Review of Contemporary Philosophy
ISSN: 1841-5261, e-ISSN: 2471-089X
Vol 22 (1), 2023
Pp 2506 - 2519

Diabetes Mellitus: A Contribution Between Pharmacists, Laboratory Technician, Health Administrators, and Social Administrators.

[1]-Ali Nasser Shammakhi,[2]-Mohammed Ali Alhazmi,[3]-Ahmed Mohammad Mrair,[4]-Yahya Mohammed Dahhas,[5]-Adel Hamad Khardli,[6]-Abdallah Ali Hakami,[7]-Faisal Hassan Al-Harbi,[8]-Abualqasim Nasser Zoagan,[9]-Khaled Mossa Mashi,[10]-Nasser Mohemmed Mjrshi,[11]-Ahmed Jibril A Sherwani

1. Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Eradah Hospital For Mental Health Jazan
2. Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Eradah Hospital For Mental Health Jazan
3. Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Eradah Hospital For Mental Health Jazan
4. Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Edabi General Hospital Jazan
5. Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Eradah Hospital For Mental Health Jazan
6. Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Eradah Hospital For Mental Health Jazan
7. Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Eradah Hospital For Mental Health Jazan
8. Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Eradah Hospital For Mental Health - Jazan
9. Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Eradah Hospital For Mental Health - Jazan
10. Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Eradah Hospital For Mental Health Jazan
11. Ksa, Ministry Of Health, Eradah Hospital For Mental Health - Jazan

Abstract:

Background: Diabetes mellitus (DM) is a chronic metabolic disorder that disrupts the body's ability to metabolize glucose. The disease encompasses several types, including Type 1 (T1DM), Type 2 (T2DM), and gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM). Its prevalence is increasing globally, and diabetes-related complications are a significant cause of morbidity and mortality. Various healthcare professionals, including pharmacists, pathologists, health administrators, and social administrators, contribute to managing the condition and its associated challenges.

Aim: This article aims to examine the role of different healthcare professionals, specifically pharmacists, pathologists, health administrators, and social administrators, in managing diabetes mellitus. It explores how their collaboration can improve patient outcomes and reduce the financial burden associated with diabetes management.

Methods: This review analyzes literature on the global impact of diabetes, current diagnostic practices, and the contributions of healthcare professionals in diabetes care. A detailed examination of laboratory guidelines, diagnostic criteria, and disease management recommendations is provided, alongside evidence on collaborative healthcare practices.

Results: Pharmacists play a crucial role in managing diabetes through medication counseling, diabetes education, and drug therapy optimization. Pathologists contribute by providing accurate diagnostic and monitoring services, helping to identify and track the disease. Health administrators are essential in organizing resources, setting policies, and improving healthcare infrastructure to address the growing diabetes burden. Social administrators support by addressing the social determinants of health, promoting public health initiatives, and coordinating care among healthcare providers.

Conclusion: The management of diabetes mellitus requires a coordinated approach involving multiple healthcare professionals. Pharmacists, pathologists, health administrators, and social administrators each have distinct, yet complementary roles in improving diabetes care. Collaborative efforts can reduce the

impact of diabetes on individuals and healthcare systems, ensuring better patient outcomes and optimizing resource utilization.

Keywords: Diabetes Mellitus, Pharmacists, Pathologists, Health Administrators, Social Administrators, Healthcare Collaboration, Disease Management, Public Health.

Received: 10 october 2023 **Revised:** 24 November 2023 **Accepted:** 08 December 2023

Introduction:

Diabetes mellitus encompasses a group of metabolic disorders that disrupt carbohydrate metabolism, resulting in an imbalance where glucose is both inadequately utilized and excessively produced, leading to hyperglycemia. Traditionally, the disease has been classified into several clinical categories; however, these classifications are currently being reevaluated in light of genetic, metabolomic, and other characteristics, along with the underlying pathophysiology. The updated classification, released in 2014 [1]. Type 1 diabetes mellitus (T1DM) is primarily caused by autoimmune destruction of the pancreatic islet β-cells, which impairs the pancreas' ability to produce and secrete insulin [3]. In contrast, Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) arises from a combination of insulin resistance and insufficient insulin secretion [4, 5]. Gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM), which more closely resembles T2DM than T1DM, affects approximately 17% of pregnancies (with a range between 5% and 30%, contingent on screening methods, diagnostic criteria, and maternal age), typically resolving post-delivery, yet it remains a significant risk factor for T2DM later in life. T2DM represents the predominant form of the disease, accounting for 85% to 95% of diabetes cases in developed nations. Though rare, monogenic subtypes of T2DM have been identified. A subset of individuals cannot be definitively categorized as having either T1DM or T2DM [6]. Additionally, an increasing number of individuals with T1DM now exhibit metabolic traits akin to T2DM, likely due to the rising prevalence of obesity. Type 1 Diabetes A. Immune-Mediated B. Idiopathic II. Type 2 Diabetes III. Other Specific Types A. Genetic Defects in β-Cell Function B. Genetic Defects in Insulin Action C. Diseases of the Exocrine Pancreas D. Endocrinopathies E. Drug- or Chemical-Induced F. Infections G. Uncommon Immune-Mediated Forms H. Other Genetic Syndromes Associated with Diabetes IV. Gestational Diabetes Mellitus (GDM) From the ADA [2]. Diabetes is a widespread condition, with the global prevalence in 2021 estimated at approximately 537 million, a number projected to rise to 783 million by 2045 [7]. According to data from the 2017–2020 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) and the 2018–2019 National Health Interview Survey (NHIS), the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reported that 37.3 million individuals, or 11.3% of the U.S. population, were affected by diabetes [8]. The number of diabetic adults is also increasing worldwide. For instance, in 2021, China and India were estimated to have 140.9 million and 74.2 million adults with diabetes, respectively, with projections of 174.4 million and 124.9 million by 2045 [7]. It is estimated that approximately 45% of individuals with diabetes globally remain undiagnosed [7].

