Review Article

The Effect of Intensive Treatment of Diabetes on the Development and Progression of Long-Term Complications in Insulin-Dependent Diabetes Mellitus (DCCT): A Contemporary Review

Takeshi Yamamoto [1]*, Rina Kato [2]

1. Nagoya University Graduate School of Medicine, Nagoya, Japan.
2. Keio University School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan.

* Correspondence: takeshi.yamamoto.jp@gmail.com

Abstract: The Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT) were a landmark randomized clinical trial that, when first reported in 1993, established that intensive insulin therapy aimed at near-normoglycemia markedly reduced the risk of microvascular complications (retinopathy, nephropathy, and neuropathy) in people with type 1 diabetes. Beyond the trial's mean 6.5-year intervention phase, the observational Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (EDIC) follow-up has documented enduring ("legacy") benefits of early intensive control on microvascular outcomes and, over longer follow-up, on macrovascular events and mortality. The DCCT/EDIC program also clarified important tradeoffs: greater risk of severe hypoglycemia and weight gain with intensive regimens. This review synthesizes the original trial design and principal results, summarizes key EDIC long-term findings (including cardiovascular benefits), places DCCT in the context of evolving diabetes technologies and guidelines, examines biological mechanisms for legacy effects, and discusses implications for current clinical practice and future research. The DCCT remains the foundational evidence base for glycemic-target strategies in type 1 diabetes, and its lessons continue to shape technology adoption (insulin pumps, continuous glucose monitoring, closed-loop systems), individualized targets, and long-term monitoring strategies.

Keywords: DCCT, type 1 diabetes, intensive therapy, microvascular complications, legacy effect

1. INTRODUCTION

Prior to the advent of the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT), the prevailing understanding of type 1 diabetes suggested, based on cross-sectional and observational studies, that chronic hyperglycemia likely played a critical role in the development of microvascular complications—namely retinopathy, nephropathy, and neuropathy—but rigorous, randomized controlled trial evidence was conspicuously absent [1]. The DCCT, which enrolled 1,441 participants with insulin-dependent (type 1) diabetes and randomized them to intensive insulin therapy aimed at maintaining near-physiologic glycemia versus conventional, intermediate glycemic targets, was specifically designed to address this evidence gap. Conducted between 1983 and 1993, the DCCT delivered a powerful paradigm shift in diabetes care: individuals assigned to intensive therapy, achieving mean HbA_1c levels of approximately 7 percent (compared to ~9 percent in the conventional arm), demonstrated dramatically lower rates of both the development and progression of microvascular disease. Quantitatively, risk reductions ranged from around 34 percent to as high as 76 percent, depending on the outcome—whether retinopathy, nephropathy, or neuropathy—and the cohort subtype (primary prevention vs secondary intervention). Although intensive therapy was associated with anticipated adverse effects—most notably a threefold

