Literature review of Diabetes noninvasive screening tools for previously undiagnosed. Scoping review

Tesfaye Haile MD, MS; Nash Rochman ScB/AB, PhD
CUNY Graduate School of Public Health & Health Policy
FALL/2023

Abstract

Background: Diabetes is a severe chronic disease that needs due attention. Worldwide distribution of the disease is increasing in alarming trend marked by its pandemic nature. Numerous people are disabled and dead due to the complexity of the disease and its management. A recent CDC report revealed that in the USA, 37.3 million people have Diabetes (11.3% of the US population). Ninety-six million people aged 18 years and older have prediabetes (38.0% of the adult US population). Worldwide, the number of people with Diabetes rose from 108 million in 1980 to 422 million in 2014. WHO on its sustainable development goal (SDG) report made clear the existing diabetic patient evaluation, intervention, and monitoring method does not adequately address the problem. Paradoxically, the ambitious goal of the American Diabetes Association is: "A Future Without Diabetes."

The current Diabetes screening method is invasive, provided that scarcity of resources and high cost of test kit makes it nonpractical to frequently checkup. We must proactively engage in its prevention by making screening cheap and easily accessible. So, this review is designed to answer the question: What is an available Diabetes noninvasive screening tool for undiagnosed?

Method: The relevant Article was searched from PubMed, MEDLINE, Embase, Web of Science, SCOPUS, and the CINHAL using a combination of the following key constructs: Diabetes screening, Diabetes noninvasive screening, Diabetes AND screening, Diabetes and ("noninvasive" or "non-invasive" or "non invasive") and "screening tool," Diabetes AND noninvasive AND screening AND Tool, "Diabetes noninvasive Screening Tool." The selection process was conducted based on the PRISMA framework statement. Exclusion and inclusion criteria were applied to select the final relevant literature, after which 22 relevant studies were selected.

Result: The review included studies conducted from 2013 to 2023, 36% in 2019 and 2022. The included articles are from 13 countries. The data sources for the articles are surveys, databanks, random sampling, and opportunity sampling. A total of 24 key predictors were used to develop 22 types of tools. The researchers used the logistic regression (LR) method while developing most studies, and ML in a couple of them. The Authors described the Tool's performance using the ROC curve, and the AUC is 0.65-0.93. The developed tool predictive power of the screening Prediabetes used Sensitivity, Specificity, PPV, NPV metrics and the result is encouraging.

Conclusion: Diabetes noninvasive Screening tests have the potential to identify prediabetes at an early stage and, thus, a more treatable disease that, as a result, saves lives. The developed tools had promising designate ability in pre-DM case findings, as shown by their ROC curve, AUC, sensitivity/specificity, and PPV/NPV. The Tool developed by these researchers looks promising for our goal of screening Diabetes by noninvasive method to answer this review research question using non-laboratory methods, which can be applied by common people regardless of the involvement of health professional skill. This review's limitations are that the included article's bias assessment was not performed, and non-English language articles were not included, so this could miss some pertinent tools. Finally, a systematic review, meta-analysis, and RCT on the Tool are recommended to identify any bias during the development of the Tool and possible generalizability of the best Tool for worldwide applicability.

Introduction

Diabetes is a severe chronic disease that needs due attention. Numerous people are disabled and dead due to the complexity of the disease and its management.[1] Worldwide distribution of the disease is increasing in alarming trend marked by its pandemic nature.[2] The June 29, 2022, report of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) revealed that in the USA, 37.3 million people have Diabetes (11.3% of the US population).[1] Ninety-six million people aged 18 years and older have prediabetes (38.0% of the adult US population).[1] Worldwide, the number of people with Diabetes rose from 108 million in 1980 to 422 million in 2014.[2] Thus, Prevalence has risen more rapidly worldwide.[2]

World health organization (WHO) on its sustainable goal (SDG) report made clear the existing diabetic patient evaluation, intervention, and monitoring method does not adequately address the problem.[2] Paradoxically, the American Diabetes Association vows "A Future Without Diabetes." So, the question is, how do we solve this paradox? One option is to focus on preventing early metabolic abnormalities and implementing routine screening.[2] However, the current Diabetes screening method is invasive (blood drawing and test for blood glucose) provided that scarcity of resources and high cost of test kit makes it nonpractical to frequently checkups, which is a hurdle to early detection of the deviation of metabolic status from the typical standard set point. So, it is better to have a self-administered, noninvasive screening tool used frequently at a convenience. This screening tool is less dangerous, less expensive, and less time-consuming and causes less physical and psychological discomfort. Thus, this review is designed to answer the question: What is an available Diabetes noninvasive screening tool for undiagnosed? This review search is intended to look for the presence of self-administered Diabetes noninvasive screening tools for the general population use from existing studies. Therefore, the rationale for this review is to look for easy tools for self-administered noninvasive Diabetes screening to effectively act to prevent this silent killer disease by detecting its early marker of metabolic abnormality. Knowing the regular status of Diabetes vulnerability in a very accessible way can enable early detection of this metabolic abnormality and facilitate the correction and prevention endeavor.

Aim: Searching for Diabetes noninvasive screening tools for undiagnosed.
Objective of the study: to look for the research availability on Diabetes noninvasive screening tools by a systematic process, transparent strategy, standardized data extraction methods, and present summary of findings.

The research question: What is available Diabetes noninvasive screening tool for undiagnosed in existing works of literature/studies?