In the U.S., the financial burden of diabetes has grown significantly, from an estimated $245 billion in 2012 to $327 billion in 2017 [9]. On average, annual healthcare costs for individuals with diabetes are approximately 2.3 times higher than those for individuals without diabetes [10]. Similarly, in the UK, diabetes accounted for about 10% of the National Health Service (NHS) budget, which in 2014 equaled approximately $14 billion annually. Globally, spending on diabetes reached an estimated $966 billion in 2021. The high costs associated with diabetes are primarily attributed to the treatment of chronic, debilitating complications, which include microvascular complications (such as retinopathy, nephropathy, and neuropathy) and macrovascular complications, particularly stroke and coronary artery disease. Collectively, these complications contribute to diabetes being the fourth leading cause of death in developed countries [11]. In 2021, approximately 6.7 million adults globally were believed to have died from diabetes-related causes [7].

In 2002 and again in 2011, the American Association for Clinical Chemistry (AACC) and the American Diabetes Association (ADA) released "Guidelines and Recommendations for Laboratory Analysis in the Diagnosis and Management of Diabetes Mellitus" [12, 13] [14, 15]. This review updates those

recommendations, with a focus on areas where new evidence has emerged since the 2011 guidelines, employing an evidence-based approach. The guideline committee, primarily composed of U.S.-based clinical, laboratory, and evidence-based methodology experts, has disclosed any financial, personal, or professional relationships that could constitute conflicts of interest. The committee did not receive direct funding for the development of these recommendations. The perspectives of various national and international organizations, as well as other stakeholders (e.g., healthcare providers, patients with diabetes, policymakers, regulatory bodies, health insurers, researchers, and industry representatives), were considered during the public consultation phase. The grading system from the 2011 guidelines for evaluating the overall quality of evidence and the strength of recommendations was utilized, and the key steps and evidence summaries are detailed in the guideline and in the supplementary data accompanying the online version of this report. The literature review was conducted through the end of 2021.

Grading Scale Quality:

The grading scale used for evaluating the quality of evidence distinguishes four levels based on the confidence researchers can place in the effect estimates derived from the studies. At the highest level, "high" quality evidence suggests that further research is unlikely to alter the confidence in the effect estimate. This body of evidence is derived from robust, high-powered studies that produce results that are both precise and consistent across relevant populations. "Moderate" quality evidence, on the other hand, indicates that additional research could significantly impact the confidence in the effect estimate, potentially leading to revisions in the effect size or the recommendation itself. Such evidence arises from high to moderate-level individual studies, which, although sufficient to estimate effects, are constrained by factors such as the study's sample size, quality, or consistency, or because the results may not be directly applicable to everyday clinical practice. "Low" quality evidence means that new research is highly likely to influence the confidence in the effect estimate and could lead to a change in the recommendation. This evidence typically comes from studies that have significant design flaws or that rely on indirect information. Finally, "very low" quality evidence suggests that the effect estimate is highly uncertain. This category includes cases where the evidence is too scarce or flawed to provide reliable conclusions, and any recommendations may change when higher-quality evidence becomes available.

The grading of the strength of recommendations is classified into three categories: "strongly recommend," "recommend," and "insufficient information to make a recommendation." In the "strongly recommend" category, adoption of an intervention is advised when there is high-quality evidence and strong expert consensus that the intervention improves significant health outcomes, with the benefits outweighing the harms. Similarly, even with moderate-quality evidence, the strong agreement of experts is sufficient to recommend an intervention. On the other hand, the recommendation against adoption occurs when there is high or moderate-quality evidence indicating that the intervention is ineffective or when the benefits and harms are closely balanced or when harms clearly outweigh benefits. The "recommend" category involves adoption when there is moderate-quality evidence and expert agreement that the intervention improves significant health outcomes and that the benefits outweigh the harms. This category also allows for adoption when there is low-quality or very low-quality evidence, as long as there is strong agreement from experts about the benefits of the intervention. Conversely, the "recommend against" adoption occurs when evidence suggests that the intervention is ineffective or that the harms outweigh the benefits, with expert consensus confirming this conclusion. The "insufficient information to make a recommendation" category, labeled as Grade C, is applied when evidence is either lacking, scarce, or of very low quality. In such cases, it is not possible to determine whether the benefits outweigh the harms, and there is no clear expert consensus for or against adoption. Additionally, Grade C is applied when the evidence is inconsistent, indirect, or inconclusive, or when there is no clear expert agreement. The "Good Practice Point" (GPP) refers to recommendations based primarily on expert consensus, professional experience, or widely accepted best practices, often in areas where formal evidence is limited or non-existent. This category is used for aspects of laboratory practice in diabetes management that are technical, organizational, or related to quality management. Such recommendations might be based on observational studies, audits, case series, or expert consensus rather than rigorous evidence-based studies.

This guideline specifically addresses laboratory aspects of diabetes testing, such as screening, diagnosis, and monitoring. It does not include clinical management issues, which are already covered by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) guidelines. This approach is designed to complement the ADA guidelines and avoid redundancy. The recommendations aim to assist healthcare providers—laboratory professionals, physicians, nurses, and other practitioners—in making informed decisions about laboratory tests related to diabetes care. While these guidelines are intended for use across national and international contexts, users are encouraged to adapt them to their specific local settings, as healthcare systems vary in terms of organizational, cultural, and economic factors. To enhance understanding, each analyte is categorized under specific headings, such as description, terminology, and use and rationale (covering diagnosis, screening, monitoring, and prognosis). Further sections provide detailed insights into preanalytical factors (e.g., sample types and frequency of measurements), analytical considerations (including methods), interpretation (e.g., reference intervals, decision limits, therapeutic targets, and turnaround times), and emerging considerations. The latter highlights ongoing studies and potential future developments that may impact laboratory practices in diabetes care.

Glucose

Description, Introduction, and Terminology:

Disrupted carbohydrate metabolism, which underpins diabetes, is characterized by hyperglycemia. Historically, blood glucose measurement was the primary diagnostic criterion for diabetes. This approach, while effective, was indirect, as it only reflected the result of the metabolic disruption rather than the root cause. Despite this, until the molecular pathophysiology of diabetes is fully understood, glycemic measurement will likely remain a critical diagnostic tool in diabetes management [16, 17].

