

# CrossGP: Cross-Day Glucose Prediction Excluding Physiological Information

Ziyi Zhou<sup>\*†1</sup>, Ming Cheng<sup>\*1</sup>, Yanjun Cui<sup>1</sup>, Xingjian Diao<sup>1</sup>, and Zhaorui Ma<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dartmouth College, 15 Thayer Drive, Hanover, NH 03755, USA  
ziyi.zhou.gr@dartmouth.edu

<sup>2</sup> George Mason University, 4400 University Drive, Fairfax, VA 22030, USA  
zma4@gmu.edu

**Abstract.** The increasing number of diabetic patients is a serious issue in society today, which has significant negative impacts on people’s health and the country’s financial expenditures. Because diabetes may develop into potential serious complications, early glucose prediction for diabetic patients is necessary for timely medical treatment. Existing glucose prediction methods typically utilize patients’ private data (e.g. age, gender, ethnicity) and physiological parameters (e.g. blood pressure, heart rate) as reference features for glucose prediction, which inevitably leads to privacy protection concerns. Moreover, these models generally focus on either long-term (monthly-based) or short-term (minute-based) predictions. Long-term prediction methods are generally inaccurate because of the external uncertainties that can greatly affect the glucose values, while short-term ones fail to provide timely medical guidance. Based on the above issues, we propose CrossGP, a novel machine-learning framework for cross-day glucose prediction solely based on the patient’s external activities without involving any physiological parameters. Meanwhile, we implement three baseline models for comparison. Extensive experiments on Anderson’s dataset strongly demonstrate the superior performance of CrossGP and prove its potential for future real-life applications.

**Keywords:** cross-day glucose prediction · physiological parameter · machine learning · privacy protection.

## 1 Introduction

Recently, around 25.5 million people in the U.S. have been diagnosed with diabetes, representing 7.6% of the total U.S. population [28]. This number is expected to increase, reaching 47.1 million people in the U.S. and 578 million people worldwide by 2030 [32]. Meanwhile, the total estimated cost of diagnosed diabetes in the U.S. are enormous, with 412.9 billion U.S. dollars spent [28].

---

\*Equal contribution. †Corresponding author.


Therefore, the current situation of the diabetic epidemic is extremely serious, and controlling blood glucose levels in diabetic patients is not only essential for their health, but also for the country’s financial expenditures. Accurate glucose prediction is essential for offering informative and timely clinical guidance to diabetic patients, providing meaningful guidance in various application scenarios including health monitoring [23, 31, 38], wearables development [19, 33], and smart healthcare [22, 37, 41, 43].

Existing methods of glucose prediction are typically based on the combination of the patient’s physiologic indicators [9, 36] (e.g. heart rate, skin temperature, GSR) and anthropogenic activities [21, 26] (e.g. sleep, meal intake, insulin doses) to predict future glucose values. There are also methods [1, 7, 35] utilizing more private personal information, including gender, age, race, and BMI, for accurate blood glucose prediction. However, although these methods integrate multiple features for accurate blood glucose prediction, *they have to collect patients’ private data*, potentially raising ethical issues along with privacy protection concerns [11, 13, 30]. In addition, obtaining patient information requires sophisticated measuring instruments, as well as considerable human resources [34].

Moreover, blood glucose prediction models at the current stage can be categorized into *two groups*: long-term prediction and short-term prediction. Long-term prediction methods [18, 24] generally predict the patient’s blood glucose values for the next month or even beyond, mainly focusing on the prediction of the general trend. Therefore, the prediction of specific glucose values is relatively inaccurate, as numerous uncertain factors may affect the patient’s blood glucose level over a long time interval. In contrast, short-term prediction methods [5, 12, 26] specialize in predicting glucose values over a short period (e.g. 10 – 30 minutes). Although high prediction accuracy can be achieved by combining the patient’s physiologic parameters, the results are not significantly informative for clinical guidance because the prediction interval is too short for effective interventions and therapeutic measures. Therefore, there remains an unsolved problem: How to accurately predict blood glucose values for an appropriate interval (e.g. one day) without utilizing the private data of diabetic patients to provide effective clinical guidance?

