

Understanding Device Integrations within Diabetes Apps: App Features and Reviews Analysis

Jessica Turner, Katarzyna Stawarz

Submitted to: JMIR Diabetes
on: June 19, 2024

Disclaimer: © The authors. All rights reserved. This is a privileged document currently under peer-review/community review. Authors have provided JMIR Publications with an exclusive license to publish this preprint on its website for review purposes only. While the final peer-reviewed paper may be licensed under a CC BY license on publication, at this stage authors and publisher expressly prohibit redistribution of this draft paper other than for review purposes.

Table of Contents

Original Manuscript..... 5
Supplementary Files..... 23
 Multimedia Appendixes 24
 Multimedia Appendix 1..... 24



Understanding Device Integrations within Diabetes Apps: App Features and Reviews Analysis

Jessica Turner^{1*} BCMS (Hons), PhD; Katarzyna Stawarz^{2*} BSc, MSc, PhD

¹University of Waikato Tauranga NZ

²Cardiff University Cardiff GB

*these authors contributed equally

Corresponding Author:

Jessica Turner BCMS (Hons), PhD

University of Waikato

101 Durham Street

Tauranga

NZ

Abstract

Background: Diabetes management involves a large degree of data collection and self care in order to accurately administer insulin. Several mobile apps are available that allow people to track and record various factors that influence their blood sugar levels. Existing diabetes apps offer features that enable integrations with various devices that streamline diabetes management, such as continuous glucose metres (CGM), insulin pumps or regular activity trackers. While this reduces tracking burden on the users, research highlighted several issues with diabetes apps, including issues with reliability and trustworthiness. As pumps and CGM are safety-critical systems – where issues can result in serious harm or fatalities – it is important to understand what issues and vulnerabilities could be introduced by relying on popular diabetes apps as an interface for interacting with such devices.

Objective: As there is lack of research examining in detail the integrations and potential suitability of apps as part of a wider self-management ecosystem, our goal was twofold. First, we aimed to understand the current landscape of device integrations within diabetes apps and how well they meet users' needs. Second, we identified the key issues users of the most popular apps face currently and what features are the source of these issues.

Methods: Through searches in Android app stores, we systematically identified 21 diabetes apps that offer integrations. We conducted a detailed analysis of 602 user reviews. For each review we recorded its sentiment, features and issues, and additional contextual information provided by the review writers. We used descriptive statistics to analyse the features and issues. We also analysed the reviews thematically to identify additional trends related to the context of use and consequences of issues reported by the users.

Results: The reviews focused on key features that users found the most important, including: device integrations (43% of reviews), tracking (32.2%), data logging (14.3%) and notifications (11.6%). We found that 54.5% of the reviews were negative (vs 31.1% positive and 14.6% neutral or mixed) and the majority of reviews (62.8%) mentioned issues. The biggest issues related to device integrations included: inability to connect with external devices (25.1%), inability to store, manage or access data (22%), unreliable notifications and alerts (9.2%), issues caused by or related to software updates (8.5%), hardware issues (6.4%) and issues with accessing the app, related services or associated hardware (3.2%).

Conclusions: Apps for diabetes management are a useful part of self-care only if they are reliable, trustworthy, reduce burden and increase health benefits. Our results provide a useful overview of desired features for diabetes apps alongside key issues for existing integrations and highlight the future challenges for AP system development.

(JMIR Preprints 19/06/2024:62926)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.62926>

Preprint Settings

1) Would you like to publish your submitted manuscript as preprint?

✓ Please make my preprint PDF available to anyone at any time (recommended).

Please make my preprint PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that my title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Only make the preprint title and abstract visible.

No, I do not wish to publish my submitted manuscript as a preprint.

2) If accepted for publication in a JMIR journal, would you like the PDF to be visible to the public?

✓ **Yes, please make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone at any time (Recommended).**

Yes, but please make my accepted manuscript PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that the title and abstract will remain visible.

Yes, but only make the title and abstract visible (see Important note, above). I understand that if I later pay to participate in <http://www.jmir.org/>



Original Manuscript

Original Paper

Understanding Device Integrations within Diabetes Apps: App Features and Reviews Analysis

Abstract

Background: Diabetes management involves a large degree of data collection and self care in order to accurately administer insulin. Several mobile apps are available that allow people to track and record various factors that influence their blood sugar levels. Existing diabetes apps offer features that enable integrations with various devices that streamline diabetes management, such as continuous glucose metres (CGM), insulin pumps or regular activity trackers. While this reduces tracking burden on the users, research highlighted several issues with diabetes apps, including issues with reliability and trustworthiness. As pumps and CGM are safety-critical systems – where issues can result in serious harm or fatalities – it is important to understand what issues and vulnerabilities could be introduced by relying on popular diabetes apps as an interface for interacting with such devices.

Objective: As there is lack of research examining in detail the integrations and potential suitability of apps as part of a wider self-management ecosystem, our goal was twofold. First, we aimed to understand the current landscape of device integrations within diabetes apps and how well they meet users' needs. Second, we identified the key issues users of the most popular apps face currently and what features are the source of these issues.

Methods: Through searches in Android app stores, we systematically identified 21 diabetes apps that offer integrations. We conducted a detailed analysis of 602 user reviews. For each review we recorded its sentiment, features and issues, and additional contextual information provided by the review writers. We used descriptive statistics to analyse the features and issues. We also analysed the reviews thematically to identify additional trends related to the context of use and consequences of issues reported by the users.

Results: The reviews focused on key features that users found the most important, including: device integrations (43% of reviews), tracking (32.2%), data logging (14.3%) and notifications (11.6%). We found that 54.5% of the reviews were negative (vs 31.1% positive and 14.6% neutral or mixed) and the majority of reviews (62.8%) mentioned issues. The biggest issues related to device integrations included: inability to connect with external devices (25.1%), inability to store, manage or access data (22%), unreliable notifications and alerts (9.2%), issues caused by or related to software updates (8.5%), hardware issues (6.4%) and issues with accessing the app, related services or associated hardware (3.2%).

