Case Study: Medical Diagnosis Terms for Diabetes

Makhbubakhon Shokirova

Department of Languages, Central Asian Medical University, Fergana, Uzbekistan.

ABSTRACT

Teaching diagnostic terms for diabetes is crucial to prepare medical students for the complexity of diagnosis and management. This paper introduces innovative teaching methods, such as the clinical laboratory diagnostic pathway, that enhance understanding through practical, real-world applications. It addresses the limitations of traditional classifications and emphasizes the need for flexible, spectrum-based approaches that are compatible with advances in precision medicine. It also highlights the importance of patient-centered education to ensure that students can communicate effectively and tailor treatment to individual needs. By applying these strategies, medical educators can improve diagnostic accuracy and achieve better patient outcomes.

Keywords: Diabetes diagnosis; medical education; teaching methods; diagnostic thresholds; patient-centered education.

INTRODUCTION

Diabetes mellitus is one of the most prevalent chronic diseases worldwide and poses major challenges to healthcare systems and professionals. Accurate diagnosis and effective management are essential to control the long-term complications of the disease and improve patient outcomes [1]. In medical education, teaching the diagnostic terms for diabetes is an important part of preparing future healthcare professionals for these challenges. However, this process is far from simple. The diagnostic framework for diabetes relies on specific numerical thresholds, such as fasting plasma glucose (FPG), oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT) and haemoglobin A1c (A1c) levels. While these thresholds provide clear guidelines, they are also complex, especially when it comes to interpreting results in the context of individual variability and the spectrum of disease [2].

Traditional methods of communicating diagnostic terms for diabetes often focus on rigid definitions and static classifications. These methods can fall short of equipping students with the skills they need to deal with the nuanced realities of clinical practice. Advances in precision medicine and the recognition that diabetes is a heterogeneous disease require more dynamic and patient-centred approaches [3]. In addition, overdiagnosis and misinterpretation of diagnostic thresholds are pressing issues that emphasize the importance of critical thinking and communication skills in medical education.

This paper explores how diagnostic terms for diabetes can be studied and taught more effectively in medical education. It explores innovative teaching methods, addresses the limitations of traditional classifications, and highlights the role of patient-centred education in improving diagnostic accuracy. By integrating these approaches, medical educators can better prepare students to manage diabetes with confidence and competence in their future clinical practice.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teaching diagnostic terminology for diabetes is an important aspect of medical education. It provides future healthcare professionals with the knowledge and skills needed to diagnose and manage this complex disease

accurately [13]. The existing literature points to different teaching approaches, challenges and the need for innovation in the research and teaching of diagnostic terms [14].

Innovative teaching methods have shown promise in improving the understanding of diabetes diagnosis. One such approach is the clinical laboratory diagnostic pathway [15], which covers the entire process of diabetes diagnosis, including differential diagnosis, treatment selection, monitoring of treatment outcomes, and assessment of prognosis [16]. This method emphasizes hands-on learning where students develop their diagnostic skills using real-life scenarios. Studies have shown that this approach increases the efficiency of teaching and helps students to better understand the diagnostic criteria [17], which is reflected in improved assessment results and feedback [18].

However, traditional teaching methods face significant challenges. Previous classifications of diabetes, such as juvenile diabetes versus adult-onset diabetes or insulin-dependent diabetes versus non-insulin-dependent diabetes, no longer reflect clinical realities. Advances in precision medicine and the complexity of diabetes manifestations, such as severe ketoacidosis in type 2 diabetes or the co-occurrence of different forms of diabetes in the same patient, require more flexible and updated diagnostic frameworks [19]. These challenges highlight the need for medical education to move beyond rigid classifications and incorporate a more nuanced understanding of diabetes as a spectrum.

