This is a peer-reviewed, accepted author manuscript of the following research article: Almeida, P. H. R. F., Godman, B., de Lemos, L. L. P., Silva, T. B. C., de Assis Acúrcio, F., Guerra Jr., A. A., de Araújo, V. E., Almeida, A. M., & Alvares-Teodoro, J. (Accepted/In press). A cross-sectional study of the quality of life of patients living with type 1 diabetes treated with insulin glargine and neutral protamine hagedorn insulin and the implications: HRQOL of patients with T1DM. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Health Services Research*, 1-19.

Research Paper

A cross-sectional study of the quality of life of patients living with type 1 diabetes treated with insulin glargine and neutral protamine hagedorn insulin and the implications

Short title: HRQOL of patients with T1DM.

*Paulo H. R. F. Almeida[1], Brian Godman[2,3,4,5], Lívia L. P. de Lemos[6], Thales B. C. Silva[1], Francisco de Assis Acúrcio[1,6,7], Augusto A. Guerra Jr.[1,7], Vânia E. de Araújo[1,7,8], Alessandra M. Almeida[1,7], Juliana Alvares-Teodoro[1,7].

1. Graduate Program in Medicines and Pharmaceutical Services, Department of Social Pharmacy, Faculty of Pharmacy, Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil. Email: henriqueribeiro.farm@gmail.com; henriqueribeiro.farm@outlook.com; thalescs1@gmail.com; fracurcio@gmail.com; augustoguerramg@gmail.com; alessandraalm@gmail.com; jualvares@gmail.com.
2. Strathclyde Institute of Pharmacy and Biomedical Sciences, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK. Email: Brian.Godman@strath.ac.uk.
3. Division of Public Health Pharmacy and Management, School of Pharmacy, Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University, Pretoria, South Africa.
4. Division of Clinical Pharmacology, Department of Laboratory Medicine, Karolinska Institutet, Karolinska University Hospital Huddinge, Stockholm, Sweden. Email: Brian.Godman@ki.se.
5. School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Universiti Sains Malaysia,Penang, Malaysia.
6. School of Medicine, Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, Graduate Program in Public Health, Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil. Email: lilolemos@gmail.com.
7. SUS Collaborating Centre for Technology Assessment and Excellence in Health (CCATES), Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil.
8. School of Dentistry, Pontifical Catholic University of Minas Gerais (PUCMG), Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil. Email: vaniaearaujo@gmail.com.

***Author for correspondence:** Paulo H. R. F. Almeida, Graduate Program in Medicines and Pharmaceutical Services, Department of Social Pharmacy, Faculty of Pharmacy, Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), Av. Pres. Antônio Carlos, 6627. Pampulha, Belo Horizonte, ZIP Code: 31270-901, Minas Gerais, Brazil. Email: henriqueribeiro.farm@gmail.com, henriqueribeiro.farm@outlook.com. Telephone: +55 31 34096718

(Accepted for publication - Journal of Pharmaceutical Health Services Research)

Abstract

Objectives: The study aim was to identify key factors associated with the health-related quality of life (HRQOL) of patients with type 1 diabetes mellitus (T1DM) treated with neutral protamine Hagedorn insulin (NPH) or human insulin analog glargine (IGLA). **Methods:** We conducted two cross-sectional studies in Minas Gerais State, Brazil. One with 401 patients treated with IGLA, and the other with 179 T1DM patients treated with NPH. HRQOL was measured by Euroqol (EQ-5D-3L). **Key findings**: Most participants were male (51%), aged between 18 and 40 years old (47%), non-black (58%) and from the highest economic strata (A1-B2) (74%). Participants perceived their health as good/very good (51%), had one to three medical consultations in the previous year (51%), were not hospitalized in the previous year (74%), did not reported angina (96%), diabetic neuropathy (90%), hearing loss (94%) or kidney disease (89%). . Non-severe hypoglycemia episodes in the last 30 days were reported by 17% of participants. **Conclusion:** Higher HRQOL was associated with younger age (18-40 years old), good/very good health self-perception , having had up to three medical consultations in the last year, not being hospitalized in the last year, having none to three comorbidities, not reporting angina, diabetic neuropathy, hearing loss or kidney disease; and having had episodes of non-severe hypoglycemia. In addition, the findings of our study demonstrated inequalities in access to treatment, which will be the subject of future research projects.

Keywords: type 1 diabetes mellitus; human insulin human insulin analog; quality of life; EQ-5D-3L.

1. INTRODUCTION

Diabetes Mellitus (DM) is a highly prevalent and costly chronic disease that requires continuous care including medicines to prevent the complications of diabetes, which include cardiovascular diseases, neuropathy, and nephropathy as well as premature death [1-8]. According to the International Diabetes Federation (IDF), approximately 463 million adults were living with DM world-wide in 2019, and this figure is likely to grow to 700 million by 2045 [9]. Among DM subtypes, type 1 diabetes mellitus (T1DM) represents 5% to 10% of the cases [1].

Various types of insulin are available for the treatment of T1DM, which differ mainly by their pharmacokinetic parameters. Fast acting insulins, such as regular and lispro insulins, are indicated for the glycemic load associated with the main meal of the day. To maintain glycemic levels throughout the day and between meals, intermediate or long acting insulins, such as neutral protamine Hagedorn insulin (NPH), and insulin analogues glargine (IGLA), detemir (IDET) and insulin degludec (IDEG), are indicated. NPH or insulin recombinant DNA (Dna-r) has been among the first choice of basal insulin [10,11] as typically it is considerably less expensive than analogue insulins - an especially important decision factor for lower- and middle-income countries where availability of insulins is a major concern especially in patients with T1DM [12-15].

The Brazilian Network of Health Technology Assessment (*Rede Brasileira de Avaliação de Tecnologias em Saúde*, REBRATS) systematic review of 2010 showed that because of the methodological biases identified in randomized controlled trials (RCTs) it was not possible to identify clear differences between IGLA and NPH insulin with respect to glycemic control and safety [16]. In addition in 2014, the National Commission for Technology Incorporation in the Unified Health System (*Comissão Nacional de Incorporação de Tecnologias no Sistema Único de Saúde* [SUS] - Conitec), which makes recommendations to the Ministry of Health of Brazil regarding the potential funding of technologies within the public health system of Brazil - the SUS - did not recommend the incorporation of IGLA for the treatment of people with T1DM [17]. Although the available evidence does not prove the superiority of IGLA versus NPH insulin, especially in relation to glycated haemoglobin (HbA1c) [18-25], the Committee received a new request for incorporation of long-acting insulin analogs (IGLA, IDET and IDEG), this time from the health authority of Minas Gerais State. In this new decision, Conitec recommended the incorporation of human insulin analogs in SUS for patients with T1DM provided that their cost is not greater than that of NPH insulin (US$ 5,41 per vial). This limitation was imposed due to the estimated incremental budget impact ranging from US$ 168 million to US$ 3.7 billion over five years with the usual prices [26]. It is worth mentioning that in 2005 Minas Gerais State listed IGLA in response to the large number of lawsuits against the state for the provision of this in insulin analogue, as lawsuits requesting high-cost medicines outside the list SUS are common in Brazil [18,27].

