

1 **A cross-sectional questionnaire study: impaired awareness of hypoglycaemia remains prevalent in adults with**
2 **type 1 diabetes and is associated with the risk of severe hypoglycaemia**

3 **Authors**

4 F. Baxter¹, N. Baillie¹, A. Dover², R.H. Stimson^{1,2}, F. Gibb², S. Forbes^{1,2}

5 **Affiliations**

- 6 1. Centre for Cardiovascular Science, Queen's Medical Research Institute, University of Edinburgh
7 2. Department of Diabetes and Endocrinology, Outpatient Department 2, Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh

8 **Corresponding author:** shareen.forbes@ed.ac.uk (SF)

9 These authors contributed equally to this work.

10 **Abstract**

11 **Objective** Impaired awareness of hypoglycaemia (IAH) is a risk factor for severe hypoglycaemia (SH) in type 1
12 diabetes (T1D). Much of the IAH prevalence data comes from older studies where participants did not have the
13 benefit of the latest insulins and technologies. This study surveyed the prevalence of IAH and SH in a tertiary adult
14 clinic population and investigated the associated factors.

15 **Methods** Adults (≥ 18 years) attending a tertiary T1D clinic completed a questionnaire, including a Gold and Clarke
16 score. Background information was collected from health records.

17 **Results** 189 people (56.1% female) with T1D (median [IQR] disease duration 19.3 [11.5, 29.1] years and age of 41.0
18 [29.0, 52.0] years) participated. 17.5% had IAH and 16.0% reported ≥ 1 episode of SH in the previous 12 months.
19 Those with IAH were more likely to report SH (37.5% versus 11.7%, $p=0.001$) a greater number of SH episodes per
20 person (median [IQR] 0 [0,2] versus 0 [0,0] $P<0.001$) and be female (72.7% versus 52.6%, $p=0.036$). Socio-economic
21 deprivation was associated with IAH ($p=0.032$) and SH ($p=0.005$). Use of technology was the same between IAH vs
22 aware groups, however, participants reporting SH were more likely to use multiple daily injections ($p=0.026$). Higher
23 detectable C-peptide concentrations were associated with a reduced risk of SH ($p=0.04$).

24 **Conclusion** IAH remains a risk factor for SH and is prevalent in females. Insulin pump and continuous glucose
25 monitor use was comparable in IAH vs aware groups. Socioeconomic deprivation was associated with IAH and SH,
26 making this an important population to target for interventions.

27 **Introduction**

28 Type 1 diabetes (T1D) affects ~35,000 people in Scotland (1). It is characterised by autoimmune destruction of the
29 pancreatic beta cells leading, in time, to absolute or near absolute insulin deficiency (2). T1D is mainly managed with
30 insulin replacement therapy which is given by multiple daily subcutaneous injections or continuous subcutaneous
31 insulin infusion (CSII).

32 The landmark Diabetes Control and Complications (DCCT) trial found that the use of intensive insulin therapy in T1D
33 reduced the risk of long-term microvascular complications, but that intensive therapy also increased the risk of
34 hypoglycaemia (3). A recent prospective study identified hypoglycaemia as an ongoing burden for people with T1D
35 who experience on average 73.3 hypoglycaemic events/patient-year (4). This effect is due in part to the inability of
36 exogenous insulin to mimic the normal profile of endogenous insulin production, leading to relative insulin excess at
37 inappropriate times (2) , impairment of the normal compensatory hormone responses to lower blood glucose (5)
38 and the loss of behavioural responses due to impaired awareness of hypoglycaemia (IAH) (2) which affects 20-40% of
39 people with T1D (6, 7). IAH is a risk factor for severe hypoglycaemia (SH) (8), defined as an episode of hypoglycaemia
40 requiring external assistance for recovery. IAH increases the risk of a SH event 6-fold (6, 9).

41 People with T1D can regain hypoglycaemia awareness through avoidance of hypoglycaemia (2, 10-12). Diabetes
42 technologies such as continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion (CSII) and continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) can
43 reduce overall episodes of hypoglycaemia (13, 14), improve glycaemic control and decrease the risk of microvascular
44 complications (15). Advanced diabetes technologies, such as hybrid closed-loop systems, have been shown to reduce
45 time in hypoglycaemia both in randomised controlled trials (RCTs)(16-19) and in real-world studies (20). However,
46 their impact on IAH is not clear due to exclusion of participants with IAH from some RCTs (17) and other trials not
47 reporting data on IAH (18). Additional studies investigating the effect of HCL systems on the counterregulatory
48 response to hypoglycaemia and IAH in T1D are required (21) to further evaluate the possible benefits of these
49 devices for those at risk of hypoglycaemia.

50 Technologies currently available in our clinic are: intermittently scanned CGM (isCGM), which users need to interact
51 with in order to see their glucose data; real-time CGM (rtCGM) which transfers data in real-time to the user and CSII
52 which can be used as part of a non-integrated system or as part of a hybrid closed-loop (HCL) system where there is
53 automatic adjustment of insulin delivery based on readings from a rtCGM device. We surveyed an unselected

54 population of adults with T1D to investigate if there has been a change in the prevalence of SH and IAH with the
55 introduction of new technologies such as CGM and HCL systems. Health records of respondents were then screened
56 to identify factors associated with IAH and SH.

57 **Methods**

58 Participants

59 Between the 1st of July 2021 and the 31st of August 2022 adults (≥ 18 years) attending a tertiary hospital T1D clinic in
60 person were approached to complete the study survey. People with a diagnosis of T1D documented in their health
61 record and a length of diagnosis of ≥ 2 years were considered eligible. Those unable to understand or complete the
62 survey were excluded. The study was approved by the local research and development office (2021/0092) and
63 research ethics committee (21/WA/0149). Written informed consent was obtained from participants.

