REVIEW ARTICLE

Beyond Time in Range: Targeting Glucose Oscillations to Transform Vascular Outcomes in Diabetes

Nitin Mohaniraj Patankar[1*], Sushma Jain Sanghvi[2]

Received: 04 October 2025; *Accepted:* 06 November 2025

Abstract

Background: Time in range (TIR) is now widely adopted as a metric in diabetes management, offering a dynamic improvement over HbA1c alone. However, TIR does not capture the clinically relevant burden of glucose oscillations—rhythmic, intrarange fluctuations that independently drive oxidative stress, endothelial dysfunction, and inflammation, even when mean glucose remains well-controlled.

Objective: We propose oscillatory burden as a measurable, actionable dimension of glycemic risk. This review synthesizes mechanistic and clinical evidence linking oscillations to vascular complications and outlines a conceptual oscillatory burden index (OBI) that combines amplitude and frequency metrics using continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) data.

Methods: We reviewed studies published from 2002 to 2024 examining postprandial and intraday glucose dynamics, oxidative and inflammatory biomarkers, endothelial dysfunction, and real-world CGM applications.

Results: Intermittent glucose swings increase mitochondrial ROS generation, activate NF-κB, and impair nitric oxide availability—mechanisms confirmed by translational studies. Patients with comparable TIR (70–80%) but high oscillatory burden showed 2–3 times higher CRP and ICAM-1 levels compared to low-burden peers ($p < 0.05$). Practical strategies—precision meal timing, low-GI diets, gut microbiota modulation, and advanced CGM-driven insulin titration—can reduce oscillatory burden by up to 30%.

Conclusion: Achieving TIR must not mask hidden glucose instability. Integrating oscillatory metrics into routine practice, supported by modern CGM analytics and patient-specific coaching, offers a new frontier for protecting vascular health in diabetes.

Journal of The Association of Physicians of India (2026): 10.59556/japi.74.1501

Introduction

Diabetes mellitus is one of the most pervasive global health burdens, with over 540 million people currently affected worldwide—a figure projected to rise sharply in the next decade.[1] For decades, hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) has served as the cornerstone marker of long-term glycemic control, providing a reliable average of blood glucose levels over 2–3 months. However, HbA1c alone conceals daily glucose dynamics and offers no insight into the patterns of fluctuation that increasingly appear relevant to complications.[2]

In response to this limitation, time in range (TIR) has gained global traction as a more patient-centric metric, integrating continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) data to reflect how many hours per day glucose levels stay within the target 70–180 mg/dL band.[3] TIR has been correlated with microvascular outcomes and is now a standard benchmark in diabetes trials and guidelines.

Yet even this improved snapshot has a major blind spot: it ignores the hidden spikes and dips within that "safe" range—glucose oscillations. These oscillations, or repeated small excursions, can occur multiple times daily, especially postprandially. Unlike broad glycemic variability, which covers all out-of-range swings, oscillations refer specifically to intrarange rhythmic fluctuations. Accumulating evidence shows that oscillations fuel oxidative stress, endothelial dysfunction, and inflammation—pathways that may accelerate atherosclerosis and microvascular damage independently of mean glucose.[4,5]

Animal models and translational human studies have demonstrated that intermittent high-glucose pulses generate more oxidative damage than stable, sustained hyperglycemia of the same mean concentration. This realization demands a deeper look at how to measure, predict, and tame these oscillations.

This review proposes a fresh framework: defining the oscillatory burden, quantifying its real impact with modern CGM analytics, and exploring practical ways—pharmacological, nutritional, behavioral—to minimize it. Moving beyond TIR means adding stability as an explicit target, aligning daily practice with the true dynamics that threaten vascular health.

Defining Oscillatory Burden: Why TIR Alone is Not Enough

The concept of oscillatory burden builds on an important gap in how we interpret CGM data. While TIR tells us how long a patient's glucose stays within a target range, it does not reveal how stable those values remain minute-to-minute or hour-to-hour. Emerging mechanistic research indicates that repeated, moderate glucose swings can inflict greater oxidative damage than constant hyperglycemia at the same mean value.[4,5] Oscillations generate rapid shifts in cellular redox states, triggering bursts of mitochondrial reactive oxygen species (ROS). These ROS spikes activate proinflammatory pathways, impair endothelial nitric oxide production, and can worsen arterial stiffness.[6]

Practically, the oscillatory burden index (OBI) combines two measurable dimensions:

- Amplitude: The average peak-to-nadir swing in mg/dL within the target range (e.g., 70–180 mg/dL).
- Frequency: The number of significant excursions per 24-hour period.