Consequently, concerns regarding the sustainability of SUS following the incorporation of human insulin analogs in 2019 are legitimate; however, eased by the entry of biosimilars at lower prices across countries [28]. In 2017, the Brazilian National Health Surveillance Agency (*Agência Nacional de Vigilância Sanitária*, Anvisa) gave market authorization to biosimilar of IGLA (Abasaglar®, Lilly) at a retail price 70% lower than IGLA and 45% lower than IDET [21]. In July 2018, a second biosimilar was approved by Anvisa, which is Biomm's Glargilin® [29].

Desirable glycemic control while also minimizing episodes of hypoglycemia are fundamental aspects to improving health-related quality of life (HRQOL) among patients withT1DM especially considering that approximately 10% of the deaths of T1DM patients, especially of young people, are due to hypoglycemia [30]. It is important to stress that the psychosocial burden of living with DM is considerable since it affects self-care behavior leading to non-glycemic control, as well as increasing both macro and microvascular complications, all contributing to lower HRQOL unless addressed [31,32]. Consequently, it is important to understand which factors are associated with a to lower HRQOL in patients with T1DM to be able to act on them to alleviate the physical and psychosocial burden related to DM, which if addressed can potentially reduce morbidity, mortality and costs associated with DM[33].

Currently, there no consensus about which factors influence the QoL of patients with DM. However, the following have been highlighted in various studies: insulin therapy and compliance to it, hypoglycemia episodes, glycemic control, age, ethnicity, social level, education level, employment, complications of the disease, psychological and family factors, as well as knowledge about the disease and self-health care [33-36]. A range of instruments are currently available to assess the HRQOL of patients with T1DM [37]. The generic instrument EuroQol (EQ-5D-3L) [38] can be used both in healthy individuals and in groups of patients with different types of diseases, such as DM, and is widely used in economic analyses [34,36,38].

We have previously shown in a systematic review that there are only a limited number of robust studies evaluating the QoL of individuals treated with IGLA versus NPH insulin, and that these studies are heterogeneous in terms of the QoL instrument used [31]. In addition, there is also a scarcity of such studies in Brazil, since no study in the systematic review used EQ-5D-3L to assess QoL [31]. Consequently, we sought to assess the HRQOL of people living with T1DM using IGLA or NPH insulin and to identify which key factors are associated with it with data from two independent cross-sectional studies . We believe our findings can potentially be used to guide future treatment approaches.

2. METHODS

2.1 Study design, setting and participants

This is a non-comparative analysis of data from two cross-sectional studies that assessed the HRQOL of people living with T1DM, one with patients treated with IGLA and the other with patients treated with NPH insulin . The first study was conducted in March 2017 with 401 patients treated with IGLA identified in the SUS database across the state of Minas Gerais, Brazil. The second study was conducted between January and February 2014 with 179 patients treated with NPH insulin conducted in 63 municipalities in Minas Gerais, Brazil [39]. It should be noted that we could not undertake a comparative study as we used different populations at different time points with different number of patients; however, with the same inclusion and exclusion criteria. We sought though to combine the data to provide an assessment of the Qol of individuals living with T1DM and key factors of interest.

We used the same inclusion and exclusion criteria in both cross-sectional studies [39]. The following inclusion criteria were applied: patients with T1DM, aged 18 years old or more, treated with IGLA for a period equal to or superior to 6 months, with or without other insulins. The following exclusion criteria were applied: patients with a diagnosis of mental disorders (except for depression and bipolar disorder), bedridden, patients with cognitive deficit, pregnant or lactating women, and patients diagnosed with adult latent autoimmune diabetes. Data from these different studies were used because patients with T1DM prescribed IGLA can only obtain this in pharmacies of the Government of the State of Minas Gerais due to current restrictions. This means access to IGLA insulin within the public system can only be authorised once an assessment has been performed against an agreed Clinical Protocol specific to IGLA within the State of Minas Gerais [40]. However, the dispensing of NPH insulin is performed by multiple pharmacies of the municipal government, which are different from the pharmacies dispensing IGLA, and no such restrictions apply. Consequently, it can be difficult to obtain reliable utilization data. As a result, we necessarily adopted this pragmatic approach.

Patients were selected from IGLA requests submitted to Minas Gerais Health Authority. We interviewed patients through telephone calls. Up to five attempts were made at different times. In case of no response, the patient was excluded from the study . It is worth mentioning that the administrative processes of the patients were chosen at random, as they were available in the database of the Minas Gerais Health Authority.

2.2 Study instrument

We used the same instrument for both cross-sectional studies [39]. The instrument comprised a questionnaire addressing the following aspects: A) sociodemographic characteristics (age, gender, race, marital status, school years, type of dwelling, presence of other residents in the household and economic class based on criteria used by the Brazilian Economic Classification methodology of the Brazilian Association of Research Companies [*Associação Brasileira de Empresas de Pesquisa*,

ABEP]) [41]; B) clinical parameters and access to health services (self-perception of health, medical consultations, hospitalizations in the last year, private health insurance, self-reported comorbidities, time of T1DM diagnosis, consumption of alcohol and tobacco, problems to access health services, extent of physical exercise, self-reported episodes of hypoglycemia and types, i.e. severe or non-severe, in the last 30 days, other insulins used); C) the patient's QoL - measured by the validated version for the Brazilian population of the EQ 5D-3L[42].

The EQ-5D-3L is composed of five dimensions (mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort and anxiety/depression) and three levels of severity (no problem, moderate problem or problem and more serious problems) [38]. The combination of these dimensions and severity levels identify 243 health states with respective utility values [42].

2.3 Statistical analysis

Categorical variables were presented as absolute and relative frequencies, and the continuous variables as mean and standard deviation (SD). We performed the following tests to check the differences between the groups treated with either IGLA or NPH insulin: we used Fisher's exact test or Pearson's chi-square for categorical variables, and for comparison of continuous variables, independent samples Student's t-test or analysis of variance (ANOVA). For the utilities of EQ-5D-3L, we verified normality parameters using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

We performed multiple linear regression analysis using the forward stepwise method with the utilities of the EQ-5D-3L as the dependent variable and all other variables as explanatory variables. The explanatory variables that obtained p-values <0.05 remained in the final model. The suitability of the model was assessed by residue analysis. The analyzes were performed using the IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software, version 26.0, 2019 (IBM Corp., Armonk, United States of America) and we adopted 95% confidence interval (95% CI).

2.4 Compliance with Ethical Standards

The research followed all current ethical principles and was approved by the Ethics and Research Committee of the Federal University of Minas Gerais under the protocol n. 55876816.0.0000.519, observing the principles of patient confidentiality according to the declaration of Helsinki.

The date of approval of the ethical committee was June 2, 2016 (head of the ethical committee). The approval number was 1.572.257. We also obtained informed consent from the patients before initiating the interviews.

3. RESULTS

Of the 580 patients evaluated, the most were women (54%), aged between 18-40 years old (47%) with a mean age of 44.13 (18,507) years old, self-declared as non-black (53%), without a partner (54%), studied for nine years or more (60%), owned their own homes (81%), did not live alone (93%) and were between the economic classes A1 and B2 (Table 1).

