Natural Resources for Human Health
eISSN: 2583-1194

Original Research

Received 09 July 2025
Revised 18 July 2025
Accepted 28 August 2025

Natural Resources for Human Health 2025, Vol. 5 (4): 853–863

KEYWORDS:
Nurse-led interventions, hypoglycemia prevention, hospitalized patients, diabetes management, patient education, blood glucose monitoring

The Effectiveness of Nurse-Led Interventions in Preventing Hypoglycemia Among Hospitalized Patients

Nawaf Faleh Abdulaziz Alnakhli[1], Omamah Faleh Alnakhli[2], Hissah Eid Ayed Alanazi[3], Abdulmohsen Khalid Turki Alanazi[4], Faizah Sakit Habib Alrewaili[5], Abdulaziz Turki Hamad Alenzi[6], Alruwili, Ziyad Sakit H[7], Wafa Abdulrahman N Alruwaili[8], Manal Abdulrahman Nafa Alrwaily[9], Mohammed Khalid Turki Alanazi[10]

[1]Nursing Technician – Medical Rehabilitation Hospital – Madinah Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Madinah – Madinah Region – Saudi Arabia, Email: Nalnakhli@moh.gov.sa
[2]Nursing Technician – King Salman Medical City – Madinah Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Madinah – Madinah Region – Saudi Arabia, Email: oalhagoog@moh.gov.sa
[3]Nursing Technician – Long-Term Care Hospital – Northern Borders Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia, Email: hualenazy@moh.gov.sa
[4]Nursing Specialist – Al Jouf Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Qurayyat – Al Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia, Email: hasson-2002@hotmail.com
[5]Nursing Specialist – Al Jouf Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Sakaka – Al Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia, Email: falrewaili@moh.gov.sa
[6]Nursing Technician – Al Jouf Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Al Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia, Email: aboturki8990@gmail.com
[7]Nursing Specialist – Prince Mutaib bin Abdulaziz Hospital – Al Jouf Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Sakaka – Al Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia, Email: z.alsakit7@gmail.com
[8]Nursing Technician – Al Jouf Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Qurayyat – Al Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia, Email: alnzywfa92@gmail.com
[9]Nursing Technician – Al Jouf Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Qurayyat – Al Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia, Email: manal00110011@hotmail.com
[10]Nursing Technician – Al Jouf Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Al Qurayyat – Al Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia, Email: Mohd.kahled@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: Nurse-led interventions have emerged as a critical strategy in preventing hypoglycemia among hospitalized patients, a significant concern in managing diabetes and ensuring patient safety. These interventions often encompass comprehensive monitoring of blood glucose levels, education on insulin administration, and the establishment of individualized care plans tailored to each patient's needs. By empowering nurses to take an active role in diabetes management, hospitals can improve the reporting and management of hypoglycemic episodes, thus enhancing patient outcomes. Studies have shown that when nurses are involved in patient education and management, there is a notable decrease in the incidence of hypoglycemia, underscoring the effectiveness of these

interventions. Furthermore, the implementation of standardized protocols within nurse-led initiatives can contribute to consistent and effective care delivery. These protocols typically involve routine screenings for hypoglycemia risk factors, collaborative team approaches that engage interdisciplinary care, and timely adjustments to medication regimens based on real-time glucose monitoring. The integration of technology, such as electronic health records and mobile health applications, also supports nurses in their efforts to track and manage patients' blood sugar levels more effectively. Overall, nurse-led interventions have proven to be essential in safeguarding hospitalized patients from the potentially dangerous consequences of hypoglycemia, thereby fostering a safer healthcare environment.

INTRODUCTION

Hypoglycemia is one of the most common preventable adverse events in hospitalized patients and remains a persistent threat to patient safety despite decades of attention to inpatient glycemic management [1]. In most hospital protocols, hypoglycemia is defined as a blood glucose concentration below 70 mg/dL, with severe hypoglycemia commonly defined as a value below 40 mg/dL [2]. These thresholds matter because they identify patients at immediate risk of confusion, falls, seizures, cardiac arrhythmias, and death, while also signaling failures in monitoring, insulin prescribing, nutrition coordination, or communication across care transitions [3]. The clinical significance of inpatient hypoglycemia has become clearer as evidence has accumulated that aggressive glycemic control does not benefit most hospitalized patients and may cause harm through iatrogenic low glucose [4]. Landmark trials and subsequent analyses demonstrated that intensive insulin therapy increased the frequency of severe hypoglycemia without a consistent mortality benefit, particularly in critically ill populations [5]. Meta-analyses reached similar conclusions and reinforced the need for safer, more patient-centered glycemic targets [6].

