NGC banner

Guideline Summary NGC-8218

Guideline Title

Standards of medical care in diabetes. III. Detection and diagnosis of gestational diabetes mellitus.

Bibliographic Source(s)

American Diabetes Association (ADA). Standards of medical care in diabetes. III. Detection and diagnosis of gestational diabetes mellitus. Diabetes Care 2011 Jan;34(Suppl 1):S15.

Guideline Status

Note: This guideline has been updated. The National Guideline Clearinghouse (NGC) is working to update this summary.

Scope

Disease/Condition(s)

Gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM)

Guideline Category

Diagnosis

Evaluation

Prevention

Risk Assessment

Screening

Clinical Specialty

Family Practice

Internal Medicine

Nursing

Obstetrics and Gynecology

Intended Users

Advanced Practice Nurses

Allied Health Personnel

Health Care Providers

Health Plans

Hospitals

Managed Care Organizations

Nurses

Patients

Physician Assistants

Physicians

Public Health Departments

Guideline Objective(s)

- To present recommendations for the detection and diagnosis of gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM)
- To provide clinicians, patients, researchers, payers, and other interested individuals with the components of diabetes care, general treatment goals, and tools to evaluate the quality of care

Target Population

Pregnant women

Interventions and Practices Considered

Risk Assessment / Screening / Diagnosis

1. Screening women with risk factors for undiagnosed type 2 diabetes at the first prenatal visit
2. Screening women not known to have diabetes at 24 to 28 weeks of gestation, using a 75-g 2-h oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT)
3. Screening women with gestational diabetes (GDM) for persistent diabetes 6 to 12 weeks postpartum
4. Lifelong screening of women with a history of GDM for diabetes or prediabetes at least every 3 years

Major Outcomes Considered

- Sensitivity of screening and diagnostic tests
- Maternal and fetal outcomes

Methodology

Methods Used to Collect / Select the Evidence

Searches of Electronic Databases

Description of Methods Used to Collect / Select the Evidence

Not stated

Number of Source Documents

Not stated

Methods Used to Assess the Quality and Strength of the Evidence

Weighting According to a Rating Scheme (Scheme Given)

Rating Scheme for the Strength of the Evidence

American Diabetes Association's Evidence Grading System for Clinical Practice Recommendations

A

Clear evidence from well-conducted, generalizable, randomized controlled trials that are adequately powered, including:

- Evidence from a well-conducted multicenter trial
- Evidence from a meta-analysis that incorporated quality ratings in the analysis

Compelling nonexperimental evidence (i.e., "all or none" rule developed by the Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine at Oxford)

Supportive evidence from well-conducted randomized controlled trials that are adequately powered, including:

- Evidence from a well-conducted trial at one or more institutions
- Evidence from a meta-analysis that incorporated quality ratings in the analysis

B

Supportive evidence from well-conducted cohort studies, including:

- Evidence from a well-conducted prospective cohort study or registry
- Evidence from a well-conducted meta-analysis of cohort studies

Supportive evidence from a well-conducted case-control study

C

Supportive evidence from poorly controlled or uncontrolled studies, including:

- Evidence from randomized clinical trials with one or more major or three or more minor methodological flaws that could invalidate the results
- Evidence from observational studies with high potential for bias (such as case series with comparison to historical controls)
- Evidence from case series or case reports

Conflicting evidence with the weight of evidence supporting the recommendation

E

Expert consensus or clinical experience

Methods Used to Analyze the Evidence

Review of Published Meta-Analyses

Systematic Review

Description of the Methods Used to Analyze the Evidence

Not stated

Methods Used to Formulate the Recommendations

Expert Consensus

Description of Methods Used to Formulate the Recommendations

Not stated

Rating Scheme for the Strength of the Recommendations

Recommendations have been assigned ratings of A, B, or C, depending on the quality of evidence (see "Rating Scheme for the Strength of the Evidence"). Expert opinion (E) is a separate category for recommendations in which there is as yet no evidence from clinical trials, in which clinical trials may be impractical, or in which there is conflicting evidence. Recommendations with an "A" rating are based on large, well-designed clinical trials or well-done meta-analyses. Generally, these recommendations have the best chance of improving outcomes when applied to the population to which they are appropriate. Recommendations with lower levels of evidence may be equally important but are not as well supported.