Use and Rationale:

Diagnosis:

The determination of diabetes is based on identifying hyperglycemia. Initially, the sole diagnostic method for diabetes was the direct measurement of elevated glucose concentrations in plasma. A set of diagnostic criteria, which were based on the distribution of glucose concentrations in high-risk populations, was established in 1979 to standardize diabetes diagnosis. These guidelines were endorsed by the World Health Organization (WHO) [16, 17]. In 1997, these criteria were revised to better identify individuals at risk for complications such as retinopathy and nephropathy [18]. The updated criteria included: (a) fasting plasma glucose (FPG) ≥7.0 mmol/L (126 mg/dL), (b) 2-hour post-load glucose >11.1 mmol/L (200 mg/dL) during an oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT), or (c) the presence of diabetes symptoms and a casual plasma glucose ≥11.1 mmol/L (200 mg/dL) [18]. Both the WHO and the International Diabetes Federation (IDF) recommended either FPG or 2-hour post-load glucose as diagnostic methods, with the same cut-off values as those outlined by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) [21]. In 2009, an International Expert Committee, including members from the ADA, European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD), and IDF, introduced the option to diagnose diabetes through hemoglobin A1c (Hb A1c) measurements, which reflect long-term blood glucose levels [22]. This recommendation was endorsed by the ADA, EASD, IDF, and WHO, positioning Hb A1c as a diagnostic alternative for diabetes [23, 24].

Criteria for Diagnosing Diabetes:

To diagnose diabetes, the following criteria are employed:

1. Hb A1c ≥6.5% (48 mmol/mol) or FPG ≥7.0 mmol/L (126 mg/dL) or 2-hour plasma glucose ≥11.1 mmol/L (200 mg/dL) during an OGTT or In a patient exhibiting classic symptoms of hyperglycemia or experiencing a hyperglycemic crisis, a random plasma glucose ≥11.1 mmol/L (200 mg/dL) In the absence of unequivocal hyperglycemia, the diagnosis requires abnormal results from two separate tests (glucose and Hb A1c), either on the same day or from different days. The test should be performed in a laboratory using methods that are National Glycohemoglobin Standardization Program (NGSP)-certified and standardized to the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT) assay. Point-of-care assays should not be utilized for diagnostic purposes. Fasting is defined as no caloric intake for at least 8 hours. The OGTT should be

administered as outlined by the WHO, with a glucose load containing 75 g of anhydrous glucose dissolved in water. "Random" refers to any time of day, regardless of the time since the previous meal. Classic symptoms of hyperglycemia include polyuria, polydipsia, and unexplained weight loss [2].

WHO Criteria for Interpreting 2-Hour OGTT

For the 2-hour OGTT, the following criteria are applied:

- Impaired fasting glucose is defined as a fasting glucose value greater than 6.1 mmol/L (110 mg/dL) but less than 7.0 mmol/L (126 mg/dL), with a 2-hour glucose level less than 7.8 mmol/L (140 mg/dL).
- Impaired glucose tolerance is indicated by a fasting glucose level less than 7.0 mmol/L (126 mg/dL) and a 2-hour glucose value ranging from 7.8 mmol/L (140 mg/dL) to less than 11.1 mmol/L (200 mg/dL).
- Diabetes is diagnosed when fasting glucose exceeds 7.0 mmol/L (126 mg/dL), and the 2-hour glucose level is greater than 11.1 mmol/L (200 mg/dL).
- Values presented here refer to venous plasma glucose following the administration of a 75 g oral glucose load, as per the WHO [21].
- If the 2-hour glucose value is not measured, the status of the individual remains uncertain, as diabetes or impaired glucose tolerance cannot be definitively excluded.
- Both fasting and 2-hour values must meet the specified criteria.
- Either fasting or 2-hour measurements can be used for diagnosis, but any single positive result must be repeated on a separate day to confirm the diagnosis.
- This confirmation can be achieved by repeating the same test (glucose or Hb A1c) using a different blood sample on another day, or by employing a different test, such as using Hb A1c for confirmation if glucose was initially tested, or vice versa. Alternatively, both glucose and Hb A1c may be measured on the same day. Repeat testing is unnecessary in symptomatic individuals who present with unequivocal hyperglycemia (i.e., a glucose level greater than 11.1 mmol/L or 200 mg/dL).

Screening for Diabetes

Screening for diabetes, particularly type 2 diabetes, is a crucial step for detecting the disease in individuals at high risk, especially given the potential for the condition to develop asymptomatically over several years. The American Diabetes Association (ADA) recommends using hemoglobin A1c (Hb A1c), fasting plasma glucose (FPG), or the 2-hour oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT) for screening purposes. In high-risk individuals, these tests should be repeated every three years if the following criteria are met: Hb A1c <5.7% (<39 mmol/mol), FPG <5.6 mmol/L (<100 mg/dL), and/or 2-hour plasma glucose <7.8 mmol/L (<140 mg/dL) [2]. When screening for diabetes, glucose should always be measured in venous plasma in an accredited laboratory, as this ensures accurate results and is crucial for effective diagnosis and ongoing management [2].

Screening asymptomatic individuals, especially those at risk of developing type 2 diabetes, has gained endorsement due to the substantial period of undiagnosed diabetes that often precedes clinical identification. Research indicates that type 2 diabetes may develop 4 to 7 years before diagnosis, with complications such as retinopathy, neuropathy, and cardiovascular issues potentially beginning even earlier [25]. This underscores the importance of consistent and systematic screening in high-risk populations, which may reduce both the time spent with undiagnosed diabetes and the prevalence of complications at the time of diagnosis. However, approximately 25% of individuals in the U.S. (and nearly half of Asian and Hispanic Americans) remain undiagnosed, with global estimates suggesting that half of all individuals with diabetes are unaware of their condition [2]. Despite these recommendations, evidence supporting long-term benefits from screening and subsequent prevention remains inconsistent [27].