Contemporary guidelines therefore recommend moderate glycemic targets for most hospitalized adults, generally between 140 and 180 mg/dL, with avoidance of glucose values below 100 mg/dL and immediate treatment of any value below 70 mg/dL [2]. These recommendations have shifted the emphasis from intensive control toward prevention of both hyperglycemia and hypoglycemia, with nurses positioned at the center of that effort [7]. Nurses perform capillary blood glucose monitoring, administer insulin, coordinate meals and enteral nutrition, recognize early symptoms, and initiate rescue treatment. Because these actions occur repeatedly at the bedside, nurse-led interventions can influence hypoglycemia risk more directly than many system-level policies alone [8].

Defining Hypoglycemia and Glycemic Targets in Hospitalized Patients

A clear definition is essential for both clinical practice and evaluation. The American Diabetes Association and other professional bodies define level 1 hypoglycemia as a glucose value between 54 and 69 mg/dL, level 2 hypoglycemia as a value below 54 mg/dL, and level 3 hypoglycemia as a severe event characterized by altered mental and/or physical status requiring assistance for recovery [1]. Many hospital policies simplify this to any value below 70 mg/dL requiring treatment, because bedside recognition and rapid response are more important than classification during an acute event [9]. The choice of definition affects reported incidence and complicates comparisons across studies, but it does not change the central clinical principle: any low glucose value in a hospitalized patient should trigger a structured response [10].

Glycemic targets in hospital are deliberately less stringent than targets used in ambulatory diabetes care. For most non-critically ill patients, a pre-meal glucose target of 140 mg/dL or less and a random glucose target of 180 mg/dL or less is acceptable, provided that hypoglycemia is avoided [2]. Critically ill patients generally receive similar or slightly higher targets, and individualized targets are appropriate for older adults, patients with advanced chronic illness, those with cognitive impairment, and patients with a history of severe hypoglycemia [3]. The rationale for relaxed targets is not indifference to hyperglycemia but recognition that the harm of hypoglycemia is immediate and often iatrogenic, whereas the benefits of very tight control in hospital are uncertain [6]. Nurse-led interventions are most effective when they operationalize these targets into practical bedside rules: when to check, when to call, when to treat, when to hold insulin, and when to escalate [11].

Why Hospitalized Patients Are at Risk

Hospitalization disrupts nearly every factor that normally maintains glucose homeostasis. Acute illness increases counter-regulatory hormone release, alters insulin sensitivity, and changes renal clearance of insulin and oral glucose-lowering agents [12]. Meals are often delayed or withheld for procedures, yet insulin orders may continue unchanged. Enteral and parenteral nutrition may be started, stopped, or interrupted without corresponding adjustment of insulin. Patients may receive sulfonylureas or meglitinides that carry a high risk of hypoglycemia, especially when oral intake declines or renal function deteriorates [13]. Glucocorticoids, vasopressors, and antibiotics can also affect glucose control, and the resulting clinical picture may change rapidly over hours [14].

Several patient-level factors further increase risk. Older age, frailty, chronic kidney disease, liver disease, sepsis, malignancy, cognitive impairment, and polypharmacy are consistently associated with inpatient hypoglycemia [9]. Patients with tight glycemic targets, poor oral intake, nausea, vomiting, or nil-per-os status are particularly vulnerable [10]. Insulin remains the most common precipitant of iatrogenic hypoglycemia in hospital, especially when basal insulin is continued during prolonged fasting or when correction insulin is given without attention to recent doses [12]. These risks are not evenly distributed across units; medical wards, surgical units, intensive care units, and emergency departments each have distinct patterns of exposure [8]. A nurse-led program that does not account for unit-specific workflows is unlikely to be effective, which is why successful interventions combine generic principles with local adaptation [15].

The Rationale for Nurse-Led Interventions

Nurse-led interventions are attractive because they target the exact points at which hypoglycemia is prevented or missed. Nurses are responsible for most glucose monitoring, they administer insulin and observe its effects, they assess whether patients are eating, and they are usually the first clinicians to recognize symptoms such as sweating, tremor, confusion, or palpitations [16]. When a glucose value is low, the nurse initiates treatment according to protocol, repeats the measurement, documents the event, and communicates with the prescriber [17]. Each of these steps is a potential failure point, and each can be standardized through nurse-led protocols, checklists, education, and audit and feedback [18].

The rationale is also organizational. Physician-led glycemic management often depends on sporadic consultation, whereas nursing care is continuous and embedded in the workflow of the ward [19]. Nurse-led interventions can therefore reduce delays in treatment, improve consistency of monitoring, and create a safety net around high-risk patients [20]. However, nurse-led does not mean nurse-only. Effective programs require medical governance, clear scope of practice, pharmacy support, nutrition coordination, and escalation pathways [21]. The evidence should therefore be interpreted not as a contest between nurses and physicians but as an examination of how nursing systems can be designed to reduce a preventable harm [22].

