IAA Journal of Applied Sciences 14(1):84-89, 2026. www.iaajournals.org

 ISSN: 2636-7246

https://doi.org/10.59298/IAAJAS/2026/1418489 IAAJAS: 141000

Closed-Loop Insulin Delivery Systems in Type 1 Diabetes: Technology Advances and Outcomes

Nagawa Jackline Irene

Department of Clinical Medicine and Dentistry Kampala International University Uganda
Email: irene.nagawa@studwc.kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

Type 1 diabetes mellitus was characterized by absolute insulin deficiency requiring lifelong exogenous insulin replacement. Traditional insulin delivery methods, including multiple daily injections and conventional insulin pumps, impose substantial burdens on patients and often fail to achieve optimal glycemic control. Closed-loop insulin delivery systems, also known as artificial pancreas systems, represented a transformative technological advancement that automates insulin dosing through real-time continuous glucose monitoring feedback and algorithmic control. This review aimed to critically evaluate the technological evolution of closed-loop insulin delivery systems, assess their clinical efficacy and safety outcomes in type 1 diabetes management, and examine the biochemical and physiological principles underlying their operation. A comprehensive synthesis of peer-reviewed literature examining closed-loop system technology, control algorithms, clinical trial outcomes, and real-world implementation studies was conducted. Closed-loop systems demonstrated superior glycemic control compared to conventional therapy, with increased time in the target glucose range, reduced hypoglycemia frequency, and improved glycemic variability metrics. Hybrid closed-loop systems, which retain user input for mealtime boluses, have achieved widespread clinical adoption with robust safety profiles. Advanced control algorithms incorporating machine learning, adaptive insulin dosing, and predictive capabilities show promise for fully automated systems. However, challenges persisted regarding sensor accuracy, algorithm optimization for diverse physiological conditions, and equitable access to technology. Closed-loop insulin delivery systems represented a significant advancement in type 1 diabetes management, offering improved outcomes through automated glycemic regulation. Continued technological refinement and expanded accessibility remain essential priorities.
Keywords: Closed-loop insulin delivery, Artificial pancreas, Type 1 diabetes, Continuous glucose monitoring, Hybrid closed-loop systems.

INTRODUCTION

Type 1 diabetes mellitus results from autoimmune destruction of pancreatic beta cells, leading to absolute insulin deficiency and chronic hyperglycemia [1, 2]. The biochemical consequences of insulin deficiency extend beyond impaired glucose metabolism to encompass dysregulation of lipid and protein homeostasis, with resultant metabolic decompensation if untreated. Insulin replacement therapy remains the cornerstone of management, yet achieving physiologic insulin delivery patterns proves extraordinarily challenging [3, 4]. The healthy pancreas continuously modulates insulin secretion in response to fluctuating glucose concentrations, meal ingestion, physical activity, and hormonal influences, maintaining plasma glucose within narrow limits. Conventional exogenous insulin administration, whether through multiple daily injections or continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion via pumps, cannot replicate this dynamic responsiveness [5]. Patients must manually calculate insulin doses based on carbohydrate intake, current glucose levels, and anticipated activity, a cognitively demanding process prone to error and requiring constant vigilance.

The inadequacy of conventional insulin delivery is reflected in suboptimal glycemic outcomes for many individuals with type 1 diabetes. Chronic hyperglycemia drives microvascular complications, including retinopathy, nephropathy, and neuropathy through multiple biochemical mechanisms, notably advanced glycation end product formation, protein kinase C pathway activation, and oxidative stress generation [6, 7]. Conversely, aggressive insulin therapy increases hypoglycemia risk, which acutely impairs cognitive function and consciousness while chronically inducing defective counterregulatory responses. Glycemic variability, characterized by frequent oscillations between hyperglycemia and hypoglycemia, independently contributes to oxidative stress and endothelial dysfunction. These limitations have driven the development of closed-loop insulin delivery systems that automatically adjust insulin infusion rates based on continuous glucose monitoring data, thereby approximating physiologic beta cell function through technological integration. The objective of this review is to critically examine the technological principles, algorithmic approaches, and clinical outcomes associated with closed-loop insulin delivery systems in type 1 diabetes management, while identifying current limitations and future research priorities.