increase in severe hypoglycemia and meaningful weight gain—it ultimately established glycemic control as the foundational principle of therapeutic strategy in type 1 diabetes [2]. Following the DCCT, the Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (EDIC) observational follow-up commenced in 1994. Despite the equalization of HbA_1c levels between former study arms—since conventional-therapy participants were educated in intensive treatment and all participants returned to community-based care—the benefits of earlier glycemic control persisted [3]. This phenomenon, termed "metabolic memory," manifested as sustained reductions in microvascular complications over time, even after initial glycemic differences had diminished during EDIC. Moreover, over the first 18 years of EDIC (1994–2012), investigators documented long-term protective effects extending into advanced microvascular complications, cardiovascular disease (CVD), and associated mortality outcomes. Specifically, the initial DCCT intensive therapy group showed persistent reductions in retinopathy and nephropathy, as well as attenuation of subclinical atherosclerosis markers including carotid intima-media thickness and coronary artery calcification [4]. The divergence in cardiovascular risk factors persisted, despite the loss of initial glycemic separation between the study arms. A landmark report published in Diabetes Care in 2016 detailed the cumulative 30-year follow-up data (DCCT plus EDIC). Over that period, 149 cardiovascular disease events occurred in the original intensive-therapy group, compared to 217 in the conventional group. The hazard ratio corresponded to a 30 percent reduction in any cardiovascular disease event (95 percent CI: 7–48; P = 0.016), and a 32 percent reduction in major cardiovascular events (nonfatal myocardial infarction, stroke, or cardiovascular death), albeit this latter estimate did not reach conventional statistical significance (95 % CI: –3 to 56; P = 0.07). The degree of risk reduction correlated tightly with HbA_1c levels during the DCCT/EDIC period, indicating that improved glycemic control was the primary mediator, though increased albuminuria also independently raised CVD risk. Beyond macrovascular and microvascular outcomes, later EDIC analyses reported compelling data indicating a 33 percent lower mortality rate in the original intensive-therapy cohort, bringing their standardized mortality rate in line with that of the general population. The long-term legacy of metabolic memory even extended into emerging complication domains—such as musculoskeletal changes (e.g., cheiro arthropathy), urologic complications (urinary incontinence, erectile dysfunction), autonomic neuropathies, hearing loss, and broader quality-of-life and economic impacts—underscoring the comprehensive and lasting influence of early intensive intervention [2]. Mechanistic insights gleaned from ancillary studies suggest that the durable effects of early glycemic control may be mediated by persistent biological changes—such as advanced glycation end-product accumulation in slowly turning-over tissues, epigenetic modifications, and altered post-translational protein profiles—that sustain risk benefit even after HbA_1c convergence. Taken together, the cumulative body of evidence from DCCT and over three decades of EDIC follow-up forms the empirical backbone for current clinical guidelines. They firmly establish that achieving and maintaining near-normal glycemia early in type 1 diabetes fundamentally reduces the risk of both micro- and macrovascular complications, lowers mortality, and yields enduring, multi-system health benefits [3]. These findings reinforce the practice paradigm wherein early; intensive glycemic management is considered not merely desirable but essential in preventing the long-term burden of type 1 diabetes.

2. TRIAL DESIGN AND METHODS

The Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT) were a landmark randomized clinical trial that enrolled 1,441 individuals with type 1 diabetes between 1983 and 1989, representing the most comprehensive and methodologically rigorous effort of its time to directly test the glycemic hypothesis. Participants were randomized to either intensive therapy—comprising multiple daily insulin injections or continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion via pump, combined with frequent self-monitoring of blood glucose and extensive patient education and behavioral support—or to conventional therapy, which consisted of one to two daily insulin injections aimed at preventing symptomatic hyperglycemia

and hypoglycemia, but without explicit goals of achieving near-normal glycemic targets [4]. This trial design reflected both the technological limitations and the clinical debates of the era: while many clinicians suspected that tight glycemic control would reduce long-term complications, concerns about severe hypoglycemia, treatment burden, and lack of definitive randomized evidence had previously precluded universal adoption of intensive regimens. The DCCT incorporated two distinct cohorts, thereby addressing both prevention and early intervention questions within the same framework. The primary prevention cohort included participants with 1–5 years' diabetes duration, absence of retinopathy by fundus photography, and normoalbuminuria at baseline [2]. In contrast, the secondary intervention cohort comprised individuals with 1–15 years' disease duration and evidence of mild to moderate non proliferative diabetic retinopathy but without advanced microvascular complications. This design allowed the investigators to evaluate whether intensive therapy could prevent the onset of complications in relatively early disease and whether it could slow progression among patients with established but limited microvascular pathology. The primary endpoints were rigorously defined and systematically assessed through centralized, standardized protocols that set a methodological benchmark for subsequent trials in diabetes. Retinopathy progression was determined via masked grading of stereoscopic fundus photographs using the Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study (ETDRS) scale. Nephropathy endpoints were captured using serial urine albumin excretion measurements, with thresholds for microalbuminuria and macroalbuminuria prespecified [4]. Neuropathy was evaluated through detailed clinical examination, quantitative sensory testing, and electrophysiological studies performed at regular intervals. These multimodal assessments provided robust and objective quantification of the major microvascular complications, ensuring that trial conclusions were not confounded by subjective reporting bias or variable diagnostic standards. Participants were followed for an average of 6.5 years, with near-term outcomes assessed at trial completion and long-term sequelae subsequently evaluated through the Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (EDIC) observational follow-up study. Glycemic exposure throughout the DCCT was measured principally by hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c), which served not only as the primary biomarker of therapeutic efficacy but also as a critical mediator variable in subsequent analyses of complication risk [5]. During the trial, the intensive therapy group achieved mean HbA1c values of ~7%, compared with ~9% in the conventional group, thus providing a clinically meaningful and sustained glycemic separation that enabled the trial's landmark findings. Importantly, the DCCT was not solely a trial of pharmacologic intervention but rather a comprehensive demonstration of an integrated diabetes care model, combining insulin regimen intensification, structured glucose monitoring, and intensive patient education. This holistic approach, although resource-intensive, represented a prototype of modern multidisciplinary diabetes management [2]. The methodological rigor and breadth of outcomes assessed in DCCT, coupled with the subsequent EDIC follow-up, cemented its role as the cornerstone trial that established glycemic control as the principal determinant of both microvascular and, with longer follow-up, macrovascular outcomes in type 1 diabetes.

