

# DIABETES

## TECHNOLOGY & THERAPEUTICS

Diabetes Technology & Therapeutics: <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/diabetesthology>

### What training, support and resourcing do health professionals need to support people using a closed-loop system? A qualitative interview study with health professionals involved in the Closed Loop from Onset in type 1 Diabetes (CLOuD) trial

Journal:	<i>Diabetes Technology and Therapeutics</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Original Articles
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Kimbell, Barbara; The University of Edinburgh, Usher Institute Rankin, David; The University of Edinburgh, Usher Institute Ashcroft, Nicole; University of Cambridge, Wellcome Trust - Medical Research Institute of Metabolic Science Varghese, Lidiya; Cambridge Clinical Trials Unit Allen, Janet; University of Cambridge, Wellcome Trust - Medical Research Institute of Metabolic Science; University of Cambridge, Department of Paediatrics boughton, charlotte; University of Cambridge, Wellcome Trust - Medical Research Institute of Metabolic Science Campbell, Fiona; St James's University Hospital Ghatak, Atrayee; Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust Randell, Tabitha; Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust Besser, Rachel; Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre; University of Oxford, Department of Paediatrics Trevelyan, Nicola; Southampton University Hospitals NHS Trust Hovorka, Roman; University of Cambridge, Wellcome Trust - Medical Research Institute of Metabolic Science; University of Cambridge, Department of Paediatrics Lawton, Julia; The University of Edinburgh, Usher Institute
Keyword:	Closed-loop systems, Artificial Pancreas, Type 1 diabetes, Diabetes Education
Manuscript Keywords (Search Terms):	closed-loop system, artificial pancreas, health professional, training, qualitative

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **What training, support and resourcing do health professionals need to support people**  
4 **using a closed-loop system? A qualitative interview study with health professionals**  
5 **involved in the Closed Loop from Onset in type 1 Diabetes (CLOuD) trial**  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 *Running title: Closed-loop training for health professionals*  
11  
12  
13  
14

15 Kimbell B<sup>1</sup>, Rankin D<sup>1</sup>, Ashcroft NL<sup>2</sup>, Varghese L<sup>3</sup>, Allen JM<sup>2,4</sup>, Boughton CK<sup>2</sup>, Campbell F<sup>5</sup>,  
16 Ghatak A<sup>6</sup>, Randell T<sup>7</sup>, Besser REJ<sup>8</sup>, Trevelyan N<sup>9</sup>, Hovorka R<sup>2,4</sup>, Lawton J<sup>1</sup> on behalf of  
17 CLOuD Consortium  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 <sup>1</sup>Usher Institute, Medical School, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK  
25

26 <sup>2</sup>Wellcome Trust – Medical Research Institute of Metabolic Science, University of Cambridge,  
27 Cambridge, UK  
28

29 <sup>3</sup>Cambridge Clinical Trials Unit, Cambridge, UK  
30

31 <sup>4</sup>Department of Paediatrics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK  
32

33 <sup>5</sup>St James's University Hospital, Leeds, UK  
34

35 <sup>6</sup>Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK  
36

37 <sup>7</sup>Nottingham University Hospital NHS Trust, Nottingham, UK  
38

39 <sup>8</sup>NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre, Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation  
40 Trust, Oxford, UK and Department of Paediatrics, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK  
41

42 <sup>9</sup>Southampton University Hospital NHS Trust, Southampton, UK  
43  
44

45 **Corresponding author:**  
46

47 Dr Barbara Kimbell, Usher Institute, University of Edinburgh, Teviot Place, Edinburgh EH8  
48

49 9AG. Tel: 0131 650 6675; Email: barbara.kimbell@ed.ac.uk  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 **Funding sources**  
55

56 This work was funded by the Efficiency and Mechanism Evaluation Programme National  
57 Institute for Health Research (14/23/09), National Institute for Health Research Cambridge  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Biomedical Research Centre, JDRF, The Leona M. and Harry B. Helmsley Charitable Trust  
4  
5 (#2016PG-T1D046), and Wellcome Trust Strategic Award (100574/Z/12/Z).  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 **Keywords:** closed-loop system; artificial pancreas; health professional; training; qualitative  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ABSTRACT

### Background

We explored health professionals' views about the training, support and resourcing needed to support people using a closed-loop system in routine clinical care.

### Methods

Interviews with health professionals (n=22) delivering the Closed Loop from Onset in type 1 Diabetes (CLOuD) trial after they had  $\geq 6$  months experience of supporting participants using a closed-loop system. Data were analysed descriptively.

### Results

Interviewees described how, compared to other insulin regimens, teaching and supporting individuals to use a closed-loop system could be initially more time-consuming. They also noted that, after an initial adjustment period, users had less need for initiating contact with the clinical team compared with people using pumps or multiple daily injections. Interviewees highlighted how a lessened need for input could result in new challenges; specifically, they had fewer opportunities to reinforce users' diabetes knowledge and skills through ad-hoc contact and to detect potential psychosocial problems. They also noted heightened anxiety amongst some parents due to the constant availability of data and unrealistic expectations. Interviewees suggested that health professionals supporting closed-loop users in routine clinical care will need comprehensive technology training and standardised clinical guidance. They also stressed that all local diabetes teams should be empowered to deliver closed-loop system care, which will require access to training and appropriate resourcing.