Cost Analysis

A formal cost analysis was not performed and published cost analyses were not reviewed.

Method of Guideline Validation

Internal Peer Review

Description of Method of Guideline Validation

The recommendations were reviewed and approved by the Professional Practice Committee and, subsequently, by the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors.

Recommendations

Major Recommendations

Note: This guideline has been updated. The National Guideline Clearinghouse (NGC) is working to update this summary. The recommendations that follow are based on the previous version of the guideline.

The evidence grading system for clinical practice recommendations (A–C, E) is defined at the end of the "Major Recommendations" field.

Detection and Diagnosis of Gestational Diabetes Mellitus (GDM)

- Screen for undiagnosed type 2 diabetes at the first prenatal visit in those with risk factors, using standard diagnostic criteria. (B)
- In pregnant women not known to have diabetes, screen for GDM at 24 to 28 weeks of gestation, using a 75-g 2-h oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT) and the diagnostic cut points shown below. (B)
- Screen women with GDM for persistent diabetes 6 to 12 weeks postpartum. (E)
- Women with a history of GDM should have lifelong screening for the development of diabetes or prediabetes at least every 3 years. (E)

After deliberations in 2008–2009, the International Association of Diabetes and Pregnancy Study Groups (IADPSG), an international consensus group with representatives from multiple obstetrical and diabetes organizations, including American Diabetes Association (ADA), developed revised recommendations for diagnosing GDM. The group recommended that all women not known to have diabetes undergo a 75-g oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT) at 24 to 28 weeks of gestation. Additionally, the group developed diagnostic cut points for the fasting, 1-h, and 2-h plasma glucose measurements that conveyed an odds ratio for adverse outcomes of at least 1.75 compared with the mean glucose levels in the Hyperglycemia and Adverse Pregnancy Outcomes (HAPO) study. Current screening and diagnostic strategies, based on the IADPSG statement, are as follows:

Screening for and Diagnosis of GDM

- Perform a 75-g OGTT, with plasma glucose measurement fasting and at 1 and 2 h, at 24 to 28 weeks of gestation in women not previously diagnosed with overt diabetes.
- The OGTT should be performed in the morning after an overnight fast of at least 8 h.
- The diagnosis of GDM is made when any of the following plasma glucose values are exceeded:
  - Fasting ≥92 mg/dL (5.1 mmol/L)
  - 1 h ≥180 mg/dL (10.0 mmol/L)
  - 2 h ≥153 mg/dL (8.5 mmol/L)

These new criteria will significantly increase the prevalence of GDM, primarily because only one abnormal value, not two, is sufficient to make the diagnosis. The ADA recognizes the anticipated significant increase in the incidence of GDM to be diagnosed by these criteria and is sensitive to concerns about the "medicalization" of pregnancies previously categorized as normal. These diagnostic criteria changes are being made in the context of worrisome worldwide increases in obesity and diabetes rates, with the intent of optimizing gestational outcomes for women and their

babies.

Because some cases of GDM may represent preexisting undiagnosed type 2 diabetes, women with a history of GDM should be screened for diabetes 6 to 12 weeks postpartum, using nonpregnant OGTT criteria. Women with a history of GDM have a greatly increased subsequent risk for diabetes and should be followed up with subsequent screening for the development of diabetes or prediabetes, as outlined in the National Guideline Clearinghouse (NGC) summary of the ADA guideline Standards of medical care in diabetes. II. Testing for diabetes in asymptomatic patients.