Another important aspect of teaching diagnostic terms is patient education. Effective diabetes management requires more than just a basic understanding of the disease [20]. Medical students need to learn how to educate their patients about their disease by promoting a clear understanding of diabetes and encouraging them to adhere to self-care measures. This approach not only ensures better outcomes for patients, but also emphasizes the importance of communication skills in medical practice.

The current nomenclature and classification of diabetes also present a challenge. The diagnostic terms often describe the severity of the disease and not its underlying causes or pathophysiological aspects [21]. For example, the terms agreed by the National Diabetes Data Group and the World Health Organization focus on broad categories rather than individual patient variability. A shift to classifications based on the etiology and pathophysiology of diabetes could improve students' ability to understand and manage the disease and enable them to provide more individualized care [2].

In summary, teaching diagnostic terms for diabetes requires a blend of innovative methods, flexibility, and a focus on patient-centered education. Approaches such as the clinical laboratory diagnostic pathway offer practical benefits, while addressing the limitations of traditional classifications ensures that medical education keeps pace with advances in precision medicine. Together, these strategies can prepare medical students to manage the complexity of diabetes diagnosis and treatment in their future practice.

TEACHING DIAGNOSTIC TERMS FOR DIABETES IN MEDICAL EDUCATION

Diabetes is a good example of a disease that is defined by certain thresholds. These thresholds include fasting plasma glucose (FPG), oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT) and hemoglobin A1c level (A1c). They are important for the diagnosis and assessment of diabetes risk. Teaching these concepts involves more than just memorizing numbers [3]. Educators also need to explain how to use these limits in real-life situations and discuss their limitations.

The most important diagnostic tests for diabetes are easy to explain. FPG measures blood glucose after fasting, with a reading of 126 mg/dL or higher indicating diabetes. OGTT measures blood glucose two hours after drinking a glucose solution. Values of 200 mg/dL or higher confirm diabetes [4]. A1c indicates the average blood glucose level over two to three months, and readings of 6.5% or higher indicate diabetes. Students also need to learn that these thresholds are not absolute [5]. They need to consider other factors, such as symptoms of hyperglycemia when making a diagnosis.

Teaching about the classification of diabetes helps students relate the diagnostic terms to the disease mechanisms. Type 1 diabetes is caused by the immune system destroying insulin-producing cells [22]. Type 2 diabetes occurs when the body becomes resistant to insulin or when insulin production decreases [23]. Gestational diabetes occurs during pregnancy and usually disappears after delivery, but increases the risk of diabetes later in life. Prediabetes, with FPG levels between 100 and 125 mg/dL or A1c levels of 5.7% to 6.4%, indicates a higher risk of diabetes and the need for early intervention [6].

Communicating diagnostic terms presents challenges. For example, A1c tests may not be reliable in patients with anaemia or other blood disorders. Educators should explain when alternative tests, such as the OGTT, are better. Students also need to understand the gradual transition from normal blood glucose levels to diabetes. Case studies can show how the limits apply in the real world [7]. Critical thinking is important to avoid overdiagnosis or misdiagnosis. Students should practice using diagnostic terms along with medical history and clinical findings.

Teaching diagnostic terms for diabetes requires a balance between technical accuracy and practical understanding. By explaining thresholds, linking them to disease mechanisms, and encouraging critical thinking, teachers can prepare students to use diagnostic criteria effectively. This approach helps students better understand the complexities of diagnosing and treating diabetes.

How can diagnostic terms for diabetes be learned and taught?

Teaching diagnostic terms for diabetes can be difficult because the thresholds used to define the disease are based on a continuous spectrum of biological conditions [24]. This spectrum includes normal blood glucose levels, prediabetes and diabetes, with no clear dividing lines. Educators must convert these complex conditions into fixed numerical values for students to understand, but these values do not always reflect individual differences or overlapping conditions.

