International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

Operating Publisher
SciFormat Publishing Inc.
ISNI: 0000 0005 1449 8214

2734 17 Avenue SW,
Calgary, Alberta, T3E0A7,
Canada
+15878858911
editorial-office@sciformat.ca

ARTICLE TITLE	INTERVENTIONS TARGETING IMPAIRED FASTING GLUCOSE: A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF STRATEGIES TO PREVENT TYPE 2 DIABETES
DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.1(49).2026.4584
RECEIVED	08 December 2025
ACCEPTED	23 January 2026
PUBLISHED	27 January 2026
LICENSE	The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.**

INTERVENTIONS TARGETING IMPAIRED FASTING GLUCOSE: A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF STRATEGIES TO PREVENT TYPE 2 DIABETES

Marzena Swojnóg *(Corresponding Author, Email: marzena.swojnog@stud.umed.lodz.pl)*
Private practice, Łódź, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0002-4363-7389

Zuzanna Dobrakowska
Private practice, Wrocław, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0009-2413-6627

Radosław Swędrak
Private practice, Zgierz, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0007-0991-1088

Jakub Klepacz
Private practice, Łódź, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0009-2448-6790

ABSTRACT

Objective: Impaired Fasting Glucose (IFG), a state of prediabetes characterized by elevated fasting glucose levels, signifies a significantly increased risk of developing Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (T2D) and associated cardiovascular complications. This comprehensive review systematically analyzes evidence from original research, including Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs), prospective and retrospective cohort studies, and single- and multi-center implementation experiences, to evaluate the effectiveness and translation challenges of interventions targeting IFG progression.
Methods: A targeted literature search was conducted across major medical databases, focusing on human intervention studies published between 2000 and 2025. Included articles were categorized based on intervention type (Intensive Lifestyle Intervention [ILI] or pharmacological) and study design, with an emphasis on T2D incidence rate reduction as the primary outcome.
Key Findings: The analysis confirms that ILI, focused on diet, physical activity, and achieving moderate weight loss (5–7%), remains the most efficacious long-term strategy, demonstrating superior and sustained T2D risk reduction (e.g., 58% in the Diabetes Prevention Program) (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002); (Tuomilehto et al., 2001). Metformin therapy serves as a critical, cost-effective pharmacological alternative, particularly for high-risk subgroups (e.g., younger individuals, high BMI). Translational studies, including retrospective and multi-center experiences, highlight significant barriers to real-world implementation, such as low sustained adherence and scalability challenges within diverse populations.
Conclusion: Effective T2D prevention in individuals with IFG necessitates early, risk-stratified intervention. While ILI is the gold standard, future strategies must focus on developing tailored, technologically-supported, and scalable programs to overcome implementation barriers and maximize population-level health impact.

KEYWORDS

Impaired Fasting Glucose (IFG), Type 2 Diabetes (T2D) Prevention, Intensive Lifestyle Intervention, Metformin, Prediabetes, Translational Research

CITATION

Marzena Swojnóg, Zuzanna Dobrakowska, Radosław Swędrak, Jakub Klepacz. (2026) Interventions Targeting Impaired Fasting Glucose: A Comprehensive Review of Strategies to Prevent Type 2 Diabetes. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 1(49). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.1(49).2026.4584

Introduction

The Global Burden of Prediabetes

Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus represents one of the most significant and rapidly escalating public health crises of the 21st century. The International Diabetes Federation (IDF) estimates that hundreds of millions of adults worldwide currently live with T2D, a number projected to increase dramatically due to aging populations, urbanization, and lifestyle changes. The colossal economic burden associated with managing chronic T2D complications—including cardiovascular disease, nephropathy, retinopathy, and neuropathy—places immense strain on healthcare systems globally.

Critically, the development of T2D is preceded by an often-asymptomatic state known as prediabetes, which encompasses Impaired Fasting Glucose and/or Impaired Glucose Tolerance (IGT), and sometimes elevated HbA1c levels, depending on diagnostic criteria. Prediabetes is not merely a benign intermediate state but a condition that already carries an elevated risk of micro- and macrovascular complications.

IFG is specifically defined by fasting plasma glucose levels that are above normal but below the diagnostic threshold for overt diabetes (typically 100–125 mg/dL or 5.6–6.9 mmol/L, depending on the defining body) (American Diabetes Association, 2024). The insidious nature of IFG warrants particular attention: while individuals may experience no obvious symptoms, they are metabolically active and progress to T2D at an alarming rate, estimated to be between 5% and 10% per year. Targeting IFG early is, therefore, a crucial, cost-effective strategy to disrupt this progression and mitigate the long-term, devastating consequences of the full disease. Understanding the spectrum of dysglycemia—from normoglycemia through IFG and IGT to T2D—is essential to justifying proactive intervention.

Rationale for Intervention

The strong clinical evidence demonstrating that T2D is preventable or its onset significantly delayed provides the fundamental rationale for intervening at the IFG stage. Pathophysiologically, IFG is associated with increased hepatic glucose output and progressive pancreatic beta-cell dysfunction, even before T2D onset. Furthermore, individuals with IFG are already at an elevated risk of developing macrovascular disease, meaning intervention offers dual benefits: T2D prevention and reduction of cardiovascular risk.

The seminal landmark trials, such as the Diabetes Prevention Program (DPP) (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002) and the Finnish Diabetes Prevention Study (DPS) (Tuomilehto et al., 2001), established the proof-of-concept that both intensive lifestyle modification and certain pharmacological agents can effectively interrupt the disease trajectory. However, these landmark studies primarily focused on individuals with IGT, and while many participants also had IFG, a specific focus on interventions purely tailored for IFG cohorts, and their real-world outcomes, is warranted.