Conceptual Framework for Nurse-Led Prevention

A useful framework for understanding nurse-led prevention organizes interventions into five domains: risk identification, surveillance, safe medication management, prompt treatment, and transition coordination [23]. Risk identification involves screening for patients with diabetes, patients receiving high-risk medications, and patients with nutritional interruptions [14]. Surveillance involves structured glucose monitoring at frequencies matched to risk and treatment [15]. Safe medication management includes insulin order sets, double-checking, holding rules, and coordination with meals and enteral feeding [18]. Prompt treatment includes a hypoglycemia protocol with oral glucose, intravenous dextrose, glucagon, and repeat monitoring [17]. Transition coordination includes education, discharge planning, and communication with primary care and home care teams [24].

This framework is consistent with implementation science models that emphasize local context, workflow fit, and feedback [25]. It also clarifies why some nurse-led interventions succeed while others fail. Programs that focus only on education may improve knowledge but not outcomes if the environment lacks protocols, supplies, staffing, or feedback [23]. Programs that change workflow and provide real-time support are more likely to reduce hypoglycemia because they alter what nurses can do at the moment of risk [24]. The framework therefore guides the review of evidence that follows.

Natural Resources for Human Health
eISSN: 2583-1194

Risk Identification and Screening

The first component of a nurse-led prevention program is systematic risk identification. Not every hospitalized patient requires the same intensity of glucose monitoring. Patients with known diabetes, those receiving insulin or sulfonylureas, those with enteral or parenteral nutrition, and those with renal impairment or unpredictable oral intake require closer surveillance [2]. Nurse-led screening tools can be embedded in admission assessments and electronic health records to flag high-risk patients for more frequent monitoring and pharmacy review [15]. A simple screening checklist that asks about diabetes history, current glucose-lowering therapy, nutritional status, renal function, and prior hypoglycemia can be completed by nursing staff at admission and updated when clinical status changes [14].

Screening is effective only when it leads to action. In several quality improvement programs, screening was linked to automatic monitoring orders, pharmacist review, and nurse-initiated holding rules for insulin when glucose was low or oral intake was poor [18]. The result was not simply more documentation but more timely adjustments in care [19]. Table 1 summarizes a practical risk stratification approach that can be used by nurses at the point of care.

Table 1. Nurse-Led Risk Stratification for Inpatient Hypoglycemia

Risk level	Criteria	Suggested monitoring	Nursing actions
High	Insulin infusion, prior severe hypoglycemia, renal failure, nil-per-os with basal insulin, sulfonylurea use	Every 1–2 hours during active risk; before meals and at bedtime when stable	Notify prescriber of low values; apply holding rules; document intake; repeat glucose after treatment [2][17]
Moderate	Type 2 diabetes on insulin or sulfonylurea, enteral nutrition, acute illness with poor intake	Before meals and at bedtime; additional check if symptoms occur	Assess meal intake; coordinate insulin timing; educate patient about symptoms [14][18]
Low	Type 2 diabetes managed with diet or metformin only; stable oral intake; no high-risk medications	Admission glucose and daily monitoring unless clinical change	Reinforce symptom awareness; reassess if new medications or fasting [1][15]

Structured Glucose Monitoring

Structured monitoring is the backbone of hypoglycemia prevention. Without reliable measurement, risk cannot be detected, treatment cannot be initiated, and trends cannot be recognized [15]. Nurse-led monitoring protocols specify who should be checked, when, how, and what to do with the result [16]. The most common schedule is before meals and at bedtime for patients receiving insulin, with additional checks at 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. for patients at high risk of nocturnal hypoglycemia [2]. For patients receiving continuous enteral nutrition or insulin infusions, more frequent monitoring is required, and the frequency should be reduced only when glucose has been stable within target for an appropriate period [12].

The effectiveness of monitoring depends on more than frequency. Technique matters: hand hygiene, correct strip storage, adequate sample size, and confirmation of unexpected values are essential [17]. Documentation matters: a low value that is not documented cannot trigger audit, feedback, or system improvement [18]. Response matters most: a monitoring protocol that does not specify immediate treatment and repeat testing is incomplete [20]. Nurse-led programs that combine monitoring with treatment algorithms and escalation criteria have consistently shown greater reductions in hypoglycemia than programs that merely increase the number of checks [21]. Table 2 presents the core elements of a nurse-led monitoring protocol.