3. PRIMARY DCCT RESULTS: MICROVASCULAR OUTCOMES AND HARMS

The DCCT provided unequivocal evidence that intensive insulin therapy dramatically reduces the risk of both the development and progression of microvascular complications in type 1 diabetes. Across the three major domains of microvascular disease—retinopathy, nephropathy, and neuropathy—the benefits of near-normoglycemia were both statistically robust and clinically meaningful. In the primary prevention cohort, intensive therapy reduced the incidence of retinopathy by 76 % compared with conventional management, while in the secondary intervention cohort it slowed the progression of pre-existing retinopathy by approximately 54 %. Similarly, the risk of developing microalbuminuria was reduced by 39 %, and progression to overt nephropathy was reduced by 54 %. Clinical neuropathy, assessed through standardized neurologic examination and nerve conduction studies, was reduced by

60 % in intensively treated patients relative to those receiving conventional therapy [6]. These magnitudes of effect, consistently ranging from one-third to over one-half depending on the outcome and cohort, established a new benchmark for what could be achieved through glycemic optimization. A central and enduring contribution of the DCCT was its demonstration of the graded and continuous relationship between glycemic exposure, as measured by hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c), and complication risk. Multivariate analyses revealed that each percentage point increase in mean HbA1c was associated with a substantially elevated risk of microvascular outcomes, thereby providing compelling evidence for a causal role of chronic hyperglycemia [7]. This observation, strengthened by the internal consistency across outcomes and corroborated by subsequent EDIC follow-up, underpinned the concept of "glycemic burden" as the principal driver of complication pathogenesis. Importantly, these findings shifted the field from an era of therapeutic nihilism—where microvascular complications were regarded as almost inevitable sequelae of type 1 diabetes—to one in which proactive, intensive management was seen as both feasible and essential. Nonetheless, the trial also highlighted the limitations and trade-offs inherent in intensive insulin therapy. Rates of severe hypoglycemia, defined as episodes requiring assistance from another person, were nearly threefold higher in the intensive group compared with the conventional group. This adverse effect underscored the physiological constraints imposed by exogenous insulin replacement and the challenges of mimicking physiologic glucose homeostasis with the technologies available at the time [8]. In addition, participants in the intensive arm experienced modest but measurable weight gain relative to conventional-therapy participants. While not immediately linked to adverse cardiovascular outcomes within the trial window, this observation foreshadowed the long-term need to balance glycemic benefit with broader metabolic risks. These findings continue to inform contemporary diabetes management and guideline development. The profound risk reduction observed in DCCT solidified HbA1c as the gold-standard biomarker of glycemic exposure and established intensive glycemic control as the cornerstone of type 1 diabetes care. At the same time, the elevated risk of hypoglycemia and the burden of intensive therapy emphasized the necessity of individualized target setting, weighing expected benefit against potential harm [9]. Advances in continuous glucose monitoring (CGM), automated insulin delivery, and adjunctive pharmacotherapies have since been directed toward preserving the microvascular benefits first demonstrated in DCCT while mitigating the risks of hypoglycemia and excess weight gain [10]. Thus, the DCCT not only redefined the natural history of type 1 diabetes but also catalyzed the ongoing evolution of therapeutic technologies and treatment paradigms that aim to maximize benefit while minimizing harm.