64 Questionnaire

65 The first part of the questionnaire included a Gold (9) and Clarke (22) Score. Both are validated methods for
66 assessing hypoglycaemia awareness in people with T1D (23). In brief, for the Gold Score the participant is asked 'Do
67 you know when your hypos are commencing?'. They respond using a 7-point Likert scale with 1 indicating 'always
68 aware' and 7 indicating 'never aware'. A score of ≥ 4 represents IAH. The Clarke score comprises 8 questions that
69 assess exposure to moderate and severe hypoglycaemia as well as assessing the glucose level for onset of
70 symptoms. It gives a score of 0-8 with a score of ≥ 4 representing IAH.

71 The second part of the questionnaire collected additional information on employment status, education level, time
72 off work or education due to hypoglycaemia, history of SH in the previous 12 months, driving status and use of
73 diabetes technology.

74 Participant health records were reviewed to collect background information and demographic details including age,
75 sex, age at diagnosis, HbA1c, insulin, date commenced CSII if applicable, date commenced intermittently scanned

76 CGM (isCGM) or real time CGM (rtCGM) if applicable, postcode and hospital admissions in the previous 12 months
77 related to diabetes. Socioeconomic status was assessed using the Scottish index for multiple deprivation (SIMD)
78 quintile(24). C-peptide data was also collected from participant's health records. Participant's using an isCGM had a
79 2-week snapshot of their data collected from Libreview consisting of: time in range (TIR) 3.9-10 mmol/L, time below
80 range (TBR) <3.9 mmol/L, time above range (TAR) >10 mmol/L, average glucose, standard deviation (SD) of glucose
81 and coefficient of variation (CV) of glucose.

82 C-peptide Analysis

83 C-peptide samples obtained prior to October 2021 were analysed by Abbot Architect and after this by Roche Elecsys.
84 Values are reported down to the limit of detection, 3pmol/L for the Abbot system and 7pmol/L for the Roche
85 system. Results below this limit of detection are reported as 0 pmol/L in this paper.

86 Statistical Analysis

87 Results are reported as median (IQR) unless otherwise specified. Group differences in continuous variables were
88 compared either using the unpaired t-test or Mann-Whitney U Test. Categorical variables were compared using the
89 chi-square test. A p-value of <0.05 was considered significant. Statistical analysis was completed using IBM SPSS
90 version 25.

91 Results

92 *189 participants (56.1% female) completed the survey. IAH was defined as a Gold Score \geq 4, or where this was missing*
93 *(2.1%), a Clarke score \geq 4. The prevalence of IAH was 17.5%. Of note the prevalence of IAH was 17.5% using either*
94 *score. When analysing respondents who completed both the Gold and Clarke questionnaires (93.1%), there was a*
95 *significant positive correlation between the two scores, Pearson r 0.623 (P <0.001). 15.9% of respondents reported an*
96 *episode of SH in the previous 12 months with a median (IQR) 0 (0,0) (range 0-12) number of episodes per person.*
97 *The median (IQR) HbA1c was 60.0 (51.0, 67.0) mmol/mol (7.6 [6.8, 8.3]%). 56.6% of respondents were using multiple*
98 *daily injections (MDI). 70.4% of respondents were using first generation insulin analogues as their bolus insulin and,*

99 of those using a basal insulin, 62.6% were using a second-generation analogue. The most common glucose
100 monitoring method was isCGM with 81.0% of respondents using this. Of the 11.1% who were rtCGM users, 52.4%
101 were using an unlicensed do-it-yourself (DIY) isCGM add-on to convert the device to a rtCGM sensor. Of the
102 respondents using CSII, 9.8% were using hybrid closed loop (HCL) systems with 25% of these being a DIY HCL system.
103 Of the 144 isCGM users, Libreview data was available for 95 (66%). The median (IQR) TIR was 49 (34, 63)%, TBR 2 (0,
104 4)% and TAR 48 (33, 64)%. TIR was significantly positively correlated with the number of scans per day, Pearson r
105 0.4381 ($P < 0.0001$) and significantly negatively correlated with HbA1c ($r -0.7118$, $P < 0.0001$). There was also a
106 significant negative correlation between TBR and HbA1c, $r -0.3388$ ($p = 0.0003$). While TAR and HbA1c were positively
107 correlated ($r 0.7310$, $P < 0.0001$).

108 C-peptide data was available for 175 participants. The median (IQR) C-peptide was 3 (0, 16) pmol/L. C-peptide
109 correlated significantly with the age at diagnosis, $r 0.239$ ($p = 0.001$) and the diabetes duration, $r -0.398$ ($p < 0.001$). C-
110 peptide did not significantly correlate with HbA1c ($p = 0.895$), average glucose ($p = 0.254$), TIR ($p = 0.473$), TAR ($p = 0.363$)
111 and TBR ($p = 0.110$).

112 42.6% of respondents came from the three most deprived SIMD quintiles. 5.9% were from the most deprived
113 quintile 1, 19.1% from quintile 2 and 17.6% from quintile 3. The largest proportion of respondents, 36.7%, were from
114 the least deprived SIMD quintile (quintile 5). Technology disparities existed between SIMD quintiles. MDI use was
115 higher in the most deprived quintiles (1-3) compared to the least deprived (4-5), 66.3% versus 49.1% ($p = 0.025$).