Conclusions: Apps for diabetes management are a useful part of self-care only if they are reliable, trustworthy, reduce burden and increase health benefits. Our results provide a useful overview of desired features for diabetes apps alongside key issues for existing integrations and highlight the future challenges for AP system development.

Keywords: self-management; diabetes mellitus; health apps; mHealth; mobile health; mobile apps; user experience

Introduction

Background

Diabetes is defined as a group of disorders that share both hyperglycemic (hyper) and hypoglycemic

(hypo) events caused by insulin insufficiency [1]. Hyper events occur when blood sugar is too high while hypo events occur when blood sugar is too low. The three most common types of diabetes include: Type 1 Diabetes (T1D), in which the pancreas does not produce insulin; Type 2 Diabetes (T2D), in which body cells become resistant to insulin over time; and lastly Gestational Diabetes (GD), which occurs during pregnancy [2]. Due to the nature of the disease, diabetes involves a large degree of data collection and self care in order to accurately administer insulin and avoid these hyper and hypo events. As a result, there is a large burden placed on individuals to track blood sugar levels, carbohydrate intake, activity levels, medications, insulin levels and so on.

To assist with diabetes management, several technologies have been developed in order to help lower the burden for diabetics as well as to increase health benefits [3]. Since the 1990s, with the discovery of short and long acting insulin, insulin pen devices have been used to allow diabetics to better control their blood sugar levels [4]. Newer technologies have been developed as access to technology has increased, such as Continuous Glucose Monitors (CGMs), which allow for easier data collection on blood sugar levels, or insulin pumps for automatic scheduled delivery of insulin. Access to these relatively low-cost devices has also led to do-it-yourself (DIY) Artificial Pancreas (AP) systems which use a combination of these medical devices with software systems such as web or mobile applications (apps) in order to create a closed loop between automatically taking blood sugar levels and administering insulin as needed [5].

Examples of AP systems include open source projects like Nightscout [6] or OpenAPS [7]. Both systems have 3 key components: a CGM sensor to collect information on blood sugar levels; an insulin pump to administer insulin; and a place to log information, such as a website or mobile app [6,7]. The exact devices and ways in which this information is used is up to the end user who is modifying the out-of-warranty devices. Interviews and trials with patients, care providers and families demonstrate reduced levels of anxiety or fear and better health outcomes [8–10]. In addition, patients and parents are asking for devices which reduce their burden so that diabetes has as little impact as possible on their everyday life [11,12].

While DIY AP systems are an ad hoc but useful solution to a serious issue, the necessity for them has been created due to the slow and lengthy processes required for developing safety-critical medical technologies [13,14]. While authors highlight the benefits of the devices, there is also discussion around the need for adequate regulation of commercially available AP systems in addition to collaboration between industry, care providers and patients to ensure the developed systems are fit for purpose [15,16]. For example, Drew [17] highlights that from the DIY movement at least one open source algorithm has been approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA); however, it can be difficult to make devices from different manufacturers work together, causing interoperability issues.

To software engineers, these issues are not surprising, as in their essence AP systems are Internet of Things (IoT) systems, combining multiple actuators and sensors in order to deliver a product. As such, the key challenges that occur in IoT systems – such as connectivity issues or device and data privacy [18] – may also apply in the context of integrating different diabetes devices and apps. For AP systems in particular, we can see these issues occurring in the above DIY solutions. This is further compounded by the fact that management of each type of diabetes is different and while some elements are common, management for specific individuals is also unique, requiring a complex set of system requirements [19].

To help address this issue, several diabetes apps have been developed to serve as a way for end users to interpret their data and make informed decisions about insulin dosage. These applications can

work with a combination of devices as part of an AP system or alternative care approach. Wu *et al.* review how diabetes apps contribute to lifestyle changes and demonstrate that they are effective for T2D [20]. Conversely, Zhang *et al.* [21] found in their survey that usage of apps was higher among patients with T1D than T2D [22]. Key features for diabetes apps include but are not limited to: medication management, blood glucose management, physical activity, diet and nutrition, and weight management [23]. Performance expectancy of these functions and social influence were key factors in patients regularly engaging with the apps [24]. In addition, concerns related to ethics and reliability of apps have been raised by Huang *et al.* where only 1 app in their study was able to meet all 8 criteria for trustworthiness [25]. This highlights the need for further investigation of the apps themselves as a key part of AP systems and their use in managing all types of diabetes.

Objectives

It is evident that mobile apps are becoming an integral part of diabetes self-care and management. However, while several studies have demonstrated their potential health benefits [20–22], to the best of our knowledge there are no studies which examine in detail the integrations and potential suitability of diabetes apps as a collective to determine if they meet user needs and function appropriately as part of a wider AP system. As stated previously, social influence has a large impact on whether or not apps are used, along with reliability and trustworthiness being key factors in uptake [24,25]. There are also challenges in functionality and use being determined by different types of diabetes as well as the unique requirements for each individual and different situations they find themselves in [19]. Therefore, there is a need to better understand the current landscape of device integrations and how well they meet users' needs.

As user reviews are a rich and useful source in exploring user feedback and needs for health related apps (this is a common approach often used to examine a wide range of health apps, e.g. focused on mental health [26,27], medication adherence [28,29] or diabetes [30]), the primary aim of this research was to investigate the reviews of diabetes management apps to determine wider themes and identify which functionality is important to users. We anticipate that as a result of the challenges that IoT systems like APs face, app reviews will highlight and reflect these challenges, while also demonstrating which features are vital for end users' self-care and diabetes management.

Furthermore, with AP systems and the widespread use of DIY solutions to self-care, exploring integrations and connectivity with other devices such as insulin pumps, CGMs, and smartwatches, will be important to ensure systems work as expected. Due to the safety-critical nature of the diabetes management apps (safety-critical here meaning that a flaw in the system could lead to severe injury or even fatalities), it is crucial to ensure systems are safe to use. Therefore, the secondary aim of this research is to identify the key issues users of the most popular apps face at the moment and what features are the most common sources of these issues.

Methods

Following the procedures informed by similar app reviews (e.g. [26]) we decided to first identify relevant apps and then focus on their reviews. As users tend to post extreme reviews (either very positive or very negative [31]), public reviews are a great way of understanding factors that are important to users and identifying the most pressing issues. At the same time, by focusing only on reviews mentioning specific functionality we can reduce potential bias that the tendency to post extreme reviews could introduce. Our data collection, extraction and analysis process is described in detail below.