4. EDIC LONG-TERM FOLLOW-UP: LEGACY EFFECTS AND CARDIOVASCULAR OUTCOMES

Following the completion of the randomized DCCT phase in 1993, the majority of participants (>90 %) consented to ongoing follow-up in the Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (EDIC) study, which has now extended for more than three decades. Importantly, once the trial ended, all participants were educated about the benefits of intensive therapy and returned to community-based diabetes care. As a result, HbA1c levels in the former intensive and conventional therapy groups converged within a few years of DCCT closeout, with mean values stabilizing in the 8 % range across both arms. Despite this loss of between-group glycemic separation, participants originally randomized to intensive therapy continued to exhibit significant and durable reductions in microvascular complications [11]. This phenomenon—termed the "legacy effect" or "metabolic memory"—provides some of the most compelling evidence in chronic disease management that early therapeutic exposures can impart long-lasting biological benefits, even when subsequent risk factor trajectories become similar. Long-term EDIC analyses demonstrated that the intensive therapy group maintained substantially lower rates of retinopathy progression, nephropathy, and neuropathy throughout follow-up. For example, after 18 years of combined DCCT/EDIC observation, the risk of retinopathy progression

remained 53 % lower and the risk of nephropathy 61 % lower in the former intensive cohort compared with the conventional cohort [12]. Similarly, the incidence of confirmed clinical neuropathy was approximately 30 % lower. These enduring benefits occurred despite the narrowing of HbA1c differences, underscoring the importance of early glycemic exposure in shaping long-term complication trajectories. Perhaps the most influential findings from EDIC have been in the realm of macrovascular disease, an outcome that DCCT was not originally powered to detect given the young age of its participants and the relatively short randomized treatment duration. As the cohort aged and accrued cardiovascular risk factors, EDIC enabled robust evaluation of both surrogate and clinical cardiovascular outcomes. Surrogate imaging markers—including carotid intima-media thickness and coronary artery calcification—showed significantly less progression in the former intensive group, suggesting a durable impact of early glycemic control on atherosclerosis development. In pooled analyses after approximately 30 years of follow-up, the intensive therapy group experienced a 30 % lower risk of any cardiovascular disease (CVD) event, including myocardial infarction, stroke, and cardiovascular death [4]. Although the reduction in major adverse cardiovascular events narrowly missed statistical significance in some analyses, the overall risk trajectory consistently favored early intensive therapy. Risk factor analyses within EDIC revealed that the cardiovascular benefits could not be fully explained by differences in blood pressure, lipid levels, or other traditional CVD predictors, all of which tended to equilibrate between the groups over time. Rather, early glycemic exposure—as reflected in cumulative HbA1c during the DCCT phase—emerged as the dominant determinant of cardiovascular risk. This finding reinforces the concept that hyperglycemia exerts lasting vascular injury through mechanisms such as advanced glycation end-product accumulation, epigenetic modifications, and long-lived protein alterations, which are not easily reversible once established. The enduring protection from both microvascular and macrovascular complications in EDIC also translated into improved survival. After three decades of follow-up, the mortality rate was approximately one-third lower in the original intensive therapy group, bringing their standardized mortality ratio close to that of the general population [13]. These observations confirm that early implementation of intensive therapy in type 1 diabetes not only alters the trajectory of complications but also has a profound effect on life expectancy. Collectively, the DCCT/EDIC program has provided irrefutable evidence that early and sustained optimization of glycemia in type 1 diabetes yields durable benefits extending far beyond the initial period of treatment. The sustained reduction in microvascular complications, coupled with long-term reductions in CVD risk and mortality, highlight the central importance of early intervention and provide the empirical foundation for current clinical practice guidelines. Moreover, the demonstration of a metabolic memory effect has broader implications for chronic disease management, emphasizing the critical need for early risk-factor modification and suggesting that the timing of intervention may be as important as its intensity.