116 Those from the three most deprived quintiles had a significantly higher median (IQR) HbA1c compared to those from
117 the two least deprived quintiles, 64 (58, 75) mmol/mol (8 [7.4, 9]%) compared to 56 (50, 64) mmol/mol (7.3 [6.7,
118 8.0]%) ($p < 0.001$).

119 72.7% of participants held a UK driving licence with 4.7% having previously surrendered their licence. While it did not
120 reach statistical significance a numerically higher percentage of male respondents were drivers (77.1% versus 69.5%)
121 and held a category of licence other than for driving a car alone (19.0% versus 12.7%).

122 Overall population characteristics are summarised in table 1.

Table 1: Overall Population Characteristics

Number (n)	189
Age (years)	41.0 (29.0, 52.0)
Female – n (%)	106 (56.1)
Age at Diagnosis (years)	17 (10.0, 27.0)
Duration of Diabetes (years)	19.3 (11.5, 29.1)
HbA1c (mmol/mol)	60.0 (51.0, 67.0)
HbA1c (%)	7.6 (6.8, 8.3)
CSII – number (%)	82 (44.4)
Time on CSII (years)	4.9 (2.2, 8.1)
isCGM User – number (%)	153 (81.0)
If isCGM user, n scans per day	9.0 (6.1, 12.0)
Time on isCGM (years)	3.75 (3.1, 4.4)
rtCGM User	21 (11.1)
Hospital Admission in the past 12 months – n (%)	19 (10.1)
Holds driving licence – n (%)	139 (72.7)
Previously Surrendered driving licence- n (%)	7 (4.7)
Low SIMD Quintile (quintile 1-3) – n (%)	80 (42.6)
Unemployed – n (%)	19 (10.1)
Time off work in the past 12 months for hypoglycaemia – n (%)*	11 (6.9)
C-peptide (pmol/L)	3 (0, 16)
Average Glucose (mmol/L)	10.2 (8.8, 12.3)
% Time in Range (3.9-10mmol/L)	49 (34, 63)
% Time Above Range (>10mmol/L)	48 (33, 64)
% Time Below Range (<3.9mmol/L)	2 (0, 4)
% Time Sensor Active	90 (78, 96)

Data presented as median (IQR) unless otherwise specified. Abbreviations: CSII- continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion, isCGM- intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring, IQR- interquartile range, rtCGM- real-time continuous glucose monitoring, SIMD- Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation, SH- severe hypoglycaemia. *those reporting as retired excluded from this number

123 Impaired Awareness of Hypoglycaemia

124 IAH group differences are summarised in table 2. Participants with IAH compared to aware respondents were more
 125 likely to report an episode of SH in the previous 12 months, 37.5% compared to 11.7% (odds ratio [OR] 4.5 [95%
 126 confidence interval (CI) 2.0 to 10.9]) (p=0.001). The median (IQR) of SH episodes /person / year was higher in the
 127 IAH group, 0 (0, 2) compared to 0 (0, 0) (p<0.001) (figure 1A and 1B). Participants with IAH were also more likely to
 128 be female, 72.7% compared to 52.6% (p=0.036); older at the time of completing the survey, 44 (33, 61) years
 129 compared to 39.5 (29, 51) years (p=0.047); unemployed, 21.2% compared to 7.7% (p=0.005); and less likely to hold a
 130 driving licence, 56.3% compared to 76.1% (p=0.022). They were not more likely to have surrendered their driving
 131 licence in the past.

Fig 1A Respondents Reporting Severe Hypoglycaemia (SH) in the Previous 12 months.

Fig 1B Number of SH events per patient in the previous year.

Table 2: Characteristics of Subgroups of Impaired Awareness of Hypoglycaemia (IAH)

Subgroup	Normal Awareness	Impaired Awareness	P-Value
Number (n) – (%)	156 (82.5)	33 (17.5)	
Age (years) – median (IQR)	39.5 (29, 51)	44 (33, 61.0)	0.047
Female – n (%)	82 (52.6)	24 (72.7)	0.036
Age at Diagnosis (years) – median (IQR)	16.0 (10.2, 25.0)	20.0 (10.0, 37.5)	0.092
Duration if Diabetes (years) – median (IQR)	19.3 (11.9, 28.3)	20.8 (9.6, 38.1)	0.779
HbA1c (mmol/mol)	59.5 (51.0, 67.0)	63.5 (50.3, 73.0)	0.341
HbA1c (%)	7.6 (6.8, 8.3)	8.0 (6.8, 8.8)	
CSII User – n (%)	69 (44.2)	13 (39.4)	0.701
Time on CSII (years)	5.3 (2.5, 8.2)	2.3 (0.3, 6.8)	0.121
isCGM – n (%)	128 (82.1)	25 (75.8)	0.591

If isCGM user, n scans per day	9 (6.5, 12.0)	9 (6.0, 11.0)	0.584
Time on isCGM (years)	3.7 (3.1, 4.4)	3.9 (3.2, 4.4)	0.905
rtCGM User	17 (10.9)	4 (12.1)	0.591
SH in the past 12 months – n (%)	18 (11.7)	12 (37.5)	0.001
No. SH Episodes	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 2)	<0.001
Hospital Admission in the past 12 months – n (%)	13 (8.3)	6 (18.2)	0.087
Holds driving licence – n (%)	118 (76.1)	18 (56.3)	0.022
Low SIMD Quintile (quintile 1-3) – n (%)	60 (39.4)	20 (60.6)	0.032
Unemployed – n (%)	12 (7.7)	7 (21.2)	0.005
Time off work in the past 12 months for hypoglycaemia – n (%)*	8 (5.9)	3 (12.5)	0.374
C-peptide (pmol/L)	3 (0, 18.5)	4.5 (0, 14.5)	0.962
Average glucose (mmol/L)	10 (8.8, 12.1)	11.9 (10.6, 14.7)	0.041
Time in range (3.9-10 mmol/L)	50 (36, 64.5)	35 (26.3, 46.3)	0.031
Time below range (<3.9mmol/L)	2 (0, 4)	1 (0, 3)	0.161
Time above range (>10 mmol/L)	46 (32.5, 62)	63.5 (52.5, 71)	0.025
% Time Sensor Active	91 (79, 96.5)	77 (62.5, 93.5)	0.081