Insert Table 1

51% of the patients reported having a self-perception of good/very good health. In the previous year, 51% had one to three consultations and 74% were not hospitalized. 53% did not have private health insurance, 58% practiced physical activities and 87% had not been bedridden in the last 15 days. Direct access to physician and difficulties in scheduling medical consultations accounted for 35% of the most recurring problems in accessing health services (Table 2).

Most participants reported having between one to three comorbidities, with a mean of 2.44 (2.406) comorbidities per person. The most self-reported comorbidities were arterial hypertension (30%), hyperthyroidism (16%), diabetic retinopathy (15%), cardiovascular disease (13%), dyslipidemia (12%), depression (12%), kidney disease (11%) and diabetic neuropathy (10%). The other comorbidities self-reported presented less than 10% of the observations and are available in Table 2. The time since the

diagnosis of T1DM ranged from one to 65 years, with a mean of 17.05 years (10.970). 74% of the patients did not consume alcohol, 98% did not smoke and 43% did not use other insulins (Table 2).

Of those who used other insulins, lispro was the most used (25%). Of the 580 subjects who participated in the study, , 65% reported they did not experienced an occurrence episodes of hypoglycemia in the last 30 days. In addition, 191 patients described the severity of their episodes of hypoglycemia. Non severe hypoglycemic episodes prevailed in 18% of the reports. With respect to episodes of hypoglycemia among the treatment groups (n=191), patients treated with IGLA reported a higher number of episodes compared to those treated with NPH insulin (66% versus 34%, respectively) (Table 2).

Insert Table 2

Regarding HRQOL, EQ-5D-3L analysis showed that 29% of patients with T1DM had a perfect health state (11111), followed by 11112 (13%), 11122 (10%) and 11121. Other health states can be seen in Table 3.

Moderate problems that had an impact on HRQOL were reported in the dimensions of anxiety/depression and pain/discomfort with the same value (35%), mobility (19%) and usual activities (e.g. work, study, housework, family or leisure activities) (17%) and self-care, i.e. moderate problems in carrying out usual activities such as work, family or leisure activities and having moderate self-care problems such as having difficulty to preserve or improve one's health (7%). For the group treated with IGLA, these values were 36% for anxiety/depression, 31% for pain/discomfort, 13.8% for mobility, 13% for usual activities and 5.8% for personal care. Moderate problems in NPH-insulin treated subjects were 44% for pain/discomfort, 35% for mobility, 34% for anxiety/depression, 25% for usual activities and 9% for self-care (Table 3).

Regarding utilities, the total population (n=580) presented a mean utility of 0.731 (0.202, 95% CI: 0.744, 0.777). Patients with T1DM treated with IGLA (n=401) had a mean utility of 0.796 (0.181, 95% CI: 0.778, 0.813) and NPH insulin (n=179) treated patients had a mean utility of 0.683 (0.224, 95% CI: 0.650, 0.716). The mean utilities of all variables can be found in Supplementary Tables 1 and 2.

Insert Table 3

Multiple regression analysis showed that higher HRQOL was associated with younger age; a self-perception of health as very good/good; a maximum of three medical consultations in the previous year; no hospitalization in the previous year; reporting up to three comorbidities; not reporting angina, diabetic neuropathy, hearing problems and kidney disease; and having had episodes of non-severe hypoglycemia (Table 4). The variables that remained in the final model explained 23,8 % of the EQ-5D-3L utility variability.

Insert Table 4

4. DISCUSSION

Patients with T1DM treated with IGLA in this study were mostly white, with a high educational level and of the higher social strata. This result is not surprising, as in Brazil there is a major barrier to access to medicines the Specialized Component of Pharmaceutical Assistance of the SUS (CEAF/SUS). The access to the high cost medicines, CEAF/SUS, such as IGLA, requires the opening of an administrative claim which has to be updated every six months with a new medical prescription. This access barrier is more easily overcome by those from the higher socioeconomic strata. In the multicenter cross-sectional study of the Brazilian Type 1 Diabetes Study Group similar results were found, as patients with T1DM treated with insulin analogues (among them, IGLA) had higher education, better economic conditions and were white [43]. Another study, focusing on psoriatic arthritis, also showed that patients with access to medicines from CEAF/SUS are from the higher socioeconomic strata and that the prescriptions came from private medical offices [44]. Furthermore, medicines access barriers are pointed to other chronic diseases in Brazil (e.g., cancer) [45,46], in the technical report of the Pan American Health Organization [47] and data from the National Survey on

Access, Use and Promotion of Rational Use of Medicines [48] indicated greater access to medicines from higher economic classes to the detriment of the lower classes. This can be explained, in part, by the greater access to health services, such as private medical offices, private clinics and diagnostic tests by patients belonging to the highest socioeconomic strata [49,50]. It is noteworthy the continuous access to IGLA requires the presentation of HbA1c results every 6 months [51], however, access to the exam is far unequal [49,52-54]. Although the present study did not specifically investigate access to CEAF/SUS medicines, the findings reinforce the evidence of a considerable access barrier to medicines from CEAF/SUS. This difference in equity needs to be addressed, and will be the subject of future research project, as it occurs in accessing the diagnosis of breast cancer in Brazil [55].

The number of self-reported comorbidities in this study was similar to those found in other studies with patients with DM in Brazil, that is, a higher prevalence of individuals with arterial hypertension, hyperthyroidism, diabetic retinopathy, cardiovascular disease, dyslipidemia, depression, kidney disease and diabetic neuropathy [34,43,56]. This rises a concern since most of study participants were women . It is known that, women with DM have a lower number of microvascular complications compared to men with DM, but they present a greater number of macrovascular complications in general such as coronary artery disease and stroke [57]. As complications related to DM are related to a poorer HRQOL [32,35], it is important to promote public policies to address both the early diagnosis of micro and macrovascular problems and the treatment corrections needed for their control .

The treatment groups IGLA and insulin NPH showed appreciable differences in relation to clinical profile and access to health services. Overall, patients treated with IGLA had better self-perceived health, were less bedridden in the last 15 days, attended one to three medical consultations in the last year, were not hospitalized in the last year, exercised regularly in the last 15 days and reported less comorbidities. In addition, they reported fewer comorbidities compared to patients treated with NPH insulin. However, these patients were of a higher economic class and had higher schooling. This again may be related to greater access to health services through a double public-private doorway for individuals with a better socioeconomic status [58], as well as greater access to information on the disease and T1DM care and to medicines [59]. These are important considerations because initially IGLA was only provided free of charge following a successful collective lawsuit [18] which may have increased access barriers especially for patients from lower economic classes who can be less confident using the judiciary to obtain high cost medicines [27,60].