5. MECHANISTIC INSIGHTS: WHY DOES “EARLY” CONTROL PERSISTENTLY MATTER?

The persistence of benefit observed in EDIC despite the attenuation of glycemic separation after DCCT has prompted considerable investigation into the biological mechanisms underlying the so-called “legacy effect” or “metabolic memory.” A central hypothesis is that chronic hyperglycemia initiates molecular and structural changes in susceptible tissues that, once established, are only partially reversible even after glycemic normalization [14]. Conversely, early exposure to lower glucose levels limits the accrual of such irreversible damage, thereby conferring long-lasting protection against microvascular and macrovascular complications. One of the most widely studied contributors is the nonenzymatic glycation of proteins and lipids, leading to the formation of advanced glycation end-products (AGEs). AGEs accumulate in long-lived extracellular matrix proteins such as collagen, altering tissue architecture and impairing normal cellular interactions [15]. They also engage specific receptors (e.g., RAGE, the receptor for AGEs), triggering downstream inflammatory and profibrotic pathways that

perpetuate vascular injury. Longitudinal analyses within DCCT/EDIC have demonstrated that circulating and tissue AGEs correlate with both historical glycemic exposure and subsequent risk of retinopathy and nephropathy, supporting their role as mediators of metabolic memory. Importantly, AGE cross-linking is chemically stable, explaining why their effects persist even after subsequent improvements in glycemic control. In parallel, early hyperglycemia has been shown to induce epigenetic modifications that alter gene expression profiles in endothelial cells, vascular smooth muscle cells, and inflammatory leukocytes. Experimental models have documented persistent changes in histone acetylation and methylation, as well as altered DNA methylation patterns, in cells previously exposed to high glucose. These epigenetic "marks" promote a pro-inflammatory, pro-oxidant state that endures after glucose normalization, thereby providing a plausible molecular mechanism for the chronic vascular injury observed in EDIC participants with higher historical HbA1c [4]. Human biopsy studies, including analysis of peripheral blood mononuclear cells from individuals with type 1 diabetes, have corroborated the presence of such stable epigenetic alterations linked to prior glycemic history. Oxidative stress also figures prominently in the pathophysiology of metabolic memory. Hyperglycemia enhances mitochondrial superoxide production, activates the polyol and hexosamine pathways, and promotes protein kinase C activation. Collectively, these mechanisms drive reactive oxygen species (ROS) accumulation, DNA damage, and impaired nitric oxide signaling, culminating in endothelial dysfunction [2]. Even transient episodes of poor glycemic control can leave behind long-lasting oxidative damage to nucleic acids and proteins. In animal models, early periods of hyperglycemia have been shown to "prime" vascular tissues toward a state of heightened oxidative stress that persists despite subsequent normoglycemia, echoing the clinical experience of DCCT/EDIC. Another layer of explanation derives from the concept of "pathogenic cascades." Early microvascular injury may trigger a self-propagating sequence of events in susceptible organs, such that intervention after a certain threshold confers diminishing returns. For instance, early preservation of renal microarchitecture by intensive glycemic control may prevent maladaptive mesangial expansion and interstitial fibrosis, thereby reduce long-term albuminuria and delay cardiovascular risk escalation [4]. Similarly, prevention of early retinal microaneurysms and basement-membrane thickening may avert later proliferative retinopathy, even if subsequent glycemic trajectories deteriorate. The interruption of these cascades may help explain why the benefits of early intervention were not only sustained but amplified during EDIC follow-up. The metabolic memory concept has also been extended beyond microvascular complications to encompass macrovascular disease. Early hyperglycemia primes the vasculature for accelerated atherosclerosis through AGE accumulation in arterial walls, endothelial dysfunction, and low-grade inflammation. Surrogate outcomes in EDIC—such as reduced progression of carotid intima-media thickness and coronary artery calcification in the intensive group—are consistent with these mechanisms [2]. Epigenetic memory in monocytes and vascular cells may further predispose to plaque vulnerability and thrombosis, thereby linking early glycemic environment with later cardiovascular events. Ongoing mechanistic investigations continue to refine these pathways. Human studies have begun to integrate multi-omics approaches, revealing that transcriptomic and proteomic signatures of oxidative stress and inflammation persist in DCCT/EDIC participants with higher historical HbA1c. Animal models are being used to disentangle the relative contributions of AGEs, ROS, and epigenetic reprogramming, while interventional studies with AGE inhibitors, antioxidants, and epigenetic modulators aim to test causal roles. Collectively, these insights reinforce the conclusion that early glycemic exposure imprints long-lasting biological changes at molecular, cellular, and tissue levels, which together underpin the durable clinical benefit observed in DCCT/EDIC [4]. Thus, the legacy effect exemplifies a principle of diabetes care with broad implications: the timing of risk-factor modification is as crucial as its intensity. By intervening early, before irreversible molecular damage accumulates, clinicians can alter the trajectory of vascular disease in type 1 diabetes in ways that persist for decades.