Methodology
After developing a search strategy together with an experienced CUNY SPH librarian, Rosemary Farrell, MA, MLS; we searched PubMed, MEDLINE, Embase, Web of Science, SCOPUS, and the CINHAL using a combination of the following key constructs: Diabetes screening; Diabetes noninvasive screening; Diabetes AND screening; Diabetes and ("non-invasive" or "non invasive" or "noninvasive") and "screening tool"; Diabetes AND noninvasive AND screening AND Tool"; "Diabetes noninvasive Screening Tool". These databases were chosen because they cover many scientific articles on eHealth. The selection process was conducted and presented based on the PRISMA framework flowchart. (see Figure 1) All duplicates were checked thoroughly and removed using Microsoft Excel to maintain the quality of the review. The titles and abstracts of the articles were checked closely for analysis and purification to ensure the articles' relevance for eligibility checks. Exclusion and inclusion criteria were defined based on relevant literature, after which 22 relevant studies were selected for further review. The Inclusion and exclusion criteria for selected studies were the following.

Inclusion criteria
The Article should be:
1. Diabetes noninvasive screening tool
2. The study published from 2013 to 2023
3. Presented in the English language
4. Full text accessible
5. The Tool is easy to be applied by common people

Exclusion criteria
The Article should not be:

1. Diabetes Screening by Imaging Procedure
2. Diabetes screening methods need instrument and result interpretation involving health professional
3. screening of Diabetes complication

Data Extraction and Analysis

After the articles fulfilled the eligibility criteria, they were retrieved for review. The following general characteristic data were extracted: the authors, year of publication and country of origin, the aim, methodology of the study, sample source and sample size, the Tool outcome measurement [referenced by the' Gold standard' (FBS, RBS, 1h PG, 2hr PG, and HbA1c)], number of the identified Key predictive findings,

Predictors Tool, Tool performance evaluation, and the tool predictive powers. The extracted Data was presented (displayed) on tables, charts, and figures for better insight acquisition and synthesized narratively, and the findings were then summarized.

Result

A total of 6,744 articles were identified from the database searches. Six thousand six hundred ninety-two were removed due to duplicates using Microsoft Excel, and articles out of the scope of the review (invasive screening and Diabetes complication screening) were screened deeply based on titles and abstracts and then excluded. Based on eligibility criteria, 39 articles were removed—15 full articles were retrieved for further review. Nine additional studies were identified through citation and Google Scholar manual searches, with seven meeting the inclusion criteria. Finally, 22 studies were included in the review process (See Figure 1).



Figure 1: PRISMA flow chart showing the article selection process

From the 22 studies included in this review, a total of 24 key risk predictor were identified for 22 Tool development. Table 1 summarizes the included studies' characteristics and prediction tools.

Table 1
Summary of study variable characteristics and prediction tools of the included studies (n = 22)

#	Author(s)	Year of publication	Origin/ country of origin	Methodology/methods	Sample source	sample size	The 'Gold standard' Out come measure by	The 'Gold standard' reference of the Tool	# of Key findings	Key findings Predictors Tool	Predictive Power (Sen. (95% CI), Spe. (95% CI), PPV (95% CI), NPV (95% CI))
1	Rokhman MR, Arifin B, Zulkarnain Z, et al	2019	Indonesia	Multivariate LR model	community members and government employees	1,403	FBG	-FBG <100mg/dL), - prediabetes(pre-DM) (100-125mg/dL) and - T2DM (≥126mg/dL	11	-Age -Gender -Weight -Height -WC -Exercise(>30m/d) -Vegetable and fruit eating -Hypertension* -Hx of hyperglycemia -Hx of diabetes in 1st degree Cuisine -Hx of diabetes in 1st degree family	sensitivity=0.664; specificity = 0.67 No PPV and NPV
2	Fu Q, Sun M, Tang W, et al.	2014	China	Multivariable stepwise logistic regression	Community based health screening study	7953	2-h PG	2-h PG ≥7.8 mmol/L~	9	- Age - Height - BMI - WC - Pulse - SBP - DLP - HTN ----Family Hx of DM	Not reported
3	Memish ZA, Chang JL, Saeedi MY, Al Hamid MA, Abid O, Ali MK.	2015	Saudi Arabia	Multivariate LR model	Geographically stratified sampling in healthcare centers	1435	FPG/ 2-h PG	FPG ≥5.6 mmol/L 2-h PG ≥7.8 mmol/L	4	-Age - Hx of GDM - HTN -WC	sensitivity=0.90, specificity= 0.84 No PPV and NPV
4	Rajput R, Garg K, Rajput M.	2019	India	Multivariate LR model	Opportunity sampling in study locations		FPG/ 2-h PG	FPG 5.6–6.9 mmol/L 2-h PG 7.8–11.0 mmol/L	4	- Age - Family Hx of DM - Waist-to-height ratio -DBP	Sensitivity= 0.84 (0.78, 0.90), Specificity=0.58(0.55, 0.62) PPV=0.31 (0.27, 0.34), NPV=0.94 (0.92, 0.96)