Table 2. Core Elements of a Nurse-Led Glucose Monitoring Protocol

Element	Specification	Nursing responsibility
Frequency	Before meals and at bedtime for insulin-treated patients; every 1–2 hours for insulin infusion or high-risk patients	Perform checks on time; document; escalate missed checks [2]
Confirmation	Repeat any value below 70 mg/dL or any unexpected value	Repeat immediately; initiate treatment if confirmed [17]

Treatment threshold	Glucose below 70 mg/dL	Give oral glucose if safe; intravenous dextrose if not; glucagon per protocol [9]
Recheck	15 minutes after treatment	Repeat glucose; repeat treatment if still low; notify prescriber [20]
Documentation	Value, symptoms, treatment, response, notification	Complete event record; hand over at shift change [18]

Insulin Safety and Medication Stewardship

Insulin is life-saving but also the most common cause of iatrogenic hypoglycemia in hospital [12]. Nurse-led insulin safety programs address prescribing, transcription, dispensing, administration, and monitoring [18]. Standardized insulin order sets that separate basal, prandial, and correction insulin reduce confusion and prevent the inappropriate continuation of sliding-scale-only regimens [19]. Holding rules allow nurses to withhold basal or prandial insulin when glucose is below a specified threshold or when a patient is not eating, according to agreed criteria [17]. Double-checking of high-risk insulin doses, clear labeling of insulin pens and vials, and separation of look-alike products reduce administration errors [21].

Medication stewardship also includes review of non-insulin agents. Sulfonylureas and meglitinides are common causes of prolonged hypoglycemia in older adults and patients with renal impairment [13]. Nurse-led programs can prompt pharmacy review when these agents are continued during hospitalization, especially if oral intake is poor [14]. The effectiveness of insulin safety interventions is well documented in quality improvement literature: structured order sets, nurse-initiated holding rules, and pharmacist-nurse collaboration have been associated with fewer hypoglycemic events and shorter lengths of stay [22]. These interventions work best when they are embedded in the electronic health record and supported by real-time data [25].

Nutrition and Medication Coordination

Mismatch between glucose-lowering therapy and nutrition is a major and preventable cause of inpatient hypoglycemia [19]. Patients may be made nil per os for procedures, experience nausea, or receive enteral feeding that is interrupted for transport or imaging, while insulin orders remain unchanged [14]. Nurse-led coordination addresses this gap by linking meal intake, enteral feeding status, and insulin administration in a single workflow [18]. Before giving prandial insulin, the nurse assesses whether the patient is eating; if not, the dose is held or adjusted according to protocol [17]. When enteral feeding is interrupted, the nurse communicates with the prescriber and pharmacy so that basal insulin or sulfonylurea therapy can be reviewed [21].

Nutrition coordination also includes patient education. Patients who understand which foods raise glucose, how to recognize low glucose, and why they should not skip meals after taking insulin are better prepared to participate in their own safety [24]. Family involvement is particularly important for older adults and patients with cognitive impairment, who may not recognize or report symptoms [20]. A nurse-led program that treats nutrition as a medication safety issue rather than a dietary afterthought is more likely to prevent recurrent events [23].

Prompt Recognition and Treatment

Even the best prevention program will not eliminate all hypoglycemia. Prompt recognition and treatment are therefore essential [9]. Nurse-led protocols authorize nurses to treat glucose below 70 mg/dL immediately with 15–20 g of fast-acting oral carbohydrate if the patient is awake and able to swallow, or with intravenous dextrose or glucagon if the patient is unable to take oral treatment [17]. Treatment should be followed by a repeat glucose check after 15 minutes and continuation of treatment until glucose is above 70 mg/dL [20]. After recovery, a snack or meal containing complex carbohydrate and protein should be provided to prevent recurrence, and the precipitating cause should be reviewed [11].

The effectiveness of nurse-initiated treatment protocols lies in reducing delays [21]. Waiting for a physician order during a symptomatic hypoglycemic event exposes patients to unnecessary risk [18]. Protocols that clearly define scope of practice, documentation requirements, and escalation criteria allow nurses to act within a governed safety framework [22]. Education alone is insufficient; nurses need access to glucose gel, dextrose, glucagon, and a clear protocol at the bedside [23]. Audit and feedback on treatment times and recurrence rates further strengthen performance [25].

Patient and Family Education

Patient education is a core nurse-led intervention for preventing recurrence and improving transition safety [24]. Hospitalized patients with diabetes should receive education about recognizing hypoglycemia, treating it, and reporting symptoms [20]. Teach-back methods are more effective than one-way instruction because they confirm understanding [21]. Family members should be included when possible, especially for older adults, patients with visual or cognitive impairment, and patients who rely on others for meal preparation or medication management [23].

Education should be tailored to the patient's health literacy, culture, language, and prior experience [24]. A brief bedside session can cover the symptoms of low glucose, the rule of 15, the importance of not skipping meals after insulin, and whom to call after discharge [22]. Written materials should be simple and accompanied by verbal reinforcement [25]. Although education alone does not reliably reduce inpatient hypoglycemia, it complements protocol and monitoring interventions and supports safer self-management after discharge [23].

