THE ARISING

Continuous Glucose Monitoring: *Reading the Pattern*



NOVEMBER 2026

Continuous Glucose Monitoring: Reading the Pattern

What continuous glucose monitors can show, and what the line cannot tell you.

A graph is an invitation to ask a question

For someone managing diabetes, seeing where glucose is heading can be more useful than seeing one isolated reading. A continuous glucose monitor, or CGM, can turn separate measurements into a pattern: overnight changes, a response to a meal, or a direction of travel that deserves attention.

For someone without diabetes, the same moving line can feel like a newly opened window into the body. The appeal is understandable. But access to a measurement is not the same thing as knowing what to do with it.

The useful question is not simply, “Can I see more?” It is, “Will seeing this help me make a better, safer decision?”

That answer depends on the person, the device and the purpose. A tool that improves a specific part of diabetes care does not automatically become a proven way to prevent disease or extend life in everyone else.

It is not drawing blood continuously

Most CGMs use a small sensor to estimate glucose in the fluid between cells, called interstitial fluid. They do not repeatedly draw samples directly from the bloodstream.

Glucose in that fluid and glucose in blood are related, but they do not always move in perfect step. Timing differences matter, particularly when glucose is changing quickly. Sensor variation and measurement error matter too.

That means a CGM reading and a finger-stick result can differ without either being a complete description of the situation. The correct response depends on the device instructions, symptoms and clinical context, not on a universal rule that one number must always be ignored.

Different devices have different approved uses, alerts and limitations. A product marketed for general awareness should not be assumed to provide all the safety functions of a device used in insulin treatment. Read the instructions for the exact product rather than borrowing advice from a different model.

Where there is evidence of benefit

One useful example is the MOBILE randomized trial. It enrolled 175 adults with type 2 diabetes whose glucose was not well controlled and who used basal insulin, but not mealtime insulin. Basal insulin provides background insulin coverage. Participants were assigned to CGM or monitoring with a blood glucose meter. [1]

At eight months, the adjusted difference in HbA1c favored CGM by about 0.4 percentage points, with a 95% confidence interval from 0.1 to 0.8 percentage points lower. HbA1c is a laboratory measure used to

assess average glucose exposure over the preceding months. That difference is not a 40% improvement, and it is an average comparison between study groups rather than a guarantee for each person. [1]

The trial started from an average HbA1c of about 9.1%, and 165 participants completed follow-up. Severe hypoglycemia occurred in one participant in each group. The result supports a use of CGM within a particular diabetes-care setting; it does not establish that healthy adults need a sensor. [1]

The context is part of the result. People using medication to manage elevated glucose have decisions to make that may differ greatly from those of someone exploring an app out of curiosity.

What we do not yet know for people without diabetes

There is growing research on glucose patterns in people without diabetes. Some studies describe the patterns; others look for associations with risk factors or test particular short-term behaviors. These are not all the same kind of evidence.

A 2026 Framingham analysis studied 1,356 people without existing diabetes or cardiovascular disease. Their mean age was about 59, and about 93% were non-Hispanic White, which limits generalization. They wore a blinded sensor for up to ten days, meaning the measurements were collected without being used as live feedback. Researchers related the patterns to cardiovascular risk factors and calculated risk estimates. [2]

That can help develop a research question. It is not a trial showing that looking at the graph improved health, and it is not proof that a CGM prevented future heart attacks. A relationship with a calculated risk score is different from following people to establish clinical outcomes.

The broader evidence for sustained, meaningful health benefit from CGM-guided behavior in people without diabetes remains limited. That does not mean there is nothing to learn. It means the claim should remain smaller than the enthusiasm.

The sensor can change the story you think you see

A small laboratory study illustrates why precision matters. Fifteen healthy adults completed seven different food or drink challenges. Researchers compared a FreeStyle Libre 2 sensor with duplicate capillary measurements from a blood glucose meter. [3]

On average, sensor estimates were about 0.9 mmol/L higher than the capillary measurements, with variation between people and challenges. This was one device in a small, selected sample, using a particular comparison method. It does not establish a correction factor for your sensor, and it does not mean every CGM behaves the same way. [3]

It does show how a seemingly precise curve can contain uncertainty. If a small difference between two meals is the basis for a large dietary decision, measurement limits become part of that decision.

The capillary comparison was not an infallible laboratory truth either. The study is a methodological warning, not a declaration that sensors are useless or that established diabetes benefits disappear.