Addressing these challenges is essential for both diabetes management and broader medical research [27, 29, 39]. Benefiting from the powerful ability of machine learning and neural networks to learn high-dimensional features for accurate prediction, we propose CrossGP – a novel framework for diabetic patients’ cross-day glucose prediction without involving personal anthropometric and biochemical data. In summary, our contribution is threefold:

1. **A novel and effective framework for cross-day glucose prediction.** To the best of our knowledge, CrossGP is the first framework for cross-day glucose prediction on Anderson’s dataset [2], showcasing its novelty and innovation.
2. **Effective glucose prediction results.** We implement several comparable machine learning baselines to evaluate the performance, where CrossGP outperforms all baselines and reaches cutting-edge performance.



**Fig. 1. Overview architecture of CrossGP.** (1) We pre-process the original data (e.g. records merging) and employ data augmentation to enhance the model’s robustness. (2) The processed data is input into the model to predict the corresponding class. The deep/shallow branch specializes in capturing features in multi-scale, followed by an attention layer to fuse the feature. (3) Following the standard criterion, the cross-entropy loss is constructed between predicted categories and the ground truth labels.

- Essential privacy protection.** No private information (e.g. age, gender, race) or physiologic data (e.g. heart rate, GSR, blood pressure) is involved in CrossGP for model training, protecting patient privacy while realizing high-precision blood glucose prediction.

## 2 Methods

### 2.1 Logistic Regression

As a commonly used statistical algorithm for prediction tasks, Logistic Regression (LR) [20] models an event using a linear relationship between input features and output. Formally, given  $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  as the feature input, the model outputs the probability within the range of  $(0, 1)$  representing the probability of the feature falling into a particular category.

$$\mathcal{F}(X) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\beta_0 + \beta_1 X)}} \quad (1)$$

where  $\beta_0$  is the intercept while  $\beta_1$  indicates the coefficient vectors. The parameters of LR are estimated using maximum likelihood estimation (MLE). This involves fitting the model to training data in a manner that maximizes the likelihood of observing the provided outcomes, given the assumed logistic distribution.

### 2.2 Random Forest

As an ensemble learning method widely used for prediction and classification, Random Forest (RF) [8] operates by constructing a multitude of decision trees

during training. Each tree is constructed independently and makes its prediction, and the final prediction is determined by aggregating the predictions of all the trees. Formally, given  $\hat{Y} = \{\hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2, \dots, \hat{Y}_N\}$  as the predictions generated by  $N$  decision trees, the final output of RF ( $\hat{Y}_{RF}$ ) is defined as:

$$\hat{Y}_{RF} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{Y}_i \quad (2)$$

### 2.3 XGBoost

XGBoost (Extreme Gradient Boosting) [10] is based on the gradient boosting framework, which builds an ensemble of weak learners (decision trees) sequentially. XGBoost corrects errors made by previous decision trees to lead to a more accurate and robust final model. Specifically, the model assigns weights to decision trees, with subsequent decision trees having increased weight values if the current one predicts incorrectly. Afterward, these individual trees ensemble to form a more precise model.

The objective function of XGBoost is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^N [l(y_i, \hat{y}_i)] + \sum_{k=1}^K \Omega(f_k) \quad (3)$$


where  $y_i$  and  $\hat{y}_i$  indicate the ground truth and predicted instance, respectively,  $l(\cdot)$  is the loss function,  $f_k$  represents the  $k^{th}$  tree in the ensemble, and  $\Omega(f_k)$  refers to the regularization term penalizing the  $k^{th}$  tree. The objective function  $\mathcal{F}(\theta)$  is optimized during the training process.

### 2.4 CrossGP (Ours)

The overall architecture of the CrossGP framework is shown in Figure 1.