With respect to the type of hypoglycemic episode, individuals treated with NPH insulin self-reported more episodes of severe hypoglycemia in relative numbers compared to individuals treated with IGLA. However, in terms of absolute number, IGLA patients presented 1 episode of severe hypoglycemia more than the NPH insulin. This compares with the study conducted by Ratner *et al*. (2000) where the authors found a lower number of episodes of severe hypoglycemia in IGLA treated individuals when compared to NPH insulin treated group [61]. In addition, two other retrospective cohort studies showed a reduction in the number of hypoglycemic episodes in the groups treated with IGLA versus NPH insulin, but without statistically significant differences in glycemic control [62,63]. The results of a RCT showed that, in general, there were no differences in the number of episodes of hypoglycemia between patients treated with IGLA versus NPH insulin [64].. In general, the findings are conflicting in the literature in terms of hypoglycemic episodes, as some studies show that the episodes are more frequent in patients treated with IGLA when compared to patients treated with NPH insulin and other studies show the opposite . It should be noted that in some articles there was no statistically significant difference in the number of hypoglycemic episodes between the two treatments (IGLA versus NPH insulin), consequently there are many uncertainties in the literature [61-64].

Interestingly as well, the meta-analysis of observational studies conducted by Mara *et al*. (2016) also found discrete favorable effectiveness and safety results with IGLA [19]. This was also reported in the recommendations of the Conitec [17,26]. Overall, the evidence suggests that IGLA is associated with better safety outcomes in controlled settings; however, when subjected to real-world scenarios, as in the study by Marra *et al.* (2017) [20], the results can be conflicting, sometimes similar to, or lower than, those achieved by NPH-treated patients [16,18-21,31]. This may be one of the reasons, along with cost differences, why long-acting insulins were not within the 2019 World Health Organization Essential Medicines List [65]; however, this is changing for those patients allergic to conventional insulins or no

longer responding to them [15], and it is likely we will see a growth in the use for long-acting insulin analogues especially with increasing availability of lower cost biosimilars.

The HRQOL results of this study were similar to those found in people living with T1DM by two other studies [34,36]. In general, patients reported good health states, with the worst health state being rarely reported, as well as the predominance of moderate-level problems. In addition, the results indicated better HRQOL in patients treated with IGLA compared to those treated with NPH insulin. In general, systematic review studies [23,31] point to no differences in HRQOL, measured by the most diverse instruments, in patients treated with IGLA or NPH insulin. However, studies that use a therapeutic preference tool, such as Diabetes Treatment Satisfaction Questionnaire, show that patients prefer treatment with human insulin analogues, such as IGLA, over treatment with human insulin, as there can be benefit in human insulin analog dosage regimens compared to human insulin treatment. . It should be noted, however, that these studies of satisfaction with treatment with insulin analogues mostly have a moderate methodological quality [31]. These findings were expected as our treatment groups had significant sociodemographic and clinical differences including for example, less comorbidities in the IGLA treatment group. Many variables are important for improved HRQOL, with our findings indicating which are the predictors that influence a better perception of HRQOL in people living with T1DM. Consequently, the combined studies [33,36,43,66] can influence policies when deciding and funding treatment approaches to enhance the HRQOL of patients with T1DM.

Multiple regression analysis in our study showed a better HRQOL in younger people (18 to 40 years old) with good or very good self-perception of health, between 0 to three medical consultations and without hospitalization in the last year, and few comorbidities other than self-reporting angina, diabetic neuropathy, hearing loss and kidney disease and non-severe hypoglycemia. However, the type of insulin therapy, IGLA or NPH insulin, did not explain the differences in HRQOL in the multiple regression analysis although this was not a comparative analysis. Overall, our results suggest that many factors are important for a better HRQOL in patients with T1DM, and that clinical variables, especially comorbidities, are very important for people living with T1DM [67,68]. Similar results are reported by Braga de Souza *et al.* (2015) [43] in which HbA1c, regular physical activity, duration of DM, age and microvascular and macrovascular complications were identified as predictors of HRQOL. However, together, they managed to explain only 7.1% of the HRQOL of patients with T1DM [43]. It is worth mentioning that we did not evaluate HbA1c in our study, which is an important limitation in our findings.

5. LIMITATIONS

Overall, we believe that the strengths of the present study are, firstly, the use of a validated and well-tested instrument, i.e. the EQ-5D-3L. Second, the study was carried out in one of the few states in Brazil that incorporated IGLA into its list of publicly funded medicines; finally, the study provides useful values for carrying out economic studies (Supplementary Material). However, we are aware of a number of limitations with this study, such as: the data collection process was carried out in different periods of time (2017 for individuals with IGLA and 2014 for patients with NPH insulin); this is a cross-sectional study and cannot be used to analyze behavior over a period of time; our results were based on the self-reporting of individuals from two cross-sectional studies; clinical data on treatment with other insulins and time of diagnosis were obtained by self-reporting without substantiation; it was not possible to verify whether changes in HbA1c could influence HRQOL since the project that evaluated patients treated with NPH insulin did not measure this variable; T1DM diagnostic data were obtained from SUS database across the state of Minas Gerais and confirmed by self-reports with patients, however there may be outliers, and it was not possible to perform propensity score matching as few individuals were evaluated Furthermore, it was not the object of this study to make a comparative approach between the two groups of treatments. Alongside this, the patients showed considerable clinical and sociodemographic differences.

6. CONCLUSION

Our study showed that a higher HRQOL was associated with being young, having good or very good self-rated health, having had up to three medical consultations in the last year, not having been hospitalized in the last year, not having any or at the most three comorbidities, not having angina,

diabetic neuropathy, hearing loss, kidney disease or episodes of non-severe hypoglycemia to the detriment of serious episodes. In addition, our findings suggest an access barrier to medicines fro CEAF/SUS, as patients treated with IGLA presented a higher socioeconomic status when compared to NPH insulin patients. It is important to highlight that this perception should be interpreted with caution, as our study was not designed to evaluate access to medicines from CEAF/SUS . Nevertheless, this discovery is a concern that needs to be addressed and we will continue to monitor this.

In conclusion, many clinical and sociodemographic predictors are important for the HRQOL of patients living with T1DM. Our findings may assist with future public health policies in the treatment of patients with T1DM, and we will be monitoring this.

ORCID

Paulo H. R. F. Almeida ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9369-0690
Brian Godman ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6539-6972
Lívia L. P. de Lemos ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8921-515X
Thales B. C. Silva ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0196-8884
Francisco de Assis Acúrcio ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5880-5261
Augusto A. Guerra Jr ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5256-0577
Vânia E. de Araújo ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0345-8522
Alessandra M. Almeida ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0138-9401
Juliana Alvares-Teodoro ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0210-0721

Conflict of interest: The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Data availability: The data used for this study is available on reasonable request to the corresponding author.

Funding: This study was financially supported by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico - CNPq) and Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - CAPES), through doctoral fellowship and funding for the research project.

Authors' contributions: Paulo H. R. F. Almeida contributed to the project design, collection, analysis and interpretation of data, article writing and final approval of the submitted article. Lívia L. P. de Lemos and Thales B. C. Silva critiqued the content and approved the final version. Brian Godman, Francisco de Assis Acúrcio, Augusto A. Guerra Jr., Vânia E. de Araújo, Alessandra M. Almeida, Juliana Alvares-Teodoro contributed in project design, article writing, critiqued the contentand approved the final version. All authors state that they had complete access to the study data that support the publication.

Authors' statement: We confirm that the manuscript has been read and approved by all named authors.

Ethical Statement: The study was approved by the Ethics and Research Committee of the Federal University of Minas Gerais (approval number 55876816.0.0000.519, June 2, 2016).

