

1

2 Glycaemic control and associated factors among patients living with type 2 diabetes in
3 Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo: a Cross-sectional study

4

5 **Jean-Pierre Fina Lubaki** ^{1,2} **Olufemi Babatunde Omole**,¹ **Joel Msafiri Francis**¹

6

7 **Jean-Pierre Fina Lubaki, MMED,**

8 Department of Family Medicine and Primary Care, University of the Witwatersrand, 2050,
9 Johannesburg, South Africa

10 Department of Family Medicine and Primary Care, Protestant University of the Congo, Kinshasa,
11 Democratic Republic of the Congo

12 **Olufemi Babatunde Omole**

13 Department of Family Medicine and Primary Care, University of the Witwatersrand, 2050,
14 Johannesburg, South Africa

15 **Joel Msafiri Francis**

16 Department of Family Medicine and Primary Care, University of the Witwatersrand, 2050,
17 Johannesburg, South Africa

18

19 *Corresponding author:

20 Jean-Pierre Fina Lubaki, Email: 2136297@students.wits.ac.za email to: jeanpierrefina@yahoo.fr,

21 Phone number: +243810703909

22

23 **Keywords:** Diabetes Mellitus, Type 2; Epidemiology; Disease Management; Developing

24 Countries

25 **Word count:** Abstract: 255, Main text: 3942

26 **Number of tables: 4**

27

28 **SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

29 **What is already known on this topic**

30 • Glycaemic control is poor in most of the SSA settings, with glycaemic control ranging from
31 10–60%.

32 • Factors associated with glycaemic control are context specific; in the Democratic Republic
33 of the Congo, few studies have investigated poor glycaemic control.

34 **What this study adds**

35 • The extent of poor glycaemic control among patients living with type 2 diabetes is
36 determined in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo.

37 • Identification of factors associated with poor glycaemic control in Kinshasa: taking only
38 insulin and having a treatment duration ≥ 7 years increased the likelihood of poor
39 glycaemic control, while being overweight and having uncontrolled blood pressure were
40 protective.

41 **How this study might affect research, practice or policy**

42 • The study findings will inform potential interventions to improve glycaemic control in
43 Kinshasa, DRC or similar settings elsewhere.

44 **ABSTRACT**

45 **Objectives**

46 To assess the prevalence and factors associated with glycaemic control to inform potential
47 interventions to improve glycaemic control in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo.

48 **Design**

49 This was a cross-sectional study conducted between November 2011–September 2022. We
50 conducted the selection of the participants through a two-stage sampling process. Participants
51 were asked to complete a structured questionnaire and to provide two millilitres of blood for
52 Hb1AC assay. We performed univariate and multivariable logistic regressions to identify factors
53 associated with poor glycaemic control.

54 **Setting**

55 A total of 20 randomly selected primary care facilities in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the
56 Congo.

57 **Participants**

58 The sample included 620 patients living with type 2 diabetes with a median age of 60 (IQR=53.5-
59 69) years.

60 **Results**

61 Most of the study participants were female (66.1%), unemployed (67.8%), having income below
62 the poverty line (76.4%), and without health insurance (92.1%). Two-thirds of the participants
63 (420; 67.6%) had poor glycaemic control. Those participants having taken only insulin (AOR=1.64,
64 95%CI 1.10 to 2.45) and those on a treatment duration ≥ 7 years (AOR=1.45, 95%CI 1.01 to 2.08)
65 were associated with increased odds of poor glycaemic control, while being overweight (AOR=

66 0.47, 95%CI 0.26 to 0.85) and those with uncontrolled blood pressure (AOR=0.65, 95% CI 0.48 to
67 0.90) were protective for poor glycaemic control.

68 **Conclusions**

69 This study confirms that poor glycaemic control is common among patients living with type 2
70 diabetes in Kinshasa, DRC. There is a need for targeted interventions to improve glycaemic
71 control, including metabolic and clinical comorbidity control, lifestyle modifications, and health
72 system factors.

73

74

75 INTRODUCTION

76 Type 2 diabetes is increasing worldwide¹ – it is expected that the greatest increase in diabetes
77 prevalence will take place in low- and middle-income countries between 2021 to 2045.² On the
78 African Continent, type 2 diabetes is progressing rapidly due to modifiable risk factors, such as
79 obesity and urbanisation.² In sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), diabetes care faces numerous challenges
80 leading to unmet needs and a greater impact on morbidity and mortality.^{3 4} In the Democratic
81 Republic of the Congo (DRC), the prevalence of diabetes is estimated to be 5.8% for adults aged
82 20 to 79 years,⁴ with a high proportion of persons living with diabetes in urban areas and the
83 western part of the country.^{5 6} The factors associated with diabetes were being male, aged ≥ 40
84 years, general and abdominal obesity associated with the elderly, family history of diabetes, and
85 hypertension.⁶

86 Glycaemic control is the cornerstone of diabetes management, as it delays the occurrence of
87 complications, reduces the cost of care and improves patient quality of life. Nevertheless, the
88 control of diabetes remains a worldwide issue, with only about 50% of the patients living with
89 type 2 diabetes controlled.⁷ In SSA, it is estimated that only one-third of patients living with type
90 2 diabetes reached target glycaemic levels.^{8 9} The accurate knowledge of factors driving glycaemic
91 control in a particular setting is essential to build up an intervention package to improve
92 glycaemic control. Multiple factors drive glycaemic control in SSA, differing across settings.⁸ A
93 recent systematic review of the studies on glycaemic control found: younger and older age,
94 gender, poor socio-economic conditions, place of living, positive family history of diabetes, longer
95 duration of diabetes, treatment modalities and effects, alcohol consumption, smoking presence
96 of comorbidities or complications, and poor management were associated with poor glycaemic

97 control.⁹ Contrarily, high diabetes health literacy, positive perceived family support, adequate
98 coping strategies, dietary adherence, exercise practice, attendance of follow-up appointments,
99 and medication adherence were associated with good glycaemic control.⁹

100 In the DRC, very few studies have investigated poor glycaemic control among persons/patients
101 living with type 2 diabetes, as high as 86% in the nearby province of Kwilu¹⁰ and 79.9% in
102 Kinshasa.¹¹ Only a few reported factors were found to be associated with glycaemic control
103 among persons living with type 2 diabetes mellitus in the DRC. Sagastume *et al*¹¹ found older
104 patients (> 40 years) had increased odds of achieving glycaemic control than younger patients (<
105 40 years), while Blum *et al*¹⁰ noticed that abdominal obesity and having a body mass index (BMI)
106 > 25 Kg/m² have been associated with poor glycaemic control. Moreover, we noticed that no
107 study in our setting had previously assessed the link between psychological factors and poor
108 glycaemic control.