### Conclusion

Supporting people to use a closed-loop system will require health professionals to adapt current approaches to offering education and support. To ensure successful rollout of closed-

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

loop technology, it is vital that healthcare providers reconsider diabetes teams' current training and resourcing.

For Peer Review Only/Not for Distribution

## BACKGROUND

A closed-loop system is a rapidly evolving technology for the management of type 1 diabetes that combines a continuous glucose monitor (CGM), an insulin pump and a control algorithm that interprets, in real time, CGM glucose data and calculates the amount of insulin needing to be administered by the pump. The first hybrid closed-loop system has recently become commercially available in the United States and Europe, and other systems will follow in due course [1].

To support rollout of this technology, it is important to learn from the perspectives and experiences of those who have already used, or supported the use of, closed-loop systems. To date, most studies have focused on patients' and/or their family members' experiences of using closed-loop systems [2-12]. Health professionals' perspectives have only received limited attention, including their views about the training, support and resourcing needed to support individuals using the technology in routine clinical care. This is an important omission, given the evidence that professionals being appropriately trained and supported is a key mediating factor in patients' access to and experience of using diabetes technologies [13].

To address this gap, we report findings from an interview study with health professionals involved in the Closed Loop from Onset in type 1 Diabetes (CLOuD) study. CLOuD is an open-label, multi-centre, randomised controlled trial, which is assessing the effect of closed-loop insulin delivery on residual beta-cell function in young people (aged 10-16 years) newly diagnosed with type 1 diabetes. In the first phase of the trial, participants were randomised to receive 24 months of treatment using either conventional multiple daily injection (MDI) therapy or closed-loop insulin delivery. Health professionals trained the adolescents and their families to use the closed-loop system and provided all study-related support. In most cases, the health professionals delivering the trial were also responsible for participants' routine clinical care. (See Figure 1 for further information about the trial, the study equipment and the training and

1  
2  
3 support provided to professionals delivering the trial and trial participants.) Key aims of the  
4 interview study were to: (a) explore health professionals' experiences of providing training and  
5 support to individuals using the closed-loop system during the trial and lessons learnt for  
6 supporting future users; and, (b) seek their views about the training and resourcing health  
7 professionals will need to support people using closed-loop systems in routine clinical care.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13  
14  
15  
16 < Figure 1 here >  
17  
18  
19

## 20 **METHODS**

21  
22  
23  
24 Qualitative methods facilitate exploration of poorly understood topics as they allow findings to  
25 emerge from the data rather than from a-priori hypotheses [14]. We used semi-structured  
26 interviews informed by topic guides to help ensure the discussion remained relevant to the  
27 study aims, while allowing participants to raise issues they considered important. Data  
28 collection and analysis took place concurrently to allow (unanticipated) findings from early  
29 interviews to be explored in later ones.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 The study was informed by Normalization Process Theory, an epistemological position which  
40 recognises that the adoption and delivery of a healthcare intervention (including a new  
41 technology) may be mediated and informed by individual and contextual factors [15]. Our  
42 approach was also informed by earlier work, which has highlighted how unexpected issues,  
43 benefits and challenges may arise from introducing and using new diabetes technologies  
44 [11,12].  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

### 54 **Recruitment**

55 We recruited health professionals (doctors, diabetes nurses, research nurses) in all seven  
56 participating sites: Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge; Leeds Children's Hospital, Leeds;  
57 Alder Hey Children's Hospital, Liverpool; Nottingham Children's Hospital, Nottingham; Oxford  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Children's Hospital, Oxford; Southampton Children's Hospital, Southampton; and Royal  
4 Hospital for Children and Young People, Edinburgh. Health professionals were invited to opt  
5 in to the interview study after they had at least six months experience of supporting people  
6 using closed-loop systems during the trial. Recruitment continued until there was good  
7 representation of staff involved in trial delivery from across all sites and data saturation was  
8 reached (i.e. no new findings were identified in new data collected).  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

### 15 16 17 18 **Data collection and analysis**

19  
20 BK, an experienced, non-clinical qualitative researcher, conducted the interviews using a topic  
21 guide informed by literature reviews, inputs from clinical co-investigators and revised in  
22 response to emerging findings. Key topic areas relevant to the reporting in this paper are  
23 outlined in Figure 2. The interviews took place between August 2018 and June 2019, averaged  
24 70 minutes and were digitally recorded and transcribed in full.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 < Figure 2 here >  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 We undertook qualitative descriptive data analysis, which produces 'low-inference'  
38 descriptions of views and experiences and is particularly suited to understanding and  
39 illuminating issues relevant to policy and practice [16,17]. BK and JL undertook independent  
40 analyses, which involved repeatedly reading and cross-comparing individual transcripts and  
41 writing separate reports, before meeting to discuss their interpretations of the data and  
42 agreeing a coding frame that captured key areas of relevance to clinical practice development.  
43 Coded datasets were subject to further analyses to develop more nuanced interpretations of  
44 the data. Use of qualitative analysis software package NVivo10 (QSR International,  
45 Doncaster, Australia) facilitated data coding and retrieval.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The Usher Research Ethics Group (UREG), University of Edinburgh, granted ethical approval  
4 for the study (approval date: 08 February 2018). To safeguard anonymity, we use unique  
5 identifiers in the reporting below (i.e. D=doctor; N=diabetes nurse; RN=research nurse).  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 11 12 13 14 **RESULTS**