REFERENCES

1. American Diabetes Association (ADA). Introduction. Diabetes Care [Internet]. 2020 Jan;43(Suppl 1): S1–2. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.2337/dc20-Sint.

2. Brown A, Reynolds LR, Bruemmer D. Intensive glycemic control and cardiovascular disease: an update. Nat Rev Cardiol. 2010 Jul;7(7):369–75. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrcardio.2010.35.

3. UK Prospective Diabetes Study Group. Tight blood pressure control and risk of macrovascular and microvascular complications in type 2 diabetes: UKPDS 38. BMJ. 1998 Sep 12;317(7160):703–13. Available from: http://www.bmj.com/cgi/doi/10.1136/bmj.317.7160.703.

4. Tancredi M, Rosengren A, Svensson AM, Kosiborod M, Pivodic A, Gudbjornsdottir S, et al. Excess Mortality among Persons with Type 2 Diabetes. N Engl J Med. 2015;373(18):1720-32.

5. Babar Z, Ramzan S, El-Dahiyat F, Tachmazidis I, Adebisi A, Hasan SS. The Availability, Pricing, and Affordability of Essential Diabetes Medicines in 17 Low-, Middle-, and High-Income Countries. Frontiers in pharmacology. 2019;10(1375)

6. Brown WV. Microvascular complications of diabetes mellitus: renal protection accompanies cardiovascular protection. Am J Cardiol . 2008 Dec 22;102(12A):10L – 13L. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amjcard.2008.09.068.

7. Folse HJ, Mukherjee J, Sheehan JJ, Ward AJ, Pelkey RL, Dinh TA, et al. Delays in treatment intensification with oral antidiabetic drugs and risk of microvascular and macrovascular events in patients with poor glycaemic control: An individual patient simulation study. Diabetes Obes Metab. 2017 Jul;19(7):1006–13. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/dom.12913.

8. Pemayun TGD, Naibaho RM, Novitasari D, Amin N, Minuljo TT. Risk factors for lower extremity amputation in patients with diabetic foot ulcers: a hospital-based case-control study. Diabet Foot Ankle. 2015 Dec 7;6: 29629. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/dfa.v6.29629.

9. International Diabetes Federation (IDF). IDF DIABETES ATLAS Ninth edition 2019 [Internet]. [cited 2020 Mar 25]. Available from: https://www.diabetesatlas.org/upload/resources/material/20200302_133351_IDFATLAS9e-final-web.pdf.

10. De Oliveira GLA, Guerra Júnior AA, Godman B, Acurcio F de A. Cost-effectiveness of vildagliptin for people with type 2 diabetes mellitus in Brazil; findings and implications. Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res . 2017 Apr;17(2):109–19. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14737167.2017.1292852.

11. Chamberlain JJ, Kalyani RR, Leal S, Rhinehart AS, Shubrook JH, Skolnik N, et al. Treatment of Type 1 Diabetes: Synopsis of the 2017 American Diabetes Association Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes. Ann Intern Med. 2017 Oct 3;167(7):493–8. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.7326/M17-1259.

12. Iqbal A, Novodvorsky P, Heller SR. Recent Updates on Type 1 Diabetes Mellitus Management for Clinicians. Diabetes Metab J . 2018 Feb;42(1):3–18. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.4093/dmj.2018.42.1.3.

13. Beran D, Ewen M, Lipska K, Hirsch IB, Yudkin JS. Availability and Affordability of Essential Medicines: Implications for Global Diabetes Treatment. Curr Diab Rep [Internet]. 2018 Jun 16;18(8):48. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11892-018-1019-z.

14. Ewen M, Joosse H-J, Beran D, Laing R. Insulin prices, availability and affordability in 13 low-income and middle-income countries. BMJ Glob Health [Internet]. 2019 Jun 11;4(3):e001410. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2019-001410.

15. Godman B, Basu D, Pillay Y, Almeida PHRF, Mwita JC, Rwegerera GM, et al. Ongoing and planned activities to improve the management of patients with Type 1 diabetes across Africa; implications for the future. Hosp Pract [Internet]. 2020 Mar 14;48(2):51–67. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21548331.2020.1745509.

16. MINISTÉRIO DA SAÚDE. Rede Brasileira de Avaliação de Tecnologias em Saúde - REBRATS. 12/2010 [cited 2021 Feb 2]. Available from: http://www.ans.gov.br/images/stories/Materiais_para_pesquisa_setor/Brats/2010_mes12_brats_13.pdf.

17. MINISTÉRIO DA SAÚDE. Comissão Nacional de Incorporação de Tecnologias no SUS - CONITEC. 09/2014 [cited 2021 Feb 2]. Available from: http://conitec.gov.br/images/Relatorios/2014/ Insulinas-tipoI-FINAL.pdf.

18. Caires de Souza AL, de Souza ALC, de Assis Acurcio F, Júnior AAG, do Nascimento RCRM, Godman B, et al. Insulin Glargine in a Brazilian State: Should the Government Disinvest? An Assessment Based on a Systematic

Review. Appl Health Econ Health Policy. 2014;12(1):19–32. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40258-013-0073-6.

19. Marra LP, Araújo VE, Silva TBC, Diniz LM, Guerra Junior AA, Acurcio FA, et al. Clinical Effectiveness and Safety of Analog Glargine in Type 1 Diabetes: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Diabetes Ther. 2016 Jun;7(2):241–58. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13300-016-0166-y.

20. Marra LP, Araújo VE, Oliveira GC, Diniz LM, Guerra Júnior AA, Acurcio F de A, et al. The clinical effectiveness of insulin glargine in patients with Type I diabetes in Brazil: findings and implications. J Comp Eff Res. 2017 Sep;6(6):519–27. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.2217/cer-2016-0099.

21. Silva TBC, Almeida PHRF, Araújo VE, Acurcio F de A, Guerra Júnior AA, Godman B, et al. Effectiveness and safety of insulin glargine detemir analysis in patients with type 1 diabetes: systematic review and meta-analysis. Ther Adv Endocrinol Metab. 2018 Jun 22;9(8):241–54. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2042018818781414.

22. German Institute for Quality and Efficency in Healthcare (IQWiG). Long-acting insulin analogues in the treatment of diabetes mellitus type 1: Executive Summary Commission No. A05-01. (2010). Available at URL: [https://www.iqwig.de/en/projects_results/projects/drug_assessment/a05_01_long_acting_insulin_analogues_in_the_treatment_of_diabetes_mellitus_type_1.1197.html]

23. Vardi M, Jacobson E, Nini A, Bitterman H. Intermediate acting versus long acting insulin for type 1 diabetes mellitus. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2008 Jul 16;(3):CD006297. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD006297.pub2.

24. Holden SE, Poole CD, Morgan CL, Currie CJ. Evaluation of the incremental cost to the National Health Service of prescribing analogue insulin. BMJ Open. 2011 Jan 1;1(2): e000258. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2011-000258.

25. Horvath K, Jeitler K, Berghold A, Ebrahim SH, Gratzer TW, Plank J, et al. Long-acting insulin analogues versus NPH insulin (human isophane insulin) for type 2 diabetes mellitus. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2007 Apr 18;(2):CD005613. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD005613.pub3.