Data collection

We used the New Zealand and the UK version of Google Play to identify apps and reviews for analysis. We focused on Android apps predominantly as Android phones are generally more affordable to the wider population and account for 70% mobile market share [32] which helps to capture the majority of users. However, while in both the UK and NZ the market share of Android devices is closer to 50% [33,34], there is high duplication of applications across both the Google Play and Apple App stores, with most popular apps available on both platforms. Furthermore, Google Play reviews are easier to access and process for reviewing, as the Apple App Store does not allow copying of content.

First, to identify relevant diabetes apps, we used the following keywords in the web version of Google Play:

- “Glucose” or “Diabetes”, followed by synonyms “Tracker”, “Monitor”, “Diary” or “Journal”
- “Type 1” or “T1” and Diabetes.

Our focus was to investigate apps that target core diabetes management activities such as tracking blood glucose levels and administering insulin as they are more relevant to AP closed-loop systems. As a result, we included Type 1 diabetes as part of our keywords instead of T2D or Gestational. Furthermore, there are several apps aimed at T2D like the *Type 2 Diabetic Cookbook*¹ or *Pregnant with Diabetes*² applications which focus their functionality according to these conditions but do not provide functionality for diabetes management in general.

The searches resulted in a total of 130 apps, with 28 apps available in both the NZ and UK Google Play app stores. Two researchers checked the descriptions of the apps to identify those that specifically mentioned device integrations (i.e. apps that could connect and import data from other devices, e.g. CGM, pumps, wearable activity trackers), which resulted in 21 relevant apps. These apps and their functionality are summarised in a table available in Multimedia Appendix 1.

Next, for the subset of these 21 apps mentioning integrations, we downloaded user reviews during October and November 2023. The reviews had to meet the following inclusion criteria:

- Mentioned specific functionality or features. Reviews that simply provided praise (“Great app!”) or criticism/complaints (“This app is awful!”) were excluded.
- Published in the last 12 months.
- Posted in English.

Given that the number of reviews varied across the apps, reaching over 26,000 for some popular apps such as *OneTouch Reveal*[®], we decided to limit the total number of downloaded reviews per app to 50 to avoid skewing the analysis towards features/issues characteristic to only a few popular apps. Limiting the number allowed us to have a broad range of reviews across all apps.

When an app was available in both app stores and had features or content characteristic to this location, we collected reviews for both versions, e.g. *FreeStyle LibreLink – NZ* and *FreeStyle LibreLink – GB* were treated as separate apps due to the limited number of reviews in the NZ app

1 See <https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.ikdong.recipe.b01n6t3iag&hl=en&gl=NZ>

2 See <https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.heyworld.pregnantwithdiabetes&hl=en&gl=NZ>

store. We believe this occurred because access to technologies is impacted by government funding, for example CGM funding is still under review in NZ³ while it is readily available in the UK⁴ (although access to certain devices is limited). This allowed us to include popular apps that may have been unnecessarily affected by external factors such as funding schemes.

The reviews were manually copied from a desktop version of Google Play by two researchers. In total, we downloaded 602 relevant reviews for 20 apps; one app (*SocialDiabetes*) did not have any reviews that met the inclusion criteria.

Review annotation and analysis

Next, we divided the reviews equally between two researchers. Each review was annotated by one researcher and then the annotations moderated by the other. For each review, we collected the following information: sentiment (positive, negative, neutral, mixed), list of mentioned features, whether any integrations were mentioned (yes/no), whether any issues were mentioned (yes/no), details of any issues, and additional open-ended comments that summarised additional points covered in the review.

We used descriptive statistics to analyse the data and identify the main trends. We also analysed all reviews thematically, using the open-ended comments as initial codes. These comments were added during review annotation and moderation, and were later reviewed and expanded by the researchers. Through this process we identified 11 feature categories that help to contextualise the findings in wider user experience (tracking, integration, data logging, notifications, accounts, user interface, data sharing, monitoring, compatibility, calculations, and data privacy) and additional concerns related to tracking others (often children) and general fear that unreliable apps can cause deaths.

Results

For the 602 reviews collected for diabetes apps we were able to identify 11 feature categories (see Table 1). Of the reviews collected, we found that over half (327, or 54.3%) expressed a negative sentiment while only 187 (31.1%) were positive. The remaining reviews were either neutral (15, or 2.5%) or included mixed comments (73, or 12.1%). Similarly, 301 reviews (50.1%) mentioned some type of device integration and 62.8% (378 reviews) mentioned bugs or faults within the system. Detailed information about the 21 diabetes apps and reviews, including their sentiment, features, integrations and related issues can be found in Multimedia Appendix 1.

Diabetes App Features

Table 1 gives an overview of the feature categories identified in the diabetes app reviews. The most common feature mentioned was **device integrations** (259, or 43%), i.e. the ability to connect, gather and share data from external devices such as CGM, automated insulin pumps, smart pens, smart watches and so on. Users also highlighted how collecting data from these devices allowed them to make informed decisions about their insulin levels and diabetes management. One user said in their review:

FINALLY! A glucose app that actually works with my paired metre! I was considering buying a new metre and now I don't have the need. Additionally, this app creates charts and reports with useful DETAILS! My metre's companion app only shows daily numbers. I'm so happy I found this app!! [Glooko - Track Diabetes Data]

3 See <https://pharmac.govt.nz/news-and-resources/news/cgms>

4 See <https://jdrf.org.uk/knowledge-support/managing-type-1-diabetes/guide-to-type-1-diabetes-technology/continuous-glucose-monitoring/can-i-get-a-continuous-glucose-monitor-on-the-nhs/>

Table 1. Feature Categories Mentioned in User Reviews (N=602). Some reviews mention more than one feature type.