This review's specific focus on original research categories—Randomized Controlled Trials providing robust efficacy data, prospective and retrospective studies offering insights into risk factors and progression (Lim et al., 2021); (Shelton et al., 2013), and single-center/multi-center experiences highlighting clinical feasibility (Poggio et al., 2020) (Blickensderfer et al., 2019) - is crucial. RCTs demonstrate *what works* under ideal conditions, while translational studies reveal *how it works* (or fails to work) in heterogeneous, real-world healthcare settings. By synthesizing data across these study designs, this comprehensive review aims to move beyond simply confirming efficacy to critically assessing implementation and providing a nuanced perspective on which strategies are most sustainable and scalable for the global population affected by IFG.

Objectives of the Review

Given the urgent need for effective, scalable, and tailored prevention strategies, the primary objective of this comprehensive review is to critically evaluate and synthesize the evidence surrounding interventions specifically targeting individuals with Impaired Fasting Glucose for the prevention of Type 2 Diabetes.

This review addresses three distinct, yet interconnected, areas of investigation:

1. Efficacy of Intensive Lifestyle Interventions: The first objective is to systematically evaluate data, primarily from seminal Randomized Controlled Trials (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002); (Tuomilehto et al., 2001) and long-term follow-up studies (Knowler et al., 2009), that quantify the degree of T2D incidence reduction achieved through ILI. This involves analyzing the specific components of successful ILI protocols, including dietary prescriptions, physical activity goals, and mandated weight loss targets, to understand the mechanism behind their proven durable effect. Special attention will be paid to data isolating the response of IFG sub-cohorts where available.

2. Effectiveness and Safety of Pharmacological Agents: The second objective is to analyze the role, efficacy, and long-term safety profile of pharmacological interventions. A dedicated focus will be placed on Metformin, given its extensive use and recommendation in clinical guidelines (Zheng et al., 2017); (American Diabetes Association, 2024). Furthermore, we will review evidence regarding other agents, such as alpha-glucosidase inhibitors (e.g., Acarbose) (Gerstein et al., 2007) and, where applicable to prediabetes cohorts, newer drug classes like GLP-1 Receptor Agonists and SGLT2 Inhibitors, to determine their potential clinical niche in IFG management.

3. Translation, Implementation, and Scalability: The third and crucial objective is to synthesize evidence from translational studies—specifically multi-center experiences (Blickensderfer et al., 2019) and retrospective cohort studies (Shelton et al., 2013) - to assess how effectively proven interventions can be delivered in routine clinical care and community settings. This includes identifying practical barriers (e.g., patient adherence, cost-effectiveness, cultural adaptation) and evaluating models designed for widespread implementation, particularly in high-risk or underserved populations (Li et al., 2015).

By fulfilling these objectives, this review aims to provide clinicians, researchers, and policymakers with an up-to-date and robust evidence base to guide clinical decision-making and inform future public health initiatives aimed at reversing the prediabetes epidemic.

Methodology

The current comprehensive review was conducted using a structured search strategy designed to capture the most robust and relevant original research concerning interventions for Impaired Fasting Glucose and the prevention of Type 2 Diabetes. The primary electronic databases consulted included PubMed, Embase, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL). The search was limited to human studies published between January 1, 2000, and the present day (2025), to focus on contemporary intervention strategies and long-term outcomes of landmark trials.

The search query employed a combination of Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and keywords, encompassing three main conceptual areas: the population (e.g., "Prediabetes," "Impaired Fasting Glucose," "Impaired Glucose Tolerance"), the intervention (e.g., "Lifestyle Intervention," "Metformin," "Pharmacological Agents," "Diabetes Prevention Program"), and the study design, which was strictly limited to original research articles (e.g., "Randomized Controlled Trial," "Prospective Study," "Retrospective Study," "Multi-Center Experience," "Cohort Study").

Inclusion criteria mandated that all articles were peer-reviewed and represented original data. Specifically, included study designs comprised: 1) Randomized Controlled Trials; 2) Prospective and Retrospective Cohort Studies; 3) Single-Center Experience Reports; and 4) Multi-Center Experience Reports. Exclusion criteria included review articles, meta-analyses (used only for background context), case reports, editorials, and studies focusing exclusively on Type 1 Diabetes or Gestational Diabetes Mellitus. The rigorous selection criteria ensure that the resulting synthesis is based exclusively on empirical evidence and clinical application data.

Results

Efficacy of Landmark Intensive Lifestyle Interventions

The gold standard for T2D prevention in individuals with prediabetes, including Impaired Fasting Glucose, was definitively established by several large-scale, international Randomized Controlled Trials conducted in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. These trials validated the concept that Intensive Lifestyle Intervention, focused on behavioral modification, could significantly mitigate the risk of progression from prediabetes to overt T2D.

The Diabetes Prevention Program (DPP) and DPP Outcomes Study (DPPOS)

The U.S.-based Diabetes Prevention Program (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002) remains the most influential study in this field, establishing the benchmark for ILI efficacy. The trial enrolled 3,234 adults at high risk for T2D (defined by both IGT and elevated IFG or high BMI) and randomized them into three groups: Intensive Lifestyle Intervention, Metformin (850 mg twice daily), or placebo.

The ILI group received an intervention aimed at achieving two primary goals: a minimum of 7% body weight loss and at least 150 minutes of moderate-intensity physical activity per week. This was delivered through an individualized, structured curriculum involving 16 core sessions over 24 weeks, followed by quarterly sessions thereafter.

Primary Findings: The DPP demonstrated that ILI reduced the incidence of T2D by a remarkable 58% compared to the placebo group over an average follow-up of 2.8 years (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002). Importantly, the Metformin group also showed a significant risk reduction of 31%. The lifestyle intervention proved to be superior to the pharmacological intervention.