26. MINISTÉRIO DA SAÚDE. Comissão Nacional de Incorporação de Tecnologias no SUS - CONITEC. 03/2019 [cited 2021 Feb 2]. Available from: http://conitec.gov.br/images/Relatorios/2019/Relatorio_Insulinas_Analogas_DM1.pdf

27. da Silva WC, de Araujo VE, Lima EMEA, Dos Santos JBR, Silva MRR da, Almeida PHRF, et al. Comparative Effectiveness and Safety of Monoclonal Antibodies (Bevacizumab, Cetuximab, and Panitumumab) in Combination with Chemotherapy for Metastatic Colorectal Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. BioDrugs. 2018 Dec;32(6):585–606. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40259-018-0322-1.

28. Ascef B de O, de Oliveira Ascef B, da Silva RGL, de Oliveira Júnior HA, De Soárez PC. Intercambialidade e substituição de biossimilares: seria a avaliação de tecnologias em saúde (ATS) um instrumento para tomada de decisão? [Internet]. Vol. 35, Cadernos de Saúde Pública. 2019. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0102-311x00087219.

29. MINISTÉRIO DA SAÚDE. Agência Nacional de Vigilância Sanitária – ANVISA. [cited 2021 Feb 2]. Available from: https://consultas.anvisa.gov.br/#/documentos/tecnicos/q/?processo=25351358833201538.

30. Seaquist ER, Chow LS. Hypoglycemia in Diabetes: Does Insulin Type Matter? JAMA. 14 de julho de 2017;318(1):31–2. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jam a.2017.8075.

31. Almeida PHRF, Silva TBC, de Assis Acurcio F, Guerra Junior AA, Araujo VE, Diniz LM, et al. Quality of Life of Patients with Type 1 Diabetes Mellitus Using Insulin Analog Glargine Compared with NPH Insulin: A Systematic Review and Policy Implications. The patient. 2018;11(4):377-89. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40271-017-0291-3.

32. Corrêa K, Gouvêa GR, Silva MAV da, Possobon R de F, Barbosa LF de LN, Pereira AC, et al. Quality of life and characteristics of diabetic patients. Cien Saude Colet. 2017 Mar;22(3):921–30. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1413-81232017223.24452015.

33. Rwegerera GM, Moshomo T, Gaenamong M, Oyewo TA, Gollakota S, Rivera YP, et al. Health-related quality of life and associated factors among patients with diabetes mellitus in Botswana. Alexandria Journal of Medicine. 2018;54(2):111-8. Available from: http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S209050681730091X.

34. da Mata AR, Álvares J, Diniz LM, da Silva MRR, Alvernaz dos Santos BR, Guerra Júnior AA, et al. Quality of life of patients with Diabetes Mellitus Types 1 and 2 from a referal health centre in Minas Gerais, Brazil. Expert Rev Clin Pharmacol . March 3, 2016;9(5):739–46. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1586/17512433.2016.1152180.

35. Novato T de S, de Sá Novato T, Grossi SAA. Fatores associados à qualidade de vida de jovens com diabetes mellitus do tipo 1. RevEscEnferm USP. 2011;45(3):770–6. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/s0080-62342011000300032.

36. Raymakers AJN, Gillespie P, O'Hara MC, Griffin MD, Dinneen SF. Factors influencing health-related quality of life in patients with Type 1 diabetes. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2018 Feb 2;16(1):27. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12955-018-0848-4.

37. Aguiar CCT, Fernandes AP, Carvalho AF, Montenegro-Junior RM. Instrumentos de avaliação de qualidade de vida relacionada à saúde no diabetes melito. Arq Bras Endocrinol Metabol. 2008;52(6):931–9. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/s0004-27302008000600004.

38. EuroQol - a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. Health Policy . 1990;16(3):199–208. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0168-8510(90)90421-9.

39. Silva MRR da, Diniz LM, Santos JBRD, Reis EA, Mata AR da, Araújo VE de et al. Drug utilization and factors associated with polypharmacy in individuals with diabetes mellitus in Minas Gerais, Brazil. Cien Saude Colet. 2018 Aug;23(8):2565–74. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1413-81232018238.10222016.

40. Secretária Estadual de Saúde de Minas Gerais (SES-MG). Resolução SES-MG nº 2359 de 17 de junho de 2010. [cited 2021 Feb 2]. Available from: http://www.saude.mg.gov.br/images/documentos/resolucao_2359.pdf.

41. Kamakura W, Mazzon JA. Critérios de estratificação e comparação de classificadores socioeconômicos no brasil. Revista de Administração de Empresas . 2016;56(1):55–70. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/s0034-759020160106.

42. Santos M, Cintra MACT, Monteiro AL, Santos B, Gusmão-Filho F, Andrade MV, et al. Brazilian Valuation of EQ-5D-3L Health States: Results from a Saturation Study. Med Decis Making [Internet]. 2016 Feb;36(2):253–63. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0272989X1561352.

43. Braga de Souza ACC, Felício JS, Koury CC, Neto JFA, Miléo KB, Santos FM, et al. Health-related quality of life in people with type 1 Diabetes Mellitus: data from the Brazilian Type 1 Diabetes Study Group. Health Qual Life Outcomes [Internet]. 2015 Dec 24;13:204. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12955-015-0396-0.

44. da Silva MRR, Dos Santos JBR, Almeida AM, Alvares-Teodoro J, Kakehasi AM, Acurcio F de A. Access to high-cost medications for psoriatic arthritis in the National Health System in Brazil: the long path up to dispensation. Adv Rheumatol [Internet]. 2019 Nov 14;59(1):48. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s42358-019-0091-7.

45. Oliveira LCF de, Nascimento MAA do, Lima IMSO. O acesso a medicamentos em sistemas universais de saúde – perspectivas e desafios. Saúde em Debate [Internet]. 2019;43(spe5):286–98. Available from: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0103-11042019001000286&tlng=pt.

46. Ades F. Access to oncology drugs in Brazil: Juggling innovation and sustainability in developing countries. Med Access Point Care [Internet]. 2017 Jan;1(1):maapoc.0000004. Available from: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.5301/maapoc.0000004.

47. Pan American Health Organization. Access to High-Cost Medicines in the Americas: Situation, Challenges and Perspectives [Internet]. Pan American Health Organization (PAHO). 09/2010 [cited 2021 Feb 2]. Available from: https://www.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2010/High-cost-Med-Tech-Series-No-1-Sep-15-10.pdf.

48. Oliveira MA, Luiza VL, Tavares NUL, Mengue SS, Arrais PSD, Farias MR, et al. Access to medicines for chronic diseases in Brazil: a multidimensional approach. Rev Saude Publica . December 2016;50(suppl 2):6s. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1518-8787.2016050006161.

49. Gomes MB, Rodacki M, Pavin EJ, Cobas RA, Felicio JS, Zajdenverg L, et al. The impact of ethnicity, educational and economic status on the prescription of insulin therapeutic regimens and on glycemic control in patients with type 1 diabetes. A nationwide study in Brazil. Diabetes Res Clin Pract. 2017 Dec;134:44–52. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2017.09.013.