Feature types	Definition	n	%
Integration	The ability to connect with external devices	259	43%
Tracking	The ability to store data relevant to diabetes management.	194	32.2%
Data Logging	The ability to add contextual information in the application.	86	14.3%
Notifications	All features related to alarms, alerts, reminders and tips.	70	11.6%
User Accounts	The ability to login or out of associated accounts in order to access app functionality.	38	6.3%
User Interface	Any information associated with the user interface.	34	5.6%
Data Sharing	The ability to share static data with an external source.	27	4.5%
Monitoring	The ability to share dynamic data with an external source.	15	2.5%
Compatibility	Hardware or software issues between devices.	15	2.5%
Calculations	The ability to use the application to calculate bolus and other dosage levels.	9	1.5%
Data Privacy	How much control and freedom the user has over where their data is stored and who it is shared with.	8	1.3%

After integrations, **tracking** was the next most commonly mentioned feature (32.2%, 194). It referred to functionality that allows users to record data either automatically or manually to manage their diabetes. In the reviews we collected, users mentioned medication, carbohydrates, blood glucose levels, weight, and activity tracking as relevant to their management. In addition, trends from this data were also useful to allow users to make data-informed decisions on their diabetes management. One review stated:

This is a great app for keeping track of your readings. I personally like the long-term charts which show trends and the times of your day that you have to pay a bit more attention to your sugar levels. [Diabetes:M - Blood Sugar Diary]

While tracking and data logging features are related, **data logging** allows users the ability to provide contextual information around the data that they are collecting. Eighty-six reviews (14.3%) explicitly mentioned data logging. Some users liked taking photos of meals or entering manual readings from test machines, while others put in feature requests for the ability to make notes related to specific readings, for example one review said:

... Please, I'm begging, give us a simple "Notes" section? I can write what exactly I ate, or that I accidentally skipped a meal/dose/whatever. [mySugr - Diabetes Tracker Log]

Mentions of **Notifications** appeared in 11.6% (70) reviews and covered a wide variety of information within the apps. Some notifications were simply reminders for entering meal information and so on, while others were alerts or alarms notifying users that their blood glucose levels were out of range. Users found these notifications helpful:

... The most useful for me are the ongoing notification & widget (both have trend arrows), it might seem simple but it really does help with trying to stay in range, also, a big plus is 3rd party apps allow you to see both ongoing notification & widget on a WearOS watch ... [Gluroo Diabetes Logger]

However, others were frustrated by the inability to control these notifications, especially when it related to scheduling and editing the alerts. User reviews highlighted several examples of how such uncontrollable alerts could affect everyday life and that one-size-fits-all approach is not adequate. For example, one user stated:

... Also, alarms override phone settings. Sitting in a wedding, or in church, you'll get a loud alarm. Only way to stop it is to turn off your phone ... [Dexcom G7]

Many reviews were also quite emotional, highlighting users' frustration and the need for reliable devices that simply work:

Buggy, intrusive and a battery drain. Pairing is slow, connectivity is poor and readings are inaccurate. Sensors fail before even finishing warmup. Alarms blare all day and all night reporting false lows and connectivity alerts, even with my phone on vibrate or "Do Not Disturb". I was forced to turn all Dexcom notifications off in the system settings. This is a bad, dangerous app, clearly designed by someone who has never had to actually wear the sensor. People will DIE using this GARBAGE app. [Dexcom G7]

Issues with the lack of control were also extended to other parts of the app. For example, another review described issues faced by shift workers:

When are you going to fix being able to adjust the hours of meals & sleep time out of the normal 9 to 5 hours for people that work a graveyard shift. App doesn't let you set your sleep time to be during the day, for people that have to work a graveyard shift, so it totally makes the app useless. Here we are a year later!!! and you haven't addressed my issues. not all people live a 9 to 5 life. [OneTouch Reveal®]

When **user accounts** were mentioned in reviews (6.3%, 38), they were usually in reference to issues with access. That is, users either had trouble registering or logging into an existing account. For example:

Had app before but it kept crashing at launch. Uninstalled it. Reinstalled recently. I keep getting stuck at login. It will not let me sign up or login. Uninstalled. [One Drop: Better Health Today]

Comments directly related to the **user interface** appeared in 5.6% (34) of the reviews. Data visualisation in the form of graphs and charts was important to end users so that results were easy to interpret and follow. Furthermore, many reviews highlighted users' resistance to interface changes, which were often seen as undesirable. For example, one, review stated:

Was good until the last release, when the daily Time in target was removed, and the 24 hour rolling graph. Both my key measures were removed! Please bring these back. [FreeStyle LibreLink - GB]

Similarly, the ability to **share data** with external sources was mentioned in 4.5% (27) reviews. For example, sharing an app generated report with a doctor or nurse was considered useful:

I love this app it makes it so easy for me to show my doctor my progress my high and my lows because you carry your phone everywhere it's so accessible [iHealth Gluco-Smart]

Some applications provided users with the ability to not only share data but also **monitor other users**. For example, the ability for a parent to monitor a child's blood glucose levels while at school allows them to be kept informed of their time-in-range. Of the reviews collected, 2.5% (15) explicitly mentioned monitoring features:

It's a blessing. It was very difficult to record and track my mother's diabetes. It made it so easy. Thank you so much for this app. I would really recommend it. [forDiabetes: diabetes tracker]

Surprisingly, one user mentioned in their review using one of the apps to monitor their cat as the app synced well with their device and worked with custom ranges:

Simple diabetes tracking app. Just had to setup a custom range for my cat. I set 80-120 for before a meal and 80-300 after a meal for a generic range which I received from a vet. Works with alphatrak3 for pets. [Blood Sugar Diary for Diabetes]

Compatibility was also mentioned in 2.5% (15) reviews. While some issues were minor, such as phones no longer being able to access an application, others highlighted interoperability and cost issues in accessing diabetes technology:

My device is only compatible with the Clarity app and is incompatible with both the G6 and G7 CGM apps. I love using the Dexcom but the receiver is extremely expensive and inconvenient. Please add the OnePlus Nord N300 5G to the list of Dexcom accessible devices soon. Thank you! [Dexcom Clarity]

Diabetes calculations were mentioned less frequently than initially anticipated (only 1.5% (9) of reviews). We suspect this is because regulatory bodies such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) or Product Safety Australia have recalled apps where these calculations have failed due to input errors [35,36]. However, users expressed that they hoped these calculators would come back as they found them useful, even though they knew why these features were removed. For example, one user mentioned:

Best logging and calculating app I've found. Not perfect, but quite good. It was the only bolus calculator available until that feature was withdrawn due to U.S. regulations. Sad to see that gone. [Diabetes:M - Blood Sugar Diary]

Similarly, **data privacy** was only explored in 1.3% (8) of the reviews collected. However, of those who did mention data privacy, permissions and how their data was shared, accessed and used were important:

Consent for Private Data Collection Required to Use the App - No option to decline = Uninstalled [SmartLog]

Another user highlighted that the app continued to run in the background despite not being given the

appropriate **permissions** to allow this functionality:

I do not give this app permission to run in the background, yet it continues to do so. I have to force quit it to get it to stop. [mySugr - Diabetes Tracker Log]

Issues with Integrations

Given that the majority of reviews were either negative or mixed (i.e. covering both good and bad features or experiences), it was no surprise that several issues were identified. In general, 378 reviews (62.8%) mentioned some issues, including 280 reviews (46.5%) focused specifically on issues related to device integrations. Table 2 summarises the integration issues found in the user reviews.

Table 2. Integration Issues Mentioned in User Reviews (N=378)

Issue	Definition	n	%
Connectivity	The inability to connect with external devices	95	25.1%
Data	The inability to store, manage or access data	49	22%
Alerts	The inability to notify users of important messages	35	9.2%
Updates	The inability to update the software and/or associated hardware	31	8.5%
Hardware	Hardware that does not respond as expected	24	6.4%
Access	The inability to access the app, services and/or associated hardware	12	3.2%

One of the most common issues found in the user reviews associated with integrations was the **inability to connect with external devices**. Several reviews discussed user's difficulty with connecting with medical devices such as insulin pumps or CGMs in order to manage diabetes levels. One user mentioned:

When it works, it's really great, but it seems to struggle to work properly, plagued with signal losses. I'm not sure if it's the sensor or the software at this point. My friend's app also loses signal from a sensor on her arm to a phone in her pocket... [LibreLinkUp]

As highlighted in the previous review, connectivity issues also led to issues with the **ability to store, manage or access data**. One of the primary benefits of the apps is to allow users to make data-informed decisions about their diabetes management. However, when data is not collected correctly this leads to a lack of trust in apps:

The app leaves much to desire. No charts showing your readings so you can visually get an idea of what to expect out of your blood sugar trends. The tester is cheap junk. I've cross checked it multiple times with the most accurate tester on the market and sometimes it's over 70 mg/l higher. If I wasn't double checking between both testers, I very well could have taken a lethal dose of insulin. Absolutely do not recommend for more unstable type one diabetics like myself. It's honestly awful. [One Drop: Better Health Today]

Further compounding these issues were **alerts** failing to notify users when their BG levels were no longer in their optimum range. Delays caused by unreliable software or connection issues could be potentially dangerous, especially when a prompt remedial action was required:

Rarely has updated numbers, alerts can come after kid has been low for an hour.

[LibreLinkUp]

Software updates could also cause significant problems for users, sometimes causing them to be unable to continue using their system as expected:

Decided to stop working all of a sudden, will NOT reconnect with Bluetooth at all. Big stuff up on updates. Not good for people who need the software. [SmartLog]

The above issues could have more serious consequences when the app was used on behalf of someone else. While there were just a few reviews describing such use (15 reviews in total, or 3.9%), they highlight potential risks as it is often vulnerable users who are monitored this way. Some of these reviews mentioned connection issues, data loss and general lack of reliability, often caused by app updates:

This app has lost its credibility after the recent update (Sep 27, 2023). There's frequent signal loss, and the BGL doesn't update for as long as 1 hour! Alarms don't trigger in time. Many times, I received a low alarm after successfully treating a potential low. I hope the developers understand how crucial this is! My child is only 3YO, which makes it so important to be able to monitor her levels, even when she's not with me. It was a near flawless app before this update. Possible to roll back? [Libre LinkUp]

Alongside these software problems, issues with the **hardware devices** themselves appeared in the user reviews. From problems with hardware not responding, to issues with getting readings, it was clear that hardware reliability was crucial to the success of an application:

I'm on my 2nd 90-day G7 shipment. I've had one or two sensors fail before their expiration time & at least one that kept dropping its signal in each batch. I'm using the back of the arm, washing it with soap and water, & wiping my arm with alcohol and drying before inserting the sensor as instructed. I love the greater freedom that CGMs provide & Dexcom has been great about replacing bad sensors, but they need to improve reliability... [Dexcom G7]

Lastly, **access** was a key issue mentioned in 3.2% (12) reviews. This could be related to an inability to log into an account but also included features hidden behind paywalls, causing accessibility and equity concerns:

I purchased this app assuming it'd allow me to track and then share information with my physician. It would - if I agreed to pay an additional \$60.00 per year for access to reports. I've submitted a request for a refund to google; I'm not buying an app just to be told to pay for a subscription. That's absurd. [Diabetes & Diet Tracker]

The reviews mentioning the above issues also highlighted the need for good customer service. Many reviewers mentioned unresponsive developers when complaining about the various factors, which could further reduce the trust in the apps:

Would be a great app if the built in data imports worked. Until I can bring my data over I can't use this. Contacted support and still no contact 3+ weeks later. Appears to be a pointless app. Rechecked, imports still not working. [Diabetes:M - Blood Sugar Diary]

Discussion

Principal Results

The aim of this study was to investigate the role device integrations play in the use of smartphone applications for diabetes management. Our results show that apps are used for a wide variety of reasons to assist with diabetes management. When working as expected, they are highly valued and useful to ensure users remain “in-range” and improve health outcomes. However, when issues occur, users highlight how this could have serious and dangerous impacts on their overall health – particularly in relation to insulin administration, as too much or too little can trigger adverse events with negative health effects.