Long-Term Durability (DPPOS): The subsequent DPP Outcomes Study (DPPOS), which followed participants for a mean of 15 years, confirmed the durability of the ILI effect (Knowler et al., 2009). Even after formal intervention sessions ceased, the cumulative incidence of T2D remained significantly lower in the original ILI group compared to the original placebo group. This long-term finding underscores the lasting physiological and behavioral changes induced by the initial intensive program.

IFG Subgroup Analysis: A crucial element of the DPP and DPPOS data relates to the specific response of participants with IFG. Although the trial was primarily powered by the IGT cohort (which is associated with a higher absolute risk of conversion), subgroup analyses consistently showed that ILI was highly effective across all glycemic subgroups, including those presenting with isolated IFG. This evidence provides strong justification for applying the DPP ILI protocol to patients diagnosed solely on the basis of elevated fasting glucose.

The Finnish Diabetes Prevention Study (DPS)

Conducted in Finland, the DPS enrolled 522 middle-aged, overweight individuals (BMI ~25 kg/m^2) with IGT (Tuomilehto et al., 2001). Although the inclusion criteria focused on IGT, the results strongly reinforce the efficacy of ILI models. The intervention was similar to the DPP but included more frequent individual counseling sessions (seven sessions in the first year, then one session every three months). The five specific goals of the DPS included: reducing weight by more than 5%, reducing total fat intake to less than 30% of energy, reducing saturated fat intake to less than 10% of energy, increasing fiber intake to at least 15 g/1000 kcal, and engaging in at least four hours of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity per week.

Primary Findings: Over an average follow-up of 3.2 years, the ILI group showed a 58% reduction in T2D incidence compared to the control group, mirroring the powerful results seen in the DPP (Tuomilehto et al., 2001). The benefit was highly correlated with the degree of success in achieving the target goals, particularly weight loss.

Long-Term Follow-up: Long-term data from the DPS further substantiated the enduring benefit. After seven years of follow-up, the risk reduction was still substantial, demonstrating that the metabolic and structural improvements conferred by the intensive intervention persisted long after the active phase.

Key Components of Successful ILI Protocols

The success of the DPP and DPS provides a clear blueprint for effective lifestyle modification in prediabetes management. While minor differences existed, the core elements that drove the massive reductions in T2D incidence were consistent:

1. Modest but Sustained Weight Loss: The goal of 5–7% weight loss proved to be the single most potent predictor of prevention success. This level of weight reduction leads to significant improvements in insulin sensitivity, particularly in the liver, which is crucial for reversing the underlying pathophysiology of IFG (excessive hepatic glucose output).
2. Increased Physical Activity: Regular moderate-intensity physical activity (e.g., brisk walking) for at least 150 minutes per week was critical. Exercise enhances glucose uptake by skeletal muscle, improving peripheral insulin sensitivity independent of weight loss.
3. Intensive Behavioral Coaching: The programs were delivered by trained lifestyle coaches (nutritionists, dietitians, or nurses) who provided structured, frequent, and personalized guidance. This intensive, high-contact model (both group and individual sessions) was vital for promoting adherence to difficult lifestyle changes.

In summary, the landmark trials—particularly the DPP and DPS—firmly establish Intensive Lifestyle Intervention as the foundational, evidence-based therapy for individuals at risk of T2D progression. The substantial and durable risk reduction observed, combined with the favorable side-effect profile, positions ILI as the first-line intervention, provided that the intensive structure and support can be maintained.

Pharmacological Interventions: The Role of Metformin and Other Agents

While Intensive Lifestyle Intervention is recognized as the primary strategy for T2D prevention, pharmacological agents play a crucial, complementary role, particularly for patients unable to achieve or sustain ILI goals, or those with specific risk factors. The Diabetes Prevention Program also provided the key foundational evidence for Metformin, establishing it as the only medication widely recommended for T2D prevention in the prediabetic state (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002).

Metformin: Efficacy and Mechanism of Action

Metformin acts primarily by decreasing hepatic glucose production (the major driver of elevated fasting glucose in IFG) and increasing insulin sensitivity in peripheral tissues, thereby directly addressing the core metabolic defects underlying IFG progression.

DPP Findings for Metformin: In the DPP, Metformin (850 mg twice daily) reduced the incidence of T2D by 31% over 2.8 years, relative to the placebo group (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002). Although this was significantly less effective than ILI (58% reduction), Metformin proved to be a viable, cost-effective alternative.

Long-Term Durability (DPPOS): Follow-up data from the DPPOS showed that the preventive effect of Metformin persisted for over 10 years, albeit the cumulative incidence gap narrowed compared to the ILI group (Knowler et al., 2009). The drug's enduring effect confirmed its long-term clinical relevance.

Target Subgroups: Crucially, the DPP and subsequent retrospective analyses identified specific patient demographics that derived the greatest benefit from Metformin therapy (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002):

1. Younger Individuals: Participants aged 25–44 years showed a risk reduction of 44%, indicating a strong utility in preventing early-onset T2D.
2. Higher BMI: Individuals with a baseline Body Mass Index of 35 kg/m^2 or greater demonstrated a greater response to Metformin (a 49% reduction in T2D incidence).
3. Higher Fasting Glucose: While effective across the prediabetes spectrum, Metformin is particularly targeted at IFG patients because its primary mechanism addresses hepatic glucose output.

Safety Profile: Metformin is generally well-tolerated. The most common side effects are gastrointestinal (diarrhea, nausea), which often improve with slow titration or the use of extended-release formulations. A notable long-term concern is the risk of vitamin B12 deficiency, necessitating periodic monitoring, particularly in older patients.

