\text{pumps} \pm 1.39$ [range: 1 – 5]. The mixed ICUs were more equipped with an average of 2.86
 233 $\text{pumps} \pm 0.86$ [range: 2-5] in Room-B, $3.15 \text{ pumps} \pm 1.03$ [1-6] in CCR1 and $3.57 \text{ pumps} \pm 1.6$ [1-6] in
 234 CCR2.

235 **Characteristics of ICU patients**

236 Of the Fifty-five patients selected across the ICUs of the Military Hospital, 50.9% were males and
 237 49.1% were females. They were between 19 and 95 years with a median age of 63.5 years. More
 238 than half (58.2%, 32/55) were under enteral feeding. Their glycaemia status indicated that 72.8%
 239 (40/55) were non-diabetic; 23.6% (13/55) and 3.6% (2/55) were respectively type 2 and type 1
 240 diabetic patients. Table 4 displayed the other characteristics of the patients.

241 **Table 4: Characteristics of the patients hospitalized in the ICUs of the Military Hospital (n=55)**

Variable	n	%	Variable	n	%
Gender (n=55)			Renal function (n=55)		
Male	28	50.9	Normal	33	60.0
Female	27	49.1	Impaired	22	40.0
Age in years (n=54)			Liver function (n=55)		
Median	63.5		Normal	53	96.4
Min-Max	19-95		Impaired	2	3.6
Patients conditions (n=55)			Patients on vasopressors (n=55)		
Sepsis	17	30.9	No	46	83.6
Neurological	8	14.5	Yes	9	16.4
Cardiovascular	8	14.5	Patients on steroids (n=55)		
Trauma	8	14.5	No	43	78.2
Stroke	5	9.1	Yes	12	21.8
Gastroenterology	3	5.5	Patients on quinine I.V. (n=55)		
Cancer/Tumor	2	3.6	No	54	98.2
Endocrine	2	3.6	Yes	1	1.8
Respiratory	2	3.6	On Fluoroquinolones (n=55)		
Hyper glycaemia status (n=55)			No	51	92.7
Non diabetic	40	72.8	Yes	4	7.3
Type 2 DM	13	23.6	On atypical antipsychotics (n=55)		

Type 1 DM	2	3.6	No	54	98.2
Feeding status (n=55)			Yes	1	1.8
Enteral feeding	32	58.2			
Oral feeding	15	27.3			
Non per oral	8	14.5			

242

243 Glycaemic status of ICU patients and hyperglycaemia control methods 244 used in Military Hospital

245 A highly statistically significant association (Likelihood ratio=49.964, $p= 0.000$) was found between

246 the hyperglycaemia control method used and the diabetes status of the patients as indicated by table

247 5.

248 **Table 5: Hyperglycaemia control methods by the glycaemic status of the patients (n=55)**

Method used	Hyperglycaemia status						Total	p -value*	
	Type 1 DM		Type 2 DM		Non-diabetic				
	n	%	n	%	n	%			
Sliding scale	0	0.0	9	81.8	2	18.2	11	20.0	0.000
Basal-Bolus	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	3.6	
Insulin I.V infusion	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	1.8	
Other methods	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	3	5.5	
None	1	2.6	0	0.0	37	97.4	38	69.1	
Total patients	2	3.6	13	23.6	40	72.7	55	100.0	

249 * Likelihood ratio=49.964

250 Blood glucose levels and hyperglycaemia control methods used

251 Two classifications of random blood glucose (glycaemic levels and the NICE-SUGAR blood glucose

252 levels) were used. The *glycaemic levels classification* revealed that 79.6% (43/54) of the patients

253 were normal glycaemic (BG: 71-180 mg/dl), 18.5% (10/54) were hyperglycaemic (BG: > 180 mg/dl)

254 and a patient (1.9%, 1/54) was hypoglycaemic (BG: < 71 mg/dl). In the other hand, the *NICE-*

255 *SUGAR blood glucose classification* indicated that 61.1% (33/54) of the patients were below range

256 (BG: <140 mg/dl), 20.4% (11/54) were in within random glucose level (BG: 140-180 mg/dl), 18.5%

257 (10/54) were above the range of BG > 180 mg/dl.

