

Bridging the Digital Divide: The UNBIASED national study to unravel the impact of ethnicity and deprivation on diabetes technology disparities in the United Kingdom

Sze May Ng^{1,2,3}, Mark L Evans⁴, Nick Oliver⁵, David Rankin⁶, Rachel Dlugatch⁶, Eda Tonga⁷, Natalie Darko⁷, Julia Lawton⁶

1. Faculty of Health, Social Care and Medicine, Edge Hill University, UK ORCID ID 0000-0002-3449-0541
2. Department of Women's and Children's Health, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK
3. Paediatric Department, Mersey and West Lancashire Teaching Hospitals, Ormskirk, UK
4. Wellcome MRC Institute of Metabolic Science and Dept of Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge UK
5. Imperial College London, London, UK
6. Usher Institute, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh UK.
7. Department of Population Health Sciences, College of life Sciences, University of Leicester.

ABSTRACT

While diabetes technology offers significant clinical and quality-of-life benefits to people with type 1 diabetes, persistent inequalities in technology use based on ethnicity and deprivation are becoming increasingly evident. To date, there is limited research into the challenges and barriers to accessing and using diabetes technology and concerns felt by end-users from racially minoritised and socioeconomically disadvantaged groups. Their views are often under-represented in the literature, and healthcare professionals' perspectives on barriers to technology access have also been neglected. This article explores the nuanced relationship between ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and technology access. By understanding the parallels between health and technology inequalities, we can pave the way for targeted interventions to bridge the digital gap and create a more inclusive technological landscape. The UNBIASED study is currently being conducted across England, and is exploring the lived experiences of under-represented children and young people with type 1 diabetes regarding the (lack of) utilisation of life-changing diabetes technologies. The study is also consulting healthcare professionals who can act as gatekeepers to technology, with the ultimate goal of identifying and dismantling existing barriers and inequities to access. By synthesising the perspectives of both people with type 1 diabetes and healthcare providers, this research seeks to develop inclusive, practical, and implementable solutions to foster improved access to cutting-edge diabetes technologies within the National Health Service (NHS).

Introduction:

Type 1 diabetes imposes a substantial burden on young individuals, necessitating constant monitoring, precise medication administration, and lifestyle adjustments. The advent of life-changing diabetes technologies, such as continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) systems, insulin pumps and hybrid closed loop (HCL) systems promise improved disease management

and enhanced quality-of-life. However, barriers to access have hindered the widespread adoption of these technologies among children and young people (CYP) with type 1 diabetes in the United Kingdom.

National Paediatric Diabetes Audit (NPDA)

According to the NPDA 2019–2022 reports, despite the increased usage of insulin pumps compared to insulin injections across all quintiles of deprivation, the gap in insulin pump usage between children and young people living in the most and least deprived areas widened over the previous six years (NPDA, 2022)¹. Additionally, the NPDA reported significantly lower usage of insulin pumps or real-time CGM systems among Black children, while White children exhibited the highest usage of pumps and CGM. Similarly, despite increased CGM usage in all quintiles of deprivation, the gap between the most and least deprived areas expanded over time. Moreover, those using CGM were more likely to achieve lower HbA1c targets compared to those not using CGM, irrespective of the mode of insulin delivery.

NICE Updated Technology Appraisal

NICE Technology appraisals (TA) are recommendations for the use of new and existing medicines and treatments within the NHS. The NHS is legally obliged to fund and resource medicines and treatments recommended by NICE's TAs, unlike NICE guidelines, which are advisory but not legally binding (NICE, 2019)². The updated NICE TA on hybrid closed-loop systems for managing blood glucose levels in type 1 diabetes: Technology appraisal guidance TA943 was published in December 2023 and advocates for comprehensive NHS utilisation and access to hybrid closed-loop systems for children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes (NICE 2023)³⁻⁴. This marks a notable and positive shift towards enhancing accessibility to advanced diabetes technologies. Unlike previous NICE guidelines, which imposed stringent criteria for accessing CGM exclusively, the latest recommendations, both for children and adults with type 1 diabetes, are poised to expand access to include hybrid closed-loop systems. The newly published NICE TA are anticipated to result in a more inclusive availability of diabetes technologies. While this is expected to incur increased costs, it is viewed as a crucial step in diminishing disparities and facilitating broader access to technology that can significantly impact long-term health outcomes. Implementing the NICE TA 943 will require time and resources. In response, NHS England has set out a five-year implementation strategy⁵ designed to ensure that eligible people across England receive equitable and fair access to HCL technologies following publication of the NICE TA⁴. Clinical teams are being encouraged to initiate early discussions with their local commissioning Integrated Care Boards (ICBs), who are responsible for setting out these five-year plans. While these initiatives are extremely welcomed, it is likely that successful rollout will still be contingent upon understanding and addressing the reasons for the inequitable access to diabetes technology highlighted in the NPDA data and other studies.

Understanding the health inequalities

Studies conducted by Addala et al. in the United States (US)⁶ have shed light on the intricate interplay between ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and health outcomes; albeit in a different social and political and healthcare context to the UK. As these authors have observed, individuals from marginalised ethnic backgrounds and/or living in deprived socio-economic conditions often face hurdles to accessing and utilising technological resources due to a complex web of historical, social and economic factors. Ethnicity and deprivation are intertwined, creating a compound effect on an individual's ability to access and engage with technology. For instance, these US-based studies have shown that certain ethnic groups are disproportionately affected by poverty and have limited access to educational resources which can support technology use⁷. Work has also shown implicit bias on the part of healthcare providers are less likely to recommend diabetes technology to under-represented groups, for reasons relating to their ethnicity or access to health insurance.