Discharge and Transition Planning

The period after discharge is a high-risk transition for patients who experienced inpatient hypoglycemia [24]. Medication changes made in hospital may not be understood at home, insulin doses may be adjusted without clear instructions, and follow-up may be delayed [22]. Nurse-led discharge planning includes medication reconciliation, review of glucose monitoring supplies, written instructions for hypoglycemia treatment, and confirmation of follow-up appointments [21]. Patients who experienced severe hypoglycemia or who are at high risk should receive priority follow-up and, where available, referral to diabetes education or a transitional care program [25].

Transition planning is particularly important for older adults, patients with limited social support, and those with new insulin prescriptions [24]. A nurse-led telephone follow-up within 48 to 72 hours can identify medication errors and reinforce education [23]. Although evidence for post-discharge nurse-led interventions is more limited than evidence for inpatient protocols, the available studies suggest that structured transitions reduce readmissions and improve glycemic safety [22]. Table 3 summarizes the evidence across nurse-led intervention components.

Table 3. Summary of Evidence for Nurse-Led Intervention Components

Component	Mechanism of effect	Evidence direction	Practical note
Risk screening	Identifies high-risk patients for targeted monitoring	Consistent improvement in process measures [15]	Must be linked to action, not documentation alone [18]
Structured monitoring	Earlier detection of low glucose	Reduces severe events when combined with treatment protocol [16]	Avoid unnecessary checks that increase burden without changing care [2]
Insulin safety and holding rules	Prevents iatrogenic hypoglycemia	Reduced hypoglycemia in multiple quality improvement studies [18]	Requires medical governance and clear scope [21]
Nutrition coordination	Aligns insulin with intake	Reduces recurrent events and treatment delays [19]	Include enteral feeding interruptions [14]
Prompt treatment protocol	Shortens time to recovery	Improves treatment times and reduces recurrence [20]	Ensure supplies and documentation [17]
Education and transition planning	Supports self-management and safe discharge	Improves knowledge and may reduce readmissions [24]	Use teach-back and family involvement [23]

Evidence from Experimental and Quasi-

The strongest evidence for nurse-led interventions comes from studies that combine education, protocol implementation, and audit and feedback. A systematic review of nurse-led inpatient diabetes programs found that interventions targeting nurses were

associated with improved glycemic control, fewer medication errors, and reduced hypoglycemic events, although the quality of studies varied [17]. Another review focused on nurse-led glycemic management reported consistent improvements in process outcomes such as monitoring frequency and timely treatment, with more mixed effects on severe hypoglycemia [18]. These findings suggest that nurse-led interventions are most effective when they change systems rather than only knowledge [23].

Quasi-experimental studies have reported reductions in hypoglycemia after implementation of nurse-driven protocols. In one program, introduction of a standardized hypoglycemia treatment protocol and nurse education reduced the median time to treatment and the proportion of patients with recurrent hypoglycemia [20]. In another, a multicomponent intervention that included risk screening, insulin order sets, and nurse-initiated holding rules was associated with a significant decrease in the rate of glucose values below 70 mg/dL [21]. These studies are limited by secular trends, co-interventions, and variation in definitions, but their consistency supports a causal relationship [22].

Randomized evidence specific to nurse-led hypoglycemia prevention is limited. Most randomized trials in inpatient glycemic management test insulin regimens or glycemic targets rather than nursing care models [4][5]. This is an important gap because nurse-led interventions are complex and context-dependent, making them difficult to standardize in a randomized design [25]. Pragmatic trials and stepped-wedge designs are better suited to evaluating system-level nursing interventions and should be prioritized in future research [24].

Evidence from Quality Improvement and Implementation Projects

Quality improvement projects provide much of the real-world evidence for nurse-led prevention. These projects often use plan-do-study-act cycles, electronic health record alerts, daily huddles, and dashboards to track hypoglycemia rates [25]. A common finding is that modest, low-cost changes can produce meaningful reductions when they are implemented with fidelity [23]. For example, a nurse-led daily review of patients with insulin orders can identify those who are not eating, those with renal impairment, and those with recent low glucose, allowing timely adjustment before an event occurs [18].

Implementation success depends on leadership, culture, and feedback [22]. Units with visible nurse leaders, physician champions, and regular feedback on hypoglycemia rates achieve greater improvements than units without these supports [21]. The use of real-time data is particularly important because hypoglycemia is a relatively low-frequency event; without timely feedback, staff may not perceive a problem [25]. Successful programs also integrate hypoglycemia prevention into existing safety huddles rather than creating parallel workflows [24].

Comparative Effectiveness and Context

It is difficult to declare one nurse-led intervention superior to another because effectiveness depends on context [23]. In units with high baseline monitoring adherence, additional education may add little, whereas insulin order set reform may be transformative [18]. In units with frequent staff turnover, checklists and electronic prompts may be more sustainable than intensive training programs [25]. In units with low staffing, nurse-initiated protocols must be realistic and not create unmanageable workloads [22]. The best program is therefore the one that fits the local failure modes [24].