109 This study aimed to assess the extent of glycaemic control and to broaden the knowledge on
110 factors driving poor glycaemic control among patients living with type 2 diabetes in Kinshasa. The
111 results will serve to build an intervention package to improve glycaemic control among patients
112 living with type 2 diabetes in Kinshasa.

113

114 **METHODS**

115 This study is a component of the research project on glycaemic control among patients living with
116 type 2 diabetes in Kinshasa, DRC, for which the study protocol was previously published.¹²

117 **Ethics**

118 The researchers declared that they complied with the conditions under which this study
119 obtained approval from the ethics committees of the Protestant University of Congo (reference
120 number: CEUPC 0067; Date: 05/02/2021) and Human Research Ethics Committee (Medical) of
121 the University of the Witwatersrand (reference number: M210308; Date: 26/08/2021). The
122 study was conducted according to the ethical guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki.
123 Permission was obtained from the Kinshasa Primary HealthCare Network to conduct the study.
124 Informed consent was obtained from each participant. Data collection was done with strict
125 adherence to local COVID-19 regulations.

126 **Type of study**

127 This was a cross-sectional study among patients recruited from 20 randomly selected health
128 facilities in Kinshasa, DRC.

129 **Study setting**

130 Our study was multisite within the city of Kinshasa, the DRC's capital, with an estimated total
131 population of about 15 million inhabitants spread over an area of 9,965 km².¹³ The study was
132 conducted in the health facilities belonging to the Catholic Church and the Salvation Army. With
133 a total of 66 health facilities (1 referral hospital and 65 health centres) distributed across 24
134 health districts, these organisations own most of the facilities that have integrated diabetes care
135 in primary care.

136 **Study population**

137 The study population consisted of patients living with type 2 diabetes attending health centres
138 offering diabetes care in the Kinshasa Primary Care Network, with about 7326 patients registered
139 in 2020. The inclusion criteria were age ≥ 18 years and receiving diabetes treatment for at least

140 six months. The exclusion criteria were pregnancy, difficulty communicating due to mental
141 disability, and refusal to provide consent for the study.

142 **Sample size estimation**

143 The estimated minimum sample size was computed using Epi info version 7.2.2.2. Assuming that
144 the prevalence of poor glycaemic control was 68%,¹⁴ with a 95% confidence level and a power of
145 80%, some 59,2% of patients who had a diabetes duration ≤ 7 years (unexposed) presented with
146 poor glycaemic control, and 74,4% of those who had a diabetes duration > 7 years (exposed)
147 presented with poor glycaemic control. The unexposed to exposed ratio is 0.47.¹⁵ The minimum
148 estimated sample size was 368. Adjusting for a design effect of 1.5, the calculated sample size of
149 552 was determined. To account for an estimated 10% non-response rate, the minimum required
150 sample size was 614 patients, rounded up to 620 patients.

151 **Sampling of participants**

152 The selection of the participants was conducted using a two-stage sampling process. The first
153 stage was the selection of healthcare facilities. As the healthcare facilities have an unequal
154 number of patients, the participants were selected by probability proportional to the patient
155 population size. Using this strategy, we randomly selected 20 healthcare facilities out of a
156 possible 48. In the second stage, a minimum of 31 patients were selected from each selected
157 healthcare facility using systematic sampling. This process ensured each patient had the same
158 overall probability of selection or self-weighting. The sampling was done without replacement.

159 **Data collection**

160 The data collection process lasted from November 2021–September 2022. For each participant,
161 the research team performed physical and anthropometric measurements. These measurements

162 were taken once by trained staff members on the same portable equipment at all the health
163 facilities. The questionnaires were pre-existing standardised questionnaires translated from
164 English into French and Lingala. The questionnaires were tested before data collection and
165 validated for use. At the end of the data collection, a blood sample was taken from the
166 participant. The questionnaire was administered on a tablet or smartphone using REDCap
167 (Research Electronic Data Capture).¹⁶ The information about the diabetes disease was verified
168 with information in the patient's medical records, if available.

169 **Variables of the study**

170 Outcome

171 The main outcome variable was poor glycaemic control which was defined as HbA1c $\geq 7\%$,¹⁷
172 which was assayed at the laboratory of the School of Medicine at the Protestant University of
173 Congo in Kinshasa. The analysis was completed using an automated Genuis WP 21B with
174 antibody-based immunoassay method of Cypress Diagnostics.¹⁸

175 Exposures

176 The possible determinants for glycaemic control sought from the participants were
177 sociodemographic parameters (age, sex, marital status, religion, education level, occupation,
178 ethnic group, income, health insurance, access to food, distance from place of residence to health
179 centre), lifestyle parameters (smoking, risky drinking), clinical parameters (duration of diabetes,
180 height, weight, body mass index, waist circumference, presence of comorbidities, blood pressure,
181 treatment, duration of treatment), and psychological parameters (adherence to treatment,

182 depression, diabetes distress, social support, self-management, knowledge). Supplementary file
183 1 detailed the exposures, their measurements, operational definitions, reliability, and references.