5	Wang H, Liu T, Qiu Q, Ding P, He YH, Chen WQ.	2015	China	Multivariate LR model	Population-based health survey	892	FPG	FPG 6.1–6.9 mmol/L	5,4	**Men**: - Age - WC - BMI - Family Hx of DM -HTN	**Women:** - Age - WC - BMI - Family Hx of DM	(1) Men: Sensitivity=0.73, specificity=0.64, PPV=0.13, NPV=0.97 Women: Sensitivity=0.81, specificity=0.60, PPV=0.19, NPV=0.96 (2) Men: Sensitivity=0.79, specificity=0.51, PPV=0.06, NPV=0.99 Women: Sensitivity=0.89, specificity=0.42, PPV=0.05, NPV=0.99 (3) Men: Sensitivity=0.31, specificity=0.49, PPV=0.02, NPV=0.96 Women: Sensitivity=0.42, specificity=0.59, PPV=0.04, NPV=0.96
6	Henjum S, Hjellset VT, Andersen E, Flaaten MØ, Morseth MS.	2022	Algeria Saharawi refugees in Algeria	Multivariate LR model	Opportunity sampling in study locations	6197	HbA1c	HbA1c ≥5.7%	3	- Age - BMI -WC		Sensitivity=0.89, Specificity= 0.65, PPV=0.28, NPV=0.97
7	Zhang, Lin, L., Xu, X., Wu, X., Jin, Q., & Liu, H.	2019	China	multivariable logistic regression model	Chinese communities	308	FPG HbA1c	-FPG ≥ 126 mg/dL (≥ 7.0 mmol/L) or -glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c) ≥ 6. 5%	7	- age, -family history of diabetes, --hypertension, -waist circumference, -body mass index, -smoking, -daily consumption of vegetables, and fruits.		Sensitivity=0.83, Specificity= 0.60 No PPV and NPV
8	Abbas M, Mall R, Errafii K, et al.	2021	Qatar	Multivariate LR model ML	Population-based Biobank data	1432	HbA1c	HbA1c 5.7-6.4%	5	- Age - BMI - HTN - Sex -WC		Sensitivity=0.86 (0.83, 0.89), Specificity=0.58 (0.55, 0.61), PPV=0.50 (0.46, 0.53), NPV=0.90 (0.87, 0.92)
9	Woo YC, Lee CH, Fong CHY, Tso AWK, Cheung BMY, Lam KSL.	2017	China	LR model	Invited randomly by their telephone numbers	5814	FBG 2-h PG	fasting glucose ≥ 7 mmol/L or 2hour post oral glucose tolerance test glucose	8	-age, -waist circumference, -gestational diabetes, -height, -race/ethnicity, -hypertension, -family history of Diabetes,		Sensitivity=0.81, specificity=0.41 PPV=0.09, NPV=0.97

								≥ 11.1 mmol/L.		-exercise.	
10	Handlos LN, Witte DR, Almdal TP, et al.	2013	Algeria, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates (Middle East and North Africa	Multivariate LR model	Opportunity sampling in study locations	1415	HbA1c	HbA1c≥6.0 %	7	- Age - BMI - Sex - Family Hx of DM(Parental) - Family Hx of DM (of siblings) - Hx of GDM -Ethnicity	(1): Sensitivity=0.76 (0.72, 0.80), Specificity=0.50 (0.48, 0.52) (2): Sensitivity= 0.74 (0.70, 0.79), Specificity=0.54 (0.52, 0.57) (3): Sensitivity= 0.76 (0.72, 0.80), Specificity=0.52 (0.49, 0.54)
11	Wu J, Hou X, Chen L, Chen P, Wei L, Jiang F, Bao Y, Jia W.	2019	China	Not explicitly mentioned	Opportunity sampling in study locations	6588	FPG, 2-h PG, HbA1c	-FPG ≥ 7 mol/L -2-h PG ≥ 11.1 mmol/L. -HbA1c 5.7-6.4%	5	-Age, -family history of diabetes, -hypertension, -BMI, and -WC	Not reported
12	Sadek K, Abdelhafez I, Al-Hashimi I, et al	2022	Qatar	Multivariate LR model	Population-based Biobank data	15,309	HbA1c -RPG	-HbA1c ≥5.7% -RPG ≥7.8 mmol/L	7	-Age Sex -WHR (Waist-Hip Ratio) -BMI -HTN -DLP -Education level	Sensitivity=0.78, Specificity= 0.69 PPV=0.45, NPV=0.91
13	Katulanda P, Hill NR, Stratton I, Sheriff R, De Silva SD, Matthews DR.	2016	Sri Lanka	multiple logistic regression	probability cluster-sampling technique in seven out of the nine provinces in Sri Lanka	2000	-FPG -2-h OGTT plasma glucose	-FPG ≥ 7 mol/L -2-h PG ≥ 11.1 mmol/L.	9	-Age, -waist circumference, -BMI, -hypertension* -balanitis or vulvitis** -family history of diabetes, -gestational diabetes, -Exercise and -osmotic symptoms***	Sensitivity=0.78, Specificity= 0.66, PPV=0. 9, NPV=0.98
14	Gray LJ, Barros H, Raposo L, Khunti K, Davies MJ, Santos AC	2013	Portugal	Multivariate LR model	Cluster sampling in healthcare centers	4276	FPG	FPG ≥5.6 mmol/L	4	- Age - BMI - Sex -HTN	Sensitivity=0.69 (0.63, 0.74), specificity=0.63 (0.60, 0.67), PPV=0.38 (0.34, 0.42), NPV=0.86 (0.83, 0.89)

