

# Designing Change: Accelerating Automated Insulin Delivery Systems in Practice Using Multifactorial Design

Nana-Hawa Yayah Jones, MD, Hailee Delsart, MD; Amy Poetker, MS, RD, CDCES; Allison Deisinger, RD, LD, CDCES; Amy Grant, DNP, RN, CPN; Kyle Kaplan, MPH; Sarah Corathers, MD



Background	Interventions to Increase AID Uptake – 3 Components utilized for MFD						Traditional Statistical Results																																						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Automated insulin delivery (AID) systems offer significant benefits for individuals with T1D, yet their adoption remains suboptimal, especially in vulnerable populations.</li> <li>Enhancing AID system uptake involves multiple factors and often necessitates both singular and complex, multi-component interventions.</li> <li>Understanding which single or combined interventions best accelerate AID uptake is key to expanding successful approaches across diverse healthcare systems.</li> <li>Multifactorial design simultaneously evaluates the effect of &gt;1 independent variable on a single dependent variable. In addition, interactions between independent variables can be explored.</li> </ul>	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: flex-start;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p><b>1</b> CGM At Diagnosis</p> <p>Update and standardize diabetes education curriculum to incorporate CGM at new onset</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p><b>2</b> CGM Trial Program</p> <p>Reduce barriers so it's easier for patients to "try before you buy." Zero cost trial kits of CGMs available for patients in clinic</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p><b>3</b> AID Video</p> <p>Connect patients to each other and care options by sharing patient stories</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p><b>4</b> Pump Options Class</p> <p>Increase access to classes that review diabetes technology in group or individual setting</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p><b>5</b> No Tech List</p> <p>EHR driven report of patients not on technology with an upcoming appointment</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p><b>6</b> Care Coordination Teams</p> <p>RN care coordinators skilled at identifying and intervening for patients not on technology (previsit planning)</p> </div> </div>	<p><b>2<sup>3</sup> Factorial Design Data Table</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Care Team</th> <th>No Tech List</th> <th>Pump Options</th> <th>N Patients</th> <th>AID Initiated</th> <th>Success Rate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>—</td> <td>—</td> <td>—</td> <td>90</td> <td>41</td> <td>45.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>—</td> <td>—</td> <td>✓</td> <td>9</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>—</td> <td>✓</td> <td>—</td> <td>35</td> <td>4</td> <td>11.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>✓</td> <td>—</td> <td>—</td> <td>24</td> <td>13</td> <td>54.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>✓</td> <td>—</td> <td>✓</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>—</td> <td>11</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Care Team	No Tech List	Pump Options	N Patients	AID Initiated	Success Rate	—	—	—	90	41	45.6%	—	—	✓	9	0	0.0%	—	✓	—	35	4	11.4%	✓	—	—	24	13	54.2%	✓	—	✓	1	0	0.0%	✓	✓	—	11	0	0.0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At baseline, 34% of patients with T1D from 9/1/2024-12/31/2024 (n = 170) initiated AID.</li> <li>Statistical analysis using Pearson's correlation and t-tests revealed both the <b>No Tech</b> list (<math>r = 0.327, p &lt; 0.005</math>) and <b>Pump Options</b> (<math>r = 0.270, p = 0.0004</math>) were <b>significantly</b> associated with increased AID initiation.</li> <li>When analyzed independently, pump options alone (<math>r = 0.180, p = 0.019</math>) and the No Tech list alone (<math>r = 0.244, p = 0.0014</math>) remained significant predictors.</li> <li>Combined interventions, pump options + No Tech list, demonstrated a positive impact (<math>r = 0.189, p = 0.013</math>).</li> <li>Notably, care team involvement, while essential to patient support, did not yield statistically significant results in isolation</li> </ul>
Care Team	No Tech List	Pump Options	N Patients	AID Initiated	Success Rate																																								
—	—	—	90	41	45.6%																																								
—	—	✓	9	0	0.0%																																								
—	✓	—	35	4	11.4%																																								
✓	—	—	24	13	54.2%																																								
✓	—	✓	1	0	0.0%																																								
✓	✓	—	11	0	0.0%																																								
<b>Objective</b>	<p><b>Factorial Dot Diagram</b> These show how much each factor or combination changes the AID initiation rate</p> <p>Dot Diagram for AID Initiation: Standardized Effects</p> <p>These put all effects on a common scale (mean = 0, SD = 1), useful for comparing relative magnitudes</p>						<b>Multifactorial Design Interpretation</b>																																						
	<p><b>Factorial Response Plots</b> These are interaction plots showing how AID initiation changes depending on the combination of two interventions at a time</p> <p>Factorial Response Plots</p> <p>These are interaction plots showing how AID initiation changes depending on the combination of two interventions at a time</p>																																												
<b>Methods</b>	<p><b>Factorial Design Cube<sup>(2)</sup></b> 3D representation showing all 8 treatment combinations. Each vertex shows the AID initiation rate for that combination.</p> <p>Factorial Design Cube<sup>(2)</sup></p> <p>3D representation showing all 8 treatment combinations. Each vertex shows the AID initiation rate for that combination.</p> <p>CT = Care Team, NT = No Tech List, PO = Pump Options</p> <p>Each corner represents 1 treatment combination. The % shown is the AID initiation rate. Green indicates highest rates, red indicates lowest. The 3 dimensions represent the 3 interventions</p>																																												
	<p><b>Limitations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual-level analysis (n=170) shows strong correlations, while group-level analysis (n=8 combinations) reveals interaction patterns.</li> <li>When averaging across groups, you lose individual patient-level variation</li> </ul>																																												