The transition from normal blood glucose levels to diabetes is not sudden. For example, a fasting plasma glucose (FPG) level between 100 and 125 mg/dL is considered prediabetes, while a level of 126 mg/dL or higher signifies a diagnosis of diabetes [25]. These thresholds are useful for recognizing risk and guiding treatment, but they cannot fully capture individual metabolic health [6]. Factors such as age, ethnicity and other health conditions can affect what is considered normal or abnormal for each person.

The variability of blood glucose levels and testing methods also makes communicating these thresholds difficult. Blood glucose levels can fluctuate due to stress, illness or lifestyle, making test results inconsistent [7]. Different laboratory standards or fasting times further complicate the interpretation of results. Students need to understand that cut-off values are guidelines, not hard and fast rules, and they need to learn to consider the full clinical context.

Teaching the spectrum of diabetes requires a balance between simplicity and clinical depth. Simplistic explanations of thresholds can lead to rigid thinking, while presenting all the complexities at once can overwhelm learners. Educators should use case studies to show how blood glucose levels evolve over time and how patient-specific factors influence diagnosis and treatment decisions. This helps students connect theoretical knowledge to real-life scenarios.

Students should also learn to weigh the benefits and risks of diagnosis [8]. For example, patients who are just above the threshold for diabetes may experience unnecessary anxiety or treatment, while those who are just below may ignore early warning signs. Educators need to emphasize the importance of tailoring treatment to each patient rather than relying solely on numerical thresholds.

In summary, teaching diagnostic terms for diabetes involves more than explaining numbers. It requires combining theoretical knowledge with clinical judgment and effective communication [3]. By focusing on both the disease spectrum and the context in which the cutoffs are applied, instructors can help students develop the skills needed to effectively diagnose and manage diabetes [8].

TEACHING DIAGNOSTIC TERMS FOR DIABETES TO AVOID OVERDIAGNOSIS

Overdiagnosis occurs when a person is diagnosed with a disease that would not have caused any harm if left untreated. In diabetes, this can be the case when diagnostic thresholds, such as blood glucose levels, are misinterpreted or applied too rigidly. It is important to teach students how to avoid overdiagnosis to ensure they understand when a diagnosis is truly useful and when it could lead to unnecessary treatment or worry [1, 8].

Thresholds for diagnosing diabetes, such as an A1c of 6.5%, are helpful tools, but they are not perfect. For example, a person with an A1c of 6.4% is very similar to a person with 6.5%, but only the latter is classified as diabetic. This small difference does not always mean that the person will have health problems. Educators need to explain that the thresholds are guidelines, not strict rules, and that they should be interpreted in the context of other factors such as symptoms and general health [9].

Advances in medicine also make it easier to detect minor changes in blood glucose levels, which can sometimes lead to overdiagnosis. While early detection is good, it can also identify diseases that are unlikely to progress or cause harm [10]. In addition, large-scale screening programs where many people are tested for diabetes can lead to people with borderline or transient blood sugar changes being classified as diabetic, even when this is not necessary [11].

Overdiagnosis affects both patients and the healthcare system. When patients learn they have diabetes, it can cause stress and anxiety, even if their condition is low risk. It can also lead to treatments such as medication or strict lifestyle changes that may not be necessary. For the healthcare system, overdiagnosis can lead to a waste of resources and an increase in costs as it focuses on people at low risk, leaving fewer resources for those who need immediate treatment.

To avoid overdiagnosis, medical students should learn to think critically about diagnostic terms. They must learn to evaluate each patient's situation and consider factors such as age, other health problems and the reliability of tests. For example, a patient with a slightly elevated A1c level but no symptoms may not need the same treatment as someone with the same A1c level and clear signs of diabetes. Students should also learn to use tools to help identify who needs treatment and who might benefit from simple monitoring or lifestyle changes [12].

Communication is another important skill to avoid overdiagnosis. Students should practice explaining borderline results to patients in a way that does not confuse them. For example, they can reassure patients that a borderline result does not mean they are seriously ill, but that careful observation is required [3, 8].