Definitions:

American Diabetes Association's Evidence Grading System for Clinical Practice Recommendations

A

Clear evidence from well-conducted, generalizable, randomized controlled trials that are adequately powered, including:

- Evidence from a well-conducted multicenter trial
- Evidence from a meta-analysis that incorporated quality ratings in the analysis

Compelling nonexperimental evidence (i.e., "all or none" rule developed by the Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine at Oxford)

Supportive evidence from well-conducted randomized controlled trials that are adequately powered, including:

- Evidence from a well-conducted trial at one or more institutions
- Evidence from a meta-analysis that incorporated quality ratings in the analysis

B

Supportive evidence from well-conducted cohort studies, including:

- Evidence from a well-conducted prospective cohort study or registry
- Evidence from a well-conducted meta-analysis of cohort studies

Supportive evidence from a well-conducted case-control study

C

Supportive evidence from poorly controlled or uncontrolled studies, including:

- Evidence from randomized clinical trials with one or more major or three or more minor methodological flaws that could invalidate the results
- Evidence from observational studies with high potential for bias (such as case series with comparison to historical controls)
- Evidence from case series or case reports

Conflicting evidence with the weight of evidence supporting the recommendation

E

Expert consensus or clinical experience

Clinical Algorithm(s)

None provided

Evidence Supporting the Recommendations

Type of Evidence Supporting the Recommendations

The type of supporting evidence is identified and graded for selected recommendations (see the "Major Recommendations" field).

Benefits/Harms of Implementing the Guideline Recommendations

Potential Benefits

Appropriate detection and diagnosis of gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) and improvement of gestational outcomes for women and their babies

Potential Harms

Not stated

Qualifying Statements

Qualifying Statements

- Evidence is only one component of clinical decision-making. Clinicians care for patients, not populations; guidelines must always be interpreted with the needs of the individual patient in mind. Individual circumstances such as comorbid and coexisting diseases, age, education, disability, and, above all, patients' values and preferences, must also be considered and may lead to different treatment targets and strategies. Also, conventional evidence

hierarchies such as the one adapted by the American Diabetes Association may miss some nuances that are important in diabetes care. For example, while there is excellent evidence from clinical trials supporting the importance of achieving glycemic control, the optimal way to achieve this result is less clear. It is difficult to assess each component of such a complex intervention.

- While individual preferences, comorbidities, and other patient factors may require modification of goals, targets that are desirable for most patients with diabetes are provided. These standards are not intended to preclude clinical judgment or more extensive evaluation and management of the patient by other specialists as needed.

Implementation of the Guideline

Description of Implementation Strategy

While numerous interventions to improve adherence to the recommended standards have been implemented, a major contributor to suboptimal care is a delivery system that too often is fragmented, lacks clinical information capabilities, often duplicates services, and is poorly designed for the delivery of chronic care. The Chronic Care Model (CCM) includes six core elements for the provision of optimal care of patients with chronic disease: 1) delivery system design (moving from a *reactive* to a *proactive* care delivery system, where planned visits are coordinated through a team-based approach; 2) self-management support; 3) decision support (basing care on consistent, effective care guidelines); 4) clinical information systems (using registries that can provide patient-specific and population-based support to the care team); 5) community resources and policies (identifying or developing resources to support healthy lifestyles); and 6) health systems (to create a quality-oriented culture). Alterations in reimbursement that reward the provision of quality care, as defined by the attainment of evidence-based quality measures, will also be required to achieve desired outcome goals. Redefinition of the roles of the clinic staff and promoting self-management on the part of the patient are fundamental to the successful implementation of the CCM. Collaborative, multidisciplinary teams are best suited to provide such care for people with chronic conditions like diabetes and to facilitate patients' performance of appropriate self-management.

A rapidly evolving literature suggests that there are three major strategies to successfully improve the quality of diabetes care delivered by a team of providers. National Diabetes Education Program (NDEP) maintains an online resource (www.betterdiabetescare.nih.gov) to help health care professionals design and implement more effective health care delivery systems for those with diabetes.

Three specific objectives are outlined below.