184 **Data analysis**

185 All the analyses were performed using survey data analysis with STATA 17 to account for the
186 study design characteristics. We expressed age as median with interquartile range (IQR), as it was
187 not normally distributed. The other variables were analysed as categorical variables and
188 expressed as frequency (n) and percentage (%). Bivariate analysis was performed to compare
189 uncontrolled versus controlled participants in terms of glycosylated haemoglobin using the Chi-
190 square test/Fisher exact test for categorical variables. We further carried out multivariable
191 logistic regression to assess factors associated with glycaemic control. Age, sex, duration of
192 treatment, and food security were included in the regression model a priori. Other variables with
193 a p-value <0.2 in univariate analysis were also included in the model. The p-value of <0.05 was
194 considered statistically significant.

195

196 **RESULTS**

197 A total of 620 participants were included in the study out of a total of 627 invited, accounting for
198 a non-response rate of 1.1%. Table 1 summarises the sociodemographic characteristics of the
199 participants.

Table 1 Sociodemographic characteristics of the patients living with type 2 diabetes, Kinshasa, n=620, 2021-2022

	N (%)
Age	
18-39	39 (6.4)
40-64	342 (55.1)
≥ 65	239 (38.5)

Sex	
Male	211 (33.9)
Female	409 (66.1)
Marital status	
Single	199 (32.2)
Married	393 (63.3)
Other	28 (4.5)
Ethnic group	
Kongo	502 (80.9)
Luba	30 (5.0)
Ngala	36 (5.9)
Swahili	19 (3.1)
Other	32 (5.2)
Religion	
Catholic	281 (45.4)
Protestant	128 (20.6)
Independent	167 (26.9)
Other	44 (7.1)
Educational level	
No formal education	77 (12.5)
Primary school	199 (32.1)
Secondary school	269 (43.4)
University	75 (12.1)
Occupation	
Employed	132 (21.1)
Unemployed	419 (67.7)
Other	69 (11.2)
Income	
Below the poverty line	473 (76.4)
Above the poverty line	147 (23.6)
Access to food	
Food secure	249 (40.0)
Mildly Food Insecure Access	77 (12.5)
Moderately Food Insecure	107 (17.3)
Access	
Severely Food Insecure Access	187 (30.2)
Health insurance	
Insured	49(7.9)
Without health insurance	571 (92.1)
Distance to a health facility	
Nearby	451 (72.6)
Distant	165 (27.4)

200

201 **Prevalence of glycaemic control and participants' characteristics**

202 About two-thirds of the participants (67.8%; n=420) had poor glycaemic control. There was no
203 statistically significant difference between controlled and uncontrolled participants in terms of
204 sociodemographic characteristics (Table 2).

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

Table 2 Sociodemographic characteristics and glycaemic control among patients living with type 2 diabetes in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo, n=620, 2021-2022

	Controlled (n, %(95%CI))	Uncontrolled (n, %(95%CI))	All participants (n, %)	p
Age				0.479
18-39	9 (22.8 (10.7 to 42.2))	30 (77.2 (57.8 to 89.3))	39 (100.0)	
40-64	112 (32.7 (26.7 to 39.4))	230 (67.3 (60.6 to 73.3))	342 (100.0)	
≥ 65	79 (33.0 (24.8 to 42.2))	160 (67.0 (57.6 to 75.2))	239 (100.0)	
Sex				0.989
Male	68 (32.2 (24.6 to 40.8))	143 (67.8 (59.2 to 75.4))	211 (100.0)	
Female	132 (32.2 (25.3 to 40.0))	277 (67.8 (60.0 to 74.7))	409 (100.0)	
Marital status				0.413
Single	68 (34.3 (25.7 to 43.9))	131 (65.7 (56.1 to 74.3))	199 (100.0)	
Married	126 (31.3 (25.4 to 39.3))	267 (65.7 (60.7 to 74.6))	393 (100.0)	
Other	6 (21.3 (9.7 to 40.6))	22 (78.7 (59.4 to 90.3))	28 (100.0)	
Ethnic group				0.405
Kongo	156 (31.0 (24.9 to 37.9))	346 (69.0 (62.1 to 75.1))	502 (100.0)	
Luba	13 (42.0 (25.5 to 60.4))	18 (58.0 (39.6 to 74.5))	31 (100.0)	
Ngala	14 (38.7 (26.2 to 52.9))	22 (61.3 (47.1 to 73.8))	36 (100.0)	
Swahili	8 (42.0 (24.4 to 61.8))	11 (58.0 (38.2 to 75.6))	19 (100.0)	
Other	8 (28.1 (13.5 to 49.5))	23 (71.9 (50.5 to 86.5))	32 (100.0)	
Religion				0.201
Catholic	92 (32.7 (25.7 to 40.7))	189 (67.3 (59.3 to 74.3))	281 (100.0)	
Protestant	44 (34.3 (25.4 to 44.6))	84 (65.7 (55.4 to 74.6))	128 (100.0)	
Independent	44 (26.2 (16.7 to 38.6))	123 (73.8 (61.4 to 83.3))	167 (100.0)	
Other	20 (45.3 (30.5 to 60.9))	24 (54.7 (39.1 to 69.5))	44 (100.0)	
Educational status				0.781
No formal	28 (36.4 (18.2 to 59.7))	49 (63.6 (40.3 to 81.8))	77 (100.0)	
Primary school	64 (32.1 (24.6 to 40.6))	135 (67.9 (59.4 to 75.4))	199 (100.0)	
Secondary school	87 (32.3 (25.9 to 39.4))	182 (67.7 (60.6 to 74.1))	269 (100.0)	