When communicating diagnostic terms for diabetes, a balance should be struck between the need for early detection and the risk of overdiagnosis. By focusing on the individual case, understanding thresholds and improving communication, educators can prepare students to apply diagnostic criteria judiciously [10]. This approach ensures that patients receive the right treatment, without unnecessary labels or treatments [12].

CONCLUSION

Teaching diagnostic terms for diabetes is a cornerstone in preparing future healthcare professionals to effectively manage this prevalent and multifaceted disease. The literature emphasizes the value of innovative teaching methods, such as clinical laboratory diagnostic pathways, that bridge the gap between theoretical knowledge and practical real-world applications. These approaches significantly improve students' understanding of diagnostic criteria and the accuracy of clinical decision making.

However, traditional teaching models and outdated classifications pose a major challenge. Earlier models, such as the strict distinction between juvenile and adult diabetes, do not do justice to the complexity of modern clinical presentations. Advances in precision medicine and the increasing recognition of overlapping diabetes

phenotypes require more adaptive and sophisticated educational strategies. Educators need to emphasize the continuum of diabetes and ensure that educational materials reflect these evolving clinical realities.

In addition, the integration of patient-centered approaches into diabetes education is paramount. When trainees learn to effectively communicate diagnostic terms and educate patients about their disease, it promotes self-management, adherence to treatment plans, and overall health outcomes. Moving to classifications based on the etiology and pathophysiology of diabetes provides an additional opportunity to improve both teaching methods and patient care.

In summary, teaching diagnostic terms for diabetes requires a balanced approach that combines innovative pedagogical methods, updated classification systems, and patient-centered strategies. Incorporating student feedback or the patient perspective on the effectiveness of these teaching methods would further enhance their credibility and depth. With this comprehensive approach, medical educators can ensure that future healthcare professionals are able to navigate the complexities of diabetes diagnosis and provide quality and compassionate care.

REFERENCES

1. Arokiasamy, P., Salvi, S., & Selvamani, Y. (2021). Global burden of diabetes mellitus. In *Handbook of global health* (pp. 1-44). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
2. American Diabetes Association. (2021). 2. Classification and diagnosis of diabetes: standards of medical care in diabetes—2021. *Diabetes care*, *44*(Supplement_1), S15-S33.
3. Gerush, K. I., Pashkovska, N. V., & Ukrainets, O. Z. (2024). Errors in the diagnosis of types of diabetes mellitus: causes and prevention strategies (literature review and own research results). *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENDOCRINOLOGY (Ukraine)*, *20*(4), 307-315.
4. Silvanus, V., Kafle, P. P., Pokhrel, A., Baral, B. K., & Pokhrel, B. R. (2019). Evaluation of fasting capillary glucose and fasting plasma glucose as screening tests for diabetes and prediabetes among adults in a semi-urban area in the Kathmandu District, Nepal. *Nepal Medical College Journal*, *21*(4), 265-275.
5. Addepally, N. S., George, N., Martinez-Macias, R., Garcia-Saenz-de-Sicilia, M., Kim, W. R., & Duarte-Rojo, A. (2018). Hemoglobin A1c has suboptimal performance to diagnose and monitor diabetes mellitus in patients with cirrhosis. *Digestive diseases and sciences*, *63*, 3498-3508.
6. Zaccardi, F., Webb, D. R., Yates, T., & Davies, M. J. (2016). Pathophysiology of type 1 and type 2 diabetes mellitus: a 90-year perspective. *Postgraduate medical journal*, *92*(1084), 63-69.
7. Shepard, J. G., Airee, A., Dake, A. W., McFarland, M. S., & Vora, A. (2015). Limitations of A1c interpretation. *South Med J*, *108*(12), 724-729.
8. Ball, J. R., Miller, B. T., & Balogh, E. P. (Eds.). (2015). Improving diagnosis in health care.
9. Aponte, J. (2013). Prevalence of normoglycemic, prediabetic and diabetic A1c levels. *World journal of diabetes*, *4*(6), 349.
10. World Health Organization. (2020). Screening programmes: a short guide. Increase effectiveness, maximize benefits and minimize harm.
11. Jalkanen, K., Järvenpää, R., Tilles-Tirkkonen, T., Martikainen, J., Aarnio, E., Männikkö, R., ... & StopDia Study Group. (2021). comparison of communication channels for large-scale type 2 diabetes risk screening and intervention recruitment: empirical study. *JMIR diabetes*, *6*(3), e21356.
12. Qaseem, A., Wilt, T. J., Kansagara, D., Horwitch, C., Barry, M. J., Forciea, M. A., & Clinical Guidelines Committee of the American College of Physicians*. (2018). Hemoglobin A1c targets for glycemic control with pharmacologic therapy for nonpregnant adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a guidance statement update from the American College of Physicians. *Annals of internal medicine*, *168*(8), 569-576.
13. Chabner, D. E. (2022). *Medical Terminology: A Short Course-E-Book: Medical Terminology: A Short Course-E-Book*. Elsevier Health Sciences.