The ADA specifically advises that individuals aged 35 or older should undergo routine screening in healthcare settings. The criteria for screening include Hb A1c, FPG, or 2-hour OGTT, and testing should be

repeated every three years if the initial results are within the normal range. For individuals who are overweight or obese (BMI ≥25 kg/m^2), or those with additional risk factors for diabetes, screening should begin at an earlier age and be conducted more frequently [2]. For individuals diagnosed with prediabetes, characterized by glucose concentrations that fall short of diagnostic criteria but are still elevated, annual testing is recommended [2]. Due to the increasing prevalence of type 2 diabetes in children, screening is now advised for this age group, especially those who are overweight (BMI >85th percentile) and have additional risk factors such as a family history of diabetes, race/ethnicity associated with higher risk, signs of insulin resistance, or maternal history of gestational diabetes. Screening for children should commence at 10 years of age (or at the onset of puberty, if earlier), and testing should be repeated every three years [2, 28].

While various studies show that interventions targeting individuals with impaired glucose tolerance (IGT) or impaired fasting glucose (IFG) can delay or even prevent the onset of type 2 diabetes [29–31], there is no conclusive evidence to suggest that treatment based on screening leads to a reduction in long-term complications. Moreover, there is a lack of consensus regarding the most effective screening method, whether FPG, OGTT, or Hb A1c, with each test presenting distinct advantages and limitations [22, 32–34]. The cost-effectiveness of screening for type 2 diabetes has also been evaluated, with the incremental cost for screening all individuals aged 25 and older estimated at $236,449 per life-year gained and $56,649 per quality-adjusted life-year (QALY) gained. Interestingly, screening was found to be more cost-effective for individuals younger than 45 years. In contrast, targeted screening for individuals with hypertension was found to be significantly more cost-effective, reducing the cost per QALY from $360,966 to $34,375, particularly for individuals aged 55 to 75 years [35, 36]. Further modeling studies suggest that started screening at ages 30 or 45 may be highly cost-effective, with costs below $11,000 per QALY gained [38]. Cohort studies have also supported the cost-effectiveness of screening for diabetes, but long-term studies are necessary to definitively establish the clinical benefits of screening [39, 40].

In 2003, the ADA lowered the threshold for "normal" FPG from <6.1 mmol/L (<110 mg/dL) to <5.6 mmol/L (<100 mg/dL), which remains a topic of debate among healthcare organizations [42]. This change was motivated by data indicating that individuals with FPG values between 5.6 mmol/L (100 mg/dL) and 6.05 mmol/L (109 mg/dL) are at an increased risk of developing type 2 diabetes [44, 45]. Additional research has shown that even FPG values lower than 5.6 mmol/L (100 mg/dL) are associated with a graded risk for developing the disease. For example, a study of 13,163 men aged 26 to 45 years with FPG <5.55 mmol/L (100 mg/dL) revealed that those with FPG between 4.83 and 5.05 mmol/L (87–91 mg/dL) had a significantly increased risk of type 2 diabetes compared to those with FPG <4.5 mmol/L (81 mg/dL). These findings support the notion of a continuous spectrum of risk between FPG levels and the likelihood of developing type 2 diabetes [46]. Additionally, a study involving 117,193 Danish individuals without diagnosed diabetes demonstrated that incremental increases in random glucose concentrations, even within the normoglycemic range, were associated with progressively higher risks of retinopathy, neuropathy, diabetic nephropathy, and myocardial infarction [47]. The risk ratios for a 1 mmol/L (18 mg/dL) increase in glucose concentration were 2.01 for retinopathy, 2.15 for neuropathy, 1.58 for diabetic nephropathy, and 1.49 for myocardial infarction. These findings highlight the importance of early detection and intervention, even at glucose concentrations within the normal range, to mitigate the risk of future complications.

Monitoring/Prognosis

Recommendation: Routine laboratory measurement of plasma glucose concentrations is not recommended as the primary method for monitoring or evaluating therapy in individuals with diabetes [B (moderate)].

The relationship between the extent of glycemia and the risk of complications such as renal, retinal, and neurological disorders is well-established in both epidemiological studies and clinical trials involving individuals with type 1 and type 2 diabetes [48, 49]. The Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT) demonstrated that adults and adolescents with type 1 diabetes who were randomized to achieve lower

average blood glucose levels experienced a significantly lower incidence of microvascular complications, such as diabetic retinopathy, nephropathy, and neuropathy [50]. Although intensive insulin therapy led to a 34% reduction in hypercholesterolemia, the risk of macrovascular disease was not significantly reduced in the initial analysis, likely due to the limited number of events and insufficient statistical power [50]. However, longer follow-up revealed a notable reduction in cardiovascular disease risk among participants initially assigned to intensive glycemic control [51]. The effects of stringent glycemic control on microvascular complications in individuals with type 2 diabetes were found to be comparable to those in individuals with type 1 diabetes, although the glycemic targets between the active intervention and control groups differed across various trials [52]. The United Kingdom Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS), which focused on individuals with short-duration type 2 diabetes, showed that intensive blood glucose control significantly reduced microvascular complications [52].

Meta-analyses suggest that intensive glycemic control in individuals with type 2 diabetes can reduce the incidence of cardiovascular disease [53, 54]. However, clinical trials have not consistently shown a reduction in macrovascular disease (e.g., myocardial infarction or stroke) with aggressive glucose-lowering interventions. The long-term (10-year) follow-up of the UKPDS cohort demonstrated a benefit of intensive therapy in reducing macrovascular disease [55], but three other trials did not show significant differences in macrovascular outcomes between those receiving intensive treatment (targeting Hb A1c concentrations around 6.5% [48 mmol/mol]) and those in control groups, whose Hb A1c levels were 0.8% to 1.1% higher [56–58]. In fact, one study even reported higher cardiovascular mortality in the intensive treatment group [56]. Both the DCCT [50] and UKPDS [52] trials showed that participants in the intensive therapy group maintained lower median capillary blood glucose concentrations. However, the outcomes were more closely linked to Hb A1c, which is used as a benchmark for assessing glycemic control, rather than directly measuring blood glucose concentrations. Most clinicians currently rely on guidelines from the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and other organizations, which define a target Hb A1c level as the optimal goal for glycemic control [25, 59]. Laboratory measurements of random or fasting glucose concentrations are not recommended as the primary method for routine outpatient monitoring of individuals with diabetes. While laboratory plasma glucose testing can be useful as a supplementary tool to assess the accuracy of self-monitoring or provide additional information, it should not be the cornerstone of routine monitoring [60-61].