University	21 (27.9 (19.5 to 38.3))	54 (72.1 (61.7 to 80.5))	75 (100.0)	
Occupation				0.518
Employed	45 (34.1 (27.2 to 41.9))	87 (65.9 (58.1 to 72.8))	132 (100.0)	
Unemployed	130 (30.9 (24.1 to 38.8))	289 (69.1(61.2 to 75.9))	419 (100.0)	
Other	25 (36.3 (25.6 to 48.6))	44 (63.7 (51.4 to 74.4))	69 (100.0)	
Income				0.342
Below the poverty line	149 (31.4 (25.1 to 38.5))	324 (68.6 (61.5 to 74.9))	473 (100.0)	
Above the poverty line	51 (34.7 (27.8 to 42.4))	96 (65.3 (57.6 to 72.2))	147 (100.0)	
Access to food				0.192
Food secure	69 (27.6 (19.7 to 37.3))	180 (72.4 (62.7 to 80.3))	249 (100.0)	
Mildly Food Insecure	28 (36.5 (24.2 to 50.9))	49 (63.5 (49.1 to 75.8))	71 (100.0)	
Moderately Food Insecure	43 (40.2 (31.5 to 49.6))	64 (59.8 (50.4 to 68.5))	107 (100.0)	
Severely Food Insecure	60 (31.9 (24.0 to 41.1))	127 (68.1 (58.9 to 76.0))	187 (100.0)	
Health insurance				0.782
Insured	17 (34.5 (20.2 to 52.2))	32 (65.5 (47.8 to 79.8))	48 (100.0)	
Uninsured	183 (32.0 (25.8 to 39.0))	388 (68.0 (61.0 to 74.2))	571 (100.0)	
Distance to a health facility				0.644
Nearby	148 (32.8 (25.8 to 40.6))	303 (67.2 (59.4 to 74.2))	451(100.0)	
Distant	52 (30.7 (23.7 to 38.7))	117(69.3 (61.3 to 76.3))	169 (100.0)	

214

215

216

217

218 However, controlled participants differed significantly from uncontrolled participants in terms of
219 BMI ($p=0.005$), control of blood pressure ($p=0.027$), and treatment regimens ($p=0.002$) (Table 3).

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

Table 3 Lifestyle and clinical characteristics and glycaemic control among patients living with type 2 diabetes in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo, n=620, 2021-2022

	Controlled (n, %(95%CI))	Uncontrolled (n, %(95%CI))	All participants (n, %)	p
Smoking				0.268
No	200 (32.4 (26.5 to 38.9))	416 (67.6 (61.1 to 73.5))	616 (100.0)	
Yes	0 (0.0 (0.0))	4 (100.0 (0.0))	4 (100.0)	
Alcohol disorder				0.566
No disorder	198 (32.4 (26.5 to 38.8))	413 (67.6 (61.2 to 73.5))	611 (100.0)	
Health risk consumption	2 (22.1 (4.0 to 66.2))	7 (77.9 (33.8 to 96.0))	9 (100.0)	
Duration of diabetes				0.549
0-5 years	84 (31.3 (23.0 to 41.0))	183 (68.7 (59.0 to 77.0))	267 (100.0)	
5-10 years	76 (35.1 (26.5 to 44.8))	141 (64.9 (55.2 to 73.5))	217 (100.0)	
≥10 years	40 (29.3 (22.2 to 37.5))	96 (70.7 (62.5 to 77.8))	136 (100.0)	
Body mass index				0.005*
Underweight	14 (21.6 (13.4 to 33.0))	51 (78.4 (67.0 to 86.6))	65 (100.0)	
Normal	102 (29.3 (21.9 to 37.9))	245 (70.7 (62.1 to 78.1))	347 (100.0)	
Overweight	66 (46.6 (39.1 to 54.2))	76 (53.4 (45.8 to 60.9))	142 (100.0)	
Obesity	18 (27.3 (15.7 to 43.1))	48 (72.7 (56.9 to 84.3))	66 (100.0)	
Waist circumference				0.083
Abnormal	93 (38.2 (29.8 to 47.3))	150 (61.8 (52.7 to 70.2))	243 (100.0)	
Normal	107 (28.3 (21.5 to 36.3))	270 (71.7 (63.7 to 78.5))	377 (100.0)	
Presence of comorbidities				0.266
Yes	136 (33.9 (27.6 to 40.7))	265 (66.1 (59.3 to 72.4))	401 (100.0)	
No	64 (29.2 (21.6 to 38.1))	155 (70.8 (61.9 to 78.4))	218 (100.0)	
Blood pressure				0.027*
Controlled	117 (29.2 (22.9 to 36.4))	283 (70.8 (63.6 to 77.1))	400 (100.0)	

Uncontrolled	83 (37.7 (30.8 to 45.2))	137 (62.3 (54.8 to 69.2))	220 (100.0)	
Treatment				0.002*
Insulin	87 (26.0 (20.7 to 32.1))	247 (74.0 (67.9 to 79.3))	334 (100.0)	
Oral hypoglycaemic drugs	98 (41.3 (31.6 to 51.7))	139 (58.7 (48.3 to 68.4))	237 (100.0)	
Mixed	15 (30.7 (21.1 to 42.3))	34 (69.3 (57.7 to 78.9))	49 (100.0)	
Duration of treatment				0.229
< 7 years	132 (34.1 (27.3 to 41.6))	255 (65.9 (58.4 to 72.7))	387 (100.0)	
≥ 7 years	68 (29.1 (21.9 to 37.4))	165 (70.9 (62.6 to 78.1))	233 (100.0)	

238 *p<0.05

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249 Perceived support from significant others ($p=0.005$), perceived family support ($p=0.020$),
250 diabetes treatment regimen distress ($p=0.029$), and adherence to physical activity ($p=0.017$)
251 were statistically significant between controlled and uncontrolled participants (Supplementary
252 table 1).

253

254 **Determinants of glycaemic control**

255 Being on insulin (AOR=1.64, 95%CI 1.10 to 2.45) and having a treatment duration ≥ 7 years
256 (AOR=1.45, 95%CI 1.01 to 2.08) were associated with increased odds of poor glycaemic control.
257 Being overweight (AOR= 0.47, 95%CI 0.26 to 0.85) and having uncontrolled blood pressure
258 (AOR=0.65, 95% CI 0.48 to 0.91) were associated with decreased odds of poor glycaemic control
259 (Table 4).