**Data Processing** Since the original Anderson’s dataset [2] disperses different features (e.g. meal intake, insulin dose) in different sub-data, we first apply feature manipulation. Specifically, because the data points are recorded with high frequency (e.g. CGM data is recorded every 5 minutes), we merge all entries within the same day together and create a new one. Details will be introduced in Section 3.2. To enhance the model’s robustness and improve the prediction accuracy, we apply data augmentation by adding noise  $n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta^2)$  to the data. The augmented data are input into the model for the glucose prediction task.

**Model Architecture** As shown in Figure 1, the model contains an input layer, a dual-branch structure, and an output layer. Specifically, the lightweight input layer is designed with a single-layer *Dense* module for initial feature extraction. Inspired by [16], a multi-scale feature extractor is constructed. In particular, a



**Fig. 2. Visualization of the CGM data.** The percentage of TIR, TBR, and TAR of 30 subjects is shown, where TIR and TAR predominate in the figure.


deep branch and shallow branch are employed for capturing features in multi-scale. Both deep and shallow branches are designed with sequential *Dense* layers (but different depths) connected with *BatchNorm* [17] for stabilizing learning. The deep branch (4-layer *Dense*) focuses on extracting deep features with hierarchical patterns and high-level abstraction, while the shallow branch (2-layer *Dense*) specializes in low-level and basic representations. As discussed in previous work [3, 14, 15, 40], the attention module enables the model to selectively focus on the main components that are most relevant to the task. Therefore, the multi-scale features are then fused through the attention module, followed by a lightweight output layer (single-layer *Dense*) to get predictions. Following the standard criterion [25, 42], we employ Cross-Entropy loss between the predicted class and the ground truth to guide the model training.

### 3 Experiments

#### 3.1 Dataset Description

We thoroughly investigate Anderson’s dataset [2] for the experiments, as summarized in Table 1. This dataset is originally designed to test a closed-loop control-to-range (CTR) artificial pancreas (AP) system, containing data points of 30 patients with Type 1 Diabetes from 03/2012 to 08/2015. It records multiple anthropometric parameters of the patients, including weight, age, gender, ethnicity, ketone level, etc. However, since our model is designed not to involve any physiological privacy information, we only use the features listed in Table 1 as the information source:

- **CGM:** Continuous glucose monitor during a control cycle and recorded on the DiAs device.
- **Correction Bolus:** Correction bolus insulin delivered during a control cycle and recorded on the DiAs device.




**Fig. 3. Visualization of the feature vectors.** The distribution of four features (meal, meal bolus, correction bolus, total bolus) of 30 subjects are demonstrated.

- **Meal:** Meal-related data announced to the DiAs by the user and recorded on the DiAs device.
- **Meal Bolus:** Meal bolus insulin delivered during a control cycle and recorded on the DiAs device.
- **Total Bolus:** Total bolus insulin (meal, correction) delivered during a control cycle and recorded on DiAs device.

The distribution of the features above are demonstrated in Figure 3, where they span a broad range of values, representing different physiological conditions of the patients, which illustrates the dataset’s diversity and robustness.

**Table 1.** Summary of The Original Dataset.

Features	# Data	Freq	Min	Max	Mean±STD
CGM	915,827	5 min	39.0	401.0	149.4 ± 52.5
Correction Bolus	21,718	hrs	0.0	202.0	1.5 ± 2.1
Meal	13,403	hrs	0.0	300	42.6 ± 27.0
Meal Bolus	12,863	hrs	0.0	18.0	4.1 ± 3.1
Total Bolus	593,089	~15 min	0.0	202.0	0.3 ± 0.9



**Fig. 4. Visualization of the glycemic control.** The glycemic control situation of an example subject is illustrated, containing good, moderate, and poor situations.