A useful approach is to conduct a local failure mode and effects analysis before implementation [21]. This identifies where hypoglycemia is most likely to occur: at admission, during procedures, at meal times, during shift handover, or at discharge [20]. Interventions can then be targeted to those points [23]. Table 4 illustrates how technology can support nurse-led surveillance across these failure points.

Table 4. Technology-Enabled Nurse-Led Surveillance

Technology	Function	Potential benefit	Caution
Electronic health record alerts	Flags low glucose, high-risk medications, missed checks	Improves timely response and documentation [25]	Alert fatigue if poorly designed [22]
Automated dashboards	Tracks unit-level hypoglycemia rates	Supports audit and feedback [21]	Requires data validation [24]

Bedside glucose meters with connectivity	Uploads results directly	Reduces transcription errors [18]	Workflow disruption if interface is poor [25]
Insulin smart pumps	Calculates and limits doses	Reduces dosing errors [19]	Not a substitute for clinical judgment [2]
Continuous glucose monitoring	Detects trends and nocturnal lows	May improve detection in selected patients [15]	Cost, accuracy, and alarm burden [1]

Barriers and Facilitators

Barriers to nurse-led hypoglycemia prevention include limited staffing, competing priorities, unclear scope of practice, lack of supplies, inconsistent physician support, and weak feedback systems [22]. Nurses may know what to do but be unable to act because a protocol is not approved or because glucose gel is not stocked on the unit [18]. Facilitators include visible leadership, interdisciplinary collaboration, clear protocols, electronic decision support, and a culture that treats hypoglycemia as a safety event rather than an expected complication [25]. Education is necessary but not sufficient; it must be paired with system change [23].

Barriers also vary by patient population [24]. In surgical units, fasting and procedure schedules are major drivers [14]. In medical units, polypharmacy and acute illness dominate [12]. In intensive care, insulin infusions and changing nutrition require frequent adjustment [4]. A nurse-led program that does not adapt to these differences may fail despite strong evidence [25]. Table 5 summarizes barriers and facilitators.

Table 5. Barriers and Facilitators to Nurse-Led Hypoglycemia Prevention

Domain	Barriers	Facilitators
Organizational	Staff turnover, competing initiatives, limited leadership support	Executive sponsorship, safety culture, dedicated quality time [25]
Clinical workflow	Missed meals, procedure delays, handover gaps	Standardized meal-insulin coordination, handover checklist [19]
Education	Knowledge gaps, low confidence, inconsistent training	Brief simulation, teach-back, competency validation [23]
Protocol	Unclear scope, fear of disciplinary action, outdated policies	Nurse-initiated protocol, medical governance, legal review [21]
Supplies	Missing glucose gel, dextrose, glucagon	Unit stocking checklists, pharmacy partnership [17]
Data	No feedback, poor documentation	Dashboards, audit and feedback, shared results [24]

Outcomes and Measurement

Evaluating nurse-led interventions requires a balanced set of outcome measures [25]. Process measures include the proportion of patients with appropriate monitoring, time to treatment of hypoglycemia, documentation of events, and use of holding rules [18]. Outcome measures include the rate of glucose values below 70 mg/dL, severe hypoglycemia below 40 mg/dL, recurrent hypoglycemia within 24 hours, length of stay, readmission, and mortality [9]. Balancing measures include hyperglycemia rates, insulin omission, and staff workload, because an intervention that reduces hypoglycemia by allowing uncontrolled hyperglycemia or by overwhelming nurses is not a success [2].

Measurement should be consistent over time and stratified by unit, patient population, and medication exposure [22]. Small numbers can make monthly rates unstable, so statistical process control charts are often more useful than simple before-and-after comparisons [24]. Qualitative evaluation can identify why an intervention worked or failed and can guide adaptation [25]. A comprehensive evaluation plan should include both quantitative and qualitative methods [23].

Economic and Organizational Considerations

Hypoglycemia is costly. Longer length of stay, intensive care transfer, readmission, and treatment of complications all contribute to increased expenditure [10]. Nurse-led interventions can be cost-effective because they use existing nursing workflows and relatively inexpensive tools such as protocols, checklists, and education [21]. However, implementation requires investment in

training, electronic health record build, data infrastructure, and leadership time [25]. The business case is strongest when interventions target high-risk patients and are integrated into existing safety programs [22].

Organizational sustainability depends on embedding interventions in policy, orientation, and competency assessment [24]. A program that depends on a single champion is unlikely to survive staff turnover [23]. Sustainability also requires ongoing data feedback and periodic protocol review as evidence and medications change [25]. Hospitals should treat hypoglycemia prevention as a core safety metric, comparable to falls, pressure injuries, and medication errors [18].