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

Table 4 Results of survey logistic regression estimating the association between different exposures and poor glycaemic control in 620 patients with type 2 diabetes in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo, 2021-2022

	Univariate analysis		Multivariate analysis	
	p	COR (95%CI)	p	AOR (95%CI)
Age (years)				
18-39		1		1
40-64	0.276	0.61 (0.24 to 1.54)	0.652	0.81 (0.32 to 2.08)
≥ 65	0.271	0.60 (0.23 to 1.54)	0.736	0.86 (0.35 to 2.13)
Sex				
Male		1		1
Female	0.989	1.00 (0.64 to 1.55)	0.494	1.16 (0.75 to 1.79)
Access to food				
Food secure		1		1
Mildly Food Insecure	0.199	0.66 (0.35 to 1.27)	0.079	0.59 (0.33 to 1.07)
Moderately Food Insecure	0.008	0.57 (0.38 to 0.85)	0.083	0.69 (0.46 to 1.05)
Severely Food Insecure	0.468	0.81 (0.45 to 1.46)	0.670	0.90 (0.53 to 1.51)
Body mass index				
Underweight		1		1
Normal	0.178	0.66 (0.36 to 1.22)	0.288	0.73 (0.41 to 1.32)
Overweight	0.000	0.32 (0.18 to 0.55)	0.015*	0.47 (0.26 to 0.85)
Obese	0.515	0.73 (0.28 to 1.94)	0.574	1.21 (0.60 to 2.48)
Waist circumference				
Normal		1		1
Abnormal	0.084	0.64 (0.38 to 1.07)	0.328	0.80 (0.51 to 1.26)
Blood pressure				
Controlled		1		1
Uncontrolled	0.027	0.68 (0.84 to 0.95)	0.011*	0.65 (0.48 to 0.90)
Duration of treatment (years)				
< 7		1		1

≥ 7	0.229	1.26 (0.85 to 1.87)	0.043*	1.45 (1.01 to 2.08)
Treatment regimen				
OAD		1		1
Insulin	0.003	2.00 (1.31 to 3.05)	0.019*	1.10 (1.10 to 2.45)
Mixed	0.144	1.59 (0.84 to 2.99)	0.319	1.39 (0.71 to 2.74)
Significant other support				
Low support		1		1
Moderate support	0.465	0.85 (0.54 to 1.34)	0.244	0.78 (0.51 to 1.20)
High support	0.002	0.42 (0.25 to 0.71)	0.128	0.64 (0.36 to 1.15)
Family support				
Low support		1		1
Moderate support	0.586	1.14 (0.69 to 1.91)	0.533	1.22 (0.63 to 2.34)
High support	0.015	0.50 (0.29 to 0.86)	0.359	0.70 (0.31 to 1.55)
Diabetes distress				
No distress		1		1
Moderate distress	0.017	1.75 (1.12 to 2.73)	0.179	1.42 (0.84 to 2.39)
High distress	0.009	1.72 (0.83 to 3.54)	0.901	0.95 (0.42 to 2.23)
Physical activity				
Poor adherence		1		1
Good adherence	0.019	1.55 (1.08 to 2.22)	0.067	1.34 (0.98 to 1.80)
Knowledge on diabetes				
Low		1		1
Acceptable	0.004	1.45 (1.14 to 1.83)	0.054	0.69 (0.48 to 1.01)
Good	0.846	1.04 (0.68 to 1.59)	0.419	1.13 (0.83 to 1.52)

*p<0.05

268

269 **DISCUSSION**

270 This study was designed to assess the extent of poor glycaemic control among patients living with
271 type 2 diabetes in Kinshasa, including its driving factors. The results found a prevalence of poor
272 glycaemic control of 67.8%. No sociodemographic and lifestyle characteristics were associated
273 with glycaemic control. Taking only insulin and having a treatment duration ≥ 7 years increased
274 the odds of poor glycaemic control, while being overweight and having uncontrolled blood
275 pressure were protective.

276 This study found that more than two-thirds of the participants have poor glycaemic control, thus
277 corroborating the findings of other studies in SSA.^{8 9} Furthermore, this study found a higher
278 prevalence of poor glycaemic control than that found by Blum *et al* in the nearby rural province
279 of Kwilu in the DRC. Findings from this study are lower than those found in the European or
280 North American studies,^{19 20} and indicated poor diabetes care in Kinshasa. These results also
281 translated the issues in SSA in general, where diabetes care faces multiple barriers.^{3 21} Moreover,
282 self-management in SSA is poor and represents a threat to the health of individuals and capacity
283 of the health system.²² Meanwhile, diabetes is becoming more predominant, with great
284 economic and health impacts.^{3 21} In a study in the Kinshasa Health Network in 2015, Kapongo *et*
285 *al* found that the capacities, knowledge, and practice of type 2 diabetes care were poor and
286 stated that the training of healthcare professionals, equipment of health facilities and
287 development of clinical guidelines could help in improving glycaemic control.²³ Thus, effective
288 funding, and better preparation for diabetes care is crucial.

289 Most of our participants (93.7%) were older than 40 years. This proportion aligns with the classic
290 description of type 2 diabetic patients, in which the disease appears in individuals older than 40
291 years most of the time. Female patients represented approximately two-thirds of the
292 participants. A retrospective analysis of the Kinshasa Health Network database conducted by
293 Sagastume *et al*¹¹ also found the same-sex prevalence. This high prevalence of type 2 diabetes
294 affects more women than men, due to the higher metabolic risk in the former.²⁴ Furthermore,
295 the health-seeking behaviour of women is greater than men.²⁵ A distribution of religion and
296 ethnic groups among the participants corresponded linearly to the distributions of those
297 parameters in the general population. Most of the participants were unemployed, poor and
298 without health insurance, which has been representative of the condition of the general
299 population in Kinshasa. No sociodemographic and lifestyle characteristics were associated with
300 poor glycaemic control. Our finding here has been corroborated by the study of Blum *et al*,¹⁰ who
301 also found no sociodemographic or lifestyle factors associated with poor glycaemic control in a
302 cross-sectional survey in the nearby province of Bandundu in the DRC. We suppose that the tools
303 used to characterise patients were unsuitable for the particularities of our setting. A recent
304 systematic review on glycaemic control among patients living with type 2 diabetes in SSA found
305 that younger and older age, gender, lower income, absence of health insurance, low level of
306 education, and place of residence were associated with poor glycaemic control.⁹ In a
307 retrospective study in Kinshasa, Sagastume *et al*¹¹ found that younger patients needed prioritised
308 attention to reach glycaemic targets. Research with more appropriate and suitable tools will be
309 needed to better define the contribution of sociodemographic and lifestyle characteristics on
310 glycaemic control in our setting. Nevertheless, interventions for better glycaemic control have to