Biochemical Rationale and Physiological Principles

Closed-loop insulin delivery systems attempt to restore the fundamental biochemical feedback regulation lost in type 1 diabetes [8]. Normal pancreatic beta cells respond to rising plasma glucose concentrations by secreting insulin in a biphasic pattern, with an immediate first-phase release of stored insulin followed by sustained second-phase secretion. This insulin secretion suppresses hepatic glucose production, enhances peripheral glucose uptake primarily in skeletal muscle and adipose tissue, and inhibits lipolysis. Simultaneously, alpha cell glucagon secretion is suppressed, further reducing hepatic glucose output. When glucose levels decline, insulin secretion ceases while counterregulatory hormones, including glucagon, epinephrine, cortisol, and growth hormone, promote glucose mobilization. This exquisite coordination maintains plasma glucose typically between 70 and 140 milligrams per deciliter despite varying metabolic demands [9].

Closed-loop systems seek to replicate this regulatory feedback through three integrated components: a continuous glucose monitor that measures interstitial glucose concentrations at frequent intervals, a control algorithm that calculates required insulin delivery based on current and predicted glucose values, and an insulin pump that administers subcutaneous insulin according to algorithmic instructions. The interstitial glucose measurements obtained by sensors correlate closely with plasma glucose, though a physiological lag time exists as glucose equilibrates between vascular and interstitial compartments [10]. Modern sensors utilize glucose oxidase or glucose dehydrogenase enzyme technology, generating an electrical current proportional to glucose concentration. Signal processing algorithms filter noise and calibrate readings, though sensor accuracy remains imperfect, particularly during rapid glucose changes or in hypoglycemic ranges.

The control algorithm constitutes the system's computational core, integrating multiple inputs to determine appropriate insulin dosing. Proportional-integral-derivative controllers form the foundation for many systems, adjusting insulin delivery based on current glucose deviation from target, cumulative deviation over time, and rate of glucose change [11]. Model predictive control algorithms represent a more sophisticated approach, utilizing mathematical models of glucose-insulin dynamics to forecast future glucose trajectories and preemptively adjust insulin delivery. These algorithms incorporate parameters including insulin sensitivity, insulin action time, carbohydrate absorption rates, and individual physiological characteristics. Machine learning approaches increasingly augment traditional control strategies, learning from historical data to personalize insulin dosing patterns and adapt to changing metabolic conditions. The subcutaneous route for both glucose sensing and insulin delivery introduces pharmacokinetic delays that complicate control, as insulin absorption requires 60 to 90 minutes to reach peak activity while glucose changes may occur more rapidly.

System Classifications and Technological Evolution

Closed-loop insulin delivery systems are categorized based on automation degree and user interaction requirements [12]. Single-hormone systems deliver only insulin, whereas dual-hormone systems administer both insulin and glucagon to more closely mimic pancreatic physiology [13]. Hybrid closed-loop systems automate basal insulin delivery and make corrections for detected glucose excursions, but require users to manually administer mealtime insulin boluses based on carbohydrate counting [14]. Fully closed-loop systems, still largely investigational, aim to eliminate mealtime bolus announcements by automatically detecting and responding to postprandial glucose increases. This classification reflects the progressive technological sophistication and clinical maturity of different system generations.

Early closed-loop research utilized intravenous glucose sensing and insulin delivery in controlled inpatient settings, demonstrating proof of concept but lacking practical applicability [15]. The development of reliable continuous glucose monitors with adequate accuracy and stability enabled outpatient closed-loop studies beginning in the early 2000s. First-generation systems employed relatively simple proportional-integral-derivative control algorithms with conservative insulin dosing to prioritize safety over optimal glycemic control. Subsequent iterations incorporated model predictive control, enabling anticipatory insulin adjustments that improved postprandial glucose management and reduced hypoglycemia through insulin suspension before predicted low glucose events. The hybrid closed-loop approach emerged as a pragmatic compromise, automating the most challenging aspects of diabetes management while retaining user input for meals, which remain difficult to manage automatically given the complexity of carbohydrate absorption kinetics and variability.