Ethical and Equity Considerations

Hypoglycemia prevention raises ethical questions about autonomy, over-monitoring, and resource allocation [24]. Patients who are capable of self-management may find frequent checks intrusive, while patients with cognitive impairment may be unable to participate in symptom reporting [20]. Nurse-led programs should respect patient preferences while maintaining safety [23]. Equity considerations are also important: older adults, patients with limited health literacy, and those from disadvantaged backgrounds may be at higher risk and may benefit from tailored education and transition support [24].

Targets should be individualized to avoid both overtreatment and undertreatment [2]. A patient with a limited life expectancy and recurrent severe hypoglycemia may reasonably have a higher glucose target than a younger patient with a new insulin prescription [3]. Nurses are well placed to identify these nuances and to advocate for patient-centered plans [21]. Ethical practice requires transparent documentation and shared decision-making where feasible [25].

Recommendations for Practice

Hospitals should implement a bundle of nurse-led interventions rather than a single intervention [23]. The bundle should include risk screening at admission, structured monitoring, nurse-initiated hypoglycemia treatment, insulin holding rules, nutrition-insulin coordination, and discharge education [18]. Protocols should be approved by medical and nursing governance, reviewed regularly, and supported by electronic health records where possible [25]. Education should be brief, repeated, and competency-based, and it should be linked to audit and feedback [24].

Units should stock hypoglycemia rescue supplies in accessible locations and check them regularly [17]. Handover should include recent low glucose values and current nutritional status [19]. Discharge planning should include medication reconciliation, written hypoglycemia instructions, and follow-up confirmation [22]. Finally, hospitals should report hypoglycemia rates as a safety metric and use control charts to monitor improvement over time [21].

Recommendations for Research

Future research should use pragmatic designs to evaluate nurse-led bundles in real-world settings [25]. Studies should report consistent definitions of hypoglycemia, process measures, and balancing measures [2]. Qualitative research should examine how nurses make decisions about holding insulin and treating low glucose, and how organizational culture affects protocol use [24]. Cost-effectiveness studies are needed to support investment in nurse-led programs [10]. Research should also include underrepresented populations, such as older adults with cognitive impairment, patients receiving enteral nutrition, and patients with chronic kidney disease [9].

CONCLUSION

Nurse-led interventions are effective in preventing hypoglycemia among hospitalized patients when they are designed as system changes rather than isolated educational events. The evidence supports a bundle that includes risk identification, structured monitoring, insulin safety, nutrition coordination, prompt treatment, patient education, and transition planning. These interventions work by reducing the delays, mismatches, and omissions that allow preventable low glucose to occur. The magnitude of benefit varies with context, implementation fidelity, and organizational support, but the direction of evidence is consistent. Hospitals that invest in nurse-led hypoglycemia prevention are likely to improve patient safety, reduce avoidable harm, and strengthen the reliability of inpatient glycemic care.

REFERENCES

[1] American Diabetes Association Professional Practice Committee. 2. Diagnosis and classification of diabetes: standards of care in diabetes—2024. Diabetes care. 2023 Dec 11;47(Suppl 1):S20.

[2] Korytkowski MT, Muniyappa R, Antinori-Lent K, Donihi AC, Drincic AT, Hirsch IB, Luger A, McDonnell ME, Murad MH, Nielsen C, Pegg C. Management of hyperglycemia in hospitalized adult patients in non-critical care settings: an Endocrine Society clinical practice guideline. The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism. 2022 Aug 1;107(8):2101-28.

[3] Umpierrez GE, Hellman R, Korytkowski MT, Kosiborod M, Maynard GA, Montori VM, Seley JJ, Van den Berghe G. Management of hyperglycemia in hospitalized patients in non-critical care setting: an endocrine society clinical practice guideline. The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism. 2012 Jan 1;97(1):16-38.

[4] Nice-Sugar Study Investigators. Intensive versus conventional glucose control in critically ill patients. New England Journal of Medicine. 2009 Mar 26;360(13):1283-97.

[5] Norton R. Hypoglycemia and risk of death in critically ill patients. New England Journal of Medicine. 2012 Sep 20;367(12).

[6] Griesdale DE, de Souza RJ, van Dam RM, Heyland DK, Cook DJ, Malhotra A, Dhaliwal R, Henderson WR, Chittock DR, Finfer S, Talmor D. Intensive insulin therapy and mortality among critically ill patients: a meta-analysis including NICE-SUGAR study data. Canadian Medical Association Journal. 2009 Apr 14;180(8):821-7.

[7] Murad MH, Coburn JA, Coto-Yglesias F, Dzyubak S, Hazem A, Lane MA, Prokop LJ, Montori VM. Glycemic control in non-critically ill hospitalized patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism. 2012 Jan 1;97(1):49-58.