311 prioritise vulnerable groups, such as younger and older age, women and non-insured patients.
312 Implementing universal coverage can increase access to care for the aforementioned groups.²⁶
313 In this study, participants taking only insulin were 1,64 times more likely to have poor glycaemic
314 control than those on oral hypoglycaemic drugs. Studies have shown that only around one-fourth
315 of patients on insulin could achieve glycaemic targets because the participants might be
316 erroneously taking an insufficient daily dose and incorrectly titrating insulin.²⁷ The lack of
317 adherence to the prescribed regimen has been also a significant factor in poor glycaemic control
318 and was magnified in our setting, as most of the patients were unemployed and not covered by
319 health insurance. They were unable to adequately follow the prescribed regimen when they
320 lacked food. The psychological resistance to insulin, prevalent in our setting according to the
321 study by Rita *et al*,²⁸ could also be another explanation for poor glycaemic control among patients
322 living with type 2 diabetes in our study. In the diabetes attitudes, wishes and needs second study
323 (DAWN), participants reported low confidence in the efficacy of insulin, with 26.9% of
324 participants abstaining from insulin because they thought insulin unfeasible or impracticable to
325 manage their diabetes.²⁹ Healthcare providers must ensure that psychological resistance to
326 initiating insulin is adequately addressed, and effectively train the patients to correctly follow
327 their prescriptions. Type 2 diabetes is a lifestyle disease, and all guidelines prescribe that insulin
328 therapy should be accompanied by lifestyle modification and oral hypoglycaemic drugs. The
329 prepotency of insulin use highlighted the lack of appropriate guidelines or poor clinicians'
330 adherence to evidence-based clinical guidelines. Clear management guidelines must also be
331 adapted for the use of available medicines and efforts must be made to offer new hypoglycaemic
332 agents at affordable prices.

333 In this study, the odds of overweight participants having poor glycaemic control were reduced by
334 53.0%. Blum *et al*¹⁰, in their study near Kinshasa, also found that BMI>25 Kg and abdominal
335 obesity were protective against poor glycaemic control. The authors stated that this finding could
336 reflect the existence of special features of diabetes in SSA. Plečko *et al*,³⁰ in an analysis
337 encompassing four large international clinical databases for critically ill patients, found that
338 higher BMI in patients with diabetes was associated with lower average glucose. The authors
339 suggested that their finding could be explained by the process of care, as the patients with higher
340 BMIs had more glucose measurements and were receiving higher insulin doses. Our finding
341 contrasted the well-known relationship between being overweight and suboptimal glycaemic
342 control and poor glycaemic control.³¹ Weight loss or the prevention of weight gain is an important
343 goal in the management of type 2 diabetes or prediabetes.³² However, increasing weight could
344 also arise in diabetic patients due to the effect of antidiabetic medication on body weight. Apart
345 from metformin and thiazolidinediones, other antidiabetic agents could lead to weight gain.³³ In
346 Kinshasa, insulin is largely used and there has been a limited range of affordable medications for
347 patients. Healthcare providers must furthermore ensure that the patients are adequately
348 managed to avoid adverse effects.³³

349 In the study sample, patients with uncontrolled blood pressure reduced the odds of having poor
350 glycaemic control by 35.0%. Mobula *et al*,³⁴ in a Ghanaian study, also found that systolic blood
351 pressure was significantly higher among patients with adequate glycaemic control compared to
352 the group with poor glycaemic control. As discussed by Mobula *et al*,³⁴ among patients with good
353 glycaemic control, it can be that there was a significantly higher proportion of patients with dual
354 diagnosis—hypertension and diabetes. This observation can also be explained by the fact that

355 health providers give more attention to persons with comorbidity or an increase in healthcare
356 utilisation by the persons with comorbidity.³⁵ Hypertension is frequently associated with
357 diabetes,³⁶ which indicates that more insight into adequate management of hypertension among
358 patients with diabetes in our setting will be required.³⁵

359 This study found that a treatment duration ≥ 7 years increased the odds of poor glycaemic control
360 by 1,45 times. Longer duration of treatment has been linked to poor glycaemic control in SSA.³⁷
361 As diabetes takes longer to emerge, there is a progressive deterioration of the pancreas function,
362 therefore requiring more adjustments in the treatment of older patients, who can develop
363 comorbidities.³⁸ One may note that in SSA, there has been a high proportion of undiagnosed
364 diabetes, and usually at the time of diagnosis made the disease is relatively advanced with
365 complications already present.³⁹ Health providers must be informed of the progression of
366 diabetes and be able to adjust the treatments for patients accordingly.

367 **Limitations of the study**

368 This study estimated the extent of poor glycaemic control among type 2 diabetes patients in
369 Kinshasa. Also, we have broadly assessed psychological scales regarding glycaemic control in SSA
370 to promote understanding in the management of patients with diabetes. Because of the cross-
371 sectional nature of the study, it is not possible to ascertain a causal relationship between poor
372 glycaemic control and the determinants. Other potential biases include selection (non-response
373 of the eligible participants), recall, interviewer, and social desirability. These biases were
374 minimised by ensuring effective training of the data collectors to make certain that the aim and
375 objectives of the study were clearly stated to the participants, and that questions asked were
376 communicated with a non-judgemental attitude.

377 **CONCLUSION**

378 This study confirms that poor glycaemic control is common among patients living with type 2
379 diabetes in Kinshasa, DRC. There is a need for targeted interventions to improve glycaemic
380 control, including metabolic and clinical comorbidity control, lifestyle modifications, and health
381 system factors.

382

383 **Special acknowledgement**

384 The authors would like to thank all the staff of the Kinshasa Primary Health Network for their
385 support during the study. We thank Mrs Manase Lusuami for performing the laboratory assays,
386 and Christian Mungongo Kifu for his support during data collection and data management.