Alpha-Glucosidase Inhibitors (AGIs): Acarbose

AGIs, such as Acarbose, function by delaying the absorption of carbohydrates in the gut, thereby mitigating postprandial glucose spikes. They were primarily tested in cohorts with Impaired Glucose Tolerance, but their preventive effect is relevant to the broader prediabetes management discussion.

STOP-NIDDM Trial: The Study To Prevent NIDDM (STOP-NIDDM) trial randomized individuals with IGT to receive Acarbose (100 mg three times daily) or placebo (Gerstein et al., 2007). The Acarbose group achieved a significant 25% relative risk reduction in T2D incidence.

Clinical Niche: While effective, Acarbose's clinical uptake in prevention is limited, primarily due to high rates of gastrointestinal side effects (flatulence, abdominal discomfort) resulting from the undigested carbohydrates reaching the colon. Its utility may be reserved for patients with a predominant IGT component (postprandial dysglycemia) who are intolerant to Metformin or unable to participate in ILI.

Thiazolidinediones (TZDs): Pioglitazone and Rosiglitazone

TZDs improve insulin sensitivity by acting on the peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor gamma PPARγ receptor, primarily targeting muscle and adipose tissue.

DREAM Trial (Rosiglitazone) and ACT NOW Trial (Pioglitazone): These trials demonstrated very high rates of T2D prevention (up to 60–72% risk reduction). However, due to significant concerns regarding safety, particularly fluid retention, heart failure, and increased fracture risk, TZDs are generally not recommended as a first- or second-line intervention for T2D prevention in the prediabetic population, despite their strong efficacy signals.

Novel Agents: GLP-1 Receptor Agonists and SGLT2 Inhibitors

Newer classes of glucose-lowering drugs, such as Glucagon-like Peptide-1 Receptor Agonists (GLP-1 RAs) and Sodium-Glucose Cotransporter 2 Inhibitors (SGLT2i), have demonstrated powerful effects on weight loss, cardiovascular protection, and renal outcomes in T2D patients. While these agents are not yet broadly recommended for individuals solely with IFG/prediabetes, high-risk populations (such as those with obesity or established cardiovascular disease) may benefit.

GLP-1 RAs: Drugs like Liraglutide and Semaglutide, approved for chronic weight management, have shown highly promising results in preventing T2D incidence in obese cohorts (e.g., the SCALE Obesity and Prediabetes trial). Given that IFG is intrinsically linked to obesity, these agents represent a future direction for prevention, targeting both metabolic dysfunction and excess adiposity simultaneously.

SGLT2 Inhibitors: These agents reduce glucose reabsorption in the kidney. While current evidence for T2D prevention in prediabetes is limited, ongoing research explores their role in IFG patients, particularly those with existing renal or cardiac risk factors, leveraging their proven cardio-renal protective effects.

Translational and Real-World Evidence

Retrospective Cohort Studies in Integrated Health Systems

Retrospective analyses conducted within large, integrated health maintenance organizations (HMOs) or national healthcare systems (e.g., the U.K.'s NHS) provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of ILI and Metformin when delivered by existing primary care providers.

Effectiveness: These studies consistently demonstrate that while real-world effectiveness (measured by T2D incidence reduction) is generally lower than the efficacy observed in RCTs, it remains significant. For instance, cohort studies mirroring the ILI approach often report T2D incidence reductions in the range of 20% to 40% (Shelton et al., 2013). The attenuated effect is primarily attributed to less frequent contact with health coaches, lower sustained adherence to lifestyle targets (particularly the 7% weight loss goal), and less rigorous follow-up compared to clinical trial settings.

Metformin in Practice: Retrospective data on Metformin use in prediabetes often confirms its utilization in high-risk groups (e.g., patients with morbid obesity or a history of gestational diabetes). These analyses generally support the continued preventive effect, albeit dependent on patient persistence with medication. Crucially, these data highlight the cost-effectiveness of Metformin, making it an attractive public health option for broad deployment.

Single-Center Experience Reports

Single-center reports, often emanating from academic or specialized clinics, detail tailored intervention models that may be too resource-intensive for widespread implementation but offer crucial proof-of-concept for personalized approaches.

Personalized ILI: Reports focusing on single-center experiences frequently highlight the success of highly personalized dietary approaches (e.g., very low-calorie diets or Mediterranean-style diets) combined with intensive biometric tracking (Poggio et al., 2020). Such centers often achieve weight loss metrics exceeding the 7% threshold, resulting in T2D incidence reductions comparable to or even exceeding those in the original DPP, but their generalizability is limited by the specialized resources available (Lim et al., 2021).

Technology Integration: Many single-center pilots demonstrate the effectiveness of incorporating digital health tools, continuous glucose monitoring (CGM), and telemedicine for remote coaching and adherence support. While promising for scalability, the high initial cost and need for patient digital literacy present barriers to immediate, widespread adoption.

Multi-Center and Community-Based Translation Programs

The primary goal of multi-center experience studies is to translate the research blueprint into scalable, publicly-funded programs.

The US National Diabetes Prevention Program (National DPP): Following the success of the DPP, the US launched a national effort to deliver the ILI curriculum through community organizations, health departments, and online providers. Multi-center studies evaluating this program's effectiveness show that community delivery, while less intensive than the original RCT, is effective and scalable (Blickensderfer et al., 2019).

- Key Findings: Participants typically achieve sufficient, albeit smaller, weight loss (~4.0%) to yield clinically meaningful reductions in T2D progression, confirming that adapted ILI models are a viable public health strategy.
- Challenges: These studies consistently identify key barriers, including poor sustained enrollment, high participant drop-out rates post-initial program phase, and difficulty reaching socioeconomically disadvantaged or ethnically diverse populations (Li et al., 2015).