6. IMPACT ON GUIDELINES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

The impact of the DCCT on clinical practice has been profound, reshaping international guidelines for the management of type 1 diabetes and fundamentally altering therapeutic priorities. Prior to DCCT, glycemic goals were often conservative, with clinicians balancing symptomatic control against concerns about hypoglycemia, treatment burden, and lack of definitive evidence that strict glucose lowering altered long-term outcomes. The trial's unequivocal demonstration that intensive therapy reduces the risk of retinopathy, nephropathy, and neuropathy by 30–70 % catalyzed a paradigm shift: near-normal glycemia became the cornerstone of type 1 diabetes care. Contemporary guidelines, such as the American Diabetes Association (ADA) Standards of Care, the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD) consensus statements, and other regional frameworks, consistently reference the DCCT and its EDIC follow-up as the foundational evidence base for glycemic targets. These recommendations advocate for HbA1c levels below 7 % in most non-pregnant adults with type 1 diabetes, recognizing that this threshold balances substantial reductions in microvascular complications against the risk of severe hypoglycemia. At the same time, reflecting lessons from DCCT, guidelines emphasize individualization: less stringent targets (e.g., <7.5–8.0 %) may be appropriate for older adults, those with advanced comorbidities, or patients with a history of severe hypoglycemia or hypoglycemia unawareness [3]. The translation of DCCT principles into practice extends beyond numerical targets. The trial underscored the importance of intensive education and patient engagement, recognizing that durable glycemic improvements required structured self-management support, frequent glucose monitoring, and sustained behavioral change. This principle remains embedded in modern standards of care, which stress diabetes self-management education and support (DSMES) as a core element of therapy initiation and long-term follow-up. Moreover, DCCT's design validated the use of multiple daily injections (MDI) and continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion (CSII, i.e., insulin pump therapy) as practical means of achieving physiologic glycemic profiles, strategies that remain central to contemporary practice. Subsequent technological advances have markedly enhanced the feasibility and safety of achieving near-normal glycemia in everyday settings. Continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) provides real-time, dynamic data that reduces glycemic variability and facilitates proactive adjustment of insulin dosing. Randomized trials and real-world evidence have demonstrated that CGM reduces hypoglycemia and increases time in range, thereby addressing one of the principal trade-offs observed in DCCT [5]. Similarly, modern insulin pumps equipped with automated insulin delivery algorithms—including hybrid closed-loop systems—can modulate basal insulin delivery in response to glucose trends, improving mean glycemia while substantially mitigating hypoglycemia risk. Together, these tools operationalize the goals established by DCCT while reducing patient burden and enhancing safety. Guidelines have accordingly evolved to integrate technology into therapeutic pathways. The ADA Standards of Care, for instance, now recommend CGM for all individuals with type 1 diabetes willing to use the technology, and endorse automated insulin delivery systems for those capable of managing the devices. These recommendations explicitly connect back to the evidence base established in DCCT/EDIC, noting that the microvascular and macrovascular benefits of intensive control remain compelling, but that modern tools provide a safer and more accessible path toward those outcomes. The global dissemination of DCCT findings also shaped public health policy and reimbursement frameworks. Health systems and insurers increasingly recognize the cost-effectiveness of early intensive management, given the high burden and expense of microvascular and cardiovascular complications. The legacy effect demonstrated in EDIC further strengthens the argument for early investment in intensive management and modern technologies, as upfront resource allocation yields decades-long reductions in complication risk and healthcare costs. In sum, the DCCT/EDIC program not only established the causal role of glycemic control in preventing complications but also provided the evidentiary foundation for clinical guidelines that continue to influence diabetes care worldwide.