15  
16  
17  
18 The sample comprised 22 health professionals (7 doctors, 9 diabetes nurses and 6 research  
19 nurses). Further details are provided in Table 1.  
20  
21  
22

23  
24  
25 < Table 1 here >  
26  
27  
28

29 Below, we report interviewees' experiences of training and supporting young people and their  
30 families to use the closed-loop system. We highlight, in particular, their perceptions of what  
31 helped or hindered this process and what unanticipated issues may arise for some young  
32 people starting out on the technology. We then present their views about what training and  
33 resourcing diabetes professionals will need to support people using a closed-loop system in  
34 routine clinical care. Finally, we describe their views about who may be best placed to deliver  
35 care on the closed-loop system when the technology becomes more widely available.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

### 46 **Teaching and supporting people to use the closed-loop system**

47 Interviewees reported that they had found teaching families how to use the closed-loop system  
48 to be a straightforward endeavour. Some attributed this to individuals' growing familiarity and  
49 competency with technologies in everyday life:  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 "They all seem to take to it really well. I don't know whether it's now with younger ones  
57 being into technology more than I would have been. You know, I would have maybe  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 struggled, but even the parents have all commented about how quickly they've picked up  
4 the use of the closed-loop." (RN1)  
5  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 However, all interviewees noted that families had needed more extensive teaching input than  
11 was required to use other insulin regimens such as MDI or continuous subcutaneous insulin  
12 infusion (CSII) therapy. Some reflected on the fact that, because trial participants were newly  
13 diagnosed, they only had a rudimentary understanding of diabetes management, which made  
14 their education "that little bit harder" (N7). Interviewees also described how providing  
15 education on each of the closed-loop system's constituent parts (i.e. insulin pump, sensor,  
16 handset and control algorithm) required more time than standard device training. Many  
17 interviewees described experimenting with different approaches to delivering this education:  
18 "I tried to do as much as possible within just one visit and failed epically, so after that I've been  
19 a lot more structured and have split things up" (N5). All interviewees concluded that delivering  
20 closed-loop education to this specific cohort, i.e. individuals naïve to all diabetes technology,  
21 worked best when the system's component parts were introduced one-by-one at a pace  
22 appropriate to the individual, typically over several weeks, as it "just gives the family time to  
23 get used to each element" (N8).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Interviewees further observed that, once people were set up on the closed-loop system, they  
42 initially required more support than individuals using other insulin regimens. This was not only  
43 due to study equipment occasionally malfunctioning, but also because adolescents and  
44 parents needed to become accustomed to the individual devices, their functions and settings,  
45 and how to use these effectively. After an initial adjustment period, most felt that the level of  
46 support needed was similar to that of people using MDI or CSII. Some, however, suggested  
47 that individuals had sought less input over time than was typically requested by people using  
48 other insulin regimens. To account for this, these interviewees noted that, when people used  
49 a closed-loop system, there was less need to routinely review and adjust basal doses and/or  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 mealtime ratios as the system automatically managed any excessive variability in blood  
4  
5 glucose levels:  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 “They’ve done really well with probably, yeah, less support, because...if it was a patient  
11  
12 who was just on a pump I think they would need a lot more support from us, looking at  
13  
14 downloads and titrating insulin constantly.” (N9)  
15  
16  
17

### 18 **Unanticipated consequences; implications for workload**

19  
20 Some interviewees observed that having less contact with closed-loop users to help optimise  
21  
22 their blood glucose control could have unanticipated consequences. For example, several  
23  
24 discussed how, when individuals started CSII therapy, they would normally use the initial  
25  
26 weeks and months of enhanced contact to proactively educate them how to interpret patterns  
27  
28 in their blood glucose data and determine appropriate adjustments to basal rates and mealtime  
29  
30 ratios. Closed-loop users’ reduced need for this type of support, however, meant that health  
31  
32 professionals had fewer teaching opportunities, which, in turn, resulted in individuals “missing  
33  
34 out really on the sort of basic education of what to do if things weren’t going as well” (N9).  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 Interviewees also observed how reduced contact to discuss blood glucose control could affect  
40  
41 more holistic aspects of diabetes care and potentially result in support needs emerging further  
42  
43 down the line. N7, for example, remarked that closed-loop system users’ reduced need for  
44  
45 clinical input meant that “we drop the ball in other areas, you know, psychosocial stuff that  
46  
47 we’d pick up if we were speaking to them more regularly” (N7). Several interviewees also  
48  
49 suggested that the system’s efficiency at controlling glycaemic excursions had the potential to  
50  
51 delay some individuals coming to terms with their diagnosis by masking the true burden of  
52  
53 having diabetes. Similarly, some noted that the system’s ability to counteract neglectful self-  
54  
55 management practices, such as lax carbohydrate-counting or missed mealtime boluses, could  
56  
57 mask underlying issues, such as a poor emotional adjustment to diabetes, which was  
58  
59 consequently “probably being picked up later than it could have been” (D3).  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Several interviewees observed that the closed-loop system could heighten the anxieties of  
6 some parents, because the greater availability of real-time data allowed minute-by-minute  
7 monitoring of their child's blood glucose. They described how having access to this information  
8 compelled some anxious parents to micromanage by overriding some of the closed-loop's  
9 automated adjustments and administering their own correction doses, thereby interfering with  
10 the system's ability to adapt to the user's individual insulin requirements. Some worried  
11 parents were also reported to have made frequent contact with clinicians to discuss what they  
12 erroneously perceived as dangerous blood glucose digressions and seek reassurance that:  
13 "when you're out of range [it] doesn't mean her kidneys are gonna explode and she's gonna  
14 go blind and we're gonna have to cut her foot off" (N7). As well as offering education to parents  
15 to address misconceptions about the implications of glucose excursions, interviewees also  
16 highlighted the importance of proactively managing their expectations of the closed-loop  
17 system:  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 "I suppose you do have to make it clear that when you're on a closed-loop system it will do  
36 its best, but you are diabetic. You will have highs still and you will have lows still. Because  
37 I think they think that this will delete them full stop, delete all lows." (RN5)  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **Training and resources needed to support closed-loop users in routine care**