Contemporary advanced hybrid closed-loop systems integrate multiple technological enhancements, including adaptive algorithms that adjust insulin sensitivity factors based on recent glucose patterns, automated correction boluses for hyperglycemia, and customizable glucose targets [16, 17]. Some systems employ smartphone-based control, enabling remote monitoring and data sharing with healthcare providers or family members. Interoperability standards have evolved to allow mixing components from different manufacturers, fostering innovation and user choice. Miniaturization has improved wearability and discretion. Sensor accuracy has progressively improved through enhanced calibration algorithms, factory calibration eliminating fingerstick requirements, and extended sensor wear duration up to 10 to 14 days. These iterative refinements have transformed closed-loop systems from research tools to clinically viable therapeutic options, with multiple systems receiving regulatory approval and achieving commercial availability in numerous countries.

Clinical Efficacy and Glycemic Outcomes

Randomized controlled trials and real-world studies consistently demonstrate that closed-loop insulin delivery systems improve glycemic control compared to conventional therapy. The primary efficacy metric, time in range, defined as the percentage of time with glucose between 70 and 180 milligrams per deciliter, typically increases by 10 to 15 percentage points with closed-loop systems [18]. Given that each day contains 1,440 minutes, this improvement translates to approximately 2 to 3 additional hours daily spent in the target glucose range. This enhancement occurs across diverse populations, including adults, adolescents, children, and individuals with varying baseline glycemic control. Glycated hemoglobin reductions of 0.3 to 0.5 percent are commonly observed, though this metric incompletely captures the benefits of reduced glycemic variability and hypoglycemia [19].

Time below range, indicating hypoglycemia exposure, consistently decreases with closed-loop systems, particularly during nighttime when conventional therapy poses the greatest hypoglycemia risk due to reduced counterregulatory responses during sleep and inability to consciously detect and treat low glucose. Reductions in time spent below 70 milligrams per deciliter range from 40 to 60 percent in most studies, with even greater reductions in severe hypoglycemia requiring assistance [20, 21]. This safety advantage proves especially valuable for individuals with impaired hypoglycemia awareness, a condition characterized by diminished or absent warning symptoms that substantially increase severe hypoglycemia risk. The ability of closed-loop algorithms to suspend or reduce insulin delivery in response to declining glucose trends provides critical protection against dangerous hypoglycemia.

Glycemic variability metrics, including the coefficient of variation and mean amplitude of glycemic excursions, improve with closed-loop therapy, reflecting more stable glucose profiles [22]. Reduced variability may independently benefit long-term outcomes by decreasing oxidative stress and inflammatory responses associated with glucose fluctuations. Postprandial glucose excursions, while improved, remain challenging with hybrid systems requiring carbohydrate announcement, as inaccurate carbohydrate counting or unpredictable absorption kinetics complicate insulin dosing. Advanced systems incorporating automated correction boluses partly address this issue. Nocturnal glucose control demonstrates particularly robust improvement, as closed-loop automation eliminates the need for sleep interruption to check glucose or treat hypoglycemia. Psychosocial benefits, including reduced diabetes-related distress, improved sleep quality, and decreased fear of hypoglycemia, represent important outcomes, though quantifying these benefits requires validated patient-reported outcome measures.

Safety Considerations and Adverse Events

Safety remains paramount in closed-loop system development and clinical implementation. The primary safety concern involves hypoglycemia resulting from excessive automated insulin delivery. However, clinical trial data consistently show reduced rather than increased hypoglycemia with closed-loop systems compared to conventional therapy, attributable to conservative algorithm tuning and insulin suspension features. Diabetic ketoacidosis, a life-threatening complication of absolute insulin deficiency, poses a theoretical risk if pump or infusion set failure occurs undetected [23]. Closed-loop systems incorporate multiple safety alarms for pump occlusion, infusion set dysfunction, and communication interruptions between system components. User education emphasizes the importance of responding to alarms and maintaining ketone testing supplies for prompt identification of insulin delivery failure.