The Role of Health Administrators and Social Administrators in Managing Type 2 Diabetes

Health administrators and social administrators play crucial roles in the management, prevention, and treatment of type 2 diabetes (T2D), a chronic metabolic condition that has reached epidemic proportions globally. These professionals are responsible for coordinating care systems, ensuring efficient resource allocation, supporting policy development, and fostering a comprehensive approach to managing diabetes in both clinical and community settings. Their roles overlap but differ in focus, with health administrators generally concentrating on the clinical and operational aspects of healthcare delivery and social administrators emphasizing community engagement, social support, and the prevention of disparities.

Health Administrators' Role

Health administrators are primarily responsible for overseeing the healthcare systems and structures that provide care for individuals with diabetes. Their role in managing T2D is multifaceted, involving the coordination of healthcare services, ensuring that resources are effectively utilized, and implementing policies that improve patient outcomes. Key aspects of their responsibilities include:

Healthcare System Management

Health administrators manage healthcare facilities, such as hospitals, clinics, and community health centers, where individuals with T2D receive care. They oversee the smooth operation of these institutions, ensuring that there are adequate resources, staffing, and infrastructure to deliver diabetes care. By implementing evidence-based practices and guidelines, health administrators help ensure that

individuals with T2D receive timely and effective care. For instance, they play a critical role in ensuring that proper screening and diagnostic procedures, such as Hb A1c testing and blood glucose monitoring, are routinely carried out.

Policy Development and Implementation

Health administrators are involved in developing and implementing policies aimed at improving diabetes care. They work closely with medical professionals, public health officials, and governmental agencies to create policies that address the growing burden of T2D. These policies may include guidelines for routine screening, treatment protocols, and initiatives to promote healthy lifestyles. Additionally, health administrators advocate for increased funding for diabetes-related research and the implementation of prevention programs. Through their policy work, they ensure that effective diabetes management strategies are integrated into national and local healthcare systems.

Resource Allocation and Cost-Effectiveness

Health administrators are responsible for the efficient allocation of resources to diabetes care programs. This includes ensuring that healthcare facilities have the necessary equipment and medications, such as insulin, and that staff are adequately trained in diabetes care. They also evaluate the cost-effectiveness of diabetes-related interventions, such as the use of metformin in the Diabetes Prevention Program, to ensure that healthcare funds are used wisely. Administrators often face the challenge of balancing the costs of diabetes management with the need for high-quality patient care, which requires them to make data-driven decisions regarding resource allocation.

Data Collection and Monitoring

Effective management of T2D requires robust data collection systems. Health administrators are responsible for ensuring that healthcare facilities implement comprehensive data tracking systems to monitor patient outcomes, track diabetes-related complications, and assess the effectiveness of interventions. This data is crucial for evaluating the success of diabetes management programs and for adjusting care plans as needed. Additionally, administrators use this data to report to government agencies and other stakeholders on the prevalence and management of T2D in their regions.

Social Administrators' Role

While health administrators focus on the operational aspects of healthcare, social administrators address the broader social determinants of health, which play a significant role in the development and management of T2D. These professionals focus on creating social structures and interventions that improve community health, reduce health disparities, and provide support for individuals affected by diabetes. Their roles in managing T2D include:

Community Outreach and Education

Social administrators focus on health education and community outreach to raise awareness about diabetes prevention and management. They design and implement public health campaigns aimed at educating the public about the risk factors for T2D, such as obesity, physical inactivity, and poor diet. They also emphasize the importance of regular screening and early detection. By partnering with community organizations, schools, and employers, social administrators promote healthier lifestyles and encourage individuals to seek medical advice and get screened for diabetes. Their work is particularly important in underserved communities, where access to healthcare may be limited, and where there are higher rates of diabetes.

Addressing Health Disparities

One of the most significant roles of social administrators is addressing the social determinants of health that contribute to the disproportionate prevalence of T2D in certain populations. These populations may include low-income individuals, racial and ethnic minorities, and those with limited access to healthy foods, safe places to exercise, and quality healthcare. Social administrators advocate for policies that reduce

health inequities, such as expanding access to healthcare services, improving housing conditions, and supporting programs that provide nutritious food options. By focusing on reducing health disparities, social administrators play a pivotal role in preventing and managing T2D in high-risk communities.

Support Services and Advocacy

In addition to public health campaigns, social administrators provide essential support services for individuals with T2D. These services may include counseling, social work interventions, and assistance with navigating the healthcare system. Social administrators also advocate for financial assistance programs to ensure that individuals with diabetes can afford necessary medications, medical devices, and access to care. They work closely with health administrators to connect individuals with resources and services that improve their overall quality of life, such as diabetes education programs and support groups.

Collaborative Initiatives

Social administrators frequently collaborate with health administrators to develop comprehensive diabetes prevention and management programs. These programs often combine clinical care with social support services, creating a more holistic approach to managing the disease. For example, a social administrator might work with healthcare providers to integrate diabetes education programs into community centers or workplaces. Additionally, they may help develop policies that ensure people with diabetes have access to affordable and nutritious food, physical activity opportunities, and healthcare services. Both health administrators and social administrators play integral roles in the prevention, management, and treatment of type 2 diabetes. Health administrators focus on managing healthcare systems, implementing effective policies, allocating resources efficiently, and ensuring high-quality care. Meanwhile, social administrators work to address the broader social factors that influence diabetes prevalence, such as poverty, education, and access to healthcare. Together, these professionals can help reduce the impact of type 2 diabetes on individuals and communities, improve patient outcomes, and reduce healthcare costs. Through collaboration and a comprehensive approach, they are essential to the fight against this growing global health challenge.