15	Mugume IB, Wafula ST, Kadengye DT, Van Olmen J	2023	Kenya	Multivariate LR model	Survey April and June 2015	3374	FPG	FPG ≥7.0mmol/l	5	-age, -BMI, - waist circumference, - history of high blood glucose - hypertension	Sensitivity= 0.57, Specificity= 0.83 PPV=0.8, NPV=0.99
16	Yu LP, Dong F, Li YZ, et al.	2022	China	Multivariate LR model	Population-based health survey	4,027	-FPG -2-h PG	FPG 6.1–6.9 mmol/L -2-h PG 7.8–11.0 mmol/L	6	- Age - Education level - Family Hx of DM - WC - BMI -SBP	Not reported
17	Štiglic G, Kocbek P, Cilar L, et al.	2018	Slovenia	Multivariate LR model	Population-wide electronic medical record dataset	40,381	FPG	FPG 6.1–6.9 mmol/L	6	- Age - Sex - WC - Hx of HG (Hyperglycemia) - Family Hx of DM -HTN	Sensitivity=0.73 (0.68, 0.79), Specificity=0.81 (0.74, 0.86), PPV=0.60 (0.53, 0.67), NPV=0.89 (0.87, 0.91)
18	Tan C, Sasagawa Y, Kamo KI, et al.	2016	Japan	Multivariate LR model	Community based health screening study	2073	FPG HbA1c	(1) FPG level ≥126 mg/dl, (2) HbA1c ≥6.5 %	5	- Sex - WC - HTN - Hx of HG -Exercise	Sensitivity= 0.92, Specificity= 0.66 No PPV and NPV
19	Bahijri S, Al-Raddadi R, Ajabnoor G, et al.	2020	Saudi Arabia	Multivariate LR model	Cluster sampling in healthcare centers		HbA1c FPG 1-h PG	-HbA1c ≥5.7% -- FPG ≥6.1 mmol/L - 1-h PG ≥8.6 mmol/L	5	- Age - Sex - WC - Hx of HG -Family Hx of DM	Sensitivity= 0.69, Specificity= 0.69, PPV=0.40, NPV=0.88
20	Fujiati II, Damanik HA, Bachtiar A, Nurdin AA, Ward P.	2017	Indonesia	Multivariate LR model	Population-based health survey data	1,915	FPG -2-h PG	FPG 5.6–6.9 mmol/L -2-h PG 7.8–11.0 mmol/L	8	- Age - Sex - Education level - Family Hx of DM - Smoking - Exercise - BMI -HTN	Sensitivity= 0.55 (0.51, 0.59), Specificity=0.66 (0.65, 0.67), PPV=0.12 (0.11, 0.13), NPV=0.94 (0.94, 0.95)
21	Barengo NC, Tamayo DC, Tono T, Tuomilehto J.	2017	Colombia	Multivariate LR model	Age-stratified sampling among population-wide	1403	-FPG -2-h PG	FPG ≥5.6 mmol/L -2-h PG	4	- Age - WC - HTN -Family Hx of DM	Sensitivity= 0.57, Specificity=0.73, PPV=0.58, NPV=0.76

					insurance users			≥7.8 mmol/L			
22	Dong W, Tse TYE, Mak LI, et al.	2022	China	Multivariate LR model; ML model	Population-based health survey data	21,720	HbA1c FPG	HbA1c ≥5.7 % FPG ≥6.1 mmol /L	8	Age BMI WHR SBP WC Smoking Sleep duration, and Exercise	LR: Sensitivity= 0.89, Specificity=0.62 PPV=0.31, NPV= 0.97 ML: Sensitivity=0.79, Specificity=0.74 PPV=0.36, NPV=0.95

Where: BMI = Body Mass Index, BP = Blood Pressure, DLP = Dyslipidemia, DM = Diabetes Mellitus, FPG = Fasting Plasma Glucose, IFG=Impaired fasting plasma glucose, RPG = Random Plasma Glucose, HG = Hyperglycemia, PDM = Prediabetes Mellitus, GDM = Gestational Diabetes Mellitus, SBP = Systolic Blood Pressure, DBP = Diastolic blood pressure,

HTN = Hypertension, Hx = History, LR = Logistic Regression, ML = Machine Learning, WC = Waist Circumference,

WHR = Waist-Hip-Ratio, 1-h PG = 1-hour Post-prandial Plasma Glucose, 2-h PG = 2-hour Post-prandial Plasma Glucose.

FINDRISC-BI= Finish (Finland) diabetes risk score-Bahasa Indonesia. ColDRISC= Colombia Diabetic Risk Score

ROC= Receiver Operating Characteristic curve AUC= Area Under the Curve

***Hypertension was diagnosed when systolic blood pressure was ≥140 mmMg/ diastolic blood pressure ≥90 mmMg or if the subjects were on antihypertensive medications.**

****Balanitis was defined as persistent itching or soreness of the glans penis and vulvitis as persistent itching, soreness and discharge from the vulva.**

~Conversion formula for blood glucose test: mmol/l * 18.018= mg/dl or mg/dl * 0.0555= mmol/l

This review included studies conducted from 2013 to 2023, 36% studies being conducted in 2019 and 2022. Generally, 50% of the article published in the last 5 years. (see fig 2)



Figure 2: The number of the included studies in each year from 2013 to 2023.

The included articles are from 13 countries, and the majority were conducted in China (32%) [4,7,9,11,13,18,25] followed by three articles from Saudi Arabia (13.6%),[5,12,21] two articles from Indonesia, Algeria and Qatar (9%).[3,6,10,14,22] Single paper from the rest of 8 countries (each 5%). (See fig. 3)



Fig. 3: shows Countries where the included studies were conducted.