Sensor-related adverse events, including skin irritation, infection, and inaccurate readings, occur but are generally mild and manageable. Sensor accuracy limitations, particularly during rapid glucose changes or in extreme glucose ranges, can lead to inappropriate insulin dosing [24]. Algorithms incorporate safety constraints limiting maximum insulin delivery rates and requiring minimum intervals between automated boluses. Some systems revert to preprogrammed basal rates when sensor accuracy is questionable or communication is lost. Infusion site reactions from insulin pumps affect a subset of users, though these issues predate closed-loop technology. Longer-term safety

data from registry studies and post-marketing surveillance continue to accumulate, with reassuring findings to date regarding severe adverse events.
Unique challenges emerge with closed-loop systems, including user overreliance on automation leading to neglect of diabetes self-management skills, inappropriate expectation of perfect glucose control, and technological literacy requirements that may present barriers for some individuals. Cybersecurity concerns regarding unauthorized access to insulin delivery systems have prompted manufacturers to implement encryption and authentication protocols [25]. Device malfunctions, though infrequent, necessitate that users maintain backup diabetes management supplies and knowledge. Pregnancy presents special safety considerations, as tighter glycemic targets are required and physiological changes alter insulin requirements substantially across trimesters. Limited but growing data support closed-loop system safety in pregnancy, with some systems specifically designed for this population. Pediatric safety data show comparable or superior safety profiles relative to conventional therapy, though parental supervision and age-appropriate education remain important.

Limitations, Barriers to Access, and Future Directions

Despite proven clinical benefits, closed-loop insulin delivery systems face multiple limitations constraining optimal performance and widespread adoption. Pharmacokinetic delays inherent to subcutaneous insulin delivery and glucose sensing prevent achievement of truly physiologic glucose control [26]. Rapid-acting insulin analogs require above 90 minutes to reach peak action, inadequate for managing rapid postprandial glucose rises or addressing exercise-induced glucose changes [27]. Investigational ultra-rapid insulin formulations and alternative delivery routes, including intraperitoneal insulin infusion, may partially address this limitation. Sensor accuracy, while improved, remains imperfect, with mean absolute relative differences of 8 to 12 percent in contemporary sensors. Inaccurate sensor readings directly compromise algorithm performance, potentially leading to inappropriate insulin dosing.
Meal management represents a persistent challenge, as even advanced hybrid systems require carbohydrate intake announcements [28]. Fully automated systems must detect meals and estimate carbohydrate content from glucose rise patterns alone, a complex computational problem given individual variability in carbohydrate absorption and insulin sensitivity. Machine learning approaches show promise, with algorithms learning individual meal response patterns and adapting insulin dosing accordingly. Exercise poses another challenge, as physical activity increases insulin sensitivity and glucose uptake while potentially triggering counterregulatory hormone release, creating unpredictable glucose dynamics. Current systems offer exercise modes that raise glucose targets and reduce insulin delivery, but optimal exercise management remains an area requiring refinement.
Economic and access barriers significantly limit closed-loop system availability [29]. High costs for integrated systems, typically thousands of dollars annually, even with insurance coverage, create financial hardship for many families. Insurance coverage varies substantially across countries and within healthcare systems, with some payers restricting access based on age, glycemic control metrics, or prior technology use. Socioeconomic disparities in technology access risk widening existing health inequities in diabetes outcomes. Healthcare system infrastructure requirements, including specialized training for clinicians and technical support for users, present additional barriers. Regulatory pathways for system approval vary internationally, affecting technology availability across regions. Future efforts must prioritize affordability, equitable access, and simplified user interfaces to maximize population-level benefits.