Conclusion:

Diabetes mellitus is a global health challenge, with significant social, economic, and health-related consequences. The condition is increasingly prevalent, and its complications contribute to substantial morbidity and mortality. Therefore, effective management of diabetes is essential, requiring contributions from multiple healthcare professionals. This article highlights the roles of pharmacists, pathologists, health administrators, and social administrators in managing diabetes, emphasizing the need for their collaboration to improve patient outcomes and alleviate the strain on healthcare systems. Pharmacists play a central role in diabetes care, particularly in medication management. They ensure that patients understand their prescribed treatments and help optimize drug therapy through personalized advice. Additionally, they provide crucial education on lifestyle changes and self-management, which are key to preventing complications. Pathologists contribute to the accurate diagnosis and monitoring of diabetes, offering laboratory services such as blood glucose testing and hemoglobin A1c measurements, which are essential for determining treatment plans and assessing the disease's progression. Their role extends to tracking microvascular and macrovascular complications, which are common in diabetic patients. Health administrators are integral to the systemic response to diabetes. They organize and manage healthcare resources, design policies, and ensure the efficient functioning of diabetes care programs. By streamlining healthcare services and promoting best practices, they improve accessibility to care and enhance treatment outcomes. Social administrators, on the other hand, address the social determinants of health, such as education, income, and access to healthcare. They work within communities to create programs that promote diabetes prevention and awareness, particularly in underserved populations. Through their efforts, they help mitigate the social barriers to care and ensure that all individuals, regardless of their background, have access to the resources necessary to manage their diabetes effectively. Ultimately, the successful management of diabetes requires a multidisciplinary approach. By combining the expertise of

healthcare professionals across various fields, diabetes can be more comprehensive, addressing both the clinical and social aspects of the disease.

References:

1 American Diabetes Association. Diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. Diabetes Care 2014;37(Suppl 1):S81–90.

2 American Diabetes Association Professional Practice Committee. 2. Classification and diagnosis of diabetes: standards of medical care in diabetes—2022. Diabetes Care 2022;45(Suppl 1):S17–38.

3 Castaño L, Eisenbarth GS. Type-I diabetes: a chronic autoimmune disease of human, mouse, and rat. Annu Rev Immunol 1990;8:647–79.

4 Reaven GM. Banting lecture 1988. Role of insulin resistance in human disease. Diabetes 1988;37:1595–607.

5 Sacks DB, McDonald JM. The pathogenesis of type II diabetes mellitus. A polygenic disease. Am J Clin Pathol 1996;105:149–56.

6 Balasubramanyam A, Garza G, Rodriguez L, Hampe CS, Gaur L, Lernmark A, Maldonado MR. Accuracy and predictive value of classification schemes for ketosis-prone diabetes. Diabetes Care 2006;29:2575–9.

7 IDF Diabetes Atlas [Internet]. 10th ed. International Diabetes Federation; 2021. https://diabetesatlas.org/idfawp/resource-files/2021/07/IDF_Atlas_10th_Edition_2021.pdf (Accessed May 2022).

8 National Diabetes Statistics Report | Diabetes | CDC. https://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/data/statistics-report/index.html (Accessed August 2022).

9 American Diabetes Association. Economic costs of diabetes in the U.S. in 2017. Diabetes Care 2018;41:917–28.

10 American Diabetes Association. Economic costs of diabetes in the U.S. in 2007. Diabetes Care 2008;31:596–615.

11 Roglic G, Unwin N, Bennett PH, Mathers C, Tuomilehto J, Nag S, et al. The burden of mortality attributable to diabetes: realistic estimates for the year 2000. Diabetes Care 2005;28:2130–5.

12 Sacks DB, Bruns DE, Goldstein DE, Maclaren NK, McDonald JM, Parrott M. Guidelines and recommendations for laboratory analysis in the diagnosis and management of diabetes mellitus. Diabetes Care 2002;25:750–86.

13 Sacks DB, Bruns DE, Goldstein DE, Maclaren NK, McDonald JM, Parrott M. Guidelines and recommendations for laboratory analysis in the diagnosis and management of diabetes mellitus. Clin Chem 2002;48:436–72.

14 Sacks DB, Arnold M, Bakris GL, Bruns DE, Horvath AR, Kirkman MS, et al. Guidelines and recommendations for laboratory analysis in the diagnosis and management of diabetes mellitus. Diabetes Care 2011;34:e61–99.

15 Sacks DB, Arnold M, Bakris GL, Bruns DE, Horvath AR, Kirkman MS, et al. Guidelines and recommendations for laboratory analysis in the diagnosis and management of diabetes mellitus. Clin Chem 2011;57:e1–47.

16 National Diabetes Data Group. Classification and diagnosis of diabetes mellitus and other categories of glucose intolerance. Diabetes 1979;28:1039–57.

17 WHO expert committee on diabetes mellitus: second report. World Health Organ Tech Rep Ser 1980;646:1–80.

18 The Expert Committee on the Diagnosis and Classification of Diabetes Mellitus. Report of the expert committee on the diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. Diabetes Care 1997;20:1183–97.

19 Engelgau MM, Thompson TJ, Herman WH, Boyle JP, Aubert RE, Kenny SJ, et al. Comparison of fasting and 2-hour glucose and HbA1c levels for diagnosing diabetes. Diagnostic criteria and performance revisited. Diabetes Care 1997;20:785–91.

20 McCance DR, Hanson RL, Charles MA, Jacobsson LT, Pettitt DJ, Bennett PH, Knowler WC. Comparison of tests for glycated haemoglobin and fasting and two hour plasma glucose concentrations as diagnostic methods for diabetes. BMJ 1994;308:1323–8.

21 Definition and diagnosis of diabetes mellitus and intermediate hyperglycaemia [Internet]. WHO and International Diabetes Federation; 2006 Apr. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/definition-and-diagnosis-of-diabetes-mellitus-and-intermediate-hyperglycaemia (Accessed 2022).