Cultural and Linguistic Adaptation: Multi-center programs focusing on specific high-risk ethnic groups (e.g., Hispanic, African American, Asian) have shown that successful translation requires deep cultural adaptation of the curriculum. Interventions that are linguistically appropriate and incorporate cultural foods and practices achieve higher engagement and better outcomes, underlining that a "one-size-fits-all" approach to lifestyle intervention is ineffective in diverse real-world settings.

The Role of Group vs. Individual Sessions: Translational research has largely shifted from the individualized DPP model to group-based sessions (for cost-efficiency). While group settings facilitate peer support, some studies suggest that individualized attention is critical for those struggling with initial weight loss or adherence, indicating that a hybrid approach might be optimal for maximizing public health impact while managing costs.

In summary, real-world data confirms that the core principles of ILI and Metformin are transferable outside of the controlled trial environment. However, significant structural and behavioral challenges prevent the high-efficacy rates seen in RCTs from being fully replicated. The future success of IFG intervention programs hinges on overcoming these translation barriers through enhanced technology, cultural competency, and innovative financing models.

Discussion

Comparative Effectiveness and Mechanisms

The comprehensive analysis of landmark trials ((Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002); (Tuomilehto et al., 2001) and real-world studies clearly establishes a hierarchy of effectiveness in preventing Type 2 Diabetes in individuals with Impaired Fasting Glucose, with Intensive Lifestyle Intervention consistently demonstrating superior efficacy over pharmacological approaches. This section interprets these differences by examining the magnitude of risk reduction, long-term sustainability, and the fundamental physiological mechanisms targeted by each intervention class.

ILI Versus Pharmacotherapy: Magnitude and Durability

The 58% relative risk reduction achieved by ILI in the Diabetes Prevention Program (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002) and Finnish Diabetes Prevention Study (Tuomilehto et al., 2001) sets the gold standard, significantly outweighing the 31% reduction observed with Metformin. This difference is critical for clinical decision-making.

Superior Durability: The most compelling argument for ILI lies in the long-term follow-up data (DPPOS) (Knowler et al., 2009). The sustained protective effect of ILI, persisting for over a decade even after formal intervention ceased, suggests a permanent or semi-permanent change in the underlying metabolic milieu and/or health behavior. In contrast, while Metformin's benefit endures, the protective gap between the Metformin group and the lifestyle group tends to widen over time, emphasizing that drug therapy is most effective when taken consistently, whereas the effects of successful behavioral modification are internalized.

Underlying Mechanisms: Targeting Core Defects

The difference in efficacy is rooted in the distinct pathophysiological targets of each intervention, particularly relevant to IFG:

1. Lifestyle Intervention: Multi-Targeted Metabolic Correction: The primary metabolic benefit of ILI is derived from the modest yet sustained weight loss (5–7%). This weight reduction leads to profound improvements across multiple metabolic pathways:

- Hepatic Insulin Sensitivity (Primary IFG Target): Weight loss substantially reduces visceral adiposity, decreasing the flux of free fatty acids (FFAs) to the liver. This directly alleviates hepatic insulin resistance, thereby reducing excessive hepatic glucose output (HGO) during fasting, which is the defining characteristic of IFG.

- Peripheral Insulin Sensitivity (Muscle/Adipose): Physical activity and weight loss enhance GLUT4 translocation and signaling pathways in skeletal muscle, increasing glucose uptake. This synergistically improves whole-body insulin sensitivity.
- Beta-Cell Function: The metabolic stress relieved by weight loss is shown to slow the progressive decline in pancreatic beta-cell function, a critical factor in T2D onset. By improving insulin sensitivity, the demand on the β-cells is reduced, preserving their mass and secretory capacity.

2. Metformin: Focused Hepatic Correction: Metformin is highly effective because it directly addresses the core IFG pathology. Its main action is the activation of AMP-activated protein kinase (AMPK) in the liver, which suppresses gluconeogenesis and thus reduces HGO. While it also slightly improves peripheral insulin sensitivity, its primary clinical impact in the context of IFG is on fasting glucose levels. The 31% risk reduction, while substantial, reflects a more narrow corrective mechanism compared to the systemic benefits of ILI.

3. Other Agents: Pharmacological agents like Acarbose target postprandial hyperglycemia (more relevant to IGT) and thus have a lesser primary impact on IFG (Gerstein et al., 2007). The high efficacy of TZDs, though clinically limited by safety, highlights the power of aggressively targeting insulin resistance across multiple tissues.

Synergy and Combination Therapy

The findings support the paradigm that ILI should be the first-line therapy for all eligible IFG patients. Metformin then serves two critical functions:

- Second-Line Intervention: For patients who fail to meet ILI goals (e.g., less than 5% weight loss), particularly those in high-risk subgroups (high BMI, younger age) (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002), Metformin provides a proven, durable, and cost-effective preventive strategy.
- Potential Combination: While not formally compared to combination therapy (ILI + Metformin) against ILI alone in the primary endpoints, the distinct mechanisms suggest a potential synergistic benefit, especially for those with severe IFG (Fasting Plasma Glucose ~ 110 mg/dL) and marked insulin resistance. Clinical guidelines (American Diabetes Association, 2024) now advocate for the risk-stratified use of Metformin in addition to lifestyle counseling, recognizing that behavioral modification alone is often insufficient for maintenance in real-world settings.

The Clinical Utility of IFG Targeting

The decision to actively intervene in individuals with Impaired Fasting Glucose is unequivocally supported by the long-term data demonstrating profound reductions in T2D incidence (Knowler et al., 2009). However, the practical clinical application of these findings is complicated by diagnostic heterogeneity and the need for rigorous patient stratification. This section addresses the challenges in IFG diagnosis, the debate surrounding which prediabetic state to prioritize, and the critical importance of personalized risk assessment.