CONCLUSION

Closed-loop insulin delivery systems represent a transformative advancement in type 1 diabetes management, leveraging continuous glucose monitoring, sophisticated control algorithms, and automated insulin delivery to improve glycemic outcomes while reducing hypoglycemia burden. Clinical evidence robustly demonstrates increased time in the target glucose range, decreased hypoglycemia exposure, and improved glycemic stability compared to conventional insulin therapy. Hybrid closed-loop systems have achieved clinical maturity and widespread adoption, while fully automated systems remain under active development. The technology approximates physiologic insulin delivery patterns more closely than previous therapeutic approaches, though pharmacokinetic limitations of subcutaneous delivery and sensor accuracy constraints prevent achievement of normal glucose homeostasis. Safety profiles are favorable, with reduced rather than increased hypoglycemia risk when systems are used appropriately. Psychosocial benefits, including reduced diabetes distress and improved quality of life, constitute important but less quantifiable advantages. However, substantial challenges persist regarding meal and exercise management, algorithm optimization for diverse physiological scenarios, and equitable access to technology. Economic barriers, regulatory heterogeneity, and healthcare system infrastructure requirements limit availability, particularly in resource-limited settings. Future research priorities include ultra-rapid insulin formulations, improved sensor accuracy, machine learning-enhanced control algorithms, and strategies to enhance affordability and accessibility. Closed-loop systems exemplify precision medicine approaches, with individualized algorithm parameters tailored to personal physiology and lifestyle. As technology continues evolving and real-world implementation expands, closed-loop insulin delivery promises to substantially improve long-term outcomes for individuals living with type 1 diabetes. Healthcare systems and policymakers should prioritize equitable access to closed-loop insulin delivery technology through insurance coverage expansion, cost reduction initiatives, and infrastructure development to ensure that demonstrated clinical benefits reach diverse populations regardless of socioeconomic status.