This, in turn, has a cascading effect on access to technology, as those in deprived conditions often lack the means to acquire and use the latest devices and internet services. These studies highlight the need to view health disparities through a lens that encompasses the social determinants of health. Similarly, the digital divide cannot be fully comprehended without better understanding of the social and cultural factors that contribute to disparities in technology use⁸. It has also been shown that community engagement is crucial to addressing the technology access digital divide, as it allows for the development of tailored solutions that consider the unique challenges faced by different ethnic groups and economically deprived communities⁹.

Effective policies at the governmental level are indispensable in narrowing the digital gap. In the UK, the significance of universal health policies that address health disparities, and a parallel approach is being undertaken in the realm of technology access. Governments should actively work towards creating an environment that fosters equal opportunities for technology access, irrespective of ethnicity or socio-economic status.

UNBIASED -Understanding Inequalities and Barriers to Accessing Diabetes Technology in Children and Young People with Type 1 Diabetes

The UNBIASED national study, which is funded by Diabetes UK (Ng, Chief investigator) commenced in October 2023 and brings together investigators with expertise in paediatric diabetes, diabetes technologies, qualitative methods and issues affecting individuals from minority ethnic groups and their access to healthcare. The collaboration is also strengthened by the involvement of JDRF, Diabetes Africa, Equality Health and Devices 4 Dignity. Workstream 1 (Darko, lead) involves interviews with CYP and/or their parents, to explore their experiences of using, and barriers to accessing, diabetes technologies. Workstream 2 (Lawton, lead) focuses on the perspectives and experiences paediatric healthcare professionals who can act as gatekeepers to diabetes technologies (Lawton 2020), and considers the training, resourcing and support these individuals may need to help ensure equitable access to diabetes technology amongst CYP with type 1 diabetes. Data collection in both workstreams is well underway, with effort being made to recruit individuals with type 1 diabetes (and their carers) from racially minoritised and socioeconomically disadvantaged groups, and healthcare professionals based in sites serving these communities, including from

sites shown in the NPDA to have had lower uptake/access to diabetes technologies compared with other sites in England.

The study aims to bridge the gap between under-represented CYP with type 1 diabetes and life-changing technologies by better understanding existing barriers and developing practical solutions. By fostering collaboration between people with lived experience, healthcare professionals, policymakers and other stakeholder groups we can better understand how ethnicity and deprivation affect inequalities in technology use in the UK and begin to identify ways to close the gap in access by developing targeted strategies. We aim to pave the way for a more inclusive and accessible landscape for diabetes technologies within the NHS, ultimately enhancing the overall well-being of young individuals managing type 1 diabetes.

Acknowledgements

Diabetes UK for funding the study.

The University of Cambridge has received salary support for ME through the National Health Service in the East of England through the Clinical Academic Reserve.

References

1. National paediatric diabetes audit. Annual report 2019-20. Available at <https://www.rcpch.ac.uk/resources/npda-annual-reports>.
2. NICE 2019 Technology Appraisal <https://www.nice.org.uk/about/what-we-do/our-programmes/nice-guidance/nice-technology-appraisal-guidance#technology-appraisals-and-the-nhs-constitution>
3. NICE 2022 Diabetes (type 1 and type 2) in children and young people: diagnosis and management. NG18. Available at: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/NG18>
4. NICE TA 2023 Hybrid closed loop systems for managing blood glucose levels in type 1 diabetes
5. Hybrid closed loop technologies: 5-year implementation strategy <https://www.england.nhs.uk/long-read/hybrid-closed-loop-technologies-5-year-implementation-strategy/>
6. Addala A, Hanes S, Naranjo D, Maahs DM, Hood KK. Provider Implicit Bias Impacts Pediatric Type 1 Diabetes Technology Recommendations in the United States: Findings from The Gatekeeper Study. *J Diabetes Sci Technol.* 2021 Sep;15(5):1027-1033

7. Blower S, Swallow V, Maturana C, et al. Children and young people's concerns and needs relating to their use of health technology to self-manage long-term conditions: a scoping review. *Arch Dis Child*. 2020;105:1093-1104.
8. Odugbesan O, Addala A, Nelson G, Hopkins R, Cossen K, Schmitt J, Indyk J, Jones NY, Agarwal S, Rompicherla S, Ebekozi O. Implicit Racial-Ethnic and Insurance-Mediated Bias to Recommending Diabetes Technology: Insights from T1D Exchange Multicenter Pediatric and Adult Diabetes Provider Cohort. *Diabetes Technol Ther*. 2022 Sep;24(9):619-627.
9. Lawton J, Kimbell B, Rankin D, Ashcroft NL, Varghese L, Allen JM, Boughton CK, Campbell F, Randell T, Besser REJ, Trevelyan N, Hovorka R. (2020). Health professionals' views about who would benefit from using a closed-loop system: qualitative study. *Diabetic Medicine*. 37(6):1030-1037