Data presented as mean (SD) unless otherwise specified. Abbreviations: CSII- continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion, isCGM- intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring, IQR- interquartile range, rtCGM- real-time continuous glucose monitoring, SIMD- Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation, SH- severe hypoglycaemia

132 IAH was associated with socioeconomic deprivation, 60.6% of respondents with IAH were in SIMD quintile 1 to 3
133 compared to 39.4% of respondents with normal awareness (p=0.032) (figure 2). Numerically a higher percentage of
134 people with IAH had a diabetes-related hospital admission in the previous 12 months, 18.2% vs. 8.3%, but this did
135 not reach statistical significance (p=0.087). There was also a trend for people with IAH being diagnosed at an older
136 age with a median (IQR) age at diagnosis of 20 (10.0, 37.5) years versus 16.0 (10.2, 25.0) years (p=0.092).

137 Fig 2: Impaired Awareness of Hypoglycaemia by SIMD Quintile Least deprived- quintile 4 and 5. Most deprived-
138 quintile 1-3. Abbreviations: SIMD- Scottish index of multiple deprivation.

139 There was no group difference between respondents with impaired and normal awareness in the use of CSII (39.4%
 140 compared to 44.2% [p=0.701]), isCGM (75.8% compared to 82.1% [p=0.591]) or rtCGM. (12.1% compared to 10.9%
 141 [p=0.591]). More people with normal awareness were using a DIY isCGM add-on than in the IAH group, 64.7%
 142 compared to 0% (p=0.035).

143 There was no significant group difference in C-peptide levels between those with IAH vs aware, 4.5 (0, 14.5) pmol/L
 144 compared to 3 (0, 18.5) pmol/L (p=0.962)

145 Respondents reporting IAH had a higher average glucose, 11.9 (10.6, 14.7) mmol/L compared to 10 (8.8, 12.1)
 146 mmol/L (p=0.041); a lower TIR, 35% (26.3, 46.3%) compared to 50% (36, 64.5%) (p=0.031) and a higher TAR, 63.5%
 147 (52.5, 71%) compared to 46% (32.5, 62%) (p=0.025).

148 Severe Hypoglycaemia

149 SH group differences are summarised in table 3. Participants reporting SH in the previous 12 months were compared
 150 to those with no history of SH and found to have: a higher median (IQR) HbA1c, 64.5 (55.7, 75.3) mmol/mol (8.1 [7.3,
 151 9.0]%) versus 59.0 (51.0, 67.0) mmol/mol (7.5 [6.8, 8.3]%) (p=0.024); were less likely to hold a current driving licence,
 152 60% versus 21.2% (p<0.001); and to have previously surrendered their driving licence, 22.2% versus 2.3% (p=0.004).

153 They were also more likely to have had a diabetes-related hospital admission in the previous 12 months, 26.7%
 154 versus 7.1% (p=0.004) and to have had at least one day off work/education in the previous 12 months due to
 155 hypoglycaemia, 38.1% compared to 2.2% (P<0.001). There was a trend towards those reporting a SH episode being
 156 younger at the time they were diagnosed with T1D, 11.0 (8.0, 29.0) years compared to 18 (12, 27) years (p=0.054).

157 Participants reporting an episode of SH in the previous 12 months had a significantly lower C-peptide than those not
 158 reporting an episode, median (IQR) 0 (0, 6.9) pmol/L versus 3 (0, 17.8) pmol/L (p=0.04) (Figure 3).

159 Fig 3 History of Severe Hypoglycaemia (SH) in the past 12 Months and Random C-peptide level.

Table 3: Characteristics of Subgroups of Severe Hypoglycaemia (SH) in the Past 12 Months

Subgroup – number (n) (%)	No Episodes of SH	At least 1 episode of SH	P-Value
Number (n) – (%)	157 (84.0)	30 (16.0)	
Age (years)	42 (30, 52)	34 (23.8, 48.5)	0.161