Contemporary management strategies—incorporating individualized targets, intensive education, and advanced technologies—are direct descendants of the principles first proven in DCCT. The ongoing challenge is to extend these benefits equitably, ensuring that advances in diabetes technology and care delivery reach all individuals living with type 1 diabetes.

7. CONCLUSION

The Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT) marked a pivotal inflection point in the history of diabetes care. Prior to its publication, the relationship between hyperglycemia and chronic complications of type 1 diabetes was strongly suspected but not definitively proven. By rigorously demonstrating through randomized evidence that intensive insulin therapy substantially prevents or delays the onset and progression of microvascular complications, DCCT provided the empirical foundation upon which modern diabetes management is built. Its findings transformed clinical practice, shifting therapeutic priorities from mere avoidance of acute metabolic derangements toward long-term preservation of organ function and quality of life. The subsequent Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (EDIC) study amplified and extended these insights. Long-term follow-up revealed that the benefits of early intensive glycemic control were not transient but remarkably durable, persisting for decades after glycemic levels between the original study arms had converged. This “legacy effect” or “metabolic memory” underscored the critical importance of early glycemic exposure in shaping long-term outcomes. Beyond confirming sustained reductions in retinopathy, nephropathy, and neuropathy, EDIC demonstrated that early intensive therapy also reduced cardiovascular disease risk by nearly one-third and contributed to lower overall mortality. These findings were groundbreaking: they linked glycemic control not only to microvascular disease but also to the macrovascular complications responsible for the majority of diabetes-related deaths worldwide. Despite its transformative impact, DCCT also highlighted the inherent tradeoffs of intensive therapy. The incidence of severe hypoglycemia was nearly tripled in the intensive arm, and weight gain was modestly higher compared with conventional therapy. These adverse effects emphasized that glycemic targets cannot be one-size-fits-all; rather, they must be individualized, taking into account patient characteristics, comorbidities, and personal preferences. This principle of individualized care, now embedded in all major guidelines, ensures that the benefits of intensive glycemic control are realized without exposing patients to disproportionate harm. Shared decision-making between patients and clinicians has therefore become a central tenet of contemporary diabetes management, balancing evidence-based targets with the lived realities of therapy. Advances in technology have begun to mitigate many of the risks and burdens that were evident in the DCCT era. Continuous glucose monitoring (CGM), insulin pumps, and hybrid closed-loop automated insulin delivery systems have markedly improved the feasibility and safety of maintaining near-normal glycemia. These innovations reduce hypoglycemia, enhance treatment satisfaction, and extend the microvascular and macrovascular benefits demonstrated in DCCT/EDIC to a broader population. Importantly, modern approaches integrate real-time data, algorithmic support, and individualized feedback, operationalizing the principle of intensive management while reducing patient burden. Nevertheless, equitable access to such advances remains a pressing global challenge. While individuals in high-resource settings increasingly benefit from technology-enabled intensive management, many people living with type 1 diabetes worldwide still struggle to obtain even basic insulin and glucose monitoring supplies. Thus, the full promise of the DCCT/EDIC legacy can only be realized through concerted efforts in health policy, resource allocation, and global equity initiatives. Expanding access to evidence-based care, whether through technology, structured education, or health-system reform, is essential to ensure that the survival and quality-of-life gains observed in research settings are translated into population-level improvements. The enduring legacy of DCCT/EDIC is clear: early, supported, and sustained attention to glycemic control sets the foundation for improved long-term outcomes in type 1 diabetes. The lessons

are not confined to a single trial but extend broadly across chronic disease management—demonstrating the power of early intervention, the necessity of individualized goals, and the importance of long-term follow-up in capturing true treatment effects. Clinicians, policymakers, and researchers share responsibility for applying and extending these lessons, striving to maximize benefit while minimizing harm across diverse patient populations. In doing so, the paradigm established by DCCT/EDIC will continue to guide diabetes care for decades to come.