The authors of the articles got data from four sources. Eleven studies' data source is from community survey (50%),[4,5,6,8,9,12,16,17,20,21,23] Eight studies used data from databank (36.4%), [3,7,10,14,18,19,22,24] another two studies collected data by random sampling (9%)[11,15] and

the rest one study collected data by non-random sampling (Convenience sampling) (4.5%)[13]to develop their risk prediction tools. The median sample size was 1,403 and ranged from 308 to 40,381. (See table 1)

The key risk Predictors of pre-Diabetes utilization frequencies to develop the Tools across the included articles are summarized in Figure 4. A total of 24 key risk predictors were used to develop different types of tools. Among the key risk predictors repeatedly used by the Tool developer are listed, and the median is three, ranging from 1 to 20 (see Figure 4). Age was the most common predictor to predict pre-DM as it was included in 20 studies (90.9%). Other commonly included factors were Hypertension and waist circumference in 16 studies (72.7%), BMI in 15 studies (68.2%), family history of DM in 14 studies (63.6%), Gender (sex) in 8 studies (36.4%), Exercise in 6 studies (27%). The rest of the parameters were used in 1 to 5 studies. (see fig. 4)



Figure 4: The number of studies utilized each key risk predictor to develop the Tools

Among the key predictors, less commonly used include pulse,[4] sleep duration,[24]osmotic symptoms,[15] Balanitis or vulvitis,[15] and DBP.[6]

The methodology used to prepare the Tools was adequately reported in most of the studies. The researchers used Logistic regression (LR) Methods for Tool development in 20 studies (90%). Two studies used machine learning (ML) in addition to LR.[10,24] These two articles reported no significant difference in predictive performances in the tools developed by LR and ML methods.[10,24]

The performance of each tool evaluated by ROC curve and the value of the AUC ranges from 0.65-0.93 by. The lowest AUC by a tool [Age, Height, BMI, WC, Pulse, SBP, DLP, HTN, Family Hx of DM] developed by Fu Q, Sun M, Tang W, et al. and the highest is [Sex, WC, HTN, Hx of HG, Exercise] developed by Tan C, Sasagawa Y, Kamo KI, et al. (see table 2 and Figure 5 and 6)

Table 2: Table shows the result of AUROC / performance evaluation/ of the 22 Tools

	Author(s)	AUROC (95% CI)	Tool
1	Rokhman MR, Arifin B, Zulkarnain Z, et al	0.78	Age, Gender, Weight, Height, WC, Exercise(>30m/d, Vegetable and fruit eating, Hypertension, Hx of hyperglycemia, Hx of diabetes in 1st degree Cuisine, Hx of diabetes in 1st degree family
2	Fu Q, Sun M, Tang W, et al.	0.65	Age , Height, BMI, WC, Pulse, SBP, DLP, HTN, Family Hx of DM
3	Memish ZA,	0.82	Age ,Hx of GDM, HTN, WC
4	Rajput R, Garg K	0.79	Age, Family Hx of DM, Waist-to-height ratio, DBP
5	Wang H, Liu	0.83	Age, WC, BMI, Family Hx of DM, HTN
6	Henjum S	0.81	Age, BMI, WC
7	Zhang, Lin	0.803	age, family history of diabetes, hypertension, waist circumference, body mass index, smoking, daily consumption of vegetables, and fruits
8	Abbas M	0.83	Age, BMI, HTN, Sex, WC
9	Woo YC, Lee	0.725	age, waist circumference, gestational diabetes, height, race/ethnicity, hypertension, family history of Diabetes, exercise
10	Handlos LN,	0.73	Age, BMI, Sex, Family Hx of DM(Parental), Family Hx of DM (of siblings), Hx of GDM, Ethnicity

11	Wu J, Hou X,	0.686	Age, family history of diabetes, hypertension, BMI, and WC
12	Sadek K,	0.81	Age , Sex, WHR (Waist-Hip Ratio), BMI, HTN, DLP, Education level
13	Katulanda P,	0.82	Age, waist circumference, BMI, hypertension, balanitis or vulvitis, family history of diabetes, gestational diabetes, Exercise and smotic symptoms
14	Gray LJ,	0.72	Age, BMI, Sex, HTN
15	Mugume IB,	0.7486	age, BMI, waist circumference, history of high blood glucose, hypertension
16	Yu LP, Dong	0.79	Age, Education level, Family Hx of DM, WC, BMI, SBP
17	Štiglic G	0.87	Age, Sex, WC, Hx of HG (Hyperglycemia), Family Hx of DM, HTN
18	Tan C, Sasagawa Y, Kamo KI, et al.	0.93	Sex, ,WC, HTN, Hx of HG, Exercise
19	Bahijri S, Al	0.79	Age, Sex, WC, Hx of HG, Family Hx of DM
20	Fujiati II	0.67	Age, Sex, Education level, Family Hx of DM, Smoking, Exercise, BMI, HTN
21	Barengo NC, Tamayo DC, Tono T, Tuomilehto J.	0.74	Age, WC, HTN, Family Hx of DM
22	Dong W, Tse TYE, Mak LI, et al	0.85	Age, BMI, WHR, SBP, WC, Smoking, Sleep duration, and Exercise



Figure 5: shows the AUC of ROC value of the TOOL



Figure 6: shows the AUC of ROC value of the TOOL represented by Authors

The authors of the articles described the predictive power of the screening tool using Sensitivity, Specificity, PPV and NPV metrics. Sensitivity and specificity are concerned with the accuracy of the screening tool in reference to the 'gold standard' value. Sensitivities and specificities of the tools were performed either during development or at the time of validation. The value of Sensitivity and Specificity of the developed screening Tools are displayed in table 1 and Figures 7,8 and 9.