Female – n (%)	83 (53.2)	21 (70.0)	0.109
Age at Diagnosis (years)	18 (12, 27.0)	11.0 (8.0, 29.0)	0.054
Time Since Diagnosis (years)	19.6 (11.7, 29.3)	15.8 (11.1, 28.0)	0.655
HbA1c (mmol/mol)	59.0 (51.0, 67.0)	64.5 (55.7, 75.3)	0.024
HbA1c (%)	7.5 (6.8, 8.3)	8.1 (7.3, 9.0)	
CSII User – n (%)	73 (46.8)	7 (23.3)	0.026
Time on CSII (years)	5.5 (2.5, 8.2)	0.7 (0.3, 7.9)	0.083
isCGM – n (%)	128 (82.2)	22 (73.3)	0.164
If isCGM user, n scans per day	9.0 (6.25, 12.0)	9.25 (6.0, 10.0)	0.789
Time on isCGM (years)	3.7 (3.1, 4.3)	4.0 (3.1, 4.5)	0.428
rtCGM User	18 (11.5)	3 (10.0)	0.168
Hospital Admission in the past 12 months – n (%)	11 (7.1)	8 (26.7)	0.004
Holds driving licence – n (%)	123 (78.8)	12 (40.0)	<0.001
Previously surrendered driving licence – n (%)	3 (2.3)	4 (22.2)	0.004
Unemployed – n (%)	10 (6.5)	8 (26.7)	0.036
Low SIMD Quintile (quintile 1-3) – n (%)	59 (38.1)	20 (66.7)	0.005
Time off work in the past 12 months for hypoglycaemia – n (%)	3 (2.2)	8 (38.1)	<0.001
C-peptide (pmol/L)	3 (0, 17.8)	0 (0, 6.9)	0.04
Average glucose (mmol/L)	9.9 (8.7, 11.7)	12.3 (10, 13.6)	0.021
% Time in Range (3.9-10 mmol/L)	50 (36, 65)	38 (25, 55)	0.053
% Time Below Range (<3.9 mmol/L)	2 (0, 4)	2 (0, 5)	0.873
% Time Above Target (>10 mmol/L)	46 (32, 63)	58 (39, 74)	0.067
% Time Sensor Active	92 (80, 97)	78 (67, 87)	0.009

Data presented as median (IQR) unless otherwise specified. Abbreviations: CSII- continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion, isCGM- intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring, IQR- interquartile range, rtCGM- real-time continuous glucose monitoring, SIMD- Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation, SH- severe hypoglycaemia

160 SH was associated with socioeconomic deprivation. Those reporting an episode of SH were more likely to be
 161 unemployed, 26.7% compared to 6.5% (p=0.036), and to come from the most deprived SIMD quintiles, 66.7%
 162 compared to 38.1% (p=0.005).

163 People with a history of SH were more likely to be MDI users, 76.7% compared to 53.2% ($p=0.026$). There was no
164 group difference in the method for monitoring blood glucose with the majority using isCGM in both the SH group
165 and the group with no history of SH, 73.3% and 82.2% respectively ($p=0.164$).

166 Participants with a history of SH had a higher average glucose, 12.3 (10, 13.6) mmol/L compared to 9.9 (8.7, 11.1)
167 mmol/L ($p=0.021$). There was a non-significant lower TIR in those with a history of SH, 38 (25, 55) % compared to 50
168 (36, 65)% ($p=0.053$) and increased TAR, 58% (39, 74%) compared to 46% (32, 63%) ($p=0.067$). Active sensor time was
169 active significantly lower in those with a history of SH, 78 (67, 87) % compared to 92 (80, 97)% ($p=0.009$).

170 **Discussion**

171 In this cross-sectional survey study completed by 189 adults with T1D the prevalence of IAH was 17.4%. This is similar
172 to a Norwegian study by Olsen et al in 2014 which also found a prevalence of IAH of 17% (25). and implies that the
173 prevalence of IAH has not changed in almost 10 years despite advances in technology.

174 It is, however, a slightly lower rate than reported in a previous study from our centre, which surveyed 518 people
175 with T1D and identified IAH in 19.5% of respondents (6). However, the population characteristics between this study
176 and ours are different. The previous study's population was younger at the time of completing the survey, median
177 (IQR) age 39 (31-50) years; had a shorter time since diagnosis, 16 (9-24) years and had a higher mean (SD) HbA1c,
178 68.3 (15.3) mmol/mol (8.4 [1.4]%). Diabetes management amongst respondents in the previous study was also
179 different with no respondents using CSII. This may limit the comparability of these studies. Another recent cross-
180 sectional survey study investigated SH and IAH in CGM users (26). This survey cohort had high levels of technology
181 use, 80% CSII users and 61% HCL users. Despite this they report higher levels of SH and IAH in their cohort, 33% had
182 a Gold score ≥ 4 and 34.6% had experienced an episode of SH. It may be that a higher proportion of people in their
183 cohort with IAH or a history of SH were on more advanced technologies as a result of these problems. However, it
184 highlights the importance of these high-risk populations being included in future studies of these devices to assess
185 the impact. Similar to our study, this survey found those with a history of SH had higher HbA1c and average glucose
186 levels.

187 In our study, those reporting IAH were 4 times more likely to report at least 1 episode of SH in the previous 12
188 months, which is concordant with other studies demonstrating an association between IAH and SH (27). SH is linked

189 to morbidity, mortality and reduced quality of life (QoL), making it an important target for interventions in
190 people with T1D. While there was no difference in the type of insulin or technology used in the IAH
191 subgroups, we did identify that those using MDI were almost 3-times more likely to have had an episode of SH in the
192 previous 12 months. The data supporting a positive impact of diabetes technology on IAH is scant. A recent paper by
193 Ali et al (2023) suggested CGM has reduced the prevalence of IAH, though this premise has been challenged
194 (28). Many studies of insulin technologies do not include people who are at risk of
195 hypoglycaemia, that is, people with a history of SH or IAH, and so it can be difficult to comment on the impact of
196 these devices on the risk of IAH. The lack of representation of these patient cohorts in research studies investigating
197 these devices is a problem. One of the few studies to show improvement in IAH ((10)) found that
198 diabetes education was key, with no difference between technology groups.