Objective 1

Provider and team behavior change: Facilitate timely and appropriate intensification of lifestyle and/or pharmaceutical therapy of patients who have not achieved beneficial levels of blood pressure, lipid, or glucose control.

- Clinical information systems including registries that can prospectively identify and track those requiring assessments and/or treatment modifications by the team.
- Electronic medical record-based clinical decision support at the point of care, both personalize and standardize care and can be used by multiple providers
- Use of checklists and/or flow sheets that mirror guidelines.
- Detailed treatment algorithms enabling multiple team members to "treat to target" and appropriately intensify therapy.
- Availability of care or disease management service by nurses, pharmacists, and other providers using detailed algorithms often catalyzing reduction in A1C, blood pressure, and low-density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol.

Objective 2

Patient behavior change: Implement a systematic approach to support patients' behavior change efforts as needed including 1) healthy lifestyle (physical activity, healthy eating, nonuse of tobacco, weight management, effective coping, medication taking and management); 2) prevention of diabetes complications (screening for eye, foot, and renal complications; immunizations); and 3) achievement of appropriate blood pressure, lipid, and glucose goals.

- Delivery of high-quality diabetes self-management education (DSME), which has been shown to improve patient self-management, satisfaction, and glucose control.
- Delivery of ongoing diabetes self-management support (DSMS) to ensure that gains achieved during DSME are sustained. National DSME standards call for an integrated approach that includes clinical content and skills, behavioral strategies (goal-setting, problem solving), and addressing emotional concerns in each needed curriculum content area. Provision of continuing education and support (DSMS) improves maintenance of gains regardless of the educational methodology.
- Provision of automated reminders via multiple communication channels to various subgroups of diabetic patients.

Objective 3

Change the system of care: Research on the comprehensive CCM suggests additional strategies to improve diabetes care, including the following:

- Basing care on consistent, evidence-based care guidelines
- Redefining and expanding the roles of the clinic staff
- Collaborative, multidisciplinary teams to provide high-quality care and support patients' appropriate self-management
- Audit and feedback of process and outcome data to providers to encourage population-based care improvement strategies
- Care management, one of the most effective diabetes quality improvement strategies to improve glycemic control

- Identifying and/or developing community resources and public policy that support healthy lifestyles
- Alterations in reimbursement that reward the provision of appropriate and high-quality care and accommodate the need to personalize care goals, providing additional incentives to improve diabetes care

The most successful practices have an institutional priority for quality of care, expanding the role of teams and staff, redesigning their delivery system, activating and educating their patients, and using electronic health record tools. Recent initiatives such as the Patient Centered Medical Home show promise in improving outcomes through coordinated primary care and offer new opportunities for team-based chronic disease care.

It is clear that optimal diabetes management requires an organized, systematic approach and involvement of a coordinated team of dedicated health care professionals working in an environment where patient-centered high-quality care is a priority.

Implementation Tools

Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) Downloads

Quick Reference Guides/Physician Guides

Slide Presentation

For information about availability, see the *Availability of Companion Documents* and *Patient Resources* fields below.

Institute of Medicine (IOM) National Healthcare Quality Report Categories

IOM Care Need

Getting Better

Living with Illness

Staying Healthy

IOM Domain

Effectiveness

Identifying Information and Availability

Bibliographic Source(s)

American Diabetes Association (ADA). Standards of medical care in diabetes. III. Detection and diagnosis of gestational diabetes mellitus. Diabetes Care 2011 Jan;34(Suppl 1):S15.

Adaptation

Not applicable: The guideline was not adapted from another source.