258 Regarding the hyperglycaemia control methods, they were used for 31.5% (17/54) of the patients.

259 Table 6 revealed that 5.9% (1/17) of the patients was monitored in using the best appropriate method

260 which was insulin infusion; 29.4% (5/17) of the patients were under alternative glycaemia control

261 methods which were namely basal- bolus (11.8%, 2/17), mixed insulin (11.8%, 2/17) and Oral
 262 (5.9%, 1/17). Unfortunately, the majority of patients (64.7%, 11/17) had their glycaemia control
 263 based on the old fashion method of sliding scale despite a no statistically significant association
 264 (likelihood ratio=10.108, $p=0.258$) between the NICE- SUGAR targets and the method used.

265 **Table 6: Glycaemic levels of patients by hyperglycaemia control methods (n=17)**

Hyperglycemia control method	NICE-SUGAR blood glucose levels						Total	<i>p</i> -value*
	Above range (BG>180mg/dl)		In range (BG 140-180mg/dl)		Below range (BG<140mg/dl)			
	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Sliding scale	4	36.4	1	9.1	6	54.5	11	64.7
Basal- Bolus	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	2	11.8
Mixed insulin	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	11.8
Oral (Glimepiride)	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.9
Insulin infusion	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	5.9
Total patients	8	47.1	2	11.8	7	41.2	17	100.0

266 * Likelihood ratio=10.108

267 Discussion

268 More than half (66.7%, 14/21) of the doctors received a training on hyperglycaemia control, while,
 269 only 36.7% (22/60) of the nurses were trained with a statistically significant difference ($p=0.017$)
 270 between the status of the staff and being trained on hyperglycaemia; training of health professionals
 271 is crucial to sustain evidence-based practice [30, 31].

272 In this study, regarding the knowledge of staff about hyperglycaemia control methods, there was no
 273 difference ($p >0.05$) between the knowledge of doctors and nurses on Basal-Bolus and insulin
 274 infusion methods and their training status. This raised a question on the training programs
 275 implemented and emphasized the need for a standard updated policy with appropriate training
 276 material addressing the gaps of knowledge on hyperglycaemia control methods regardless the status
 277 of the staff [18].

278 Target blood glucose level of 140- 180 mg/dl, acceptable for most ICU patients [11] and adopted by
 279 most of the major agencies [2, 3, 13] was known by only 11% of our study participants.

280 In our research, the practice of staff towards blood glucose monitoring frequency did not differ
 281 between trained and untrained doctors and nurses. This monitoring method using point of care

282 (POC), glucometer or ICU laboratory, is acceptable as well as continuous glucose monitoring
283 (CGM) [32]. However, regarding the practice towards DKA, as published in the literature [1, 19, 33],
284 it statistically differed between doctors and nurses ($p=0.006$), as well as, according to training status
285 ($p=0.036$).

286 Consistent with guideline-based practice [34, 35], all the staff (100.0%) of the cardiac care unit
287 (CCU) in the Military Hospital were practicing the HbA1c measurement, as expected in such unit;
288 contrary to the mixed (71.9%) and surgical ICUs (30.0%) with a statistically significant difference
289 ($p= 0.002$) across the ICUs.

290 Detailed assessment on barriers and facilitators on policy implementation was published elsewhere
291 [18, 31] as well as the availability of infusion pumps (indicated for the administration of insulin) in
292 ICU [13, 34, 35]. Our findings revealed that the surgical ICU was the least equipped with an average
293 of 1.7 infusion pumps \pm 0.82.

294 The dominant hyperglycaemia control method in both surgical and mixed ICUs was sliding scale,
295 which stood as the standard practice of our study participants while this method was discouraged [17,
296 19, 34, 36, 37]. Insulin infusion method is the recommended control method [1, 28, 22, 37], hence
297 the need to move away nowadays from sliding scale [36]. This was our leitmotiv for proposing a
298 protocol for glycaemia control in Sudan ICUs Military Hospital (supporting information S1). The
299 proposed protocol is justified by our findings, which revealed that more than half of the care
300 providers used sliding scale and were satisfied with it. Despite 89.0% of those caregivers did not
301 know the target BG level [11] with a no statistically significant association ($p= 0.365$) between the
302 staff satisfaction and the methods used. This appeal for the adoption of local institutional guidelines
303 for all Military Hospital ICUs given the diversity of the specialities of health professionals [34].

304 Regarding patient safety, no glycaemia control method was used for the majority (69.1%, 38/55) of
305 the patients; this was consistent with a Brazilian study [38] reporting the dominant use of sliding
306 scale in ICUs; this reduced the use of basal-bolus and insulin infusion methods (69.2%, 7.1%, 3.9%).

