Abstract

Introduction:
Selection of what blood glucose monitoring system to utilize has become an issue for physicians, diabetes educators, pharmacists, and patients. The field of competing makes and models of blood glucose monitoring systems has become crowded, with manufacturers touting improvements in accuracy, ease of use/alternate site options, stored results capacity, software evaluation tools, and/or price point.

Methods:
Personal interviews of 12 pharmacists from community and academic practice settings about monitor preference, as well as results from a national survey of pharmacist recommendations, were compared to actual wholesale sales data to estimate the impact of such recommendations on final monitor selection by the patient.

Results:
Accu-Chek® monitors were recommended 34.65% of the time and represented 28.58% of sales, with a success rate of 82.48% of being the monitor selected. OneTouch® monitors had 27.72% of recommendations but represented 31.43% of sales, indicating possible patient brand loyalty or formulary preference for that product. FreeStyle® monitors came in third for pharmacist recommendations and were selected by the patient 61.68% of the time when recommended. The category of “other monitor” choices was selected 60.89% of the time by patients given those suggestions. Included in the “other monitor” category was the new disposable monitor marketed as the Sidekick®. Based on sales data provided, the Sidekick® made up 2.87% of “other monitor” category sales, representing 68% of the “other monitor” segment.

Conclusions:
While patients frequently follow pharmacist monitoring system suggestions, the ultimate deciding factor is most often the final out-of-pocket cost to the patient. As a result, cost of supplies often becomes the most important determining factor in final monitor selection at the patient level. If the patient cannot afford to perform the recommended daily testing intervals, all other determining factors and suggestions become moot.