387 **Author Contributions**

388 JPF (guarantor), OBO, and JMF designed the study. JPF contributed to acquisition of funding and
389 data. JPF oversaw the research process. JPF and JMF performed the data processing and quality
390 control. JPF conducted the statistical analyses, drafted the manuscript, and is the guarantor of
391 this work. JPF, OBO, and JMF interpreted the data. All authors edited and critically reviewed the
392 manuscript for intellectual content and approved the final version.

393 **Funding support**

394 The authors received no specific funding for this work. The Protestant University of Congo
395 provided laboratory reagents and facilitated laboratory assays.

396 **Declaration of interests**

397 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

398 **Patient consent for publication**

399 Informed consent was obtained from each participant.

400 **Data availability statement**

401 All datasets supporting the conclusions in this article are included within the article.

402 **Disclaimers**

403 The authors stated that the views expressed in this article are their own and not an official

404 position of the institution or funder.

405 **REFERENCES**

406

- 407 1. International Diabetes Federation. IDF Diabetes Atlas Ninth. Dunia : IDF. 2019.
- 408 2. Sun H, Saeedi P, Karuranga S, et al. IDF Diabetes Atlas: Global, regional and country-level
409 diabetes prevalence estimates for 2021 and projections for 2045. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract*
410 2022 Jan 1;183:109119.
- 411 3. Pastakia S, Pekny C, Manyara S, et al. Diabetes in sub-Saharan Africa – from policy to
412 practice to progress: targeting the existing gaps for future care for diabetes. *Diabetes,*
413 *Metab Syndr Obes Targets Ther* 2017 Jun;10:247–63.
414 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28790858> (Accessed 10 Nov 2019)
- 415 4. Democratic Republic of the Congo diabetes report 2000 — 2045.
416 <https://diabetesatlas.org/data/en/country/55/cd.html> (Accessed 21 Dec 2022)
- 417 5. Katchunga PB, Mirindi P, Baleke A, et al. The trend in blood pressure and hypertension

- 418 prevalence in the general population of South Kivu between 2012 and 2016: Results
419 from two representative cross-sectional surveys-The Bukavu observational study. PLoS
420 One 2019;14(8):e0219377.
- 421 6. Muyer MTMC, Botomba S, Poka N, et al. Diabetes prevalence and risk factors,
422 underestimated without oral glucose tolerance test, in rural Gombe-Matadi Adults,
423 Democratic Republic of Congo, 2019. Sci Rep 2022 Dec;12(1):15293.
424 /pmc/articles/PMC9467973/ (Accessed 21 Dec 2022)
- 425 7. Giugliano D, Maiorino MI, Bellastella G, et al. Glycemic control in type 2 diabetes: from
426 medication nonadherence to residual vascular risk. Endocrine 2018 Jul 1;61(1):23–7.
- 427 8. Sobngwi E, Ndour-Mbaye M, Boateng KA, et al. Type 2 diabetes control and
428 complications in specialised diabetes care centres of six sub-Saharan African countries:
429 The Diabcare Africa study. Diabetes Res Clin Pract 2012 Jan;95(1):30–6.
430 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2011.10.018> (Accessed 26 Apr 2020)
- 431 9. Lubaki F, Omole OB, Francis JM. Glycaemic control among type 2 diabetes patients in sub
432 - Saharan Africa from 2012 to 2022 : a systematic review and meta - analysis.
433 Diabetology & Metabolic Syndrome 2022: 1–78 [https://doi.org/10.1186/s13098-022-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13098-022-00902-0)
434 [00902-0](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13098-022-00902-0) (Accessed 21 Dec 2022)
- 435 10. Blum J, Chaney M, Mudji J, et al. Glycaemic control among patients with type 2 diabetes
436 followed in a rural African primary care setting - A reality check in the Democratic
437 Republic of Congo. Prim Care Diabetes. 2020;14(2):139–46.

- 438 11. Sagastume D, Mertens E, Sibongwere DK, et al. A retrospective database study of the
439 demographic features and glycaemic control of patients with type 2 diabetes in Kinshasa,
440 Democratic Republic of the Congo. *BMC Med* 2022;20(1):1–14.
441 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-022-02458-2> (Accessed 21 Dec 2022)
- 442 12. Fina Lubaki JP, Omole OB, Francis JM. Protocol: Developing a framework to improve
443 glycaemic control among patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus in Kinshasa, Democratic
444 Republic of the Congo. *PLoS One* 2022;17(9):e0268177.
445 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0268177> (Accessed 21 Dec 2022)
- 446 13. Megacity Kinshasa Eyes Climate Resilient Future Through Urban Management.
447 [https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2021/08/19/why-kinshasa-could-be-in-](https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2021/08/19/why-kinshasa-could-be-in-the-vanguard-of-megacities-climate-resilience)
448 [the-vanguard-of-megacities-climate-resilience](https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2021/08/19/why-kinshasa-could-be-in-the-vanguard-of-megacities-climate-resilience) (Accessed 2 Mar 2022)
- 449 14. Longo-Mbenza B, Kasiam Lasi On'kin JB, Nge Okwe A, et al. The metabolic syndrome in a
450 Congolese population and its implications for metabolic syndrome definitions. *Diabetes*
451 *Metab Syndr* 2011;5(1):17–24.
- 452 15. Chetoui A, Kaoutar K, Elmoussaoui S, et al. Prevalence and determinants of poor
453 glycaemic control: a cross-sectional study among Moroccan type 2 diabetes patients. *Int*
454 *Health* 2020;1–8.
- 455 16. REDCap. <https://redcap.core.wits.ac.za/redcap/> (Accessed 4 Nov 2022)
- 456 17. Ministry of Public Health of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. [Standards and
457 guidelines for diabetes management].