307 The American Diabetes Association (ADA) [2] and Nottingham University Hospitals (NUH)
308 guidelines [13], which pledged that hyperglycaemic patients even non- diabetics should have their
309 glycaemia levels controlled, contradicted our findings and the ones of Moreira J.E.D et al. [38].

310 The blood glucose readings pointed that 11.8% of the patients had readings in the target range of
311 140-180 mg/dl, 41.2% had BG levels below the target range and 47.1% of the patients were
312 hyperglycaemic (BG > 180 mg/dl). Our findings raised concerns about the nutritional status of the
313 patients and the methods used as discussed in the literature [8, 9, 39]. In our research, insulin
314 infusion method was used for one patient and the NICE-SUGAR target was achieved in-line with
315 published data [6, 11]. While, mixed insulin method did not achieve the target glycaemic range as
316 already reported by Marik P.E et al. [10]. Sliding scale method achieved the target range in only
317 9.1% of the patients of our study; consistent with published literature [8, 19, 40] recommending the
318 use of insulin infusions in ICU patients to achieve the NICE-SUGAR range which had proven
319 efficacy and safety in low-income countries [41].

320 The limitations of our study were due to the exclusion of the medical ICU because of renovation at
321 the time of our data collection, and the data collected from working staff were not validated through
322 Cronbach test of reliability. Nonetheless, the findings provided key elements that enabled the
323 development of a protocol approved by the decision making ICU professionals and yet to be applied
324 with respect to the forthcoming national guidelines.

325 **Conclusions**

326 The poor knowledge and a lack of awareness towards hyperglycaemia management led to
327 inappropriate implementation of glycaemia control methods across the Military Hospital ICUs.
328 Sustained training programs on hyperglycaemia control for ICU healthcare staff are indicated as well
329 as the availability of local guidelines on glycaemia control in all ICUs is needed. For best practice in
330 ICUs, the use of intravenous insulin infusion targeting NICE-SUGAR blood glucose level should be
331 recommended firstly, then, switching to basal-bolus method with nutritional support when patients
332 get stable [6,39].

333 **Declarations**

334 **Ethical approval and consent to participate**

335 SUMASRI Institutional Review Board of the University of Medical Sciences and Technology
336 reviewed the proposal. Ethical Approval was obtained from the Military Hospital, the
337 implementation of the research was granted by the administration of the respective ICUs.
338 Participants (doctors, nurses and patients) were well informed about the research objectives and
339 verbal consent was obtained from each of them. They were ensured about their confidentiality with
340 the use of an anonymous research tool and that the data collected from them would be used strictly
341 for the purpose of the study objectives.

342 **Consent for publication**

343 Not applicable

344 **Availability of data and materials**

345 To support data sharing and in compliance with PLOS data policy, all the data used in the framework
346 of this research will be deposit to Dryad Digital Repository through data@plos.org to obtain a DOI
347 which will be communicated to PLOS ONE.

348 **Competing interests**

349 The authors declared no competing interest.

350 **Funding**

351 Ghada Omer Hamad Abd El-Raheem bore all the cost related to the study in the framework of her
352 thesis for the post-graduate Diploma in Research methodology and Biostatistics in the University of
353 Medical Sciences and Technology.

354 **Authors' contributions**

355 **AOHG:** Elaborated the research proposal, implemented the field data collection, developed the local
356 protocol for glycaemia control, conducted the statistical analysis and drafted the initial manuscript
357 and the final manuscript.

358 **AMAM:** Facilitated the administrative arrangements at the Military Hospital, revised the proposal
359 and read the final manuscript prior to submission.

360 **NM:** Supervised the implementation of the research from proposal to completion, and proof read the
361 final the manuscript.

362 **Abbreviations**

363 **AACE:** American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists

364 **ACP:** American College of Physicians

365 **ADA:** American Diabetes Association, **BG:** Blood glucose

366 **CCR:** Critical Care Room

367 **CCU:** Cardiac Care Unit

368 **CGM:** Continuous Glucose Monitoring

369 **ICU:** Intensive Care Unit

370 **IIT:** Intensive Insulin Therapy

371 **NICE-SUGAR:** The Normoglycaemia in Intensive Care Evaluation - Survival Using Glucose
372 Algorithm Regulation

373 **NUH:** Nottingham University Hospitals

374 **POC:** point of care

375 **SCCM:** Society of Critical Care Medicine

376 **SGC:** Space Glucose Control

377 **Acknowledgments**

378 The authors are grateful to the patients, doctors and nurses of the Military Hospital whose
379 participation enabled this study to be completed.