44 Interviewees generally considered themselves proficient and confident with pump and sensor  
45 technology, so their main training needs to support people using a closed-loop system cohered  
46 around the handset containing the system's algorithm, which they found "reasonably  
47 straightforward, it's not difficult to learn" (N6). Interviewees felt that, while it was not necessary  
48 for everyone to be trained to educator-level, all team members involved in looking after people  
49 using a closed-loop system in routine clinical care should have at least some understanding  
50 of the system: "I think all the clinicians...should be aware and understand the functionalities  
51 and know a little bit of troubleshooting" (D4). They also offered suggestions for how future  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 training for health professionals might be delivered; this included training videos, Webinars,  
4 recorded TED talks and in-depth training from device manufacturers “to provide specific  
5 competencies that we have proven to the company trainers that we are able to follow” (N5).  
6  
7 Similarly, several interviewees recommended a competency assessment on completion of  
8 training to demonstrate one’s aptitude before supporting use of the technology in clinical  
9 practice. Others highlighted the need for a formal, accredited training scheme:  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15  
16  
17  
18 “It needs a training scheme of some description and you shouldn’t be able to use it unless  
19 you’ve done that training scheme, be it a much more in-depth closed-loop educator scheme  
20 or a more loosely affiliated ‘you’ve been on the course’ type of affair.” (N7)  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 Regardless of the mode of training delivery, all interviewees emphasised the importance of  
27 being given opportunities to familiarise themselves with the technology “in a safe environment,  
28 to play, to make your mistakes, to feel confident with the system” (N7) prior to use in clinical  
29 practice. As N2 explained:  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 “I think webinars have their place...and recorded training. But you’d need to hold the kit...to  
38 actually have the kit in your hands and to manipulate it yourself...We wouldn’t expect that  
39 the patients, you know, learn about how to do an injection from watching a video.” (N2)  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Several interviewees also described how they would routinely test new insulin pumps and  
46 sensors on themselves to further their own understanding or demonstrate their use to families,  
47 but how this had not been logistically feasible with a closed-loop system in preparation for this  
48 trial. Consequently, they suggested that, upon wider rollout, health professionals should have  
49 access to simulation equipment to aid their own learning as well as a demonstration system  
50 to support education sessions with families. Interviewees also noted that having a manual  
51 available for ongoing reference was helpful, because “sometimes it’s quite a gap  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 between...someone going on closed-loop and when your next one goes onto it...so you need  
4 to go back and refer to it" (N8).  
5  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 As the care of individuals using a closed-loop system differs from that of people using other  
11 insulin regimens, interviewees suggested that diabetes professionals should be issued with  
12 structured guidance on how to advise closed-loop users clinically. This included guidance  
13 about more atypical cases, such as how best to manage a very active person, and non-routine  
14 events such as travel across time zones. Additionally, D3, like others, suggested that guidance  
15 should highlight the clinically most important areas within the system's extensive data outputs,  
16 because "there are I think at least like 40, 50 pages of download that happen and...we've got  
17 to go through all of it, or the most pertinent aspects of it, in a flash, so knowing what bits will  
18 be useful and why in a clinic setting would be helpful" (D3). Relatedly, all interviewees  
19 emphasised that centres will require robust IT systems with good internet connectivity to  
20 facilitate these large data downloads. Ultimately, interviewees acknowledged that learning 'on  
21 the job' was key to consolidating their understanding of the closed-loop system:  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35  
36  
37 "I knew the theory of the closed-loop and I knew what I was looking at, but even now, having  
38 dealt with the patients in clinic, I feel I'm in a better position...So even if the information is  
39 given at the start, until you've actually had the experience of dealing with it or having to  
40 understand it, you don't really take it in." (D2)  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

#### 47 **Who should provide closed-loop care?**

48  
49 All interviewees emphasised that, to be able to appropriately advise and support closed-loop  
50 users, health professionals needed to be proficient in the use of insulin pumps and sensors:  
51  
52  
53

54  
55  
56 "I think the prerequisite should be complete familiarity with pumps and CGM...because it's  
57 a closed-loop and it will do pretty much all the work itself, it cannot be delivered by people  
58 who are not completely conversant with the parts of the loop." (D2)  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Some, however, noted that this expertise was currently lacking in some diabetes centres and,  
6 hence, that closed-loop system care should, at least initially, be managed by tertiary centres  
7 with the requisite technological expertise:  
8  
9  
10