Fourteen studies (63.6%)[6,7,8,10,11,14,15,16,17,19,21,22,23,24] reported the performance of their prediction power using sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV. However, in five studies (22.7%), [3,5,9,12,20] PPV and NPV were not reported, and the remaining three studies (13.6%) did not report all.[4,13,18]

To evaluate the predictive power of the developed noninvasive screening tool, the biochemical parameters utilized as the 'Gold standard' varied a lot among the studies. For instance, eight studies (36.4%) used FBS and 2hr PG,[5,6,11,15,18,20,22,23] five studies (22.7%) used only

FBS,[3,7,16,17,19] two studies used FBS and HbA1c (9%),[9,24] three studies (13.6%) used only HbA1C,[8,10,12] one study (4.5%) used FBS, 1h PG and HbA1C,[21] one study (4.5%) used FBS, 2h PG and HbA1c,[13] one study (4.5%) used RBS and HbA1C,[14] and one study (4.5%) used 2h PG to define pre-DM and DM.[4] to calibrate the developed Tools. (See Table 1)

Though the evaluation method differs from study to study, generally, the author used the 'gold standard' references to ensure the Tool's accuracy. Among the included studies' predictive Tools, the highest sensitivity finding is 0.92 (92%) and the lowest is 0.57 (57%). Sex, WC, HTN, Hx of HG, and Exercise represent the highest sensitivity finding tool. This Tool was developed by Tan C, Sasagawa Y, Kamo KI, et al.[20] On the other hand, the lowest sensitivity result is recorded on the Tool's key risk predictive parameters, including ‘Age, WC, HTN, Family Hx of DM’ developed by Barengo NC, Tamayo DC, Tono T, Tuomilehto J.[23]

On the contrary, the studies' predictive Tools Specificity ranges from 0.83 (83%) to 0.41 (41%), highest and lowest, respectively. The highest specificity is recorded by 'age, BMI, waist circumference, history of high blood glucose, history of hypertension' tool developed by Mugume IB, Wafula ST, Kadengye DT, Van Olmen J.[17] The lowest Specificity test result recorded by the tool' age, waist circumference, gestational diabetes, height, race/ethnicity, hypertension, family history of Diabetes, exercise' developed by Woo YC, Lee CH, Fong CHY, Tso AWK, Cheung BMY, and Lam KSL.[11] (See table 1, and Figure 7,8 and 9)

Each tool was optimized with respect to the ROC choosing the optimal cut-point.



Figure 7: Sensitivity and Specificity of Predictive Tool represented by the Authors



Figure 8: Sensitivity and Specificity of Key Finding representing the Predictor Tool



Figure 9: SCATTER PLOT OF AUROC, SENSITIVITY, SPECIFICITY VALUE AND THEIR CORRELATION (OF THE TOOL)

The developed Tools' positive predictive value (PPV) and negative predictive value (NPV) indicate the Tool's effectiveness in categorizing people as having or not having a Diabetes metabolic abnormality.[25,26] The developed Tool has PPV ranging from 0.09 (9%) to 0.80 (80%). The highest PPV having Tool is 'age, BMI, waist circumference, history of high blood glucose, history of hypertension'

developed by Mugume IB, Wafula ST, Kadengye DT, Van Olmen J.[17] On the other hand, the lowest PPV tool is 'age, waist circumference, gestational diabetes, height, race/ethnicity, hypertension, family history of Diabetes, and exercise' developed by Woo YC, Lee CH, Fong CHY, Tso AWK, Cheung BMY, and Lam KSL.[11]

The NPV of the developed Tool ranges from 0.76 (76%) to 0.99 (99%). The highest NPV having Tool is 'age, BMI, waist circumference, history of high blood glucose, and history of hypertension' developed by Mugume IB, Wafula ST, Kadengye DT, Van Olmen J.[17] On the other hand, the lowest NPV is 0.76 (76%). The Tool is 'Age, WC, HTN, Family Hx of DM' developed by Barengo NC, Tamayo DC, Tono T, Tuomilehto J.[23] (See table 1, and figures 10 and 11)



Figure 10: The predictor Tool PPV and NPV in reference to the Authors



Figure 11: The PPV and NPV of Key predictive tool

Discussion

Diabetes noninvasive Screening tests have the potential to identify prediabetes at an early stage and, thus, a more treatable abnormality, as a result, saves lives.[27] This review identified 24 risk key prediction parameters to develop the tools that used only non-laboratory risk predictors to detect individuals with pre-DM from 22 published studies conducted from 2013 to 2023. The tools included similar risk predictors in 60% to 90%: age, hypertension, family history of DM, and obesity (represented by BMI and WC), regardless of the origin of the Article's geographic location. The Tools had promising discrimination ability in case finding of pre-DM as shown by its Sensitivity/Specificity and PPV/NPV.[27]

Sensitivity and specificity indicate the Tool's effectiveness to the ‘gold standard’ referent.[27,28] So, sensitivity and specificity indicate the concordance of a Tool test for a chosen ‘gold standard’ reference, in these studies, FBS, RBS, 1 h PG, 2h PG, HbA1C. It was noted that some reporting variation was found among the studies on cutting points for pre-DM diagnosis. This variation may originate from the Prediabetes and Diabetes definition source. It is wise to bear this fact in mind when interpreting the discrepancy of the result since this, in turn, affects the sensitivity/specificity of the developed Tool.

As shown in Figures 7,8,9,10 and 11, there are noticeable tradeoffs between sensitivity and specificity and between positive predictive values (PPVs) and negative predictive values (NPVs).[27] A highly value-sensitive test means that there are few false negative results, and thus, fewer disease cases are missed. The specificity of a test is its ability to detect an individual who does not have a disease as a negative result.[27,28] A high specificity test means that there are few false positive results. For example, the Tool developed by Tan and his colleague revealed a sensitivity/Specificity of 0.92 (92%)/0.66(66%).[20] (see Figures 7 and 8) The Tool, according to the article result, only 8% of cases are missed, and 44% are falsely included as a positive.