199 The authors acknowledge that the use of the most advanced technologies, such as HCL systems and rtCGM was low
200 in our study, however, this is representative of our local T1D clinic population as reimbursement for isCGM is
201 standard. We did identify a significantly higher proportion of people with normal awareness using a DIY
202 rtCGM system than those with IAH. This is likely due to IAH being a criterion for receiving funded rtCGM in our clinic.
203 Locally, IAH and SH are criteria for referral for more advanced diabetes technologies, however, this work highlights
204 the need to assess patients who are not able to attend clinic using other modalities. It is this sort of data that
205 can influence policy, improve community outreach and aid the development of strategies to help inform and
206 improve access to technology, which may improve uptake and engagement in those difficult to
207 reach lower socioeconomic groups. Such strategies may include reducing barriers to access technologies by offering
208 these to all, increasing provision of information out with the hospital setting and, importantly, peer support.

209 IAH and a history of SH was associated with the most deprived SIMD quintiles. Health disparities exist in T1D (27-29)
210 and previous studies have reported an increased risk of SH in people from more deprived socioeconomic
211 backgrounds (29). However, few studies have linked IAH with socioeconomic status as reported here. Only 5.7% of
212 all respondents in this study were from the most deprived SIMD quintile (quintile 1) and 56.8% were from the least
213 deprived quintiles (quintile 4 and 5). This means that the prevalence of IAH and SH in people from the most
214 socioeconomically deprived areas is likely underestimated in this study. The low proportion of people from the most
215 deprived areas completing this study may in part be due to the questionnaire being administered at a face-to-face
216 clinic: people from the most deprived socioeconomic backgrounds often face more barriers to engaging with health
217 appointments and so the population we have surveyed is not likely to be fully representative of this group.

218 Previous studies, indicate that non-attenders may have poorer glycaemic control (29) and conceivably higher rates
219 of SH and IAH. Although we do not have ethical permission to collect this data we may have underestimated the
220 prevalence of both SH and IAH in the general clinic population. In the IAH group there was a higher proportion of
221 female respondents compared to males, 72.7% versus 52.2%. This may be skewed by the higher proportion of

222 female respondents in the study, 55.7%. this is not a pattern that has been previously reported in studies

223 investigating IAH. As previously noted, a higher proportion of male respondents held a driving licence and a

224 category of licence other than for driving a car alone. Some of these respondents may have had these licence

225 categories as part of their job, which may have made them less forthcoming about their hypoglycaemia awareness

226 status, although confidentiality of the information collected was assured at the time consent was taken.

227 Contrary to previous studies C-peptide levels in this patient cohort were not associated with CGM glycaemic metrics

228 such as average glucose, TBR and TAR (30, 31). However, in these studies C-peptide levels were higher. We did see a

229 reduced incidence of SH in those with higher detectable C-peptide concentrations as has been reported

230 previously(32) demonstrating the benefit of even very low levels of C-peptide concentrations against hypoglycaemia

231 concordant with studies in islet transplant recipients(33). We did not demonstrate an association between C-peptide

232 and HbA1c in our sample. A previous study investigating the impact of random C-peptide on risk of complications

233 and glycaemic control found a lower HbA1c in participants with a C-peptide >200pmol/L (34).

234 This study does have limitations: This study may not necessarily be representative of the wider Type 1 diabetes

235 population as people attending the clinic are more likely to be compliant with treatment and prepared to embrace

236 new technologies versus those who do not attend. Also, older people were more likely to complete our

237 survey, which meant that there were few participants with short duration Type 1 diabetes. A further limitation was

238 that the study was completed as a one-off survey and so relied on the recall of participants at a single point in time,

239 however, recall of SH events in the previous 12 months has been shown to be robust (35). This also means that we

240 do not have information about the hypoglycaemia awareness status or history of SH in respondents before they

241 started using diabetes technologies.

242 The survey was also carried out at a single site and only included participants attending a face-to-face clinic. This may

243 have selected out more motivated and possibly a better controlled cohort than the general clinic population. With

244 this in mind, the authors feel it is important for future studies to reach a wider general clinic population, so that the

245 true extent of these problems can be assessed, and management plans instigated to prevent associated morbidity

246 and mortality.

247 We also recognise that renal failure is a major risk factor for severe hypoglycaemia. We do not have information

248 regarding renal function in patients. However, intervention with diabetes technology may still positively impact this

249 group and this could be the basis for future work.

250 **Conclusions**

251 IAH remains a problem for people living with T1D with a prevalence rate of 17.4% in this cohort. In our cohort IAH
252 was associated with a 4-fold increased risk of SH. Both IAH and SH were more prevalent in females and those from a
253 more deprived socioeconomic background and respondents with these problems were more likely to be
254 unemployed. Our study did not identify any difference in the use of diabetes technologies between groups in those
255 who were aware vs those with IAH. However, SH was lower in those using technology.

256 As has been demonstrated in other studies detectable C-peptide concentrations even at very low levels are
257 protective against SH. Similar to real-world observational studies we found that IAH and SH are associated with
258 higher HbA1c and average glucose levels.

259 Randomised controlled trials are required to investigate if and how advanced diabetes technologies are beneficial
260 for participants with IAH and, or a history of SH. Since IAH and SH were more prevalent in the most socioeconomic
261 deprived areas, it is important that participants are actively recruited from these groups.

262 **Acknowledgements**


263 The authors would like to thank the staff and patients of the type 1 diabetes clinic, outpatient department 2, Royal
264 Infirmary of Edinburgh without whom this study would not have been possible.

265 This study was supported by the Helmsley Charitable Trust (Charity EIN 13-7184401) from whom FB and NB received
266 funding.