11  
12  
13 “I’ve worked in quite a few different diabetes centres and have often been the only person  
14 with any pump experience there...I think getting everybody comfortable with delivering  
15 training for patients on closed-loop is probably a bit of a step too far, so at least starting  
16 with specialised centres is probably the most economical way of delivering it in the future.”  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 (D5)  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 Conversely, many interviewees agreed with N6’s sentiment that: “there’s no reason why every  
27 specialist diabetes team in every centre can’t take on that role. It’s not any more rocket science  
28 than what people are managing with the pumps...and the CGM that’s routine now” (N6).  
29 Indeed, several argued that it was in patients’ best clinical interest that local diabetes centres  
30 have knowledge of closed-loop technology to ensure their appropriate support in times of  
31 emergency: “...diabetes is a secondary-level speciality that should be delivered in the centre  
32 nearest to the child’s home, because...unfortunately lots of children do have emergencies with  
33 their diabetes...unless the local service is able to understand their insulin regimen it is  
34 dangerous.” (D6)  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

## 50 **DISCUSSION**

51  
52  
53

54 This is the first study to explore health professionals’ views about the training, support and  
55 resourcing needed to support people using closed-loop systems once this technology  
56 becomes more widely available in routine clinical care. Interviewees described how, compared  
57 to other insulin regimens, teaching and supporting individuals to use a closed-loop system  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 could be initially more time-consuming. They also noted that, after an initial adjustment period,  
4 users had less need for initiating contact with the clinical team compared with people using  
5 CSII and MDI. Interviewees highlighted how use of the closed-loop system could give rise to  
6 new challenges as well as opportunities. Specifically, they noted that, by virtue of the system's  
7 ability to keep blood glucose stable, they were presented with fewer opportunities to reinforce  
8 users' diabetes knowledge and skills through ad-hoc contact as well as to detect potential  
9 psychosocial problems affecting management practices. Heightened anxiety amongst some  
10 parents was also noted, due to the constant availability of data and these individuals holding  
11 unrealistic expectations. Interviewees recommended that all local diabetes teams should be  
12 empowered to deliver closed-loop system care, which will require access to comprehensive  
13 technology training, standardised clinical guidance and appropriate resourcing.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Our findings indicate that, when training and supporting new users, the closed-loop system's  
29 complexity may lead to an initial increase in health professionals' workloads. However, it  
30 should be noted that the CLOuD trial involved newly-diagnosed individuals; hence, users with  
31 prior experience of pumps and/or sensors are likely to have fewer training needs. Furthermore,  
32 users' need for clinical input and technological support should attenuate as new components  
33 become available (e.g. calibration-free CGMs) or are rendered redundant (e.g. by embedding  
34 the control algorithm in a smartphone or smartwatch app) [18,19]. (These system  
35 modifications are currently being tested in phase 2 of the CLOuD trial.) Having fewer  
36 component parts requiring less user input should reduce the potential for equipment  
37 malfunctions and user errors, and further alleviate health professionals' workloads.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Our findings also highlight several challenges as well as benefits, which may arise from  
52 introducing and using closed-loop technology. Interviewees noted that, because of the  
53 system's ability to reduce glycaemic excursions, individuals had needed less clinical input than  
54 is typically required by those using CSII and MDI. This led to concerns that individuals might  
55 miss out on critical teaching opportunities, such as those needed to make independent  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 adjustments to basal rates and mealtime ratios. Users' inability to manage their blood glucose  
4 independently may put them at risk of potentially lengthy, but avoidable, periods of suboptimal  
5 glycaemic control and compromise the glycaemic benefits offered by the closed-loop system.  
6  
7 This finding therefore highlights the importance of ensuring that people going onto a closed-  
8 loop system from diagnosis, like other individuals newly diagnosed with type 1 diabetes, are  
9 given access to high-quality, structured education programmes [20].  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 Interviewees also noted how reduced contact with users, alongside the system's ability to  
19 rectify (and therefore mask) poor self-management practices (e.g. meal boluses being  
20 miscalculated or omitted), might compromise timely detection of issues, such as poor  
21 emotional adjustment or psychosocial problems. Previous studies [21,22] have shown how  
22 the closed-loop system can compensate for lax dietary management practices commonly  
23 observed among adolescents [23,24]. To date, however, none have reported a potential for  
24 unintended psychological consequences to arise from the closed-loop's ability to make these  
25 compensations. Others have highlighted how diabetes-related depressive symptoms may  
26 lead to adolescents discontinuing use of diabetes technologies [25]. Thus, new users of  
27 closed-loop systems, particularly adolescents, might benefit from ongoing psychological  
28 assessment and referral to psychological services if required.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Our findings also lend support to others' observations that people who lack knowledge about  
44 closed-loop technology may hold unrealistic expectations about the system's capabilities  
45 [8,11]. Most families in the current study lacked diabetes experience prior to their child's  
46 diagnosis, which may have resulted in some parents being more prone to seeking frequent  
47 reassurance about glycaemic excursions. As others have shown, having realistic expectations  
48 helps ensure that individuals adopt, and appropriately use, closed-loop technology [26,27].  
49 Hence, to reduce future workload, health professionals should explore people's understanding  
50 of the closed-loop system and clarify its capabilities and limitations.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Interviewees highlighted that those training and supporting people to use a closed-loop system  
4 must be competent with current pump and sensor technologies. They also raised concerns  
5 that some diabetes teams still lacked these skills. In studies of other diabetes technologies,  
6 similar shortfalls in expertise have been linked to: time constraints, health professionals having  
7 limited device exposure because of prohibitive costs which limit patient access to technology,  
8 and a lack of consensus or policy regarding training requirements [13,28]. It has also been  
9 noted that a lack of training can result in health professionals being reluctant to recommend  
10 closed-loop systems to patients [29]. Hence, health professionals should be encouraged and  
11 enabled to access existing technology training to help them acquire the necessary skills and  
12 confidence to support closed-loop technology upon its wider rollout. Approaches used to  
13 promote staff training in other diabetes technologies might also be considered to support the  
14 rollout of closed-loop technology; these include: organisational and managerial support  
15 through funding and study time, placements, mentorship schemes, peer support and  
16 professional development using videoconferencing facilities [13]. To address interviewees'  
17 suggestions regarding competency assessments prior to using closed-loop systems in clinical  
18 practice, device manufacturers could provide accredited training options, including online  
19 resources that enable flexible access for busy professionals. Interviewees also indicated a  
20 need for experiential learning prior to supporting patients using the closed-loop system.  
21 Considered an 'ethical imperative' by some [30], simulation-based learning in medical  
22 education is recognised as enhancing health professionals' knowledge and skills (and thus  
23 patient safety) as well as benefitting wider organisational outcomes, such as staff retention  
24 and positive culture change [31]. Hence, manufacturers could look to develop simulation  
25 closed-loop systems in order to facilitate individual learning and understanding and promote  
26 awareness, acceptance and adoption of this technology among the wider community of  
27 diabetes professionals.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55  
56  
57  
58 In addition to training staff in specialist centres, consideration should be given to providing  
59 training to health professionals in local diabetes teams who support closed-loop users, as they  
60