380 **References**

- 381 1. Bass SN, Bauer SR. Hepatic failure/GI/endocrine emergencies. In: Bass S, Benken ST, et al., eds.
382 Critical Care Pharmacy Preparatory Review and Recertification Course, 2019 ed. Lenexa, KS:
383 American College of Clinical Pharmacy, 2019: P 569- 626.
- 384 2. Klonoff DC. Intensive insulin therapy in critically ill-hospitalized patients: making it safe and
385 effective. *J Diabetes Sci Technol*; 2011: 755-767. Doi:10.1177/193229681100500330
- 386 3. Clain J, Ramar K, Surani SR. Glucose control in critical care.. *World J Diabetes*. 2015 Aug 10;
387 6(9): 1082–1091.
- 388 4. Abu-Samah A, Knopp JL, Abdul Razak NN, et al. Model-based glycemic control in a Malaysian
389 intensive care unit: performance and safety study. *Med Devices (Auckl)*. 2019; 12:215-226.
390 Published 2019 May 31. doi:10.2147/MDER.S187840
- 391 5. Van Strrn SC, Rijkenberg S, Van der Voort PHJ, DeVries JH. The association of intravenous
392 insulin and glucose infusion with intensive care unit and hospital mortality: a retrospective study.
393 *Ann Intensive Care*. 2019; 9(29): 12.
- 394 6. Doolin MK, Walroth TA, Harris SA, Whitten JA, Fritschle-Hilliard AC. Transition From
395 Intravenous to Subcutaneous Insulin in Critically Ill Adults. *J Diabetes Sci Technol*. 2016;10(4):932-
396 938. Published 2016 Jun 28. Doi:10.1177/1932296816629985
- 397 7. Davis G, Fayfman M, Reyes-Umpierrez D, et al. Stress hyperglycemia in general surgery: Why
398 should we care?. *J Diabetes Complications*. 2018; 32(3):305-309.
399 doi:10.1016/j.jdiacomp.2017.11.010.
- 400 8. Dickerson R. Fluids, electrolytes, acid-base disorders and nutrition support. In: Bass S, Benken
401 ST, et al., eds. Critical Care Pharmacy Preparatory Review and Recertification Course, 2019 ed.
402 Lenexa, KS: American College of Clinical Pharmacy, 2019: P 83- 137.

- 403 9. Gosmanov AR, Umpierrez GE. Management of hyperglycaemia during enteral and parenteral
404 nutrition therapy. *Curr Diab Rep.*2013; 13(1): 155-162.
- 405 10. Marik PE. Glycemic control in critically ill patients: What to do post NICE-SUGAR?. *World J*
406 *Gastrointest Surg.* 2009;1(1):3-5. doi:10.4240/wjgs.v1.i1.3.
- 407 11. Finfer S, Chittock D, et al. Intensive versus conventional glucose control in critically ill patients
408 with traumatic brain injury: long-term follow-up of a subgroup of patients from the NICE-SUGAR
409 study. *Intensive Care Med.* 2015;41(6):1037-1047. doi:10.1007/s00134-015-3757-6
- 410 12. Bellomo R, Egi M. What Is a NICE-SUGAR for Patients in the Intensive Care Unit?. *Mayo Clin*
411 *Proc.* 2009; 84 (5):400-402.
- 412 13. Alrifai Z, Beed M, Javaid A, Jamieson E. Management and monitoring of insulin infusions and
413 glycemic control in adult critical care patients. *Nottingham University Hospitals NHS; 3.* 2020. P 19.
- 414 14. Qaseem A, Humphrey LL, Chou R, Snow V, Shekelle P; Clinical Guidelines Committee of the
415 American College of Physicians. Use of intensive insulin therapy for the management of glycemic
416 control in hospitalized patients: a clinical practice guideline from the American College of
417 Physicians. *Ann Intern Med.* 2011;154(4):260-267. Doi:10.7326/0003-4819-154-4-201102150-
418 00007
- 419 15. Okabayashi T, Shima Y, Sumiyoshi T, et al. Intensive versus intermediate glucose control in
420 surgical intensive care unit patients. *Diabetes Care.* 2014;37(6):1516-1524. Doi:10.2337/dc13-1771
- 421 16. Gandhi H, Sarvaia A, Malhotra A, Acharya H, Shah K, Rajavat J. Effects of Glargine Insulin on
422 Glycaemic Control in Patients with Diabetes Mellitus Type II Undergoing Off-pump Coronary
423 Artery Bypass Graft. *Annals of Cardiac Anaesthesia.*2018: 167-172.
- 424 17. Clayton J. Guideline for Variable Rate Insulin Infusion (VRIII) prescription and supplementary
425 fluid prescription. *Nottingham University Hospitals NHS.* 2018; 2: P 12.