Date Released

1998 (revised 2011 Jan)

Guideline Developer(s)

American Diabetes Association - Professional Association

Source(s) of Funding

American Diabetes Association (ADA)

Guideline Committee

Professional Practice Committee

Composition of Group That Authored the Guideline

Committee Members: John Anderson, MD; John Buse, MD, PhD; Martha Funnell; Robert Gabbay, MD; Silvio Inzucchi (*Chairman*); Jane Kadohiro, DrPH, APRN, CDE; Daniel Lorber, MD; Michelle Magee, MD; Sunder Mudaliar, MD; Patrick O'Connor, MD, MPH; Peter Reaven, MD; Susan Braithwaite, MD; Guillermo Umpierrez, MD; Stuart Weinzimer, MD; Carol Wysham, MD; Gretchen Youssef, MS, RD, CDE; Judy Fradkin, MD (*Ex officio*); Stephanie Dunbar, RD, MPH (*Staff*); Sue Kirkman, MD (*Staff*)

Financial Disclosures/Conflicts of Interest

All members of the Professional Practice Committee are required to disclose potential conflicts of interest.

Conflict of interest disclosures for the 2010 Professional Practice Committee Members are available from the American Diabetes Association (ADA) Web site (see "Availability of Companion Documents" field).

Guideline Status

Note: This guideline has been updated. The National Guideline Clearinghouse (NGC) is working to update this summary.

Guideline Availability

Electronic copies of the updated guideline: Available from the American Diabetes Association (ADA) Web site.

Print copies: Available from the American Diabetes Association, 1701 North Beauregard Street, Alexandria, VA 22311.

Availability of Companion Documents

The following are available:

- Introduction. Diabetes Care 34:S1-S2, 2011.
- Summary of revisions for the 2011 clinical practice recommendations. Diabetes Care 34:S3, 2011.
- Executive summary: standards of medical care in diabetes. Diabetes Care 34:S4-S10, 2011.
- Professional Practice Committee Members (includes conflict of interest disclosure). Diabetes Care 34:S97-S98, 2011.

Electronic copies: Available from the American Diabetes Association (ADA) Web site.

Print copies: Available from the American Diabetes Association, 1701 North Beauregard Street, Alexandria, VA 22311.

The following are also available:

- Diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. Diabetes Care 2011 Jan; 34(Suppl 1):S62-S69. Electronic copies: Available from the ADA Web site.
- 2011 Standards of medical care in diabetes. Clinical practice recommendations. Slide set. American Diabetes Association; 2011 Jan. 130 p. Electronic copies: Available from the ADA Web site.
- 2011 Standards of medical care in diabetes. Clinical practice recommendations. Personal Digital Assistant (PDA). American Diabetes Association; 2011 Jan. Electronic copies: Available for download from the ADA Web site.

Patient Resources

None available

NGC Status

This summary was completed by ECRI on April 2, 2001. The information was verified by the guideline developer on August 24, 2001. The summary was updated by ECRI on January 29, 2002, April 21, 2003, March 24, 2004, July 1, 2005, and March 16, 2006, and April 30, 2007. This summary was updated by ECRI Institute on March 31, 2008. The updated information was verified by the guideline developer on May 15, 2008. This summary was updated by ECRI Institute on May 20, 2010. The information was verified by the guideline developer on May 25, 2010. This summary was updated by ECRI Institute on February 25, 2011.

Copyright Statement

Disclaimer

NGC Disclaimer

The National Guideline Clearinghouse™ (NGC) does not develop, produce, approve, or endorse the guidelines represented on this site.

All guidelines summarized by NGC and hosted on our site are produced under the auspices of medical specialty societies, relevant professional associations, public or private organizations, other government agencies, health care organizations or plans, and similar entities.

Guidelines represented on the NGC Web site are submitted by guideline developers, and are screened solely to determine that they meet the NGC Inclusion Criteria which may be found at http://www.guideline.gov/about/inclusion-criteria.aspx.

NGC, AHRQ, and its contractor ECRI Institute make no warranties concerning the content or clinical efficacy or effectiveness of the clinical practice guidelines and related materials represented on this site. Moreover, the views and opinions of developers or authors of guidelines represented on this site do not necessarily state or reflect those of NGC, AHRQ, or its contractor ECRI Institute, and inclusion or hosting of guidelines in NGC may not be used for