

A System of Random ODEs for Representing Trends of CGM Signals

Giulia Elena Aliffi¹, Giovanni Nastasi¹, Vittorio Romano¹, Dario Pitocco², Alessandro Rizzi³, Elvin J. Moore⁴ and Andrea De Gaetano^{5,6,7}

¹Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, Università degli Studi di Catania, Catania ITALY

²Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Rome ITALY

³Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino gemelli IRCCS, Rome ITALY

⁴Department of Mathematics, King Mongkut's University Of Technology North Bangkok, Bangkok THAILAND

⁵CNR-IASI Istituto di analisi dei sistemi ed informatica "Antonio Ruberti", Roma, ITALY

⁶CNR-IRIB Istituto per la Ricerca e l'Innovazione Biomedica, Palermo ITALY

⁷Óbuda University, Budapest HUNGARY

Abstract

Diabetes Mellitus is a metabolic disorder which may result in severe and potentially fatal complications if not well-treated and monitored. In this study, a quantitative analysis of the data collected using CGM (Continuous Glucose Monitoring) devices from six subjects with type 2 diabetes in good metabolic control at the University Polyclinic Agostino Gemelli, Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, is carried out. In particular, a system of random ordinary differential equations

whose state variables are affected by a sequence of stochastic perturbations is proposed and used to extract more informative inferences from the patients' data. For this work, Matlab and R programs were used to find the most appropriate values of parameters (according to the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC)) in models for each patient. Specifically, the fitting was carried out by using the Particle Swarm Optimization Method to minimize the ordinary least squares error between the observed CGM data and the data from the random ODE model. Goodness of fit tests were made in order to assess whether or not the exponential distribution, whose parameter had been estimated by Maximum Likelihood Estimation, was suitable for representing the waiting times computed from the model parameters. Finally, both parametric and non-parametric density estimation of the frequency histograms associated with the variability of the glucose elimination rate from blood into the external environment were conducted and their representative parameters assessed from the data. The results show that the chosen models succeed in capturing most of the glucose fluctuations for almost every patient.

Keywords

Diabetes Mellitus , Continuous Glucose Monitoring , Random Ordinary Differential Equations , Particle Swarm Optimization Method, Maximum Likelihood Estimation, Akaike Information Criterion

1 Introduction

Marked by chronically high basal and post-prandial glycemia due to insulin production deficiency and/or tissue insulin resistance, Diabetes Mellitus is increasing in prevalence throughout the world, especially as a function of evolving food intake patterns. During the past 30 years there has been an increase of around 4% in worldwide incidence with a four-fold increase in the number of patients [1, 2, 3].

In its various forms, Diabetes Mellitus (DM) is now the eighth major cause of death worldwide [2]. Undiagnosed or ineffectively treated DM can result in

severe and potentially fatal complications (heart disease, strokes, microvascular insufficiency leading to blindness or limb amputations, infections, even the development of specific types of cancer and physical and cognitive disability). Among pregnant women DM can be the cause of fetal loss, congenital malformations, stillbirth and perinatal death [1, 2]. Uncontrolled hyperglycemia may lead to diabetic ketoacidosis and hyperosmolar coma, while treatment with injected insulin carries a concrete risk of hypoglycemia, with attendant seizures, coma and possibly death.

According to the American Diabetes Association, the disease can be classified into three main categories: type 1 (T1DM), type 2 (T2DM) and gestational diabetes (GDM) [3].

T1DM is mainly characterized by a deficiency of insulin in the body, probably caused by autoimmune destruction of pancreatic β -cells [1, 2, 3]. Type 1 diabetic patients account for approximately 5-10% of the diabetic population. In the majority of patients (around 80-90%) the disease appears when they are children or adolescents [3]. T1DM is not currently preventable. For people who are affected, daily insulin injections or continuous insulin infusion via pump are essential for survival [2]. The causes of the autoimmune response, set in motion by T-lymphocytes [1], have not yet been well identified. However, several studies have suggested genetics, viral infections and environmental stress as possible risk factors [2, 3].

T2DM affects 90-95% of diabetics. It is characterized by an imbalance associated with the development of insulin resistance of tissue cells between insulin supply (possibly increased in the early phases of the disease) and insulin requirements [1, 3]. T2DM may evolve slowly and remain subclinical for several years before the appearance of hyperglycemia [2]. Typically, T2DM patients do not require insulin treatment unless pancreatic β -cells loss occurs [3]. Although T2DM mostly affects adults, increasing prevalence in adolescents and young adults is now becoming apparent. Obesity, sedentary lifestyle and unhealthy food choices during childhood are considered the major causes of this phenomenon [3], even though genetic predisposition and metabolic environment during gestation may also play an important role [2]. Unlike T1DM, which is not currently preventable, T2DM may be prevented or its development slowed down. Insulin sensitivity can be improved through a healthy diet and regular physical activity [2]. Very often these lifestyle changes, if

maintained, are more effective than pharmacological treatments [2].