22 International Expert Committee. International expert committee report on the role of the A1C assay in the diagnosis of diabetes. Diabetes Care 2009;32:1327–34.

23 Use of Glycated Haemoglobin (HbA1c) in the Diagnosis of Diabetes Mellitus: Abbreviated Report of a WHO Consultation [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2011. https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/70523/WHO_NMH_CHP_CPM_11.1_eng.pdf (Accessed 2022).

24 Mbanya JC, Henry RR, Smith U. Presidents' statement on WHO recommendation on HbA1c for diabetes diagnosis. Diabetes Res Clin Pract 2011;93:310–1.

25 American Diabetes Association. Tests of glycemia in diabetes. Diabetes Care 2000;23(Suppl 1):S80–82.

26 Harris MI. Undiagnosed NIDDM: clinical and public health issues. Diabetes Care 1993;16:642–52.

27 Nathan DM, Bennett PH, Crandall JP, Edelstein SL, Goldberg RB, Kahn SE, et al. Does diabetes prevention translate into reduced long-term vascular complications of diabetes? Diabetologia 2019;62:1319–28.

28 American Diabetes Association. Type 2 diabetes in children and adolescents. Diabetes Care 2000;23:381–9.

29 Knowler WC, Barrett-Connor E, Fowler SE, Hamman RF, Lachin JM, Walker EA, et al. Reduction in the incidence of type 2 diabetes with lifestyle intervention or metformin. N Engl J Med 2002;346:393–403.

30 Tuomilehto J, Lindström J, Eriksson JG, Valle TT, Hämäläinen H, Ilanne-Parikka P, et al. Prevention of type 2 diabetes mellitus by changes in lifestyle among subjects with impaired glucose tolerance. N Engl J Med 2001;344:1343–50.

31 Selph S, Dana T, Blazina I, Bougatsos C, Patel H, Chou R. Screening for type 2 diabetes mellitus: a systematic review for the U.S. preventive services task force. Ann Intern Med 2015;162:765–76.

32 Icks A, Rathmann W, Haastert B, John J, Löwel H, Holle R, et al. Cost-effectiveness of type 2 diabetes screening: results from recently published studies. Gesundheitswesen 2005;67(Suppl 1):S167–71.

33 Perry RC, Shankar RR, Fineberg N, McGill J, Baron AD. HbA1c measurement improves the detection of type 2 diabetes in high-risk individuals with nondiagnostic levels of fasting plasma glucose: the Early Diabetes Intervention Program (EDIP). Diabetes Care 2001;24:465–71.

34 Jesudason DR, Dunstan K, Leong D, Wittert GA. Macrovascular risk and diagnostic criteria for type 2 diabetes: implications for the use of FPG and HbA(1c) for cost-effective screening. Diabetes Care 2003;26:485–90.

35 The cost-effectiveness of screening for type 2 diabetes. CDC diabetes cost-effectiveness study group, centers for disease control and prevention. JAMA 1998;280:1757–63.

36 Hoerger TJ, Harris R, Hicks KA, Donahue K, Sorensen S, Engelgau M. Screening for type 2 diabetes mellitus: a cost-effectiveness analysis. Ann Intern Med 2004;140:689–99.

37 Glümer C, Yuyun M, Griffin S, Farewell D, Spiegelhalter D, Kinmonth AL, et al. What determines the cost-effectiveness of diabetes screening? Diabetologia 2006;49:1536–44.

38 Kahn R, Alperin P, Eddy D, Borch-Johnsen K, Buse J, Feigelman J, et al. Age at initiation and frequency of screening to detect type 2 diabetes: a cost-effectiveness analysis. Lancet

39 Zhou X, Siegel KR, Ng BP, Jawanda S, Proia KK, Zhang X, et al. Cost-effectiveness of diabetes prevention interventions targeting high-risk individuals and whole populations: a

40 Greenberg RA, Sacks DB. Screening for diabetes: is it warranted? Clin Chim Acta 2002;315(1–2):61–9.

41 Herman WH, Hoerger TJ, Brandle M, Hicks K, Sorensen S, Zhang P, et al. The cost-effectiveness of lifestyle modification or metformin in preventing type 2 diabetes in adults with impaired glucose tolerance. Ann Intern Med 2005;142:323–32.

42 Genuth S, Alberti KGMM, Bennett P, Buse J, Defronzo R, Kahn R, et al. Follow-up report on the diagnosis of diabetes mellitus. Diabetes Care 2003;26:3160–7.

43 Forouhi NG, Balkau B, Borch-Johnsen K, Dekker J, Glumer C, Qiao Q, et al. The threshold for diagnosing impaired fasting glucose: a position statement by the European Diabetes Epidemiology Group. Diabetologia 2006;49:822–7.

44 Tai ES, Goh SY, Lee JJM, Wong MS, Heng D, Hughes K, et al. Lowering the criterion for impaired fasting glucose: impact on disease prevalence and associated risk of diabetes and ischemic heart disease. Diabetes Care 2004;27:1728–34.

45 Gabir MM, Hanson RL, Dabelea D, Imperatore G, Roumain J, Bennett PH, Knowler WC. The 1997 American Diabetes Association and 1999 World Health Organization criteria for hyperglycemia in the diagnosis and prediction of diabetes. Diabetes Care 2000;23:1108–12.

46 Tirosh A, Shai I, Tekes-Manova D, Israeli E, Pereg D, Shochat T, et al. Normal fasting plasma glucose levels and type 2 diabetes in young men. N Engl J Med 2005;353:1454–62.

47 Emanuelsson F, Marott S, Tybjærg-Hansen A, Nordestgaard BG, Benn M. Impact of glucose level on micro- and macrovascular disease in the general population: a Mendelian randomization study. Diabetes Care 2020;43:894–902.

48 The relationship of glycemic exposure (HbA1c) to the risk of development and progression of retinopathy in the diabetes control and complications trial. Diabetes 1995;44:968–83.