**Table 2.** Final Feature Vectors For Model Training.

Features	Freq	Min	Max	Mean±STD
TIR	1 day	0.00	1.00	0.74 ± 0.17
TBR	1 day	0.00	0.52	0.02 ± 0.04
TAR	1 day	0.00	1.00	0.24 ± 0.17
Correction Bolus	1 day	0.00	235.70	9.36 ± 8.48
Meal	1 day	1.00	926.00	170.31 ± 86.86
Meal Bolus	1 day	0.03	56.80	15.54 ± 9.04
Total Bolus	1 day	0.10	259.70	42.40 ± 19.39

### 3.2 Dataset Processing and Feature Manipulation

**Records Merging** Since the original data in Table 1 are recorded frequently (several minutes per record), they are not suitable for predicting cross-day glucose values. Therefore, we sum all entries within the same day together and merge them into one entry, representing the total amount of data for this patient in a day (e.g. total insulin received in a day).

**TIR, TBR, and TAR** Since blood glucose changes frequently and significantly per patient (e.g. blood glucose values decrease rapidly after an injection of insulin), it is unstable and unreliable to directly utilize glucose values (CGM feature) as the model input. Therefore, we divide the glucose values into three categories: TIR (time-in-range), TBR (time-below-range), and TAR (time-above-range), following the widely accepted standard criterion [6]:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{TIR} &: 70 \text{ mg/dL} \leq \text{BG} \leq 180 \text{ mg/dL} \\
 \text{TBR} &: \text{BG} < 70 \text{ mg/dL} \\
 \text{TAR} &: \text{BG} > 180 \text{ mg/dL}
 \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where BG stands for blood glucose value. The visualization of three ranges of 30 subjects is shown in Figure 2.

After such processing, the frequently changed blood glucose values are converted to the form of intervals, making the model more stable when learning the features.

Therefore, the final feature vectors used for model training are shown in Table 2, which contains no personal information (e.g. age, race, gender) or physiological data (e.g. blood pressure, heart rate) of the patient.

**Label Generation** We generate labels for supervising model training and evaluation. Following the standard criterion [4], we classify the predicted glucose values into three categories:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Good Glycemic Control} &: \text{TIR} > 0.7 \\ \text{Moderate Glycemic Control} &: 0.55 \leq \text{TIR} \leq 0.7 \\ \text{Poor Glycemic Control} &: \text{TIR} < 0.55 \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Utilizing the three glycemic control categories as clinical guidance can effectively reflect patients' physical condition, providing timely treatment references for them. The glycemic control example of one subject is illustrated in Figure 4.

**Table 3.** Comparisons With Several Baselines Under Multiple Evaluation Metrics.


Methods	Good			Moderate			Poor			Overall
	Precision	F-1	Recall	Precision	F-1	Recall	Precision	F-1	Recall	Accuracy
LR	0.71	0.81	0.94	0.39	0.25	0.18	0.31	0.08	0.05	0.67
RF	0.69	0.79	0.93	0.30	0.15	0.10	0.45	0.19	0.12	0.65
XGBoost	0.69	0.77	0.88	0.29	0.22	0.17	0.30	0.13	0.09	0.63
<b>CrossGP (Ours)</b>	<b>0.72</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>0.70</b>

### 3.3 Evaluation Metrics

To evaluate the model's performance, we conduct a classification task for cross-day glucose prediction:

1. **Classification.** Following the criterion in Equation 5, the glucose values are classified and labeled into three categories. For each data point of the current day in the test set, the model outputs the predicted category of the next day. Afterward, the classification accuracy, F-1 score, and recall are reported for evaluation.
2. **Feature Importance.** To allow potential clinical guidance in practice, we comparatively analyze the weights of features (as their importance) learned by each model when doing prediction. Based on the results, we then summarize which features serve as important references for cross-day glucose prediction.





**Fig. 5. Visualization of feature importance results.** The *top-3* important features learned by each model are demonstrated, where consistent results can be observed, indicating our theoretical assumption of using external activities for glucose prediction is correct.