1  
2  
3 are typically the first port of call for diabetes-related emergencies. Health professionals in  
4 smaller centres often have not just diabetes as their sub-speciality, but may also work in other  
5 specialities for which they are required to maintain their professional development and adopt  
6 new technologies and learning. This may limit their ability to adopt increasingly more  
7 complicated technologies in diabetes. However, there is a need for them to do so to ensure  
8 that access to these treatments is equitable and patients can be looked after safely by their  
9 local services. Interviewees also highlighted the importance of having robust IT infrastructure  
10 in place to facilitate the large data downloads that inform the clinical input and advice given to  
11 system users. As others have noted, having limited local expertise and unsupportive service  
12 structures and processes can lead to some health professionals limiting their involvement in  
13 technology-based diabetes care [29]. In line with recommendations in relation to existing  
14 diabetes technologies [13], healthcare providers should consider whether service  
15 reconfiguration, reallocation of staffing and resources, or improvements to IT infrastructure  
16 may be required to ensure that local teams can deliver care for closed-loop users.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 A key study strength is the use of a flexible, open-ended approach, which enabled us identify  
36 issues and challenges erstwhile unreported in the literature. A potential limitation is that we  
37 focused upon health professionals involved in a clinical trial involving youths newly diagnosed  
38 with type 1 diabetes. This might limit the generalisability of our findings and recommendations.  
39 Future research should consider longer-term follow-up of newly-diagnosed closed-loop  
40 system users to establish whether health professionals' concerns regarding a delayed  
41 emergence of support needs are realised. All centres running the trial had experience of the  
42 use of insulin pumps and CGMs in a wide range of patients with diabetes. Furthermore,  
43 interviewees in our study agreed to take part in a trial of closed-loop systems and some had  
44 prior experience of supporting individuals using this technology. As such, they are not  
45 necessarily representative of the wider community of diabetes professionals. Future studies  
46 should thus seek the views of diabetes professionals who have less engagement with  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 treatment technologies to explore the reasons behind this and their expectations, concerns  
4 and support needs regarding the rollout of closed-loop technology.  
5  
6  
7  
8

9 As closed-loop systems become more widely available, diabetes services will need to adapt  
10 comprehensively to meet the requirements for delivering this technology. With the future of  
11 diabetes management increasingly being dominated by technological solutions, it is  
12 imperative that health professionals are given appropriate training, time and support to  
13 embrace these developments and ensure that people with type 1 diabetes are able to access,  
14 and benefit from, these innovative advances.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

### 25 **Acknowledgements**

26  
27 The authors would like to thank the health professionals who kindly took part in this study. The  
28 views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not those of the MRC, NIHR,  
29 the Department of Health and Social Care or other funding bodies.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

### 37 **Author disclosure statement**

38  
39 RH reports having received speaker honoraria from Eli Lilly and Novo Nordisk, serving on  
40 advisory panel for Eli Lilly and Novo Nordisk, receiving licence fees from BBraun and  
41 Medtronic. RH reports patent patents and patent applications. TR reports having received  
42 speaker honoraria from Novo Nordisk and consultancy fees from Abbott Diabetes Care. FC  
43 reports having received travel expenses and honorarium to attend the Advisory Boards of  
44 Medtronic, Dexcom, Ypsomed and Eli Lilly. RB reports having received speaker honoraria  
45 from Eli Lilly and Springer Healthcare. BK, DR, JMA, NLA, LV, CKB, NT, GA and JL – No  
46 competing financial interests exist.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## REFERENCES