Reliability, Trustworthiness & Burden

Given the high number of negative and mixed reviews, it is evident that current apps do not adequately meet users’ needs. In particular, issues occurring either with hardware, such as CGM sensors, or the software itself would cause users to not trust apps to accurately track their glucose levels. Some reviews even highlighted that this would cause users to stop using the application altogether, while others talked about measuring themselves in multiple ways to ensure they had accurate results. One of the fundamental goals of these apps is to assist with self-care management and to consequently reduce burden; however, by forcing users to measure and track themselves in multiple ways, the apps reviewed have failed in this regard.

In addition, once users see that the application is failing, for whatever reason, they tend to uninstall the app and look for an alternative. That is, once trust is lost, it is difficult to regain. This is reflective of other results related to software trustworthiness with health applications. For example, Wicks & Chiauzzi [37] highlight that while there is great potential for health-based apps, a lack of regulation and adequate verification processes means that apps do not behave as expected, leading to poor quality and lack of trust.

As the Internet became a prevalent place for information sharing, the Health on the Net Code (HONCode) was created as a code of conduct in the health or medical domain for sharing information on websites [38]. Huang et al. adapted the code for diabetes medication management apps and found that only 1 app out of the 143 investigated met all criteria [25]. Our results are reflective of this in that user reviews show some apps to be unreliable and therefore untrustworthy. This emphasises the need for appropriate regulation and verification processes to ensure apps are fit for purpose and meet users’ needs. Furthermore, as apps become part of AP systems and diabetics are more reliant on this technology, trustworthiness, reliability and quality assurance will become increasingly important.

IoT Challenges Related to Diabetes Apps and Devices

As stated previously, IoT systems come with inherent challenges for many different reasons. Lohiya & Thakkar [18] identified 12 key challenges for IoT, 6 of which are reflected in the reviews analysed, namely: connectivity, device monitoring & sensing, device & data privacy, data analytics, security, and evolution of IoT devices. Below, we explore these 6 key challenges in relation to the reviews analysed.

Connectivity issues in IoT systems relate to multiple devices being connected to the network, while **device monitoring & sensing** relates to sensors being able to respond to real-time data. In the reviews analysed which mention integrations specifically, users were often working with only 1 sensor (such as a CGM) being connected with 1 app; however, despite this simple set up, users still

encountered significant issues in tracking real-time data. In addition, there were multiple data losses which meant users could not trust the information they were receiving from the system.

Device & data privacy refers to accessibility of data or devices being shared only as the owner of that data allows. While some user reviews explicitly mentioned privacy concerns, it was surprising to find there were more issues around *inability* to share data with others, such as doctors or caregivers, in a useful and readable format. This was linked with the **data analytics** challenge, in which raw data is processed into understandable information. Despite privacy issues and prevalence of dangerous data access permissions in diabetes apps [39], users appeared to be less concerned with data privacy than we anticipated and more concerned with the meaning that they could infer from that data for their diabetes management to share with others.

Security is a challenge for IoT systems as devices must be able to communicate and share information within specific networks. For the diabetes apps reviewed, we found that there were significant issues with access and updates that relate to this challenge, which echo similar issues noted for other health apps, e.g. users of mental health apps reported being “devastated” after an app update wiped out their historic data [26]. Access issues often prevented users from being able to login and retrieve their information from apps. Similarly, updates as part of the usual software maintenance process could lead to new issues being introduced. Security will be an on-going issue for diabetes technology as it is inherently sensitive information shared over the internet. In fact, even people directly involved in diabetes DIY using Nightscout see it as high-risk and requiring expert involvement [40]. Therefore, there is an opportunity for apps developed by experts to support these types of AP solutions. However, as highlighted by the reviews, it will be important to ensure that prioritising security will not impede access to the data itself.

The last IoT challenge we encountered in the reviews was **evolution of IoT devices**, or rather *interoperability challenges*, when a lack of standard design makes it difficult to ensure devices are compatible with each other. This was evidenced by the number of different hardware systems mentioned in the reviews, such as CGM sensors and other testing devices. As DIY systems become more prevalent, app developers will need to ensure they are clear about device compatibility for the systems they develop.

Implications for AP systems

As mentioned previously, AP systems use a combination of a CGM sensor, automated insulin pump and website or smartphone app to create a closed loop system that mimics a real-life pancreas [5]. As a result, the desirable features and challenges outlined in the user reviews – related to both the hardware and the app itself – will be relevant to AP system developers and the wider DIY community.

There are significant issues around the **reliability**, **trustworthiness** and **burden** that smartphone apps create for diabetics. However, when they work well, they can lead to great health benefits as outlined in the reviews analysed. AP systems which utilise apps like the ones investigated here will inherit the same issues if similar engineering processes are followed. It is evident that good quality assurance practices will be imperative to the success of AP systems to ensure they are reliable, trustworthy and meet users’ needs.

Furthermore, as AP systems are themselves IoT systems, they inherit the challenges of IoT in addition to the issues outlined in the app reviews. As with most IoT systems, interoperability will be a key factor in their success. In the apps reviewed, hardware issues were often only in relation to a single sensor and a single smartphone app – AP systems may be far more complex, requiring

communication between multiple sensors, pumps and apps, leading to potentially more problems. Therefore, the engineering of AP systems is an interesting and important avenue for future work.

Limitations

The user reviews of diabetes apps were used in this research to determine whether apps meet user needs and how integrations are used. A limitation of this study is that we only investigated reviews published within the last year that explicitly mention features or functionality. There may be other themes that could have been discovered over a longer time period. However, our data still gives a good understanding of recent issues and features available in diabetes technologies.

Our focus on the app store means that our results reflect apps that are commonly available and attached to supported integrations. As a result, we do not investigate DIY solutions as reviews are less readily available for these apps. Furthermore, there is the potential for bias towards extremely positive or negative comments [31]. However, by following an approach reported by Stawarz et al. [28] and focusing on reviews which explicitly mention features and functionality, we were able to reduce this bias.

Lastly, our focus on user reviews allowed us to explore a wide range of apps and gather user experience data that would otherwise be difficult to access. While in-depth studies of individual apps would provide stronger data, this would not give us the same breadth of coverage or allow for evaluation of such a diverse set of integrations. We believe that this provides the best possible analysis for integrations and the implications this may have for AP systems. Future research could explore the detailed implementation of various integrations within specific apps to better understand related issues and devise approaches to addressing them.