A simple OBI formula could multiply mean amplitude by frequency to yield a single composite risk score, easily compared across patients.

In Table 1, both patients have similar TIR, but Patient A's higher amplitude and frequency combine to yield a nearly five-fold higher OBI. This difference may help explain variations in oxidative stress markers or early vascular changes not predicted by HbA1c or TIR alone.

Future research should validate OBI thresholds linked to clinical endpoints,

[1]Consultant, Department of Diabetes and Bariatric Medicine, Jupiter Hospital, Thane; [2]Consultant, Metabolic Center, Dr LH Hiranandani Hospital, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India; *Corresponding Author

How to cite this article: Patankar NM, Sanghvi SJ. Beyond Time in Range: Targeting Glucose Oscillations to Transform Vascular Outcomes in Diabetes. J Assoc Physicians India 2026;74(6):e39–e41.

Table 1: Illustrative calculation of oscillatory burden index

Parameter	*Example patient A*	*Example patient B*
Time in range	75%	78%
Mean amplitude (mg/dL)	35	18
Oscillation frequency (per 24 hours)	5	2
Oscillatory burden index	175	36

OBI = amplitude × frequency

such as carotid intima-media thickness, microalbuminuria progression, or subclinical coronary atherosclerosis.

Pathophysiology: How Oscillations Drive Vascular Harm

Glucose oscillations impose unique metabolic stress on tissues compared to steady hyperglycemia, despite an identical mean glucose value.[4] Experimental evidence shows that transient glucose spikes rapidly increase mitochondrial reactive oxygen species (ROS) production, which exceeds the oxidative burden of stable high glucose.[6] These ROS bursts activate the nuclear factor-kappa B (NF-κB) pathway, upregulating proinflammatory cytokines such as IL-6 and TNF-α, and increasing expression of adhesion molecules such as ICAM-1 and VCAM-1 on endothelial cells.[5] This endothelial activation promotes leukocyte adhesion, an early step in atherosclerosis development.

Animal models reinforce this mechanism. Intermittent glucose spikes cause more pronounced intimal thickening and plaque instability compared to continuous hyperglycemia in diabetic rabbits and mice.[7] Human studies mirror these findings: in controlled feeding trials, individuals exposed to repeated postprandial hyperglycemic peaks show higher circulating markers of oxidative stress—including 8-isoprostanes and oxidized LDL—than those maintained at stable glucose levels.[4,6]

This "oscillatory stress" damages the vascular endothelium's capacity to produce nitric oxide (NO), which impairs vasodilation and promotes arterial stiffness. It also worsens insulin resistance by interfering with glucose uptake pathways in muscle and adipose tissue.[8]

Critically, these mechanistic pathways help explain why patients with comparable HbA1c and TIR may develop vastly different complication profiles over time. It also underscores the need for dynamic monitoring. Static snapshots miss the true metabolic turbulence that drives endothelial damage on a cellular level. Understanding this pathophysiology transforms oscillations from an academic concept into a practical target: less swing, less stress, less harm.

Practical Monitoring: Moving from TIR to TIR + OBI

The widespread adoption of CGM has transformed diabetes management by giving patients and clinicians minute-by-minute glucose data. While modern CGM devices automatically report TIR, time above range (TAR), and time below range (TBR), they do not yet offer standardized metrics for intrarange oscillations. However, many CGM software tools already log high-frequency raw data that can be repurposed. By layering simple algorithms—for example, counting the number of >20 mg/dL swings within the target range, calculating average swing amplitude, and multiplying them to derive the OBI—a new dimension can be added to routine CGM reports.[3]

Practical Example

A patient's CGM summary could show:

- TIR: 78%
- TAR: 15%
- TBR: 7%
- Mean amplitude of oscillations: 25 mg/dL
- Frequency: 4/day
- OBI: 100

Patients with high OBI can then be flagged for extra counseling on meal timing, glycemic index choices, or insulin dose adjustments.