- 426 18. Zimmerman LH. Practice administration and development: Protocol development and quality
427 improvement. In: Bass S, Benken ST, et al., eds. Critical Care Pharmacy Preparatory Review and
428 Recertification Course, 2019 ed. Lenexa, KS: American College of Clinical Pharmacy, 2019: P 247-
429 282.
- 430 19. Alldredge, B. K., Corelli, R. L., Ernst, M. E., Guglielmo, B. J., Jacobson, P. A., Kradjan, W. A.,
431 & Williams, B. R. (2013). Koda-Kimble and Young's applied therapeutics: The clinical use of drugs.
432 Wolters Kluwer Health Adis (ESP).
- 433 20. Preiser, J.-C., Chase, J. G., Hovorka, R., Joseph, J. I., Krinsley, J. S., De Block, C., Wernerman,
434 J. (2016). Glucose Control in the ICU: A Continuing Story. Journal of Diabetes Science and
435 Technology, 10(6), 1372–1381. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1932296816648713>
- 436 21. Jacobi J, Bircher N, Krinsley J, et al. Guidelines for the use of an insulin infusion for the
437 management of hyperglycemia in critically ill patients. Crit Care Med. 2012;40(12):3251-3276.
438 doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e3182653269.
- 439 22. De Block CEM, Rogiers P, Jorens PG, et al. A comparison of two insulin infusion protocols in
440 the medical intensive care unit by continuous glucose monitoring. Annals of Intensive Care. 2016
441 Dec;6(1):115. DOI: 10.1186/s13613-016-0214-9.
- 442 23. Miller EE, Lalla M, Zaidi A, Elgash M, Zhao H, Rubin DJ. Eating and Glycemic Control among
443 Critically Ill Patients Receiving Continuous Intravenous Insulin. Endocr Pract. 2020;26(1):43-50.
444 doi:10.4158/EP-2019-0095.
- 445 24. Stewart KW et al.,. How should we interpret retrospective blood glucose measurements?
446 Sampling and Interpolation. IFAC.2017; 50 (1): 874-879. IFAC PapersOnLine 50-1 (2017) 874–879.
- 447 25. Wilson M, Weinreb J, Hoo GW. Intensive insulin therapy in critical care: a review of 12
448 protocols. Diabetes Care. 2007;30(4):1005-1011. doi:10.2337/dc06-1964

- 449 26. John SM, Waters KL, Jivani K. Evaluating the Implementation of the EndoTool Glycemic
450 Control Software System. *Diabetes Spectrum* 2018 Feb; 31(1): 26-30. [https://doi.org/10.2337/ds16-](https://doi.org/10.2337/ds16-0061)
451 [0061](https://doi.org/10.2337/ds16-0061).
- 452 27. Chase JG, Desai T, Bohe J, et al. Improving glycemic control in critically ill patients:
453 personalized care to mimic the endocrine pancreas. *Crit Care*. 2018;22(1):182. Published 2018 Aug
454 2. doi:10.1186/s13054-018-2110-1.
- 455 28. Steil, G. M., Deiss, D., Shih, J., Buckingham, B., Weinzimer, S., & Agus, M. S. D. (2009).
456 Intensive Care Unit Insulin Delivery Algorithms: Why So Many? How to Choose? *Journal of*
457 *Diabetes Science and Technology*, 3(1), 125–140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/193229680900300114>.
- 458 29. Blaha J, Barteczko-Grajek B, Berezowicz P, et al. Space GlucoseControl system for blood
459 glucose control in intensive care patients--a European multicentre observational study. *BMC*
460 *Anesthesiol*. 2016;16:8. Published 2016 Jan 22. doi:10.1186/s12871-016-0175-4.
- 461 30. Boucher BA, Haas C. critical care pharmacy evolution and validation, practice standards, training
462 and professional development. In: Bass S, Benken ST, et al., eds. *Critical Care Pharmacy Preparatory*
463 *Review and Recertification Course*, 2019 ed. Lenexa, KS: American College of Clinical Pharmacy,
464 2019: P 821- 860.
- 465 31. Meijering S, Corstjens AM, Tulleken JE, Meertens JH, Zijlstra JG, Ligtenberg JJ. Towards a
466 feasible algorithm for tight glycaemic control in critically ill patients: a systematic review of the
467 literature. *Crit Care*. 2006; 10(1):R19. Doi: 10.1186/cc3981.
- 468 32. Boom DT, Sechterberger MK, Rijkenberg S, et al. Insulin treatment guided by subcutaneous
469 continuous glucose monitoring compared to frequent point-of-care measurement in critically ill
470 patients: a randomized controlled trial. *Crit Care*. 2014; 18(4):453. Published 2014 Aug 20. Doi:
471 10.1186/s13054-014-0453-9.

