THE ARISING

Glycemic Index and Everyday Meals



NOVEMBER 2026

Glycemic Index and Everyday Meals

Glycemic index, everyday meals, and making food work for you.

A number can help without becoming a food rule

Two foods can contain the same amount of carbohydrate and produce different average blood glucose responses. That observation led to the glycemic index, usually called GI.

It can be useful. It can also be asked to do far more than it was designed to do. GI does not measure a food's full nutritional value, tell you how much to eat, or predict exactly what will happen in your body after a mixed meal.

A practical approach begins with the question you want the number to answer. Are you managing diabetes with a clinical team? Trying to make a breakfast more satisfying? Comparing two similar carbohydrate foods? Or reacting to a dramatic-looking line on a glucose-monitor app?

Those questions overlap, but they are not the same.

What glycemic index actually measures

GI compares the incremental blood glucose response over a standardized period, not simply its speed or highest point. It compares the response to a standardized amount of available carbohydrate in a food with the response to a reference food. Available carbohydrate means the carbohydrate counted as available for digestion, rather than treating all fiber as though it has the same glucose effect. On the glucose-reference scale, glucose is assigned a value of 100.

The key phrase is equal carbohydrate. Researchers are not necessarily comparing the portions people would ordinarily put on their plates.

On this scale, a GI of 55 or below is commonly described as low, 56–69 as medium, and 70 or above as high. Those categories describe a measured response under a test protocol. They are not grades for the person eating the food.

A food can have a lower GI and still contribute substantial energy or added sugar. A food with a higher GI can still fit into an otherwise useful eating pattern. The label is information, not a verdict.

Portion size changes the question

Glycemic load, or GL, adds the amount of available carbohydrate in the portion. It is calculated as GI multiplied by available carbohydrate grams, divided by 100.

Here is a hypothetical example, not a laboratory result for a particular food. A food with a GI of 60 and 10 grams of available carbohydrate in a portion has a calculated GL of 6. A larger portion containing 30 grams has a calculated GL of 18. The GI has not changed; the amount being eaten has.

This explains why a GI list cannot tell the whole story about a meal. It also explains why “low GI” should not be translated as “unlimited.”

GL is still an estimate, not a promise about your next glucose reading. A meal contains more than one ingredient, and people vary.

The food is not only its carbohydrate

Physical structure, processing, cooking and ripeness can affect how carbohydrate is made available during digestion. A label such as “whole grain” does not guarantee that every product carrying it produces the same response.

A mixed meal also combines carbohydrate with protein, fat and fiber. The order and timing of digestion, the size of the meal and the person's circumstances complicate any attempt to infer the response from one ingredient's GI.

This is a reason to think about the meal, not a reason to distrust every food. Beans, intact grains, vegetables and fruit can contribute useful nutrients and fiber within a broader pattern. You do not need to hunt for a single perfect carbohydrate.

Nor is the flattest possible glucose curve always the best nutritional aim. Adding large amounts of fat can change the curve while changing energy intake and other aspects of the meal. A glucose response alone does not tell you what happened to LDL cholesterol risk, overall diet quality or the enjoyment of eating.

What studies in diabetes found

A 2021 systematic review and meta-analysis combined 29 trial comparisons involving 1,617 participants, mostly adults with type 2 diabetes. The median study duration was 12 weeks. The HbA1c analysis included 22 comparisons and 1,502 participants, rather than everyone in the full review. Lower-GI or lower-GL dietary patterns reduced HbA1c by an average of about 0.31 percentage points compared with the comparison diets. [1]

HbA1c is a measure used to assess average glucose exposure over the preceding months. A change of 0.31 percentage points is not a 31% reduction. For illustration, a change from 8.0% to 7.69% would be 0.31 percentage points, although an individual's result may differ from the study average.

The 95% confidence interval, an uncertainty range for the pooled difference, ranged from 0.19 to 0.42 percentage points lower. That describes uncertainty around the average effect, not a guaranteed range of benefit for each person.

This is evidence that lower-GI or lower-GL patterns can be one useful part of diabetes care. It is not proof that a GI label prevents heart attacks or extends life. These were generally short studies, and the outcomes measured should stay attached to the claim. Only four trials reported adverse events, so the review also had limited information about harms.

Why the answer is not identical for everyone

OmniCarb studied 163 overweight adults without diabetes who had elevated blood pressure. Participants were provided versions of a DASH-type eating pattern for five weeks at a time, with food provided to maintain weight. Lowering the glycemic index did not improve insulin sensitivity, LDL cholesterol or blood pressure overall. [2]

That finding does not erase the diabetes evidence. The participants, food patterns, study durations and questions were different. It also means that a result in diabetes should not automatically become a promise of benefit for everyone without diabetes.

Sometimes the whole dietary pattern already does much of the useful work. Changing a single index within it may not add the expected benefit. Sometimes a particular person needs help managing glucose in a setting where carbohydrate quantity, medicines and daily routines all matter.

Good guidance leaves room for those differences.

Build a meal, not a list of forbidden foods

Consider a familiar lunch built mainly around a large portion of refined starch. An experiment might be to include beans or another appropriate protein source, add vegetables, and choose a carbohydrate portion that fits your needs. This is an illustrative meal change, not a tested prescription or a claim that everyone should eat the same lunch.

Or consider breakfast. If it leaves you hungry soon afterward, it may be useful to look at its fiber, protein, portion size and whether it fits your day, rather than searching only for the lowest GI score.

The point is to make a sustainable pattern more useful. Budget, culture, cooking facilities, preferences and appetite belong in that discussion. A food plan that cannot be lived with is not made better by an impressive spreadsheet.

If you take insulin or other medicines that can cause low blood glucose, significant dietary changes need coordination with your clinical team. A general food article cannot determine whether your medication needs to change.

Use a personal response carefully

People can respond differently to the same food, and the same person can have different responses on different days. A single high-looking reading should not automatically condemn a food. Portion, meal composition, activity, sleep, illness and measurement limitations can all affect interpretation.

Continuous glucose monitors can reveal patterns, especially in appropriate diabetes care. Outside that setting, a graph is not a complete assessment of health and is not a stand-alone diagnostic test. The question is whether the information leads to a useful, safe decision, not whether every rise can be eliminated.

The companion issue on glucose monitors explores that distinction. The cholesterol issue offers another reminder: a food's glucose effect and its effects on blood lipids are different questions.

A few questions worth keeping

• Am I comparing equal carbohydrate amounts, ordinary portions, or whole meals?

• Does this food help the overall pattern, including fiber and nutritional variety?

• What outcome am I trying to improve?

• Does the evidence come from people with circumstances like mine?

• Will this change be practical, satisfying and safe with my treatment?

GI can be a useful tool without becoming the judge of every meal. Let it contribute to the decision while leaving room for the whole food, the whole person and the life around the table.

Sources and further reading

[1] Chiavaroli L, Lee D, Ahmed A, et al. Effect of low glycaemic index or load dietary patterns on glycaemic control and cardiometabolic risk factors in diabetes: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ*. 2021;374:n1651. Full text. Correction: an omitted blood-pressure statement, not a change to the HbA1c result.

[2] Sacks FM, Carey VJ, Anderson CAM, et al. Effects of high vs low glycemic index of dietary carbohydrate on cardiovascular disease risk factors and insulin sensitivity: the OmniCarb randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2014;312:2531–2541. Full text.

Definitions and practical context: University of Sydney GI questions and Diabetes UK.

OmniCarb received US National Institutes of Health support; one author disclosed expert-witness work involving food companies. Several authors of the diabetes review disclosed food-industry research, consulting or related interests.