Meanwhile, PPV and NPV assess the people being screened.[27,28] The value of PPV/NPV indicates the likelihood that the Tool can successfully identify whether people have prediabetes or not. PPV answers: what is a person's likelihood of true positive if the screening tool yields a positive result? Or what is the probability that a person has Prediabetes? On the other hand, NPV gives us insight: if the screening tool yields a negative result, what is the probability that the person does not have Prediabetes?[27,28] For instance, the study conducted by Mugume IB and his colleague[17] (Figures 10 and 11) revealed that the Tool they developed has 0.80 (80%) PPV and 0.99 (99%) NPV. That means the likelihood or probability of the person screened by this Tool being positive for Prediabetes, being true Prediabetes is 80%, and falsely labeling the person as having Pre-DM is 20%. If the Tool shows a negative result (i.e., Free of Prediabetes), its probability of being truly free of Prediabetes is 99% and misses only 1%. So, the Tool developed by these researchers looks promising for our goal of screening Diabetes by noninvasive method to answer this review research question. To optimize the screening procedure capacity, it is essential to identify the target population likely to benefit most, considering the prevalence of pre-diabetes, such as age, gender, race, Obesity, known medical condition, or another risk factor (e.g., family history of diabetes).[27]

Hence, the knowledge gained by screening using a tool like this can increase health awareness and motivate the person to develop intervention strategies to prevent the occurrence of Diabetes, for instance, by modifying lifestyle. Modifying parameters indicated in this review, such as number of hours of sleep, Exercise (physical activity), and obesity [represented by BMI, WC, and waist-to-hip ratio (WHR) can contribute to the prevention strategies of Diabetes.[1,2]

Conclusions

This review revealed potential Tools to screen Diabetes noninvasively and non-laboratory methods, which can be applied individually or population-based screening purposes where the prevalence of the disorder is high regardless of involving health professionals. The findings promise to make screening tools easily accessible and applicable. In the review, the most common risk predictors were Age, WC, Hypertension, BMI, and Family history of Diabetes, which needs considerable attention in the planning process of prevention. (see figure 3) Early screening and intervention by developing healthy lifestyles can contribute to successfully preventing and controlling Diabetes.[1,2]

The strength of this review is that it included an up-to-date synthesis of the results from studies conducted in 13 countries and different continents (which addresses the cultural and race diversity) of the world, conducted in the last ten years. The review result explicitly showed the value of sensitivity, Specificity, PPV, and NPV of the developed Tool to compare and choose from to facilitate the case finding (pre-DM).[27,28] However, several limitations regarding these Scoping reviews must be acknowledged. The bias assessment of the included Article is not performed, which can be addressed in the future by a systematic review and meta-analysis when time constraint is not an issue.[27] In addition, the inclusion of only studies published in the English language could miss some pertinent tools from studies written in another language.

A systematic meta-analysis and RCT on the Tool described in this scoping review is recommend to identify any bias during the development of the Tool and possible generalizability of the best Tool for worldwide applicability.

Funding: None

Reference

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC National Diabetes Statistics Report 2020: Estimates of Diabetes and its Burden in the United States.
   https://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/data/statistics-report/index.html. Accessed 5/01/2023
2. World health Organization. World health statistics 2016: monitoring health for the SDGs sustainable development goals. World Health Organization; 2016 Jun 8.
   https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/diabetes2World Health Organization.Accessed 11/12/2023.
3. Rokhman MR, Arifin B, Zulkarnain Z, et al. Translation and performance of the Finnish Diabetes Risk Score for detecting undiagnosed diabetes and dysglycaemia in the Indonesian population. PLoS One. 2022;17(7):e0269853. Published 2022 Jul 21. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0269853
4. Fu Q, Sun M, Tang W, et al. A Chinese risk score model for identifying postprandial hyperglycemia without oral glucose tolerance test. Diabetes Metab Res Rev. 2014;30(4):284-290. doi:10.1002/dmrr.2490
5. Memish ZA, Chang JL, Saeedi MY, Al Hamid MA, Abid O, Ali MK. Screening for Type 2 Diabetes and Dysglycemia in Saudi Arabia: Development and Validation of Risk Scores. Diabetes Technol Ther. 2015;17(10):693-700. doi:10.1089/dia.2014.0267
6. Rajput R, Garg K, Rajput M. Prediabetes Risk Evaluation Scoring System [PRESS]: A simplified scoring system for detecting undiagnosed Prediabetes. Prim Care Diabetes. 2019;13(1):11-15. doi:10.1016/j.pcd.2018.11.011
7. Wang H, Liu T, Qiu Q, Ding P, He YH, Chen WQ. A simple risk score for identifying individuals with impaired fasting glucose in the Southern Chinese population. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2015;12(2):1237-1252. Published 2015 Jan 23. doi:10.3390/ijerph120201237
8. Henjum S, Hjellset VT, Andersen E, Flaaten MØ, Morseth MS. Developing a risk score for undiagnosed prediabetes or type 2 diabetes among Saharawi refugees in Algeria. BMC Public Health. 2022;22(1):720. Published 2022 Apr 11. doi:10.1186/s12889-022-13007-0