50. Katrein F, Tejada CAO, Restrepo-Méndez MC, Bertoldi AD. Desigualdade no acesso a medicamentos para doenças crônicas em mulheres brasileiras. Cadernos de Saúde Pública . 2015;31(7):1416–26. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0102-311x00083614.

51. MINISTÉRIO DA SAÚDE. Comissão Nacional de Incorporação de Tecnologias no SUS - CONITEC. 12/11/2019 [cited 2021 Feb 2]. Available from: http://conitec.gov.br/images/Protocolos/Portaria-Conjunta-PCDT-Diabete-Melito-1.pdf.

52. Garnelo L, Parente RCP, Puchiarelli MLR, Correia PC, Torres MV, Herkrath FJ. Barriers to access and organization of primary health care services for rural riverside populations in the Amazon. Int J Equity Health [Internet]. 2020 Jul 31;19(1):54. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12939-020-01171-x.

53. Sousa F de OS, de Medeiros KR, Gurgel Júnior GD, de Albuquerque PC. [From normative aspects to the reality of the Unified Health System: revealing barriers that curtail access to the health care network]. Cien Saude Colet [Internet]. 2014 Apr;19(4):1283–93. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1413-81232014194.01702013.

54. Vieira RA da C, Formenton A, Bertolini SR. Breast cancer screening in Brazil. Barriers related to the health system. Rev Assoc Med Bras [Internet]. 2017 May;63(5):466–74. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1806-9282.63.05.466.

55. Lemos LLP de, de Souza MC, Moreira DP, Almeida PHRF, Godman B, et al. Stage at diagnosis and stage-specific survival of breast cancer in Latin America and the Caribbean: A systematic review and meta-analysis [Internet]. Vol. 14, PLOS ONE. 2019. p. e0224012. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0224012.

56. Palma CCSSV, Pavesi M, Nogueira VG, Clemente ELS, Vasconcellos M de FBMP, Pereira LC Júnior, et al. Prevalence of thyroid dysfunction in patients with diabetes mellitus. Diabetol Metab Syndr [Internet]. 2013 Oct 9;5(1):58. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1758-5996-5-58.4Maric-Bilkan C. Sex differences in micro- and macro-vascular complications of diabetes mellitus. Clin Sci . 1o de maio de 2017;131(9):833–46. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1042/CS20160998.

57. Maric-Bilkan C. Sex differences in micro- and macro-vascular complications of diabetes mellitus. Clin Sci . 1o de maio de 2017;131(9):833–46. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1042/CS20160998.

58. Andrade MV, de Souza Noronha KVM, de Miranda Menezes R, Souza MN, de Barros Reis C, Martins DR, et al. Desigualdade socioeconômica no acesso aos serviços de saúde no Brasil: um estudo comparativo entre as regiões brasileiras em 1998 e 2008. Economia Aplicada . 2013;17(4):623–45. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/s1413-80502013000400005.

59. Katrein F, Tejada CAO, Restrepo-Méndez MC, Bertoldi AD. Desigualdade no acesso a medicamentos para doenças crônicas em mulheres brasileiras. Cadernos de Saúde Pública . 2015;31(7):1416–26. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0102-311x00083614.

60. Izidoro JB, Piazza T, Andrade EIG, Alvares-Teodoro J. [Budget impact of the incorporation of second-line drug treatment for diabetic macular edema in the Brazilian Unified National Health System from the perspective of the Minas Gerais State Health Department, Brazil]. Cad Saude Publica [Internet]. 2019 Aug 22;35(8):e00145518. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0102-311X00145518.

61. Ratner RE, Hirsch IB, Neifing JL, Garg SK, Mecca TE, Wilson CA. Less hypoglycemia with insulin glargine in intensive insulin therapy for type 1 diabetes. U.S. Study Group of Insulin Glargine in Type 1 Diabetes. Diabetes Care. 2000;23(5):639–43. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.2337/diacare.23.5.639.

62. Päivärinta M, Tapanainen P, Veijola R. Basal insulin switch from NPH to glargine in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes. Pediatr Diabetes. June 2008;9(3 Pt 2):83–90. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-5448.2007.00341.x.

63. Yamamoto-Honda R, Takahashi Y, Yoshida Y, Hara Y, Kawai A, Kitazato H, et al. Use of Insulin Glargine in Japanese Patients with Type 1 Diabetes. Intern Med. 2007;46(13):937–43. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.2169/internalmedicine.46.6467.

64. Raskin P, Klaff L, Bergenstal R, Hallé JP, Donley D, Mecca T. A 16-week comparison of the novel insulin analog insulin glargine (HOE 901) and NPH human insulin used with insulin lispro in patients with type 1 diabetes. Diabetes Care. 2000 Nov;23(11):1666–71. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11092290.

65. WHO. World Health Organization Model List of Essential Medicines 2019. [cited 2021 Feb 2]. Available at URL: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/325771/WHO-MVP-EMP-IAU-2019.06-eng.pdf?ua.

66. Alvarado-Martel D, Velasco R, Sánchez-Hernández RM, Carrillo A, Nóvoa FJ, Wägner AM. Quality of life and type 1 diabetes: a study assessing patients' perceptions and self-management needs. Patient Prefer Adherence [Internet]. 2015 Sep 14;9:1315–23. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/PPA.S87310.

67. Daniele TM da C, Bruin VMS de, Oliveira DSN de, Pompeu CMR, Forti ACE. Associations among physical activity, comorbidities, depressive symptoms and health-related quality of life in type 2 diabetes. Arq Bras Endocrinol Metabol [Internet]. 2013 Feb;57(1):44–50. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/s0004-27302013000100006.

68. Wegeberg A-ML, Meldgaard T, Hyldahl S, Jakobsen PE, Drewes AM, Brock B, et al. Quantities of comorbidities affects physical, but not mental health related quality of life in type 1 diabetes with confirmed polyneuropathy. World J Diabetes [Internet]. 2019 Feb 15;10(2):87–95. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.4239/wjd.v10.i2.87.

Tables

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of patients with type 1 diabetes mellitus (n=580), Minas Gerais, Brazil, 2017 (IGLA users = 401) and 2014 (NPH insulin users = 179).

Variables		Total		NPH = 179		IGLA = 401	
Gender		**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**
	Female	313	54	114	64	199	49
	Male	267	46	65	36	202	51
Age							
		44.13±18.507		51.69±19.858		40.76±16.831	
	18-40	275	47	52	29	223	56
	41-60	174	30	57	32	117	30
	61-90	131	23	70	39	61	14
Race							
	Black	270	47	102	57	168	42
	Non-black	310	53	77	43	233	58
Marital status							
	With partner	265	46	78	44	187	47
	Without partner	315	54	101	56	214	53
School years							
	< 9 years	231	40	154	86	77	19
	≥ 9 years	349	60	25	14	234	80
Type of dwelling							
	Onership	109	19	34	19	75	19
	No onership	471	81	145	81	326	81
Residents in dwelling							
	Only the interviewee	40	7	27	8	13	7
	Other people	540	93	374	92	166	93
Economic classes							
	A1-A2	200	34	1	0.5	199	50
	B1	201	35	7	3.5	194	48
	B2	27	5	19	11	8	2
	C1	45	7	45	25	0	0
	C2	48	8	48	27	0	0
	D-E	59	11	59	33	0	0

A1-A2 = richest and D-E= poorest (KAMAKURA *et al*.) [41].