References


- 267 1. Scottish Diabetes Survey 2020: Scottish Diabetes Data Group; [Available from:
268 <https://www.diabetesinscotland.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Diabetes-Scottish-Diabetes-Survey-2020.pdf>.
- 269 2. Rickels MR. Hypoglycemia-associated autonomic failure, counterregulatory responses, and therapeutic
270 options in type 1 diabetes. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 2019;1454(1):68-79.
- 271 3. Nathan DM, Genuth S, Lachin J, Cleary P, Crofford O, Davis M, et al. The effect of intensive treatment of
272 diabetes on the development and progression of long-term complications in insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. *N*
273 *Engl J Med.* 1993;329(14):977-86.
- 274 4. Khunti K, Alsifri S, Aronson R, Cigrovski Berković M, Enters-Weijnen C, Forsén T, et al. Rates and predictors of
275 hypoglycaemia in 27 585 people from 24 countries with insulin-treated type 1 and type 2 diabetes: the global HAT
276 study. *Diabetes Obes Metab.* 2016;18(9):907-15.
- 277 5. Verhulst CEM, Fabricius TW, Teerenstra S, Kristensen PL, Tack CJ, McCrimmon RJ, et al. Glycaemic thresholds
278 for counterregulatory hormone and symptom responses to hypoglycaemia in people with and without type 1
279 diabetes: a systematic review. *Diabetologia.* 2022;65(10):1601-12.
- 280 6. Geddes J, Schopman JE, Zammitt NN, Frier BM. Prevalence of impaired awareness of hypoglycaemia in adults
281 with Type 1 diabetes. *Diabet Med.* 2008;25(4):501-4.
- 282 7. Pieri B, Deshmukh H, Wilmot EG, Choudhary P, Shah N, Gregory R, et al. Impaired awareness of
283 hypoglycaemia: Prevalence and associated factors before and after FreeStyle Libre use in the Association of British
284 Clinical Diabetologists audit. *Diabetes Obes Metab.* 2022.
- 285 8. Lin YK, Hung M, Sharma A, Chan O, Varner MW, Staskus G, et al. IMPAIRED AWARENESS OF HYPOGLYCEMIA
286 CONTINUES TO BE A RISK FACTOR FOR SEVERE HYPOGLYCEMIA DESPITE THE USE OF CONTINUOUS GLUCOSE
287 MONITORING SYSTEM IN TYPE 1 DIABETES. *Endocr Pract.* 2019;25(6):517-25.
- 288 9. Gold AE, MacLeod KM, Frier BM. Frequency of severe hypoglycemia in patients with type I diabetes with
289 impaired awareness of hypoglycemia. *Diabetes Care.* 1994;17(7):697-703.
- 290 10. Cranston I, Lomas J, Maran A, Macdonald I, Amiel SA. Restoration of hypoglycaemia awareness in patients
291 with long-duration insulin-dependent diabetes. *Lancet.* 1994;344(8918):283-7.
- 292 11. Fanelli CG, Epifano L, Rambotti AM, Pampanelli S, Di Vincenzo A, Modarelli F, et al. Meticulous prevention of
293 hypoglycemia normalizes the glycemic thresholds and magnitude of most of neuroendocrine responses to,
294 symptoms of, and cognitive function during hypoglycemia in intensively treated patients with short-term IDDM.
295 *Diabetes.* 1993;42(11):1683-9.
- 296 12. Yeoh E, Choudhary P, Nwokolo M, Ayis S, Amiel SA. Interventions That Restore Awareness of Hypoglycemia
297 in Adults With Type 1 Diabetes: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care.* 2015;38(8):1592-609.
- 298 13. Reddy M, Jugnee N, Anantharaja S, Oliver N. Switching from Flash Glucose Monitoring to Continuous Glucose
299 Monitoring on Hypoglycemia in Adults with Type 1 Diabetes at High Hypoglycemia Risk: The Extension Phase of the I
300 HART CGM Study. *Diabetes Technol Ther.* 2018;20(11):751-7.
- 301 14. van Beers CA, DeVries JH, Kleijer SJ, Smits MM, Geelhoed-Duijvestijn PH, Kramer MH, et al. Continuous
302 glucose monitoring for patients with type 1 diabetes and impaired awareness of hypoglycaemia (IN CONTROL): a
303 randomised, open-label, crossover trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol.* 2016;4(11):893-902.
- 304 15. Reid LJ, Gibb FW, Colhoun H, Wild SH, Strachan MWJ, Madill K, et al. Continuous subcutaneous insulin
305 infusion therapy is associated with reduced retinopathy progression compared with multiple daily injections of
306 insulin. *Diabetologia.* 2021;64(8):1725-36.
- 307 16. Brown SA, Kovatchev BP, Raghinaru D, Lum JW, Buckingham BA, Kudva YC, et al. Six-Month Randomized,
308 Multicenter Trial of Closed-Loop Control in Type 1 Diabetes. *N Engl J Med.* 2019;381(18):1707-17.
- 309 17. Tauschmann M, Thabit H, Bally L, Allen JM, Hartnell S, Wilinska ME, et al. Closed-loop insulin delivery in
310 suboptimally controlled type 1 diabetes: a multicentre, 12-week randomised trial. *Lancet.* 2018;392(10155):1321-9.
- 311 18. Collyns OJ, Meier RA, Betts ZL, Chan DSH, Frampton C, Frewen CM, et al. Improved Glycemic Outcomes With
312 Medtronic MiniMed Advanced Hybrid Closed-Loop Delivery: Results From a Randomized Crossover Trial Comparing
313 Automated Insulin Delivery With Predictive Low Glucose Suspend in People With Type 1 Diabetes. *Diabetes Care.*
314 2021;44(4):969-75.
- 315 19. McAuley SA, Trawley S, Vogrin S, Ward GM, Furlanos S, Grills CA, et al. Closed-Loop Insulin Delivery Versus
316 Sensor-Augmented Pump Therapy in Older Adults With Type 1 Diabetes (ORACL): A Randomized, Crossover Trial.
317 *Diabetes Care.* 2022;45(2):381-90.