49 Stratton IM, Adler AI, Neil HAW, Matthews DR, Manley SE, Cull CA, et al. Association of glycaemia with macrovascular and microvascular complications of type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 35): prospective observational study. BMJ 2000;321:405–12.

50 The Diabetes Control and Complications Trial Research Group. The effect of intensive treatment of diabetes on the development and progression of long-term complications in insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. N Engl J Med 1993;329:977–86.

51 Nathan DM, Cleary PA, Backlund JYC, Genuth SM, Lachin JM, Orchard TJ, et al. Intensive diabetes treatment and cardiovascular disease in patients with type 1 diabetes. N Engl J Med 2005;353:2643–53.

52 UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) Group. Intensive blood-glucose control with sulphonylureas or insulin compared with conventional treatment and risk of complications in patients with type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 33). Lancet 1998;352:837–53.

53 Selvin E, Marinopoulos S, Berkenblit G, Rami T, Brancati FL, Powe NR, Golden SH. Meta-analysis: glycosylated hemoglobin and cardiovascular disease in diabetes mellitus. Ann Intern Med 2004;141:421–31.

54 Ray KK, Seshasai SRK, Wijesuriya S, Sivakumaran R, Nethercott S, Preiss D, et al. Effect of intensive control of glucose on cardiovascular outcomes and death in patients with diabetes mellitus: a meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. Lancet 2009;373:1765–72.

55 Holman RR, Paul SK, Bethel MA, Matthews DR, Neil HAW. 10-year follow-up of intensive glucose control in type 2 diabetes. N Engl J Med 2008;359:1577–89.

56 The Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes Study Group. Effects of intensive glucose lowering in type 2 diabetes. N Engl J Med 2008;358:2545–59.

57 The ADVANCE Collaborative Group. Intensive blood glucose control and vascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes. N Engl J Med 2008;358:2560–72.

58 Duckworth W, Abraira C, Moritz T, Reda D, Emanuele N, Reaven PD, et al. Glucose control and vascular complications in veterans with type 2 diabetes. N Engl J Med 2009;360:129–39.

59 American Diabetes Association Professional Practice Committee. 6. Glycemic targets: standards of medical care in diabetes—2022. Diabetes Care 2022;45(Suppl 1):S83–96.

60 Howe-Davies S, Simpson RW, Turner RC. Control of maturity-onset diabetes by monitoring fasting blood glucose and body weight. Diabetes Care 1980;3:607–10.

61 Sacks, D. B., Arnold, M., Bakris, G. L., Bruns, D. E., Horvath, A. R., Lernmark, Å., ... & Kirkman, M. S. (2023).Guidelines and recommendations for laboratory analysis in the diagnosis and management of diabetes mellitus. *Clinical Chemistry*, *69*(8), 808-868.

.مرض السكري: مساهمة بين الصيادلة واخصائي التحاليل الطبية والاداريين الصحيين والاخصائيين الاجتماعيين

الملخص:

الخلفية: مرض السكري (DM) هو اضطراب أيضي مزمن يعطل قدرة الجسم على التمثيل الغذائي للجلوكوز. يشمل المرض عدة أنواع، بما في ذلك النوع 1 (T1DM)، والنوع 2(T2DM) ، ومرض السكري الحملي .(GDM) تنتشر هذه الحالة بشكل متزايد على مستوى العالم، وتشكل مضاعفات السكري سببًا رئيسيًا للممراضة والوفيات. يساهم مختلف المهنيين الصحيين، بما في ذلك الصيادلة، والأطباء الشرعيين، والإداريين الصحيين، والإداريين الاجتماعيين، في إدارة الحالة والتحديات المرتبطة بها.

الهدف: يهدف هذا المقال إلى فحص دور مختلف المهنيين الصحيين، وخاصة الصيادلة والأطباء الشرعيين والإداريين الصحيين والإداريين الاجتماعيين، في إدارة مرض السكري. يستكشف كيف يمكن أن تُحسن تعاونهم نتائج المرضى وتقلل من العبء المالي المرتبط بإدارة مرض السكري.

الطرق: يحلل هذا المراجعة الأدبية تأثير مرض السكري على مستوى العالم، والممارسات التشخيصية الحالية، ومساهمات المهنيين الصحيين في رعاية مرض السكري. يتم توفير فحص تفصيلي لإرشادات المختبر والمعايير التشخيصية وتوصيات إدارة المرض، بالإضافة إلى الأدلة حول ممارسات الرعاية الصحية التعاونية.

النتائج: يلعب الصيادلة دورًا حيويًا في إدارة مرض السكري من خلال الاستشارة الدوائية، وتعليم السكري، وتحسين العلاج الدوائي. يساهم الأطباء الشرعيون من خلال تقديم خدمات تشخيصية دقيقة ومتابعة، مما يساعد في تحديد المرض وتتبع تطوره. يعد الإداريون الصحيون أساسيين في تنظيم الموارد، وتحديد السياسات، وتحسين البنية التحتية للرعاية الصحية لمواجهة العبء المتزايد للسكري. يدعم الإداريون الاجتماعيون من خلال معالجة المحددات الاجتماعية للصحة، وتعزيز المبادرات الصحية العامة، وتنسيق الرعاية بين مقدمي الرعاية الصحية.

الخاتمة: يتطلب إدارة مرض السكري نهجًا منسقًا يشمل العديد من المهنيين الصحيين. لكل من الصيادلة، والأطباء الشرعيين، والإداريين الصحيين، والإداريين الاجتماعيين أدوارًا مميزة، ولكن مكملة في تحسين رعاية مرض السكري. يمكن للجهود التعاونية تقليل تأثير مرض السكري على الأفراد وأنظمة الرعاية الصحية، مما يضمن نتائج مرضية أفضل وتحسين استخدام الموارد.

الكلمات المفتاحية: مرض السكري، الصيادلة، اخصائي التحاليل الطبية، الإداريون الصحيون، الإداريون الاجتماعيون، التعاون في الرعاية الصحية، إدارة الأمراض، الصحة العامة.