- 458 1]. [https://extranet.who.int/ncdccs/Data/COD_B6_NV_Draft%20final_Normes%20Diab%](https://extranet.who.int/ncdccs/Data/COD_B6_NV_Draft%20final_Normes%20Diab%20C3%A8te)
459 [C3%A8te](https://extranet.who.int/ncdccs/Data/COD_B6_NV_Draft%20final_Normes%20Diab%20C3%A8te) (Accessed 21 May 2021)
- 460 18. Cypress Diagnostics. HbA1c Turbi. <https://diagnostics.be/fr/product/ht001> (Accessed 21
461 Dec 2022).
- 462 19. De Pablos-Velasco P, Parhofer KG, Bradley C, et al. Current level of glycaemic control and
463 its associated factors in patients with type 2 diabetes across Europe: Data from the
464 PANORAMA study. *Clin Endocrinol (Oxf)* 2014;80(1):47–56.
- 465 20. Fang M, Wang D, Coresh J, et al. Trends in Diabetes Treatment and Control in U.S. Adults,
466 1999–2018. *N Engl J Med* 2021 Jun 10;384(23):2219–28.
- 467 21. Motala AA, Mbanya JC, Ramaiya K, Pirie FJ, Ekoru K. Type 2 diabetes mellitus in sub-
468 Saharan Africa: challenges and opportunities. *Nat Rev Endocrinol* 2022 Jan;18(4):219–29.
469 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41574-021-00613-y> (Accessed 21 Dec 2022)
- 470 22. Stephani V, Opoku D, Beran D. Self-management of diabetes in Sub-Saharan Africa: A
471 systematic review. *BMC Public Health* 2018. p. 1148. Available from:
472 <https://bmcpublikealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-018-6050-0>
473 (Accessed 19 Apr 2020)
- 474 23. Kapongo RY, Lulebo AM, Mafuta EM, et al. Assessment of health service delivery
475 capacities, health providers' knowledge and practices related to type 2 diabetes care in
476 Kinshasa primary healthcare network facilities, Democratic Republic of the Congo Health
477 services research in low and middle income countries. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2015;15(1):1–6.

- 478 24. Goedecke JH, Olsson T. Pathogenesis of type 2 diabetes risk in black Africans: a South
479 African perspective. *J Intern Med* 2020;288(3):284–94.
- 480 25. Yeatman S, Chamberlin S, Dovel K. Women’s (health) work: A population-based, cross-
481 sectional study of gender differences in time spent seeking health care in Malawi. *PLoS*
482 *One* 2018;13(12):3–4.
- 483 26. Jackson Y, Lozano Becerra JC, Carpentier M. Quality of diabetes care and health
484 insurance coverage: a retrospective study in an outpatient academic public hospital in
485 Switzerland. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2016 Oct;16(1):1–7.
486 <https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12913-016-1801-z>
487 (Accessed 20 Dec 2021)
- 488 27. Sendekie AK, Belachew EA, Dagne EM, et al. Rate of glycaemic control and associated
489 factors in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus treated with insulin-based therapy at
490 selected hospitals in Northwest Ethiopia: a multicentre cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*
491 2022;12:65250. <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> (Accessed 20 Dec 2021)
- 492 28. Rita SL, Lubaki FJP, Bompeka LF, et al. Prevalence and determinants of psychological
493 insulin resistance among type 2 diabetic patients in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of
494 Congo. *African J Prim Heal Care Fam Med* 2019;11(1):1–5.
- 495 29. Funnell MM, Bootle S, Stuckey HL. The diabetes attitudes, wishes and needs second
496 study. *Clin Diabetes* 2015;33(1):32–6.
- 497 30. Plečko D, Bennett N, Mårtensson J, et al. The obesity paradox and hypoglycemia in

- 498 critically ill patients. Crit Care 2021;25(1):1–15. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-021-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-021-03795-z)
499 03795-z (Accessed 20 Nov 2021)
- 500 31. Bae JP, Lage MJ, Mo D, et al. Obesity and glycemic control in patients with diabetes
501 mellitus: Analysis of physician electronic health records in the US from 2009-2011. J
502 Diabetes Complications 2016;30(2):212–20.
- 503 32. Boye KS, Lage MJ, Thieu V, et al. Obesity and glycemic control among people with type 2
504 diabetes in the United States: A retrospective cohort study using insurance claims data. J
505 Diabetes Complications 2021;35(9):107975.
- 506 33. Han SJ, Boyko EJ. The evidence for an obesity paradox in type 2 diabetes mellitus.
507 Diabetes Metab J 2018;42(3):179–87.
- 508 34. Mobula LM, Stephen F, Carson KA, et al. Translational Metabolic Syndrome Research
509 Predictors of glycemic control in type-2 diabetes mellitus : Evidence from a multicenter
510 study in Ghana. Transl Metab Syndr Res 2018;1:1–8.
- 511 35. Schnell O, Crocker JB, Weng J. Impact of HbA1c Testing at Point of Care on Diabetes
512 Management. J Diabetes Sci Technol 2017;11(3):611–7.
- 513 36. Ekoru K, Doumatey A, Bentley AR, Chen G, Zhou J, Shriner D, et al. Type 2 diabetes
514 complications and comorbidity in Sub-Saharan Africans. EclinicalMedicine 2019;16:30–
515 41. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2019.09.001> (Accessed 31 May
516 2022)
- 517 37. Fekadu G, Bula K, Bayisa G, Turi E, Tolossa T, Kasaye HK. Challenges And Factors

- 518 Associated With Poor Glycemic Control Among Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Patients At
519 Nekemte Referral Hospital, Western Ethiopia. *J Multidiscip Healthc* 2019 Nov;12:963–74
520 <http://doi.org/10.2147/JMDH.S232691> (Accessed 12 Apr 2021)
- 521 38. Davies MJ, Alessio DAD, Fradkin J, Kernan WN, Mathieu C, Mingrone G. Management of
522 Hyperglycemia in Type 2 Diabetes , 2018 . A Consensus Report by the American Diabetes
523 Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD).
524 2018;41:2669–701.
- 525 39. Noor SKM, Bushara SOE, Sulaiman AA, Elmadhoun WMY, Ahmed MH. Undiagnosed
526 diabetes mellitus in rural communities in Sudan: prevalence and risk factors. *East*
527 *Mediterr Heal J* 2015;21(3):164–70.
- 528