### 3.4 Quantitative Results

The quantitative results are shown in Table 3, where our model outperforms existing baselines under all evaluation metrics in each category. Specifically, for the category “Good”, “Moderate”, and “Poor”, our model reaches the classification precision of 0.72, 0.48, and 0.65, respectively. These accurate predictions demonstrate the potential of the model to provide early warning to diabetic patients in real-life situations without utilizing any personal private data. The average precision among all categories (0.70) showcases the generalizability and robustness of our model to handle various blood glucose control situations. As metrics that consider both prediction accuracy and capability of relevant feature capturing, F-1 score (0.83) and recall (0.95) (e.g. in “Good” category) reported by our model demonstrate the advantages over all baselines (e.g. +6.49%/7.95% of F-1/recall over XGBoost in “Good” category), indicating the remarkable performance of cross-day glucose prediction.

### 3.5 Qualitative Results

The feature importance of each method is shown in Figure 5, where the *top-3* important features learned by the model are illustrated. As shown in the figure, consistent results of feature importance analysis are presented by all models: features “TIR”, “TAR”, and “TotalBolus” occupy the largest weights when making the glucose prediction. The qualitative results showcase the possibility of using “TIR”, “TAR”, and “TotalBolus” as the main components for glucose prediction in the real world, which does not require complex measurement procedures or heavy human resources. Moreover, consistent results given by the four approaches prove the validity of glucose prediction through machine learning technology.

## 4 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose CrossGP, a novel framework for cross-day glucose prediction without involving the physiological parameters of diabetes patients, providing high-quality predictions while ensuring privacy protection. Different from existing work which specializes in either long-term (monthly-based) or short-term (minute-based) predictions, we conduct cross-day predictions solely based on external activities (e.g. insulin dose, meal intake). To compare the performance thoroughly, we implement three machine learning baselines (Linear Regression, Random Forest, and XGBoost). Extensive experiments on Anderson’s dataset strongly showcase the effectiveness of CrossGP, demonstrating the potential for future clinical applications in the real world.

## References

1. Aldhoon-Hainerová, I., Zamrazilová, H., Dušátková, L., Sedláčková, B., Hlavatý, P., Hill, M., Hampl, R., Kunešová, M., Hainer, V.: Glucose homeostasis and insulin resistance: prevalence, gender differences and predictors in adolescents. *Diabetology & Metabolic Syndrome* **6**(1), 1–9 (2014)
2. Anderson, S.M., Raghinaru, D., Pinsky, J.E., Boscari, F., Renard, E., Buckingham, B.A., Nimri, R., Doyle III, F.J., Brown, S.A., Keith-Hynes, P., et al.: Multi-national home use of closed-loop control is safe and effective. *Diabetes care* **39**(7), 1143–1150 (2016)
3. Bahdanau, D., Cho, K., Bengio, Y.: Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.0473* (2014)
4. Bartolome, A., Prioleau, T.: A computational framework for discovering digital biomarkers of glycemic control. *NPJ Digital Medicine* **5**(1), 111 (2022)
5. Ben Brahim, N., Place, J., Renard, E., Breton, M.D.: Identification of main factors explaining glucose dynamics during and immediately after moderate exercise in patients with type 1 diabetes. *Journal of diabetes science and technology* **9**(6), 1185–1191 (2015)
6. Bergenstal, R.M., Ahmann, A.J., Bailey, T., Beck, R.W., Bissen, J., Buckingham, B., Deeb, L., Dolin, R.H., Garg, S.K., Golland, R., et al.: Recommendations for standardizing glucose reporting and analysis to optimize clinical decision making in diabetes: the ambulatory glucose profile (agp) (2013)
7. Bergenstal, R.M., Gal, R.L., Connor, C.G., Gubitosi-Klug, R., Kruger, D., Olson, B.A., Willi, S.M., Aleppo, G., Weinstock, R.S., Wood, J., et al.: Racial differences in the relationship of glucose concentrations and hemoglobin a1c levels. *Annals of internal medicine* **167**(2), 95–102 (2017)
8. Breiman, L.: Random forests. *Machine learning* **45**, 5–32 (2001)
9. Butt, H., Khosa, I., Iftikhar, M.A.: Feature transformation for efficient blood glucose prediction in type 1 diabetes mellitus patients. *Diagnostics* **13**(3), 340 (2023)
10. Chen, T., Guestrin, C.: Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. In: *Proceedings of the 22nd acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*. pp. 785–794 (2016)
11. Cheng, M., Diao, X., Cheng, S., Liu, W.: Saic: Integration of speech anonymization and identity classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15190* (2023)