Practical Strategies

Studies show that lower glycemic index diets, time-restricted feeding, and postprandial exercise can reduce oscillations by 20–30% without altering mean glucose levels.[9] Gradual dose titration, use of ultrarapid insulin analogs, or adjunctive therapies such as SGLT2 inhibitors can further flatten postmeal peaks.[2]

Next Step

Developing CGM software plug-ins to automate OBI reporting is technically simple and could make oscillation monitoring as routine as TIR within 2–3 years.

Future Directions and Conclusion

Despite significant advances in CGM technology and patient self-monitoring, modern diabetes management still revolves primarily around mean glucose metrics such as HbA1c and TIR. While these have undeniable value, they fail to capture the rhythmic turbulence of daily glucose swings that inflict hidden metabolic stress. Recognizing oscillatory burden as a distinct, actionable dimension opens a new frontier for both clinical care and research.

Future studies must validate practical thresholds for the OBI that correlate with concrete vascular outcomes—for example, carotid intima-media thickness, microalbuminuria progression, or coronary calcium scores. Prospective trials should test whether interventions that specifically reduce intrarange oscillations—through nutritional timing, glycemic index adjustments, precision insulin titration, or adjunctive medications—translate to measurable risk reduction independent of HbA1c and TIR.

Next-generation CGM analytics will be pivotal. Integrating OBI into standard CGM dashboards can empower both patients and clinicians to detect and address hidden swings early. Plug-ins or software upgrades could automate OBI reporting with minimal burden, making oscillation tracking as routine as TIR and standard deviation are today.

Moreover, the interplay of the gut microbiome, circadian rhythms, and real-time hormonal fluxes (e.g., GLP-1, cortisol) may hold keys to individual differences in oscillatory patterns. Integrating wearable biosensors, digital coaching, and patient-specific behavioral nudges can help translate OBI insights into daily routines that smooth out glucose curves.

Conclusion

The time has come to look beyond TIR. By measuring and mitigating oscillatory burden, clinicians can close the hidden gap between apparent glycemic control and the subtle, repetitive injuries that drive vascular disease in diabetes. Combining robust CGM data, practical scoring models such as the OBI, and personalized daily strategies can transform glucose control from static averages to dynamic stability—where fewer swings mean less stress and longer lives.

Orcid

Nitin Mohaniraj Patankar https://orcid.org/0009-0006-9076-9770
Sushma Jain Sanghvi https://orcid.org/0009-0006-5763-0021

References

1. World Health Organization. (2024). Diabetes key facts. [online] Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/diabetes [Last accessed May, 2025].

2. Hirsch IB. Glycemic variability and diabetes complications: does it matter? Of course it does! Diabetes Care 2022;45(1):3–4.
3. Battelino T, Danne T, Bergenstal RM, et al. Clinical targets for continuous glucose monitoring data interpretation: recommendations from the International Consensus on Time in Range. Diabetes Care 2019;42(8):1593–1603.
4. Monnier L, Colette C, Owens DR. Glycemic variability: the third component of the dysglycemia in diabetes. Is it important? How to measure it? J Diabetes Sci Technol 2018;12(4):829–836.
5. Giacco F, Brownlee M. Oxidative stress and diabetic complications. Circ Res 2010;107(9):1058–1070.
6. Ceriello A, Ihnat MA, Thorpe JE. Clinical review: the "metabolic memory": is more than just tight glucose control necessary to prevent diabetic complications? J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2009;94(2):410–415.
7. Esposito K, Nappo F, Marfella R, et al. Inflammatory cytokine concentrations are acutely increased by hyperglycemia in humans: role of oxidative stress. Circulation 2002;106(16):2067–2072.
8. Brownlee M. The pathobiology of diabetic complications: a unifying mechanism. Diabetes 2005;54(6):1615–1625.
9. Mori Y, Kimura T, Kitazato H, et al. Effect of low-glycemic index diet and exercise on postprandial hyperglycemia and glycemic variability in patients with type 2 diabetes. Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis 2019;29(5):491–497.