- [1] Allen N, Gupta A. Current diabetes technology: Striving for the artificial pancreas. *Diagnostics (Basel)*. 2019;9:31.
- [2] Barnard KD, Wysocki T, Ullly V, et al. Closing the loop in adults, children and adolescents with suboptimally controlled type 1 diabetes under free living conditions: A psychosocial substudy. *J Diabetes Sci Technol*. 2017;11:1080-1088.
- [3] Hendrieckx C, Poole L, Sharifi A, et al. "It is definitely a game changer": A qualitative study of experiences with in-home overnight closed-loop technology among adults with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther*. 2017;19:410-416.
- [4] Barnard KD, Wysocki T, Allen JM, et al. Closing the loop overnight at home setting: Psychosocial impact for adolescents with type 1 diabetes and their parents. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care*. 2014;2:e000025.
- [5] Barnard KD, Wysocki T, Thabit H, et al. Psychosocial aspects of closed- and open-loop insulin delivery: Closing the loop in adults with type 1 diabetes in the home setting. *Diabet Med*. 2015;32:601-608.
- [6] Young AJ, Thabit H, Heller SR, et al. Holistic impact of closed-loop technology on people with type 1 diabetes. *J Diabetes Sci Technol*. 2015;9:932-933.
- [7] Farrington C, Stewart ZA, Barnard K, et al. Experiences of closed-loop insulin delivery among pregnant women with type 1 diabetes. *Diabet Med*. 2017;34:1461-1469.
- [8] Iturralde E, Tanenbaum ML, Hanes SJ, et al. Expectations and attitudes of individuals with type 1 diabetes after using a hybrid closed loop system. *Diabetes Educ*. 2017;43:223-232.
- [9] Tanenbaum ML, Iturralde E, Hanes SJ, et al. Trust in hybrid closed loop among people with diabetes: Perspectives of experienced system users. *J Health Psychol*. 2017:1359105317718615.

1  
2  
3 [10] Iturralde E, Tanenbaum M, Naranjo D, et al. Partner perspectives on closed loop systems.  
4  
5 PLAID. 2016;2:30-38.  
6

7  
8 [11] Lawton J, Blackburn M, Rankin D, et al. Participants' experiences of, and views about,  
9  
10 daytime use of a day-and-night hybrid closed-loop system in real life settings: Longitudinal  
11  
12 qualitative study. *Diabetes Technol Ther*. 2019;21:119-127.  
13

14  
15 [12] Lawton J, Blackburn M, Rankin D, et al. The impact of using a closed-loop system on food  
16  
17 choices and eating practices among people with type 1 diabetes: A qualitative study involving  
18  
19 adults, teenagers and parents. *Diabet Med*. 2019;36: 753–760.  
20

21  
22 [13] James S, Perry L, Gallagher R, et al. Diabetes educators: Perceived experiences,  
23  
24 supports and barriers to use of common diabetes-related technologies. *J Diabetes Sci*  
25  
26 *Technol*. 2016;10:1115-1121.  
27

28  
29 [14] Pope C, Mays N. Qualitative research: Reaching parts other methods cannot reach: An  
30  
31 introduction to qualitative methods in health and health services research. *BMJ*. 1995;311:42-  
32  
33 45.  
34

35  
36 [15] May C, Finch T. Implementing, embedding, and integrating practices: An outline of  
37  
38 normalization process theory. *Sociology*. 2009;43:535-554.  
39

40  
41 [16] Sandelowski M. Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Res Nurs Health*.  
42  
43 2000;23:334-340.  
44

45  
46 [17] Sandelowski M. What's in a name? Qualitative description revisited. *Res Nurs Health*.  
47  
48 2010;33:77-84.  
49

50  
51 [18] Kowalski A. Pathway to artificial pancreas systems revisited: Moving downstream.  
52  
53 *Diabetes Care*. 2015;38:1036-1043.  
54

55  
56 [19] Trevitt S, Simpson S, Wood A. Artificial pancreas device systems for the closed-loop  
57  
58 control of type 1 diabetes: What systems are in development? *J Diabetes Sci Technol*.  
59  
60 2016;10:714-723.

1  
2  
3 [20] Choudhary P, Campbell F, Joule N, et al. A type 1 diabetes technology pathway:  
4 Consensus statement for the use of technology in type 1 diabetes. *Diabet Med*. 2019;36:531-  
5 538.  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 [21] Elleri D, Maltoni G, Allen JM, et al. Safety of closed-loop therapy during reduction or  
11 omission of meal boluses in adolescents with type 1 diabetes: A randomized clinical trial.  
12 *Diabetes Obes Metab*. 2014;16:1174-1178.  
13  
14

15  
16 [22] Chernavsky DR, DeBoer MD, Keith-Hynes P, et al. Use of an artificial pancreas among  
17 adolescents for a missed snack bolus and an underestimated meal bolus. *Pediatr Diabetes*.  
18 2016;17:28-35.  
19  
20  
21

22  
23 [23] Olinder AL, Kernell A, Smide B. Missed bolus doses: Devastating for metabolic control in  
24 CSII-treated adolescents with type 1 diabetes. *Pediatr Diabetes*. 2009;10:142-148.  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 [24] Vanderwel BW, Messer LH, Horton LA, et al. Missed insulin boluses for snacks in youth  
30 with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2010;33:507-508.  
31  
32