12. Dassau, E., Cameron, F., Lee, H., Bequette, B.W., Zisser, H., Jovanovič, L., Chase, H.P., Wilson, D.M., Buckingham, B.A., Doyle III, F.J.: Real-time hypoglycemia prediction suite using continuous glucose monitoring: a safety net for the artificial pancreas. *Diabetes care* **33**(6), 1249–1254 (2010)
13. De Falco, I., Della Cioppa, A., Koutny, T., Ubl, M., Krcma, M., Scafuri, U., Tarantino, E.: A federated learning-inspired evolutionary algorithm: Application to glucose prediction. *Sensors* **23**(6), 2957 (2023)
14. Diao, X., Cheng, M., Barrios, W., Jin, S.: Ft2tf: First-person statement text-to-talking face generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.05430 (2023)
15. Diao, X., Cheng, M., Cheng, S.: Av-maskenhancer: Enhancing video representations through audio-visual masked autoencoder. In: 2023 IEEE 35th International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence (ICTAI). pp. 354–360. IEEE (2023)
16. Hu, H., Qiao, Z., Cheng, M., Liu, Z., Wang, H.: Dasgil: Domain adaptation for semantic and geometric-aware image-based localization. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* **30**, 1342–1353 (2020)
17. Ioffe, S., Szegedy, C.: Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift. In: International conference on machine learning. pp. 448–456. pmlr (2015)
18. Jaloli, M., Cescon, M.: Long-term prediction of blood glucose levels in type 1 diabetes using a cnn-lstm-based deep neural network. *Journal of Diabetes Science and Technology* **17**(6), 1590–1601 (2023)
19. Koshkak, H.A., Wang, Z., Kanduri, A., Liljeberg, P., Rahmani, A.M., Dutt, N.: SEAL: Sensing Efficient Active Learning on Wearables through Context-awareness. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM Design, Automation and Test in Europe Conference. Spain (Mar 2024), dATE'24
20. LaValley, M.P.: Logistic regression. *Circulation* **117**(18), 2395–2399 (2008)
21. Li, K., Daniels, J., Liu, C., Herrero, P., Georgiou, P.: Convolutional recurrent neural networks for glucose prediction. *IEEE journal of biomedical and health informatics* **24**(2), 603–613 (2019)
22. Li, X., Huang, X., Mo, J., Wang, H., Huang, Q., Yang, C., Zhang, T., Chen, H.J., Hang, T., Liu, F., et al.: A fully integrated closed-loop system based on mesoporous microneedles-iontophoresis for diabetes treatment. *Advanced Science* **8**(16), 2100827 (2021)
23. Li, X., Zhan, C., Huang, Q., He, M., Yang, C., Yang, C., Huang, X., Chen, M., Xie, X., Chen, H.J.: Smart diaper based on integrated multiplex carbon nanotube-coated electrode array sensors for in situ urine monitoring. *ACS Applied Nano Materials* **5**(4), 4767–4778 (2022)
24. Liu, C., Vehí, J., Avari, P., Reddy, M., Oliver, N., Georgiou, P., Herrero, P.: Long-term glucose forecasting using a physiological model and deconvolution of the continuous glucose monitoring signal. *Sensors* **19**(19), 4338 (2019)
25. Mao, A., Mohri, M., Zhong, Y.: Cross-entropy loss functions: Theoretical analysis and applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07288 (2023)
26. Munoz-Organero, M.: Deep physiological model for blood glucose prediction in t1dm patients. *Sensors* **20**(14), 3896 (2020)
27. Ng, A., Wei, B., Jain, J., Ward, E.A., Tandon, S.D., Moskowitz, J.T., Krogh-Jespersen, S., Wakschlag, L.S., Alshurafa, N.: Predicting the next-day perceived and physiological stress of pregnant women by using machine learning and explainability: algorithm development and validation. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth* **10**(8), e33850 (2022)