A rise after eating is not automatically a problem

Glucose normally changes after meals. The aim for someone without diabetes is not necessarily to eliminate every rise or make the line perfectly flat.

A food's glucose response is only one part of its nutritional story. Fiber, protein, energy intake, fats, micronutrients, enjoyment and the overall eating pattern also matter. A meal that produces a smaller glucose rise is not automatically better for LDL cholesterol or long-term cardiovascular health.

Imagine someone comparing two breakfasts. One produces a lower-looking peak, but is less satisfying, provides less fiber, or crowds out foods they value. That is an illustrative scenario, not a clinical finding about a particular breakfast. It shows why a single curve should not become the final judge of a meal.

A sensor does not measure inherited Lp(a), artery plaque or the quality of a relationship around the dinner table. Its value is real only within the questions it can help answer.

A single trace should not diagnose diabetes

The American Diabetes Association's 2026 guidance states that evidence is insufficient to use CGM for screening or diagnosis of diabetes or prediabetes. Appropriate diagnostic assessment uses validated tests and clinical interpretation. [4]

An unexpected reading can be a reason to ask a question. It is not a reason to diagnose yourself from an app or start treating a presumed condition on your own.

Symptoms matter. If you feel unwell or have concerning readings, seek clinical advice and follow the device's instructions about confirmation and response. Severe symptoms require urgent care, not an extended experiment with food or a search for a prettier graph.

Do not adjust prescribed glucose-lowering medication solely on the basis of this article. Someone using insulin or a medicine that can cause low glucose needs an individualized plan for interpreting readings and acting safely.

Make an experiment smaller and more useful

If you and your clinician decide that short-term monitoring would answer a useful question, decide on that question before collecting a flood of data.

For example: is there a repeated pattern worth discussing, rather than one dramatic isolated point? What other information should be recorded, such as meal timing, activity or symptoms? What finding would lead to a validated blood test or a change in a clinical plan?

Repeated observations can be more informative than one reading, but home comparisons are not controlled trials. Sleep, activity, illness, portion size and timing can change between days. A confident personal explanation may still be wrong.

It can also help to decide when to stop. If the data do not change a useful decision, the cost and attention required may not be worthwhile. If tracking causes distress or increasingly restrictive eating, that deserves attention rather than being treated as evidence of commitment.

Look beyond the purchase price

Sensors have practical burdens: cost, skin irritation, replacement routines and time spent interpreting results. Data privacy matters too. Before using a service, understand what information it collects, who can access it and whether sharing is optional.

There is no need to turn every person into a full-time analyst of their own meals. A device should earn its place by helping the person, not merely by generating more information.

For some people with diabetes, CGM is a valuable part of treatment. For people without diabetes, the case for routine use is much less established. Curiosity can be reasonable without being converted into a medical necessity.

Questions before you start

• What specific question would this device help me answer?

• Is the evidence relevant to someone with my health and treatment situation?

• What can this model measure, and what alerts or limitations does it have?

• What should I do if a reading does not fit my symptoms?

• Would a standard clinical assessment answer the question more directly?

• How will I know whether the monitoring has helped enough to continue?

The best outcome is not the smoothest line. It is a better-informed decision that improves life without creating a new burden larger than the problem it was meant to solve.

Sources and further reading

[1] Martens T, Beck RW, Bailey R, et al. Effect of Continuous Glucose Monitoring on Glycemic Control in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes Treated With Basal Insulin: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2021;325:2262–2272. Publication. Full text.

[2] Bakhshi B, Lin H, Sultana N, et al. Beyond Traditional Glycemic Measures: CGM Glycemic Profiles Reveal Associations With Cardiometabolic Risk in Individuals Without Diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2026;49:2040–2049. Publication.

[3] Hutchins KM, Betts JA, Thompson D, et al. Continuous glucose monitor overestimates glycemia, with the magnitude of bias varying by postprandial test and individual: a randomized crossover trial. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2025;121:1025–1034. Publication. Full text.

[4] American Diabetes Association Professional Practice Committee for Diabetes. Diagnosis and Classification of Diabetes: Standards of Care in Diabetes, 2026. *Diabetes Care*. 2026;49(Suppl 1):S27–S49. Publication.

Dexcom funded MOBILE and supplied study devices; investigators disclosed diabetes-industry relationships. The small accuracy study received an unrestricted grant and products from Innocent Drinks, and authors disclosed food-industry and related interests.