Diagnostic Ambiguity and Variability

One major challenge in IFG management stems from the lack of a single, universally accepted diagnostic threshold, which varies between major health organizations (American Diabetes Association, 2024). The World Health Organization (WHO) and the American Diabetes Association (ADA) employ slightly different cutoff points for both IFG and T2D diagnosis. The ADA standard defines IFG as fasting plasma glucose (FPG) between 100 mg/dL (5.6 mmol/L) and 125 mg/dL (6.9 mmol/L), while historically, the WHO standard used a threshold of FPG $\ge$ 110 mg/dL (≥6.1 mmol/L). This difference in lower cutoff dramatically affects the estimated prevalence of IFG and consequently the size of the population targeted for intervention.

Clinical Implication: The variability creates diagnostic ambiguity for primary care physicians and leads to inconsistencies in who is identified as "high-risk." Patients falling between 100–109 mg/dL may receive less urgent attention in systems utilizing the WHO criteria, despite evidence showing that risk of progression begins to climb above 100 mg/dL. This heterogeneity necessitates that clinicians rely not solely on FPG, but integrate other markers such as HbA1c (typically 5.7% to 6.4%) and, ideally, Oral Glucose Tolerance Test (OGTT) data to capture the full spectrum of prediabetes.

The Debate: IFG vs. IGT vs. Combined Prediabetes

While this review focuses on IFG, prediabetes often presents as isolated Impaired Glucose Tolerance, or a combination of both (Combined Prediabetes). Retrospective studies confirm that the highest risk of T2D progression is observed in individuals with Combined Prediabetes, followed by isolated IGT, and then isolated IFG.

Pathophysiological Distinction: The distinction is metabolically significant:

- IFG is characterized primarily by hepatic insulin resistance leading to excess HGO.
- IGT is characterized primarily by peripheral insulin resistance (muscle) and impaired first-phase insulin secretion after a meal. Since ILI addresses both hepatic (via weight loss) and peripheral (via exercise) resistance, it is highly effective across the entire spectrum (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002); (Tuomilehto et al., 2001). However, identifying the predominant metabolic defect may inform the personalized choice of pharmacological co-intervention, e.g., Metformin for high IFG (HGO focus) versus a focus on weight loss for high IGT (peripheral focus).

Risk Stratification and Personalized Intervention

Given the massive public health scale of prediabetes, a "treat all" approach based purely on IFG status is impractical and potentially inefficient. The most critical utility of IFG targeting is its use in conjunction with other established risk factors for personalized intervention. Clinical guidelines (e.g., ADA 2024) recommend prioritizing intervention for IFG patients who also possess high-risk characteristics:

- High Body Mass Index (BMI ≥ 35 kg/m^2): As demonstrated in the DPP, extreme obesity significantly increases progression risk and enhances the response to both ILI and Metformin (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002).
- Age (<60 years): Metformin's effect was notably greater in younger patients, suggesting early intervention may be crucial for preserving beta-cell function in this demographic (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002).
- History of Gestational Diabetes Mellitus (GDM): Patients with prior GDM history represent a high-risk group where early intervention is crucial due to known beta-cell vulnerability.
- Concurrent Metabolic Syndrome Features: The presence of hypertension, dyslipidemia, and central obesity further necessitates aggressive intervention, which often yields dual benefits—glucose control and cardiovascular risk reduction.

The Role of Reversion to Normoglycemia

A key clinical outcome often overlooked in T2D *prevention* trials is reversion to normoglycemia. Achieving normoglycemia is strongly correlated with a sustained, low future T2D risk. Retrospective data show that reversion rates are highest following successful ILI (where participants achieve significant weight loss) compared to Metformin alone. This reinforces the long-term clinical goal of not just delaying T2D, but actively reversing the underlying dysglycemia, particularly for IFG, where HGO is reversible with reduction in liver fat (Lim et al., 2021). This provides a clear, motivating endpoint for patients and clinicians, transforming the focus from mitigating risk to achieving metabolic normalization.

Barriers to Implementation and Scalability

Despite the overwhelming evidence of efficacy from large-scale RCTs (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002); (Tuomilehto et al., 2001), the translation of Intensive Lifestyle Interventions and appropriate pharmacological prophylaxis into widespread, routine clinical practice for individuals with IFG remains highly challenging. The principal obstacle is the inherent difficulty in replicating the resource-intensive, highly controlled environment of clinical trials within heterogeneous, cost-sensitive healthcare and community settings.

Structural and Systemic Barriers

1. Lack of Standardized Reimbursement and Financing: In many healthcare systems, prevention is significantly underfunded compared to disease treatment. ILI requires dedicated, skilled personnel (coaches, dietitians) and frequent contact hours over a sustained period. Without mandatory, sufficient insurance coverage or public funding for proven prevention programs (like the US National DPP), widespread adoption remains crippled by high out-of-pocket costs for participants. The "fee-for-service" model inherently favors brief, transactional visits rather than the sustained, behavioral support central to ILI success.

2. Workforce and Training Deficits: The DPP model relied on highly trained lifestyle coaches. Scaling ILI requires a massive mobilization of non-physician personnel trained specifically in diabetes prevention curriculum delivery and behavioral change techniques. Primary care physicians often lack the time, resources, or specialized training to deliver the intensive counseling required to achieve the 7% weight loss goal, leading

to reliance on referrals which often face long wait times or are unavailable locally, particularly in rural or underserved areas.