33  
34 [25] Wong JC, Dolan LM, Yang TT, et al. Insulin pump use and glycemic control in adolescents  
35 with type 1 diabetes: Predictors of change in method of insulin delivery across two years.  
36 *Pediatr Diabetes*. 2015;16:592-599.  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 [26] Gonder-Frederick L, Shepard J, Peterson N. Closed-loop glucose control: Psychological  
42 and behavioral considerations. *J Diabetes Sci Technol*. 2011;5:1387-1395.  
43  
44

45  
46 [27] Aleppo G, Webb KM. Integrated insulin pump and continuous glucose monitoring  
47 technology in diabetes care today: A perspective of real-life experience with the Minimed™  
48 670g hybrid closed-loop system. *Endocr Pract*. 2018;24:684-692.  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 [28] Perry L, James S, Gallagher R, et al. Supporting patients with type 1 diabetes using  
54 continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion therapy: Difficulties, disconnections, and disarray. *J*  
55 *Eval Clin Pract*. 2017;23:719-724.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 [29] Weissberg-Benchell J, Hood K, Laffel L, et al. Toward development of psychosocial  
4 measures for automated insulin delivery. J Diabetes Sci Technol. 2015;10:799-801.  
5  
6

7  
8 [30] Ziv A, Root Wolpe P, Small SD, et al. Simulation-based medical education: An ethical  
9 imperative. Acad Med. 2003;78:783-788.  
10  
11

12  
13 [31] Gaba DM. The future vision of simulation in health care. Qual Saf Health Care. 2004;13  
14 (Suppl 1):i2-10.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Figure 1. Details about the CLOuD trial, study device and training provided**

The CLOuD trial aims to determine whether continued intensive metabolic control using a hybrid closed-loop system is better able to preserve beta-cell function in young people newly diagnosed with type 1 diabetes than standard multiple daily injection (MDI) therapy. The automated hybrid closed-loop system used in the first phase of the CLOuD trial, FlorenceM, comprised:

- ↗ A modified Medtronic 640G pump
- ↗ A Medtronic Guardian 3 sensor
- ↗ A locked-down Android smartphone with Medtronic enclosure containing the Cambridge model predictive control algorithm enabling wireless communication with the insulin pump.

Eligibility criteria for the trial included: a diagnosis of type 1 diabetes within the preceding 21 days; aged between 10 and 16.9 years old; a willingness to perform regular capillary blood glucose monitoring (at least 4 blood glucose measurements every day); to wear the study devices; and, to upload pump and sensor data at regular intervals.

*Training and support provided to trial participants*

Pre-randomisation, participants and their families received structured diabetes education and training in accordance with standard clinical practice. All participants received training on the multiple daily injection (MDI) regimen. Participants randomised to the closed-loop arm were additionally trained on the use of the study insulin pump and CGM sensor, and their competency on these devices assessed, prior to starting closed-loop insulin delivery. They were also given a user manual to take away.

The study involved 14 planned visits and 1 telephone/email contact in each arm over the 24-month study period. Participants were contacted by email/telephone within one week after study initiation and subsequently followed up at 3-monthly study visits to: record any adverse events, device deficiencies and changes to insulin doses; take an HbA1c sample; download data from the study devices; and fit participants of both study arms with a blinded CGM sensor to be worn for the next 14 days. Participants also had access to a 24-hour telephone helpline to contact their local study team with any study-related matters. In most sites, the health professionals delivering the trial were also responsible for participants' routine clinical care during the trial.

*Training and support provided to site teams delivering the trial*

Each participating centre received a training visit from two members of the research team, who demonstrated the different study devices (pump, sensor, study handset) and set up a working closed-loop system in real time. They also explained data downloads and the practicalities of the study, including details of the participant visits. The research team also supported the centres on a second visit when they started their first participant on the closed-loop technology. Site teams received a trouble-shooting guide and had access to 24-hour telephone support from the research team throughout the study.

Figure 1. Details about the CLOuD trial, study device and training provided

159x219mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **Figure 2. Key topic areas explored in the interviews**  
7

- 8  
9
- 10     $\curvearrowright$  Interviewees' clinical background, training and experience; previous involvement (if any)  
11       in trials of closed-loop technology.
  - 12     $\curvearrowright$  Experiences of training study participants to use the closed-loop system; perceived  
13       differences to training people using conventional insulin regimens.
  - 14     $\curvearrowright$  Experiences of providing support to participants using a closed-loop system; perceived  
15       differences in the type and amount of support required compared with people using  
16       other approaches; perceived sustainability of this level of support upon rollout.
  - 17
  - 18     $\curvearrowright$  Experiences of the training and support received to deliver the trial; views about what  
19       kind of training, support and resources health professionals will need to support closed-  
20       loop users in routine clinical care.
  - 21
  - 22     $\curvearrowright$  Views about who should deliver closed-loop routine care.
  - 23     $\curvearrowright$  Perceived impact of the rollout of closed-loop technology on workloads and wider  
24       healthcare resources.
- 25

26                   Figure 2. Key topic areas explored in the interviews

27                                   158x93mm (300 x 300 DPI)  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1. Participant characteristics**

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>CLOuD sites (n=7)</b>		
Total number of interviewees	22	
Interviewees per site - range (mode)	1-5 (4)	
<b>Role</b>		
Diabetes Consultants	7	32
Diabetes Nurses	9	41
Research Nurses	6	27
<b>Number of interviewees with previous closed-loop experience</b>	5	23

Table 1. Participant characteristics  
117x93mm (300 x 300 DPI)