REFERENCES

1. Alum, E.U., Umoru, G.U., Uti, D.E., Aja, P.M., Ugwu, O.P., Orji, O.U., Nwali, B.U., Ezeani, N.N., Edwin, N., Orinya, F.O.: HEPATO-PROTECTIVE EFFECT OF ETHANOL LEAF EXTRACT OF Datura stramonium in ALLOXAN-INDUCED DIABETIC ALBINO RATS. Journal of Chemical Society of Nigeria. 47, (2022). https://doi.org/10.46602/jcsn.v47i5.819
2. Uti, D.E., Igile, G.O., Omang, W.A., Umoru, G.U., Udeozor, P.A., Obeten, U.N., Ogbonna, O.N., Ibiam, U.A., Alum, E.U., Opotu, Ohunene, R., Chukwufumnanya, M.J., Oplekwu, R.I., A, W., Obio: Anti-Diabetic Potentials Of Vernonioside E Saponin; A Biochemical Study. NVEO - NATURAL VOLATILES & ESSENTIAL OILS Journal | NVEO. 14234–14254 (2021)
3. Home, P.D., Mehta, R.: Insulin therapy development beyond 100 years. The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology. 9, 695–707 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(21)00182-0
4. Greenway, F., Loveridge, B., Grimes, R.M., Tucker, T.R., Alexander, M., Hepford, S.A., Fontenot, J., Nobles-James, C., Wilson, C., Starr, A.M., Abdelsaid, M., Lewis, S.T., Lakey, J.R.T.: Physiologic Insulin Resensitization as a Treatment Modality for Insulin Resistance Pathophysiology. International Journal of Molecular Sciences. 23, 1884 (2022). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms23031884
5. Pala, L., Dicembrini, I., Mannucci, E.: Continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion vs modern multiple injection regimens in type 1 diabetes: an updated meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. Acta Diabetol. 56, 973–980 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00592-019-01326-5
6. Ugwu, O.P.-C., Alum, E.U., Okon, M.B., Aja, P.M., Obeagu, E.I., Onyeneke, E.C.: Ethanol root extract and fractions of Sphenocentrum jollyanum abrogate hyperglycaemia and low body weight in streptozotocin-induced diabetic Wistar albino rats. RPS Pharmacy and Pharmacology Reports. 2, rqad010 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1093/rpsppr/rqad010
7. Alum, E.U., Ikpozu, E.N., Offor, C.E., Igwenyi, I.O., Obaroh, I.O., Ibiam, U.A., Ukaidi, C.U.A.: RNA-based diagnostic innovations: A new frontier in diabetes diagnosis and management. Diabetes & Vascular Disease Research. 22, 14791641251334726 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1177/14791641251334726
8. Lal, R.A., Ekhlaspour, L., Hood, K., Buckingham, B.: Realizing a Closed-Loop (Artificial Pancreas) System for the Treatment of Type 1 Diabetes. Endocr Rev. 40, 1521–1546 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1210/er.2018-00174
9. Alhajrasi, H.N., Alanazi, M.H.R., Alanizi, H.G., Almutairi, A.K., Al-Rashudi, K.A.R.S., Alahmari, K.S.O., Hayjan, S.A.A., Alshehri, M.M.A., Alhefdhi, S.A., Bakri, M.A.I., Saleh, W.S., Alhazmi, A.H., Alajlan, A.A.M., Alanazi, A.A.A., Alharbi, A.L., Alharbi, B.N., Al-Azmi, N.A., Ahmed, O.A., Hayjan, S.A.A.: Physiology of Glucose: An Updated Review for Healthcare Professionals. Egyptian Journal of Chemistry. 68, 1175–1184 (2025). https://doi.org/10.21608/ejchem.2025.405197.12065
10. Moser, O., Yardley, J.E., Bracken, R.M.: Interstitial Glucose and Physical Exercise in Type 1 Diabetes: Integrative Physiology, Technology, and the Gap In-Between. Nutrients. 10, 93 (2018). https://doi.org/10.3390/nu10010093
11. Patra, A.K., Rout, P.K.: Adaptive continuous-time model predictive controller for implantable insulin delivery system in Type I diabetic patient. Optimal Control Applications and Methods. 38, 184–204 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1002/oca.2250
12. Templer, S.: Closed-Loop Insulin Delivery Systems: Past, Present, and Future Directions. Front. Endocrinol. 13, (2022). https://doi.org/10.3389/fendo.2022.919942
13. Peters, T.M., Haidar, A.: Dual-hormone artificial pancreas: benefits and limitations compared with single-hormone systems. Diabetic Medicine. 35, 450–459 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1111/dme.13581
14. Nimri, R., Grosman, B., Roy, A., Nir, J., Fisch Shvalb, N., Kurtz, N., Loewenthal, N., Gillon-Keren, M., Muller, I., Atlas, E., Phillip, M.: Feasibility Study of a Hybrid Closed-Loop System with Automated Insulin Correction Boluses. Diabetes Technology & Therapeutics. 23, 268–276 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1089/dia.2020.0448
15. Templer, S.: Closed-Loop Insulin Delivery Systems: Past, Present, and Future Directions. Front. Endocrinol. 13, (2022). https://doi.org/10.3389/fendo.2022.919942
16. Nuzzo, M.G., Schettino, M.: Advanced Technology (Continuous Glucose Monitoring and Advanced Hybrid Closed-Loop Systems) in Diabetes from the Perspective of Gender Differences. Diabetology. 4, 519–526 (2023). https://doi.org/10.3390/diabetology4040045
17. Dermawan, D., Purbayanto, M.A.K.: An overview of advancements in closed-loop artificial pancreas system. Heliyon. 8, (2022). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e11648