14. Yuldashevich, T. A. (2024). Innovative approaches to training future teachers for diagnostic practices in education. *Научный Импульс*, *2*(24), 23-28.

15. Chamberlain, J. J., Rhinehart, A. S., Shaefer Jr, C. F., & Neuman, A. (2016). Diagnosis and management of diabetes: synopsis of the 2016 American Diabetes Association Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes. *Annals of internal medicine*, *164*(8), 542-552.

16. Florkowski, C., Don-Wauchope, A., Gimenez, N., Rodriguez-Capote, K., Wils, J., & Zemlin, A. (2017). Point-of-care testing (POCT) and evidence-based laboratory medicine (EBLM)–does it leverage any advantage in clinical decision making?. *Critical reviews in clinical laboratory sciences*, *54*(7-8), 471-494.

17. Schneeweiss, S., & Patorno, E. (2021). Conducting real-world evidence studies on the clinical outcomes of diabetes treatments. *Endocrine Reviews*, *42*(5), 658-690.

18. Tong, Y., Chen, H., Wang, Y., Wu, Z., Gu, J., Wu, Q., ... & Zheng, H. (2023). An Innovative Teaching Approach for Diabetes Mellitus in Laboratory Medicine Uses the Clinical Laboratory Diagnostic Pathway. *Journal of Medical Education and Curricular Development*, *10*, 23821205231219396.

19. Sivakumar, P. M., Prasad, R., & Prabhakar, P. K. (2023). Advanced approaches in the diagnosis and treatment of diabetes mellitus and secondary complications. *Frontiers in Endocrinology*, *14*, 1291637.

20. Wittink, H., & Oosterhaven, J. (2018). Patient education and health literacy. *Musculoskeletal Science and Practice*, *38*, 120-127.

21. World Health Organization. (2019). Classification of diabetes mellitus. https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/325182/9789241515702-eng.pdf

22. Eizirik, D. L., Szymczak, F., & Mallone, R. (2023). Why does the immune system destroy pancreatic β-cells but not α-cells in type 1 diabetes?. *Nature Reviews Endocrinology*, *19*(7), 425-434.

23. Czech, M. P. (2017). Insulin action and resistance in obesity and type 2 diabetes. *Nature medicine*, *23*(7), 804-814.

24. Ledford, C. J., Seehusen, D. A., Cafferty, L. A., Rider, H. A., Rogers, T., Fulleborn, S., ... & Crawford, P. F. (2020). Diabetes ROADMAP: teaching guideline use, communication, and documentation when delivering the diagnosis of diabetes. *MedEdPORTAL*, *16*, 10959.

25. Bansal, N. (2015). Prediabetes diagnosis and treatment: a review. *World journal of diabetes*, *6*(2), 296.