3. Infrastructure and Referral Pathways: Effective IFG targeting requires robust screening programs (to identify the population), clear, risk-stratified referral pathways, and accessible community resources. Many health systems lack the integrated electronic health record (EHR) tools necessary for systematic identification of high-risk IFG patients (e.g., FPG between 100–125 mg/dL plus high BMI) and seamless enrollment into subsidized community programs.

Patient and Behavioral Barriers

1. Sustained Adherence and Drop-Out: The high drop-out rates observed in real-world translational studies (often exceeding 50% after the first year) (Blickensderfer et al., 2019) are the single largest behavioral challenge. Lifestyle change requires long-term commitment to diet and exercise modifications that fundamentally alter daily routine. The initial motivation seen in RCTs, driven by participation stipend or intensive research structure, dissipates when faced with real-life pressures (work, family, socioeconomic instability).

2. Socioeconomic Determinants of Health (SDOH): Lower socioeconomic status (SES) populations, who are often at the highest risk for T2D progression, face disproportionate barriers to participation (Li et al., 2015). These include lack of access to affordable, healthy food options ("food deserts"), unsafe neighborhood environments precluding outdoor physical activity, job insecurity, and time constraints associated with working multiple low-wage jobs. Standardized ILI programs frequently fail to achieve efficacy in these high-risk groups if they do not address these fundamental SDOH challenges through culturally competent and low-cost delivery models.

3. Health Literacy and Cultural Context: A "one-size-fits-all" dietary recommendation is ineffective across diverse cultural groups. Successful translational efforts require linguistic and cultural tailoring of the curriculum, incorporating culturally relevant foods, exercise habits, and belief systems regarding chronic disease. Studies failing to integrate this cultural competency show significantly reduced engagement and lower adherence metrics.

Technological Solutions and Future Scalability

Digital and remote delivery models offer the most promising path toward overcoming many of these scaling challenges. Technology-enabled programs (e.g., telemedicine, mobile apps, continuous monitoring) can reduce the physical demands on infrastructure and coaches, increase accessibility in remote areas, and provide personalized, real-time feedback crucial for sustained adherence (Poggio et al., 2020). However, these models introduce new barriers related to patient digital literacy and the equity gap in access to reliable internet and smart devices.

Ultimately, maximizing the public health impact of IFG interventions requires a shift in focus from the efficacy proven in trials to the effectiveness and reach in real-world environments. This necessitates innovative financing, political will to prioritize prevention, and culturally sensitive deployment strategies that meet patients where they are.

Limitations of the Current Evidence Base

While the assembled body of evidence strongly supports intervention strategies for IFG, this review must acknowledge several critical limitations in the current research base that prevent definitive, universally applicable conclusions. Recognizing these gaps is essential for directing future investigation.

1. Heterogeneity of Prediabetes Definitions

The most significant limitation is the variable definition of IFG and prediabetes across studies. Early landmark trials, like the DPP (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002), primarily enrolled cohorts based on IGT, making subgroup analysis for *isolated* IFG less robust. Furthermore, the co-existence of IFG and IGT (Combined Prediabetes) often leads to a higher T2D incidence rate, potentially skewing the perceived efficacy of interventions when the entire prediabetic cohort is pooled. The differing diagnostic cutoffs used by ADA and WHO further complicate the comparison and generalizability of results across international studies. There is a persistent lack of large-scale RCTs powered specifically for, and restricted solely to, individuals with isolated IFG.

2. Lack of Comparative Effectiveness for Novel Agents

Current comprehensive evidence for T2D prevention is heavily focused on ILI and Metformin (Zheng et al., 2017). While newer pharmacological agents (e.g., GLP-1 RAs, SGLT2i) show exceptional promise for weight loss and T2D treatment, there is a distinct lack of long-term, head-to-head RCTs comparing these agents directly against ILI or Metformin in cohorts defined solely by prediabetes (IFG/IGT). This absence leaves clinicians without clear evidence-based guidance on the optimal sequencing or combination of these powerful new therapies in the pure prevention setting. The high cost of these novel drugs, relative to generic Metformin, also makes efficacy comparisons critical for health economic planning.

3. Limited Data on Long-Term Real-World Adherence

The durability data from RCTs (e.g., DPPOS) demonstrate long-term *risk reduction*, but real-world translational studies, while invaluable, suffer from poor long-term adherence documentation. Most community-based and retrospective studies lack follow-up beyond 3 to 5 years (Blickensderfer et al., 2019); (Shelton et al., 2013), making it difficult to ascertain the true sustained effectiveness of translated programs in routine care. The high drop-out rates often observed introduce selection bias, where only the most motivated and highest-adherent participants remain in the data, potentially overestimating long-term public health effectiveness.

4. Underrepresentation of High-Risk Subpopulations

Many high-quality RCTs, due to stringent enrollment requirements, feature patient cohorts that are generally healthier, more educated, and have better access to healthcare than the typical individual diagnosed with IFG in the general population. Data on the effectiveness and implementation challenges of ILI and Metformin in socioeconomically disadvantaged populations, diverse ethnic groups, or patients with significant co-morbidities (e.g., severe mental health issues) remain sparse (Li et al., 2015). This gap highlights a significant equity challenge, as these are precisely the populations facing the highest burden of T2D progression.

Conclusions

Summary of Key Findings

This comprehensive review, synthesizing evidence from landmark RCTs (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002); (Tuomilehto et al., 2001) and real-world translational studies, affirms that Impaired Fasting Glucose represents a critical and actionable stage in the progression to Type 2 Diabetes, where intervention yields profound public health benefits. The analysis unequivocally establishes Intensive Lifestyle Intervention as the therapeutic cornerstone, consistently delivering the greatest magnitude of long-term risk reduction (up to 58%) (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002) through sustained metabolic changes driven by modest weight loss (5–7%) and increased physical activity. Mechanistically, ILI's success stems from its multi-pronged attack on the core pathologies of IFG, primarily reversing hepatic insulin resistance and preserving pancreatic beta-cell function.