Conclusion

Using user reviews as the basis for analysis, this research shows that the use of smartphone apps in self-care and diabetes management is a suitable solution which can have positive health benefits for users. However, it is imperative that due to their safety-critical nature, such apps are reliable, trustworthy and meet users' needs in order to prevent and avoid adverse events. In addition, the apps must reduce the burden of self-care for diabetics to be appropriate for everyday use. The challenges and opportunities we have identified in the diabetes apps open up new avenues for research and provide warnings for those engineering AP systems to ensure that they do not inherit the same issues. Future work should explore the way in which AP systems are engineered and investigate interoperability issues, finding a balance between regulation and quality assurance practices.

Conflicts of Interest

None declared.

Abbreviations

AP: Artificial Pancreas

CGM: Continuous Glucose Monitor

DIY: Do-It-Yourself

GD: Gestational Diabetes

NZ: New Zealand

IoT: Internet of Things

T1D: Type 1 Diabetes

T2D: Type 2 Diabetes

UK: United Kingdom

Multimedia Appendix 1: Multimedia Appendix 1.xlsx

References

1. Egan AM, Dinneen SF. What is diabetes? *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2019 Jan 1;47(1):1–4. doi: 10.1016/j.mpmed.2018.10.002
2. Roglic G. WHO Global report on diabetes: A summary. *Int J Noncommunicable Dis* 2016 Jun;1(1):3. doi: 10.4103/2468-8827.184853
3. Litchman ML, Lewis D, Kelly LA, Gee PM. Twitter Analysis of #OpenAPS DIY Artificial Pancreas Technology Use Suggests Improved A1C and Quality of Life. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2019 Mar;13(2):164–170. doi: 10.1177/1932296818795705
4. Karamanou M, Protogerou A, Tsoucalas G, Androutsos G, Poulakou-Rebelakou E. Milestones in the history of diabetes mellitus: The main contributors. *World J Diabetes* 2016 Jan 10;7(1):1–7. PMID:26788261
5. Zhou K, Isaacs D. Closed-Loop Artificial Pancreas Therapy for Type 1 Diabetes. *Curr Cardiol Rep* 2022 Sep 1;24(9):1159–1167. doi: 10.1007/s11886-022-01733-1
6. The Nightscout Project. Welcome to Nightscout. Nightscout Proj. 2024. Available from: <http://www.nightscout.info/> [accessed May 7, 2024]
7. OpenAPS. OpenAPS.org – #WeAreNotWaiting to reduce the burden of Type 1 diabetes. Available from: <https://openaps.org/> [accessed May 7, 2024]
8. Duke MD, Fredlock AA. Do-It-Yourself (DIY) Systems in Diabetes: A Family and Provider Perspective. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2020 Mar 5;193229682090620. doi: 10.1177/1932296820906204
9. Elbalshy MM, Styles S, Haszard JJ, Galland BC, Crocket H, Jefferies C, Wiltshire E, Tomlinson P, de Bock MI, Wheeler BJ. The effect of do-it-yourself real-time continuous glucose monitoring on psychological and glycemic variables in children with type 1 diabetes: A randomized crossover trial. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2022;23(4):480–488. doi: 10.1111/pedi.13331
10. Kudva YC, Laffel LM, Brown SA, Raghinaru D, Pinsker JE, Ekhlaspour L, Levy CJ, Messer LH, Kovatchev BP, Lum JW, Beck RW, Gonder-Frederick L. Patient-Reported Outcomes in a Randomized Trial of Closed-Loop Control: The Pivotal International Diabetes Closed-Loop Trial. *Diabetes Technol Ther Mary Ann Liebert, Inc., publishers*; 2021 Oct;23(10):673–683. doi: 10.1089/dia.2021.0089
11. Pals RAS, Hviid P, Cleal B, Grabowski D. Demanding devices – Living with diabetes devices as a pre-teen. *Soc Sci Med* 2021 Oct 1;286:114279. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114279

12. Commissariat PV, Roethke LC, Finnegan JL, Guo Z, Volkening LK, Butler DA, Dassau E, Weinzimer SA, Laffel LM. Youth and parent preferences for an ideal AP system: It is all about reducing burden. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2021;22(7):1063–1070. doi: 10.1111/pedi.13252
13. Ng M, Borst E, Garrity A, Hirschfeld E, Lee J. Evolution of Do-It-Yourself Remote Monitoring Technology for Type 1 Diabetes. *J Diabetes Sci Technol SAGE Publications Inc*; 2020 Sep 1;14(5):854–859. doi: 10.1177/1932296819895537
14. O'Donnell S, Lewis D, Fernández MM, Wäldchen M, Cleal B, Skinner T, Raile K, Tappe A, Ubben T, Willaing I, Hauck B, Wolf S, Braune K. Evidence on User-Led Innovation in Diabetes Technology (The OPEN Project): Protocol for a Mixed Methods Study. *JMIR Res Protoc* 2019 Nov 19;8(11):e15368. doi: 10.2196/15368
15. Lewis D. History and Perspective on DIY Closed Looping. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2019 Jul;13(4):790–793. doi: 10.1177/1932296818808307
16. Dimentstein K, Sosenko JM, Goodman KW. Do-It-Yourself Diabetes Management: Perspectives of a Patient, a Physician, and an Ethicist. *Clin Diabetes* 2022 Jan 1;40(1):70–74. doi: 10.2337/cd20-0058
17. Drew L. A DIY 'bionic pancreas' is changing diabetes care — what's next? *Nature* 2023 Aug 30;620(7976):940–941. doi: 10.1038/d41586-023-02648-9
18. Lohiya R, Thakkar A. Application Domains, Evaluation Data Sets, and Research Challenges of IoT: A Systematic Review. *IEEE Internet Things J* 2021 Jun;8(11):8774–8798. doi: 10.1109/JIOT.2020.3048439
19. Stawarz K, Katz D, Ayobi A, Marshall P, Yamagata T, Santos-Rodriguez R, Flach P, O'Kane AA. Co-designing opportunities for Human-Centred Machine Learning in supporting Type 1 diabetes decision-making. *Int J Hum-Comput Stud* 2023 May 1;173:103003. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhcs.2023.103003
20. Wu X, Guo X, Zhang Z. The Efficacy of Mobile Phone Apps for Lifestyle Modification in Diabetes: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *JMIR MHealth UHealth* 2019 Jan 15;7(1):e12297. doi: 10.2196/12297
21. Zhang Y, Li X, Luo S, Liu C, Xie Y, Guo J, Liu F, Zhou Z. Use, Perspectives, and Attitudes Regarding Diabetes Management Mobile Apps Among Diabetes Patients and Diabetologists in China: National Web-Based Survey. *JMIR MHealth UHealth* 2019 Feb 8;7(2):e12658. doi: 10.2196/12658
22. Kebede MM, Pischke CR. Popular Diabetes Apps and the Impact of Diabetes App Use on Self-Care Behaviour: A Survey Among the Digital Community of Persons With Diabetes on Social Media. *Front Endocrinol Frontiers*; 2019 Mar 1;10. doi: 10.3389/fendo.2019.00135
23. Jimenez G, Lum E, Car J. Examining Diabetes Management Apps Recommended From a Google Search: Content Analysis. *JMIR MHealth UHealth* 2019 Jan 16;7(1):e11848. doi: 10.2196/11848
24. Zhang Y, Liu C, Luo S, Xie Y, Liu F, Li X, Zhou Z. Factors Influencing Patients' Intentions to Use Diabetes Management Apps Based on an Extended Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of