18. Lal, R.A., Ekhlaspour, L., Hood, K., Buckingham, B.: Realizing a Closed-Loop (Artificial Pancreas) System for the Treatment of Type 1 Diabetes. Endocr Rev. 40, 1521–1546 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1210/er.2018-00174
19. Wolf, R.M., Patel, D., Gera, S., Molano, G., Dolivera, T., Meighan, S., Brown, E.A., Marks, B.E.: Does the OP5 Automated Insulin Delivery System Close the Gap in Glycemic Control Between White and Black Youth with Type 1 Diabetes? Diabetes Technology & Therapeutics. 27, 469–478 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1089/dia.2024.0612
20. Lin, Y.K., Fisher, S.J., Pop-Busui, R.: Hypoglycemia unawareness and autonomic dysfunction in diabetes: Lessons learned and roles of diabetes technologies. Journal of Diabetes Investigation. 11, 1388–1402 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1111/jdi.13290
21. Buckingham, B.A., Raghinaru, D., Cameron, F., Bequette, B.W., Chase, H.P., Maahs, D.M., Slover, R., Wadwa, R.P., Wilson, D.M., Ly, T., Aye, T., Hramiak, I., Clarson, C., Stein, R., Gallego, P.H., Lum, J., Sibayan, J., Kollman, C., Beck, R.W., for the In Home Closed Loop Study Group: Predictive Low-Glucose Insulin Suspension Reduces Duration of Nocturnal Hypoglycemia in Children Without Increasing Ketosis. Diabetes Care. 38, 1197–1204 (2015). https://doi.org/10.2337/dc14-3053
22. Beato-Víbora, P.I., Gallego-Gamero, F., Lázaro-Martín, L., Romero-Pérez, M. del M., Arroyo-Díez, F.J.: Prospective Analysis of the Impact of Commercialized Hybrid Closed-Loop System on Glycemic Control, Glycemic Variability, and Patient-Related Outcomes in Children and Adults: A Focus on Superiority Over Predictive Low-Glucose Suspend Technology. Diabetes Technology & Therapeutics. 22, 912–919 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1089/dia.2019.0400
23. Kjærulff, M.L.B.G., Astrup, B.S.: Sudden death due to diabetic ketoacidosis following power failure of an insulin pump: Autopsy and pump data. Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine. 63, 34–39 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jflm.2019.02.013
24. Kovatchev, B.P., Patek, S.D., Ortiz, E.A., Breton, M.D.: Assessing Sensor Accuracy for Non-Adjunct Use of Continuous Glucose Monitoring. Diabetes Technology & Therapeutics. 17, 177–186 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1089/dia.2014.0272
25. Klonoff, D.C.: Cybersecurity for Connected Diabetes Devices. J Diabetes Sci Technol. 9, 1143–1147 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1177/1932296815583334
26. Zhang, J., Xu, J., Lim, J., Nolan, J.K., Lee, H., Lee, C.H.: Wearable Glucose Monitoring and Implantable Drug Delivery Systems for Diabetes Management. Advanced Healthcare Materials. 10, 2100194 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1002/adhm.202100194
27. Modeling of Exercise Induced Effects on Blood Glucose Dynamics in T1DM Patients, https://www.research-collection.ethz.ch/entities/publication/297dc3e3-0e13-45a9-a2bb-c6bbc9cb9208
28. Petrovski, G., Campbell, J., Pasha, M., Day, E., Hussain, K., Khalifa, A., van den Heuvel, T.: Simplified Meal Announcement Versus Precise Carbohydrate Counting in Adolescents With Type 1 Diabetes Using the MiniMed 780G Advanced Hybrid Closed Loop System: A Randomized Controlled Trial Comparing Glucose Control. Diabetes Care. 46, 544–550 (2023). https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-1692
29. Tapia, C., Bianchi, M., Pallaske, G., Bassi, A.M.: Towards a territorial definition of a circular economy: exploring the role of territorial factors in closed-loop systems. European Planning Studies. 29, 1438–1457 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2020.1867511

CITE AS: Nagawa Jackline Irene (2026). Closed-Loop Insulin Delivery Systems in Type 1 Diabetes: Technology Advances and Outcomes. IAA Journal of Applied Sciences 14(1):84-89. https://doi.org/10.59298/IAAJAS/2026/1418489