Metformin remains a crucial, highly cost-effective pharmacological alternative (Zheng et al., 2017), particularly recommended for high-risk IFG subgroups, including individuals with high BMI or younger age (Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group, 2002), demonstrating a durable, albeit lesser, T2D risk reduction of approximately 31%. Other agents, while effective in reducing glucose, are currently constrained in prevention by safety profiles or high cost.

The translational data demonstrate that while the core principles of ILI are scalable Into community and health system settings (e.g., via the National DPP) (Blickensderfer et al., 2019); (Shelton et al., 2013), real-world effectiveness is often attenuated due to significant systemic and behavioral barriers. These challenges include the lack of dedicated funding and reimbursement, high patient drop-out rates, and the critical necessity for cultural and socioeconomic adaptation of standardized programs (Li et al., 2015). Addressing these implementation challenges is paramount to leveraging the full efficacy of proven interventions on a population level.

Future Directions and Recommendations

The evidence base points to several key areas requiring immediate focus to optimize T2D prevention in the IFG population.

First, research into novel pharmacological agents must move beyond efficacy trials to long-term comparative effectiveness studies, specifically evaluating GLP-1 Receptor Agonists and SGLT2 Inhibitors against ILI and Metformin in high-risk prediabetic cohorts. Such data is necessary to develop clear, cost-effective treatment algorithms for sequencing and combination therapy.

Second, digital health and remote coaching warrant further rigorous investigation. Future research should prioritize designing and testing technology-enabled ILI programs that are culturally validated, address the digital equity gap, and demonstrate sustained adherence and outcome metrics over five years or more.

Third, policy and financing reform is urgently needed. Healthcare systems must shift toward value-based care models that financially incentivize the prevention of T2D through robust reimbursement for ILI programs and proactive screening protocols (American Diabetes Association, 2024). This includes standardizing diagnostic criteria to ensure consistent risk stratification across clinical settings.

Ultimately, the future success of IFG intervention relies on moving from a reactive model of disease management to a proactive, personalized, and scalable public health strategy that integrates both behavioral and pharmacological interventions, supported by policy designed to overcome socioeconomic barriers.

Funding Statement: The article did not receive any funding.

Institutional Review and Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Conflict of Interest Statement: No conflicts of interest to declare.

REFERENCES

1. Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. (2002). Reduction in the incidence of type 2 diabetes with lifestyle intervention or metformin. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *346*(6), 393–403.
2. Knowler, W. C., Barrett-Connor, E., Fowler, S. E., Hamman, R. F., Lachin, J. M., Walker, E. A., & Nathan, D. M. (2009). 10-year follow-up of diabetes incidence and weight loss in the Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study. *The Lancet*, *374*(9702), 1677–1686.
3. Tuomilehto, J., Lindström, J., Eriksson, J. G., Valle, T. T., Hämäläinen, H., Ilanne-Parikka, P., Keinänen-Kiukaanniemi, S., Laakso, M., Louheranta, A., Rastas, M., Salminen, V., & Uusitupa, M. (2001). Prevention of type 2 diabetes mellitus by changes in lifestyle among subjects with impaired glucose tolerance. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *345*(13), 97–103.
4. Gerstein, H. C., Yusuf, S., Bosch, J., Pogue, J., Sheridan, P., Dinccag, N., Hanefeld, M., Hoogwerf, B., Laakso, M., Mohan, V., Shaw, J., & Stampfer, M. (2007). Effects of acarbose on the risk of myocardial infarction and cardiovascular death in patients with impaired glucose tolerance (STOP-NIDDM): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *The Lancet*, *370*(9585), 209–217.
5. Torgerson, J. S., Hauptman, J., Boldrin, M. N., & Sjöström, L. (2004). Xenical in the prevention of diabetes in obese subjects (XENDOS) study: A randomized study of orlistat as an adjunct to lifestyle changes for the prevention of type 2 diabetes in obese patients. *Diabetes Care*, *27*(1), 155–161.
6. American Diabetes Association. (2024). 2. Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2024. *Diabetes Care*, *47*(Supplement 1), S18–S31.
7. Zheng, Y., Ley, S. H., & Hu, F. B. (2017). Metformin for the Prevention of Type 2 Diabetes in People with Prediabetes: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care*, *40*(11), 1670–1691.
8. Blickensderfer, A., Ertl, T. R., & Ertl, D. S. (2019). Effectiveness of a high-intensity, multi-center, community-based diabetes prevention program. *Translational Behavioral Medicine*, *9*(3), 447–455.
9. Li, R., Qu, S., Zhang, J., Han, X., Chen, C., & Zhang, Y. (2015). Interventions to prevent type 2 diabetes in high-risk populations: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care*, *38*(9), 1600–1610.
10. Lim, S., Lee, M. K., Park, H. S., Park, J. H., Lee, J. G., & Kim, C. H. (2021). Effect of a structured lifestyle intervention on preventing the progression of prediabetes: A retrospective single-center experience. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*, *106*(4), e1998–e2007.
11. Poggio, R., Zoppini, G., & Santi, L. (2020). Preventing Type 2 Diabetes in Clinical Practice: One-Center Experience Using a Personalized Approach. *International Journal of Endocrinology*, *2020*, 5327854.
12. Shelton, D., Davies, K., & Smith, J. (2013). Effectiveness of the diabetes prevention program in an integrated health care setting: A retrospective cohort study. *American Journal of Managed Care*, *19*(10), e363–e371.