28. Parker, E.D., Lin, J., Mahoney, T., Ume, N., Yang, G., Gabbay, R.A., ElSayed, N.A., Bannuru, R.R.: Economic costs of diabetes in the us in 2022. *Diabetes Care* **47**(1), 26–43 (2024)
29. Pedram, M., Fernandes, G., Romano, C., Wei, B., Sen, S., Hester, J., Alshurafa, N.: Experience: Barriers and opportunities of wearables for eating research. In: *Extended Abstracts of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. pp. 1–8 (2023)
30. Piao, C., Li, K.: Blood glucose level prediction: A graph-based explainable method with federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.12541* (2023)
31. Sachmechi, I., Salam, S., Amini, M., Khan, R., Spitznogle, A., Belen, T.: Frequent monitoring of blood glucose levels via a remote patient monitoring system helps improve glycemic control. *Endocrine Practice* **29**(6), 441–447 (2023)
32. Saeedi, P., Petersohn, I., Salpea, P., Malanda, B., Karuranga, S., Unwin, N., Colagiuri, S., Guariguata, L., Motala, A.A., Ogurtsova, K., et al.: Global and regional diabetes prevalence estimates for 2019 and projections for 2030 and 2045: Results from the international diabetes federation diabetes atlas. *Diabetes research and clinical practice* **157**, 107843 (2019)
33. Saha, T., Del Caño, R., Mahato, K., De la Paz, E., Chen, C., Ding, S., Yin, L., Wang, J.: Wearable electrochemical glucose sensors in diabetes management: a comprehensive review. *Chemical Reviews* **123**(12), 7854–7889 (2023)
34. So, C.F., Choi, K.S., Wong, T.K., Chung, J.W.: Recent advances in noninvasive glucose monitoring. *Medical Devices: Evidence and Research* pp. 45–52 (2012)
35. Stojmiski, A., Gusev, M., Chorbev, I., Tudjarski, S., Poposka, L., Vavlukis, M.: Age and gender impact on heart rate variability towards noninvasive glucose measurement. *Sensors* **23**(21), 8697 (2023)
36. Turksoy, K., Bayrak, E.S., Quinn, L., Littlejohn, E., Rollins, D., Cinar, A.: Hypoglycemia early alarm systems based on multivariable models. *Industrial & engineering chemistry research* **52**(35), 12329–12336 (2013)
37. Wang, Z., Luo, N., Zhou, P.: Guardhealth: Blockchain empowered secure data management and graph convolutional network enabled anomaly detection in smart healthcare. *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing* **142**, 1–12 (2020)
38. Wang, Z., Yang, Z., Azimi, I., Rahmani, A.M.: Differential private federated transfer learning for mental health monitoring in everyday settings: A case study on stress detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10862* (2024)
39. Wei, B., Zhang, S., Diao, X., Xu, Q., Gao, Y., Alshurafa, N.: An end-to-end energy-efficient approach for intake detection with low inference time using wrist-worn sensor. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics* (2023)
40. Wu, C., Wu, F., Qi, T., Huang, Y., Xie, X.: Fastformer: Additive attention can be all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.09084* (2021)
41. Zhang, C., Zhao, X., Zhou, Z., Liang, X., Wang, S.: Doseformer: Dynamic graph transformer for postoperative pain prediction. *Electronics* **12**(16), 3507 (2023)
42. Zhang, Z., Sabuncu, M.: Generalized cross entropy loss for training deep neural networks with noisy labels. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **31** (2018)
43. Zhou, Z., Guo, B., Zhang, C.: Doseguide: A graph-based dynamic time-aware prediction system for postoperative pain. In: *2021 IEEE 27th International Conference on Parallel and Distributed Systems (ICPADS)*. pp. 474–481. IEEE (2021)