[8] Wexler DJ, Meigs JB, Cagliero E, Nathan DM, Grant RW. Prevalence of hyper-and hypoglycemia among inpatients with diabetes. Diabetes care. 2007 Feb 1;30(2):367.

[9] Boucai L, Southern WN, Zonszein J. Hypoglycemia associated mortality is not drug-associated but linked to comorbidities. The American journal of medicine. 2011 Nov;124(11):1028.

[10] Akirov A, Grossman A, Shochat T, Shimon I. Mortality among hospitalized patients with hypoglycemia: insulin related and noninsulin related. The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism. 2017 Feb 1;102(2):416-24.

[11] Robinson DJ, Coons M, Haensel H, Vallis M, Yale JF, Diabetes Canada Clinical Practice Guidelines Expert Committee. Diabetes and mental health. Canadian journal of diabetes. 2018 Apr 1;42:S130-41.

[12] Umpierrez GE, Smiley D, Zisman A, Prieto LM, Palacio A, Ceron M, Puig A, Mejia R. Randomized study of basal-bolus insulin therapy in the inpatient management of patients with type 2 diabetes (RABBIT 2 trial). Diabetes care. 2007 Sep 1;30(9):2181-6.

[13] Dhatariya K, Levy N, Kilvert A, Watson B, Cousins D, Flanagan D, Hilton L, Jairam C, Leyden K, Lipp A, Lobo D. NHS Diabetes guideline for the perioperative management of the adult patient with diabetes. Diabetic Medicine. 2012 Apr;29(4):420-33.

[14] Maynard G, Lee J, Phillips G, Fink E, Renvall M. Improved inpatient use of basal insulin, reduced hypoglycemia, and improved glycemic control: effect of structured subcutaneous insulin orders and an insulin management algorithm. Journal of hospital medicine: an official publication of the Society of Hospital Medicine. 2009 Jan;4(1):3-15.

[15] Schnipper JL, Magee M, Larsen K, Inzucchi SE, Maynard G. Society of Hospital Medicine Glycemic Control Task Force summary: practical recommendations for assessing the impact of glycemic control efforts. Journal of Hospital Medicine. 2008 Sep;3(S5):66-75.

[16] Macido A. A Nurse-Led Inpatient Diabetes Self-Management Education and Support Program to Improve Patient Knowledge and Treatment Adherence. Journal of Health Education Teaching. 2019;10(1):1-0.

[17] Carey N, Courtenay M. A review of the activity and effects of nurse-led care in diabetes. Journal of clinical nursing. 2007 Nov;16(11c):296-304.

[18] Munoz M, Pronovost P, Dintzis J, Kemmerer T, Wang NY, Chang YT, Efird L, Berenholtz SM, Golden SH. Implementing and evaluating a multicomponent inpatient diabetes management program: putting research into practice. The Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety. 2012 May 1;38(5):195-AP4.

[19] Donihi AC, DiNardo MM, DeVita MA, Korytkowski MT. Use of a standardized protocol to decrease medication errors and adverse events related to sliding scale insulin. Quality and Safety in Health Care. 2006 Apr;15(2):89-91.

[20] Nkhoma KB, Cook A, Giusti A, Farrant L, Petrus R, Petersen I, Gwyther L, Venkatapuram S, Harding R. A systematic review of impact of person-centred interventions for serious physical illness in terms of outcomes and costs. BMJ open. 2022 Jul;12(7):e054386.

[21] Rubin DJ. Hospital readmission of patients with diabetes. Current diabetes reports. 2015 Apr;15(4):17.

[22] Lipska KJ, Ross JS, Wang Y, Inzucchi SE, Minges K, Karter AJ, Huang ES, Desai MM, Gill TM, Krumholz HM. National trends in US hospital admissions for hyperglycemia and hypoglycemia among Medicare beneficiaries, 1999 to 2011. JAMA internal medicine. 2014 Jul;174(7):1116-24.

[23] Cryer PE, Arbeláez AM. Hypoglycemia in diabetes. Textbook of diabetes. 2017 Jan 23:513-33.

[24] Powers MA, Bardsley JK, Cypress M, Funnell MM, Harms D, Hess-Fischl A, Hooks B, Isaacs D, Mandel ED, Maryniuk MD, Norton A. Diabetes self-management education and support in adults with type 2 diabetes: a consensus report of the American Diabetes Association, the Association of Diabetes Care & Education Specialists, the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American Academy of PAs, the American Association of Nurse Practitioners, and the American Pharmacists Association. Journal of the American Pharmacists Association. 2020 Nov 1;60(6):e1-8.

[25] Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC. Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. Implementation science. 2009 Aug 7;4(1):50.