- 472 33. Clayton J. NUH management of diabetic ketoacidosis in adults (18 years old and over).
473 Nottingham University Hospitals NHS. 2017. P 2. <http://www.diabetologists->
474 abcd.org.uk/JBDS/JBDS.htm and the Diabetes UK website at www.diabetes.org.uk.
- 475 34. Dharmalingam M. Glycemic control in Intensive Care Unit. Indian J Endocr Metab 2016;
476 20:415-7
- 477 35. Erhayiem B. Guidance based on NICE clinical guideline 130 'Management of hyperglycaemia in
478 acute coronary syndromes' - Issued: October 2011 - www.nice.org.uk/cg130.
- 479 36. Browning LA, Dumo P. Sliding-scale insulin: an antiquated approach to glycemic control in
480 hospitalized patients. American Journal of Health-system Pharmacy : AJHP : Official Journal of the
481 American Society of Health-system Pharmacists. 2004 Aug;61(15):1611-1614. DOI:
482 10.1093/ajhp/61.15.1611.
- 483 37. Wiffen P, Mitchel M, Snelling M, Stoner N. Oxford Handbook of Clinical Pharmacy, 3rd edition
484 Oxford University Press 2017.
- 485 38. Moreira ED Jr, Silveira PC, Neves RC, et al. Glycemic control and diabetes management in
486 hospitalized patients in Brazil. Diabetol Metab Syndr. 2013;5(1):62. Published 2013 Oct 18.
487 doi:10.1186/1758-5996-5-62.
- 488 39. Mesejo A, Montejo-González JC, Vaquerizo-Alonso C, et al. Diabetes-specific enteral nutrition
489 formula in hyperglycemic, mechanically ventilated, critically ill patients: a prospective, open-label,
490 blind-randomized, multicenter study. Crit Care. 2015;19:390. Published 2015 Nov 9.
- 491 40. Gray A, Write J, Googey V, Bruce L. Injectable drugs guide. Pharmaceutical Press. London.
492 2011. ISBN 978 0 85369 787 9.
- 493 41. Hamimy Wet al. Application of conventional blood glucose control strategy in surgical ICU in
494 developing countries: Is it beneficial?, Egypt J Anaesth (2015),
495 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.egja.2015.05.002>.

496

497 **Supporting Information captions**

498 **Document attached**

499 **S1 File** Local guidelines for Hyperglycaemia Control in Intensive Care Units of Military Hospital,
500 Sudan, 2020

501 **Tables**

502 **S1 Table 1:** Characteristics of the healthcare staff and training on glycaemia control (n=81)

503 **S2 Table 2:** Awareness of healthcare staff towards hyperglycaemia control methods and the reasons for lack of
504 awareness (n=81)

505

506 **S3 Table 3:** Management of diabetic ketoacidosis (DKA) by the participants according to their status
507 of training on glycaemia control (n=81)

508 **S4 Table 4:** Characteristics of patients admitted in the ICUs of Military Hospital (n=55)

509 **S5 Table 5:** Hyperglycaemia control methods by the glycaemic status of the patients (n=55)

510 **S6 Table 6:** Glycaemic levels of patients by hyperglycaemia control methods (n=17)

511 **Figure**

512 **S1 Figure 1:** Hyperglycemia control methods used among healthcare professionals




Figure 1: Hyperglycemia control methods used among healthcare professionals