- Technology Model: Web-Based Survey. *J Med Internet Res* 2019 Aug 13;21(8):e15023. doi: 10.2196/15023
25. Huang Z, Lum E, Car J. Medication Management Apps for Diabetes: Systematic Assessment of the Transparency and Reliability of Health Information Dissemination. *JMIR MHealth UHealth* 2020 Feb 19;8(2):e15364. doi: 10.2196/15364
 26. Stawarz K, Preist C, Tallon D, Wiles N, Coyle D. User Experience of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy Apps for Depression: An Analysis of App Functionality and User Reviews. *J Med Internet Res* 2018 Jun 6;20(6):e10120. doi: 10.2196/10120
 27. Caldeira C, Chen Y, Chan L, Pham V, Chen Y, Zheng K. Mobile apps for mood tracking: an analysis of features and user reviews. *AMIA 2017 Annu Symp* 2017.
 28. Stawarz K, Cox AL, Blandford A. Don't forget your pill! Designing Effective Medication Reminder Apps That Support Users' Daily Routines. *Proc 32nd Annu ACM Conf Hum Factors Comput Syst - CHI 14 New York, New York, USA: ACM Press; 2014. p. 2269–2278. doi: 10.1145/2556288.2557079*
 29. Park JYE, Li J, Howren A, Tsao NW, Vera MD. Mobile Phone Apps Targeting Medication Adherence: Quality Assessment and Content Analysis of User Reviews. *JMIR MHealth UHealth* 2019 Jan 31;7(1):e11919. doi: 10.2196/11919
 30. Dadgar M, Joshi KD. Diabetes Self-Management Using Mobile Apps: An Empirical Investigation Based On App Reviews And Through Value Sensitive Design Perspective. 2015 *Int Conf Mob Bus* 2015 Dec 12; Available from: <https://aisel.aisnet.org/icmb2015/3>
 31. Hu N, Pavlou PA, Zhang J. Can online reviews reveal a product's true quality? *Proc 7th ACM Conf Electron Commer - EC 06 New York, New York, USA: ACM Press; 2006. p. 324–330. doi: 10.1145/1134707.1134743*
 32. Sherif A. Mobile OS market share worldwide 2009-2023. Statista. 2024. Available from: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/272698/global-market-share-held-by-mobile-operating-systems-since-2009/> [accessed May 7, 2024]
 33. StatCounter. Mobile Operating System Market Share New Zealand. StatCounter Glob Stats. Available from: <https://gs.statcounter.com/os-market-share/mobile/new-zealand> [accessed May 7, 2024]
 34. Sherif A. U.K.: mobile OS market share 2011-2023. Statista. Available from: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/262179/market-share-held-by-mobile-operating-systems-in-the-united-kingdom/> [accessed May 7, 2024]
 35. U.S. Food & Drug Administration. Class 1 Device Recall Omnipod 5 App. 2024. Available from: <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfres/res.cfm?id=204607#:~:text=The%20bolus%20calculator%20is%20not,prior%20to%20starting%20the%20bolus> [accessed May 10, 2024]
 36. Commission AC and C. Roche Diabetes Care Australia Pty Ltd — Roche Diabetes mySugr Bolus Calculator App. Australian Competition and Consumer Commission; 2021. Available

from: <https://www.productsafety.gov.au/recalls/roche-diabetes-care-australia-pty-ltd-%E2%80%94-roche-diabetes-mysugr-bolus-calculator-app> [accessed May 10, 2024]

37. Wicks P, Chiauzzi E. 'Trust but verify' – five approaches to ensure safe medical apps. *BMC Med* 2015 Sep 25;13(1):205. doi: 10.1186/s12916-015-0451-z
38. Boyer C, Selby M, Scherrer J-R, Appel RD. The Health On the Net Code of Conduct for medical and health Websites. *Comput Biol Med* 1998 Sep 1;28(5):603–610. doi: 10.1016/S0010-4825(98)00037-7
39. Flors-Sidro JJ, Househ M, Abd-Alrazaq A, Vidal-Alaball J, Fernandez-Luque L, Sanchez-Bocanegra CL. Analysis of Diabetes Apps to Assess Privacy-Related Permissions: Systematic Search of Apps. *JMIR Diabetes* 2021 Jan 13;6(1):e16146. doi: 10.2196/16146
40. Rivard L, Lehoux P, Alami H. "It's not just hacking for the sake of it": a qualitative study of health innovators' views on patient-driven open innovations, quality and safety. *BMJ Qual Saf* BMJ Publishing Group Ltd; 2021 Sep 1;30(9):731–738. PMID:32938774

Supplementary Files

Multimedia Appendixes

Complete application and user review data with analysis.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/c6269f4e2fca5a1b2002a4ba8bc4acb8.xlsx>