Table 2. Clinical information, life-style and access to health services of patients with diabetes mellitus type 1 (n=580). Minas Gerais, Brazil, 2017 (IGLA users = 401) e 2014 (NPH insulin users = 179).

Variables		Total = 580		NPH = 179		IGLA = 401	
Self-perception of health		**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**
	Good/Very good	296	51	69	39	227	57
	Regular	229	39	74	41	155	39
	Bad/Very bad	55	10	36	20	19	4
Bedridden in the last 15 days							
	Yes	79	13	39	22	40	10
	No	501	87	140	78	361	90
Number of medical consultations on the last year							
	0-3	315	54	65	36	250	63
	4 or more	255	44	112	63	143	35
	DK/DR	10	2	2	1	8	2
Number of hospitalizations on the last year							
	None	430	74	118	66	312	78
	1	112	20	40	22	72	18
	2 or more	38	6	21	12	17	4
Private health insurance							
	Yes	270	47	46	26	224	56
	No	310	53	133	74	177	44
Physical activity in the last 15 days							
	Yes	335	58	78	44	257	64
	No	245	42	101	56	144	36
Problems to access health services							
	Schedule an appointement	196	35	53	30	143	36
	None	189	31	80	45	110	28
	Access to medicines	132	22	22	13	109	26
	Other	63	12	24	12	39	10
Number of comorbidities							
		2.44±2.406		4.44±3.054		1.55±1.289	
	0-3	446	77	73	41	373	93
	4-6	83	14	61	34	22	5
	7 or more	51	9	45	25	6	2
Arterial hypertension							
	Yes	176	30	114	64	62	15
	No	404	70	65	36	339	85
Cardiovascular disease							

	Yes	75	13	51	28	24	6
	No	505	87	128	72	377	94
Stroke							
	Yes	20	3	15	8	5	1
	No	560	94	164	92	396	99
Kidney disease							
	Yes	66	11	42	23	24	6
	No	514	89	137	77	377	94
Diabetic retinopathy							
	Yes	88	15	47	26	41	10
	No	492	85	132	74	360	90
Dyslipidemia							
	Yes	73	12	63	35	10	2
	No	507	88	116	65	391	98
Obesity							
	Yes	47	8	40	22	7	2
	No	533	92	139	78	394	98
Diabetic foot							
	Yes	36	6	32	18	4	1
	No	544	94	147	82	397	99
Diabetic neuropathy							
	Yes	62	10	35	19	27	7
	No	518	90	144	71	374	93
Chronic lung disease (e.g. emphysema, asthma, bronchitis)							
	Yes	41	7	30	17	11	3
	No	539	93	149	73	390	97
Hearing loss							
	Yes	35	6	28	7	7	2
	No	545	94	151	93	394	98
Depression							
	Yes	71	12	48	27	23	6
	No	378	78	131	73	378	94
Hyperthyroidism							
	Yes	94	16	26	14	68	17
	No	486	84	153	86	333	83
Any type of cancer							
	Yes	12	2	9	5	3	1
	No	568	98	170	95	398	99
Spondylarthritis							
	Yes	51	9	40	22	11	3

	No	529	92	139	78	390	97
Thrombosis or cerebral ischemia							
	Yes	13	2	12	7	1	0.2
	No	567	98	167	93	400	99.8
Any type of angina							
	Yes	24	4	23	13	1	0.2
	No	556	96	156	87	400	99.8
Time since diagnosis of T1DM (years)							
		17.05±10.970		15.07±11.950		17.93±10.400	
	1-10	199	34	80	44	119	30
	11-20	209	36	62	35	147	35
	21-30	105	18	22	12	83	21
	31-40	52	9	10	6	42	11
	41 or more	15	3	5	3	10	3
Hypoglicemia episodes in the last 30 days							
	Yes	191	33	64	36	127	32
	No	379	65	115	64	264	66
	DK/DR	10	2	0	0	10	2
Type of episodes hypoglycemia							
	Severe	93	16	46	26	47	12
	Non-severe	98	17	18	10	80	20
	None/DK/DR	389	67	115	64	274	68
Alcohool consumption							
	No	479	74	32	18	282	70
	Yes	151	26	147	82	119	30
Tabacco consumption							
	Yes	58	10	30	17	28	7
	No	522	90	149	83	373	93
Use of other insulins							
	None	249	43	136	76	113	28
	Lispro	147	25	7	4	140	35
	Asparte	88	15	2	1	86	21
	Glulisin	60	10	0	0	60	15
	Other	36	7	34	19	2	1

DK= did not know; DR= did not respond; T1DM = type 1 diabetes mellitus.

Table 3. EQ-5D-3L score of patients with diabetes mellitus type 1 (n = 580). Minas Gerais, Brazil, 2017 (IGLA users = 401) and 2014 (NPH insulin users = 179).

Variable		Total = 580		NPH = 179		IGLA = 401	
	Severity*	n	%	n	%	n	%
Mobility	1	459	80	109	61	350	86
	2	112	19	62	35	50	13.8
	3	9	1	8	4	1	0.2
Self-care	1	529	91	154	86	375	94
	2	41	7	16	9	25	5.8
	3	10	2	9	5	1	0.2
Usual activities	1	466	80	122	68	344	86
	2	96	17	44	25	52	13
	3	18	3	13	7	5	1
Pain/Discomfort	1	311	54	67	37	244	61
	2	202	35	78	44	124	31
	3	67	11	34	19	33	8
Anxiety/Depression	1	285	49	85	47	200	50
	2	203	35	60	34	143	36
	3	92	16	34	19	58	14

*Severity: Level 1: indicating no problem; Level 2: indicating some problems; Level 3: indicating extreme problems [38, 42].

Table 4. Forward stepwise multiple regression analysis of factors associated with Quality of Life of patients with type 1 diabetes mellitus (n = 580).

Variable		Utility		
		Coeficient	SE±	p value*
Age (years)	41-60	-0.040	0.018	0.027
	61-90	-0.055	0.020	0.006
	18-40	0		
Sel-perception of health	Regular	-0.085	0.017	<0.001
	Bad/Very bad	-0.372	0.026	<0.001
	Good/Very good	0		
Number of consultations on the last year	DK/DR	-0.085	0.050	0.087
	4 or more	-0.148	0.018	<0.001
	0-3	0		
Number of hospitalizations on the last year	1	-0.054	0.021	0.010
	2 or more	-0.119	0.034	<0.001
	None	0		
Number of comorbidities	4-6	-0.055	0.030	0.063
	7 or more	-0.136	0.023	<0.001
	0-3	0		
Any type of angina				
	Yes	-0.147	0.039	<0.001
	No	0		
Diabetic neuropathy				
	Yes	-0.064	0.028	0.022
	No	0		
Hearing loss				
	Yes	-0.089	0.035	0.012
	No	0		
Kidney disease				
	Yes	-0.101	0.026	<0.001
	No	0		
Type of episodes hypoglicemia	Severe	-0.043	0.017	0.012
	Non-severe	0		

*p value <0.05; DK= did not know; DR= did not respond; SE = standard error.