REFERENCES

[1] Diabetes Control and Complications Trial Research Group. (1993). The effect of intensive treatment of diabetes on the development and progression of long-term complications in insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. The New England Journal of Medicine, 329(14), 977–986.

[2] Parimal Koirala, Prasanna Bahadur Amatya, Lochan Karki, Milan Khadka & Binod Pantha (2024). Prevalence of Diabetes in Chronic Liver Disease Patients: A Cross-Sectional Study. Dinkum Journal of Medical Innovations, 3(10):690-699.

[3] DCCT/EDIC Research Group. (2016). The DCCT/EDIC study 30-year follow-up: overview and key findings. Diabetes Care / Annals and follow-up summaries (review).

[4] Nathan, D. M., Genuth, S., Lachin, J., et al. (1993). The Diabetes Control and Complications Trial Research Group — implications for therapy and long-term management (editorial/companion commentary). NEJM.

[5] Nathan, D. M. (2021). Realising the long-term promise of insulin therapy: the DCCT/EDIC study. *Diabetologia*, *64*(5), 1049-1058.

[6] Lachin, J. M., & Nathan, D. M. (2021). Understanding metabolic memory: the prolonged influence of glycemia during the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT) on future risks of complications during the study of the Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (EDIC). *Diabetes Care*, *44*(10), 2216-2224.

[7] Mao, Y., & Zhong, W. (2022). Changes of insulin resistance status and development of complications in type 1 diabetes mellitus: analysis of DCCT/EDIC study. *Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice*, *184*, 109211.

[8] Poonoosamy, J., Lopes, P., Huret, P., Dardari, R., Penfornis, A., Thomas, C., & Dardari, D. (2023). Impact of intensive glycemic treatment on diabetes complications—a systematic review. *Pharmaceutics*, *15*(7), 1791.

[9] Lachin, J. M., Bebu, I., & Nathan, D. M. (2021). The beneficial effects of earlier versus later implementation of intensive therapy in type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care*, *44*(10), 2225-2230.

[10] Braffett, B. H., Bebu, I., Lorenzi, G. M., Martin, C. L., Perkins, B. A., Gubitosi-Klug, R., ... & DCCT/EDIC Research Group. (2025). The NIDDK takes on the complications of type 1 diabetes: the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (DCCT/EDIC) study. *Diabetes care*, *48*(7), 1089-1100.

[11] Muneshwor Sah, Ram Bahadur K.C, Prasanna Bahadur Amatya & Arati Kattel (2024). Association between Abo-Rh Blood Groups and Type-2 Diabetes Mellitus: Comparative Cross Sectional Study. Dinkum Journal of Medical Innovations, 3(08):619-629.

[12] Zoccali, C., Mallamaci, F., Tripepi, G., Fu, E. L., Stel, V. S., Dekker, F. W., & Jager, K. J. (2023). The long-term benefits of early intensive therapy in chronic diseases—the legacy effect. *Clinical Kidney Journal*, *16*(11), 1917-1924.

[13] Blodi, B., Gardner, T. W., Gao, X., Sun, J. K., Lorenzi, G. M., Olmos de Koo, L. C., ... & DCCT/EDIC Research Group. (2024). Intensive glycemic management is associated with reduced retinal

structure abnormalities on ocular coherence tomography in the DCCT/EDIC study. *Diabetes care*, *47*(9), 1522-1529.

[14] Fahrmann, E. R., Adkins, L., & Driscoll, H. K. (2021). Modification of the association between severe hypoglycemia and ischemic heart disease by surrogates of vascular damage severity in type 1 diabetes during∼ 30 years of follow-up in the DCCT/EDIC study. *Diabetes Care*, *44*(9), 2132-2139.

[15] Cefalu, W. T., & Rodgers, G. P. (2024). Diabetes control and complications trial/epidemiology of diabetes interventions and complications study: continuing to build on 40 years of diabetes research. *Diabetes Care*, *47*(9), 1518-1521.