- 318 20. Noor N, Kamboj MK, Triolo T, Polsky S, McDonough RJ, Demeterco-Berggren C, et al. Hybrid Closed-Loop
319 Systems and Glycemic Outcomes in Children and Adults With Type 1 Diabetes: Real-World Evidence From a U.S.-
320 Based Multicenter Collaborative. *Diabetes Care*. 2022;45(8):e118-e9.
- 321 21. Baxter F, Baillie N, Forbes S. Study protocol: a randomised controlled proof-of-concept real-world study -
322 does maximising time in range using hybrid closed loop insulin delivery and a low carbohydrate diet restore the
323 glucagon response to hypoglycaemia in adults with type 1 diabetes? *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(12):e054958.
- 324 22. Clarke WL, Cox DJ, Gonder-Frederick LA, Julian D, Schlundt D, Polonsky W. Reduced awareness of
325 hypoglycemia in adults with IDDM. A prospective study of hypoglycemic frequency and associated symptoms.
326 *Diabetes Care*. 1995;18(4):517-22.
- 327 23. Geddes J, Wright RJ, Zammit NN, Deary IJ, Frier BM. An evaluation of methods of assessing impaired
328 awareness of hypoglycemia in type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2007;30(7):1868-70.
- 329 24. Government S. Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 2020 2020 [Available from:
330 <https://www.gov.scot/collections/scottish-index-of-multiple-deprivation-2020/>].
- 331 25. Olsen SE, Bjorgaas MR, Asvold BO, Sand T, Stjern M, Frier BM, et al. Impaired Awareness of Hypoglycemia in
332 Adults With Type 1 Diabetes Is Not Associated With Autonomic Dysfunction or Peripheral Neuropathy. *Diabetes*
333 *Care*. 2016;39(3):426-33.
- 334 26. Lin YK, Richardson CR, Dobrin I, DeJonckheere MJ, Mizokami-Stout K, Feters MD, et al. Beliefs Around
335 Hypoglycemia and Their Impacts on Hypoglycemia Outcomes in Individuals with Type 1 Diabetes and High Risks for
336 Hypoglycemia Despite Using Advanced Diabetes Technologies. *Diabetes Care*. 2022;45(3):520-8.
- 337 27. Choudhary P, Geddes J, Freeman JV, Emery CJ, Heller SR, Frier BM. Frequency of biochemical hypoglycaemia
338 in adults with Type 1 diabetes with and without impaired awareness of hypoglycaemia: no identifiable differences
339 using continuous glucose monitoring. *Diabet Med*. 2010;27(6):666-72.
- 340 28. Ali N, El Hamdaoui S, Nefs G, Walburgh Schmidt JWJ, Tack CJ, de Galan BE. High diabetes-specific distress
341 among adults with type 1 diabetes and impaired awareness of hypoglycaemia despite widespread use of sensor
342 technology. *Diabet Med*. 2023;40(9):e15167.
- 343 29. Brewster S, Bartholomew J, Holt RIG, Price H. Non-attendance at diabetes outpatient appointments: a
344 systematic review. *Diabet Med*. 2020;37(9):1427-42.
- 345 30. Gibb FW, McKnight JA, Clarke C, Strachan MWJ. Preserved C-peptide secretion is associated with fewer low-
346 glucose events and lower glucose variability on flash glucose monitoring in adults with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetologia*.
347 2020;63(5):906-14.
- 348 31. Rickels MR, Evans-Molina C, Bahnson HT, Ylescupidez A, Nadeau KJ, Hao W, et al. High residual C-peptide
349 likely contributes to glycemic control in type 1 diabetes. *J Clin Invest*. 2020;130(4):1850-62.
- 350 32. Gubitosi-Klug RA, Braffett BH, Hitt S, Arends V, Uschner D, Jones K, et al. Residual β cell function in long-term
351 type 1 diabetes associates with reduced incidence of hypoglycemia. *J Clin Invest*. 2021;131(3).
- 352 33. Vantghem M-C, Raverdy V, Balavoine A-S, Defrance F, Caiazzo R, Arnalsteen L, et al. Continuous Glucose
353 Monitoring after Islet Transplantation in Type 1 Diabetes: An Excellent Graft Function (β -Score Greater Than 7) Is
354 Required to Abrogate Hyperglycemia, Whereas a Minimal Function Is Necessary to Suppress Severe Hypoglycemia
355 (β -Score Greater Than 3). *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*. 2012;97(11):E2078-E83.
- 356 34. Jeyam A, Colhoun H, McGurnaghan S, Blackburn L, McDonald TJ, Palmer CNA, et al. Clinical Impact of
357 Residual C-Peptide Secretion in Type 1 Diabetes on Glycemia and Microvascular Complications. *Diabetes Care*.
358 2021;44(2):390-8.
- 359 35. Pedersen-Bjergaard U, Pramming S, Thorsteinsson B. Recall of severe hypoglycaemia and self-estimated
360 state of awareness in type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev*. 2003;19(3):232-40.



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.10.24301136>; this version posted January 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure 1A



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.10.24301136>; this version posted January 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure 1B





Figure 2



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.10.24301136>; this version posted January 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure 3