9. Zhang, Lin, L., Xu, X., Wu, X., Jin, Q., & Liu, H. (2019). Noninvasive screening tool to detect undiagnosed diabetes among young and middle-aged people in Chinese community. International Journal of Diabetes in Developing Countries, 39(3), 458–462. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13410-018-0698-y (from Web of Science database and CUNY OneSearch)
10. Abbas M, Mall R, Errafii K, et al. Simple risk score to screen for prediabetes: A cross-sectional study from the Qatar Biobank cohort. J Diabetes Investig. 2021;12(6):988-997. doi:10.1111/jdi.13445
11. Woo YC, Lee CH, Fong CHY, Tso AWK, Cheung BMY, Lam KSL. Validation of the diabetes screening tools proposed by the American Diabetes Association in an aging Chinese population. PLoS ONE. 2017;12(9):e0184840.
12. Handlos LN, Witte DR, Almdal TP, et al. Risk scores for diabetes and impaired glycaemia in the Middle East and North Africa. Diabet Med. 2013;30(4):443-451. doi:10.1111/dme.12118
13. Wu J, Hou X, Chen L, Chen P, Wei L, Jiang F, Bao Y, Jia W. Development and validation of a non-invasive assessment tool for screening prevalent undiagnosed diabetes in middle-aged and elderly Chinese. Prev Med. 2019 Feb;119:145-152. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2018.12.025. Epub 2018 Dec 28. PMID: 30594538
14. Sadek K, Abdelhafez I, Al-Hashimi I, et al. Screening for diabetes and impaired glucose metabolism in Qatar: Models' development and validation. Prim Care Diabetes. 2022;16(1):69-77. doi:10.1016/j.pcd.2021.10.002
15. Katulanda P, Hill NR, Stratton I, Sheriff R, De Silva SD, Matthews DR. Development and validation of a Diabetes Risk Score for screening undiagnosed diabetes in Sri Lanka (SLDRISK). BMC Endocr Disord. 2016 Jul 25;16(1):42. doi: 10.1186/s12902-016-0124-8. PMID: 27456082; PMCID: PMC4960842
16. Gray LJ, Barros H, Raposo L, Khunti K, Davies MJ, Santos AC. The development and validation of the Portuguese risk score for detecting type 2 diabetes and impaired fasting glucose. Prim Care Diabetes. 2013;7(1):11-18. doi:10.1016/j.pcd.2013.01.003
17. Mugume IB, Wafula ST, Kadengye DT, Van Olmen J. Performance of a Finnish Diabetes Risk Score in detecting undiagnosed diabetes among Kenyans aged 18-69 years. PLoS One. 2023 Apr 26;18(4):e0276858. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0276858. PMID: 37186010; PMCID: PMC10132597
18. Yu LP, Dong F, Li YZ, et al. Development and validation of a risk assessment model for prediabetes in China national diabetes survey. World J Clin Cases. 2022;10(32):11789-11803. doi:10.12998/wjcc.v10.i32.11789
19. Štiglic G, Kocbek P, Cilar L, et al. Development of a screening tool using electronic health records for undiagnosed Type 2 diabetes mellitus and impaired fasting glucose detection in the Slovenian population. Diabet Med. 2018;35(5):640-649. doi:10.1111/dme.13605
20. Tan C, Sasagawa Y, Kamo KI, et al. Evaluation of the Japanese Metabolic Syndrome Risk Score (JAMRISC): a newly developed questionnaire used as a screening tool for diagnosing metabolic syndrome and insulin resistance in Japan. Environ Health Prev Med. 2016;21(6):470-479. doi:10.1007/s12199-016-0568-5

21. Bahijri S, Al-Raddadi R, Ajabnoor G, et al. Dysglycemia risk score in Saudi Arabia: A tool to identify people at high future risk of developing type 2 diabetes. J Diabetes Investig. 2020;11(4):844-855. doi:10.1111/jdi.13213
22. Fujiati II, Damanik HA, Bachtiar A, Nurdin AA, Ward P. Development and validation of prediabetes risk score for predicting prediabetes among Indonesian adults in primary care: Cross-sectional diagnostic study. Interv Med Appl Sci. 2017;9(2):76-85. doi:10.1556/1646.9.2017.2.18
23. Barengo NC, Tamayo DC, Tono T, Tuomilehto J. A Colombian diabetes risk score for detecting undiagnosed diabetes and impaired glucose regulation. Prim Care Diabetes. 2017;11(1):86-93. doi:10.1016/j.pcd.2016.09.004
24. Dong W, Tse TYE, Mak LI, et al. Non-laboratory-based risk assessment model for case detection of diabetes mellitus and pre-diabetes in primary care. J Diabetes Investig. 2022;13(8):1374-1386. doi:10.1111/jdi.13790
25. Mavrogianni, C, Lambrinou, C-P, Androutsos, O, Lindström, J, Kivelä, J, Cardon, G, et al.. Evaluation of the Finnish Diabetes Risk Score as a screening tool for undiagnosed type 2 diabetes and dysglycaemia among early middle-aged adults in a large-scale European cohort. The Feel4Diabetes-study. Diabetes Res Clin Pract 2019;150:99–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2019.02.017.
26. Kengne AP, Beulens JW, Peelen LM, et al. Non-invasive risk scores for prediction of type 2 diabetes (EPIC-InterAct): a validation of existing models [published correction appears in Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 2014 Apr;2(4):e11] Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 2014;2(1):19-29. doi:10.1016/S2213-8587(13)70103-7
27. Maxim LD, Niebo R, Utell MJ. Screening tests: a review with examples [published correction appears in Inhal Toxicol. 2019 Jun;31(7):298]. Inhal Toxicol. 2014;26(13):811-828. doi:10.3109/08958378.2014.955932 (Accessed 11/15/2023)
28. Sensitivity, Specificity, and Predictive Values: Foundations, Pliabilities, and Pitfalls in Research and Practice perspective article Front. Public Health, 20 November 2017 Sec. Epidemiology Volume 5 - 2017 | https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2017.00307 https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2017.00307/full (Accessed 11/15/2023)