Gestational Diabetes Mellitus (GDM) is a non-permanent condition which arises in 5 to 10% of pregnant women. It consists of glycemic levels which are above average but not high enough to classify the patient as outright diabetic. It is mostly diagnosed by prenatal screening rather than through the appearance of symptoms. It may be influenced by maternal age, overweight, obesity, diabetes in the family, sedentary lifestyle, previous occurrence of GDM, stillbirth and polycystic ovary syndrome [2, 3]. Among the women involved, 40 to 60% are likely to develop T2DM in the following decade [1, 2]. In addition, GDM may lead to macrosomia, preterm births and increased frequency of cesarean deliveries [3].

Among the diabetic population, it is also possible to identify a minority of about 1 – 2% affected by Maturity Onset Diabetes of the Young (MODY). MODY is an autosomal dominant genetic disease that is associated with pancreatic β -cells dysfunction. Due to its symptomatic similarity with T1DM and T2DM, its diagnosis can be time consuming and require specific clinical tests [4]. Typical characteristics of subjects suffering from this disease are strong family history of diabetes, insulin independence, lack of β -cells autoimmunity, no sign of insulin resistance mechanisms and occurrence of diabetes between the second and fifth decades. Depending on the gene involved in the mutation causing the β -cells dysfunction, the clinical picture of the patient, the prognosis of the disease and their response to the therapy can vary accordingly [4, 5].

Monitoring blood glucose levels plays a fundamental role in controlling the progression of disease and the efficacy of therapy. T1DM, GDM and late-stage T2DM patients require strict glycemic control and frequent measurements of glycemia [2]. Although originally developed for T1DM patients, Continuous Glucose Monitoring (CGM) is now a common diagnostic tool for all patients receiving significant insulin therapy [6, 7].

A CGM device provides between 288 and 1440 measurements of subcutaneous glucose concentration (nearly reflecting blood glucose concentration) per day, thus allowing the possibility of assessing glycemic variability and identifying the times of the day in which the risk of hypo- and hyper-glycemia is maximal [6, 8]. As a result of monitoring, the treatment regimen (diet, insulin

dosage, other medications, physical activity, etc.) can be adjusted.

While visual examination of a CGM tracing already delivers important information to the trained practitioner, a quantitative assessment of the tracing would allow more precise and possibly more informative inferences to be drawn. This is the domain where mathematical and statistical analysis of CGM is required [8].

Extensive reviews and articles concerning the several approaches, which have been adopted to best describe the dynamics of the glucose-insulin system, have been given in the papers of Huard et al. [9] and Palumbo et al. [10], where several methods to address this issue are reported. A commonly referenced model, not exempt from criticism [10, 11, 12], is the nonlinear minimal model developed by Bergman et al. [13, 14]. The proposed system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs) enabled the authors to elicit from the parameters, functions and indices estimated from the model information concerning glucose effectiveness, insulin sensitivity, plasma glucose and insulin concentration as a function of time [15]. Modified versions of this model in which classical derivatives are replaced with Caputo fractional derivatives can be found in the papers of Cho et al. [16] and Coman et al. [17] and in the paper of Rooka et al. [18] in which a glucose input disturbance is also introduced.

Alternative methodologies have been proposed and analysed in the works of Pompa et al. [19], Boiroux et al. [20], Palumbo et al. [22], Panunzi et al. [12, 23], Saleem et al. [24] and De Gaetano et al. [25, 26]. Specifically, Pompa et al. [19] gave a comprehensive description and comparison between the Sorensen, Hovorka and UVAPadova models, and Boiroux et al. [20] proposed a Stochastic Differential Equation-Grey Box (SDE-GB) model reformulation of the Medtronic Virtual Patient (MPV) model developed by Kanderian et al. [21]. Further, Palumbo et al. [22] and Panunzi et al. [12, 23] developed a single-delay model and Saleem et al. [24] employed a system of Caputo-Fabrizio fractional order differential equations. Finally, De Gaetano et al. [25, 26] proposed a combination of Caputo fractional order and ordinary differential equations in [25] and an ordinary differential equations compartmental model in [26].

In the present work, we expand on the deterministic first-order differential equation model previously proposed by Sakulrang et al. [27] for the analysis

of CGM data from Type 1 diabetes patients. The new approach involves the use of random ordinary differential equations (RODEs), where the state variables (representing respectively blood glucose concentration, the rate of glucose elimination from blood and its first derivative) are affected by a sequence of stochastic perturbations. We study a family of nested mathematical models, where the parameter k_{XG} of [27] is substituted by a function $H(t)$ whose law is defined by a further differential equation to which a term representing glucose fluctuations caused by unknown factors has been added.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In section 2, we give details of the methods used for collection of data, the random ODE model and the numerical methods used to solve the model. In section 3, we give a detailed discussion of the results. In section 4, we give conclusions. Finally, the paper includes an appendix (section 5) which gives tables of the kinetic parameter fits and the AIC and BIC values for each subject.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Collection of Data

For the analysis, CGM data from subjects with type 2 diabetes in good metabolic control were collected. These were a data subset from a prospective study conducted at the Diabetes Care Unit, Fondazione Policlinico Agostino Gemelli in Rome, Italy. The original protocol was approved by the local Ethics Committee (ref. 51266/19) and was conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki. Each subject signed the appropriate informed consent before any study activity was undertaken. All CGM datasets were recorded between November 2021 and March 2022 with a Medtronic Guardian Connect System (Medtronic, Northridge, CA).

In order to prevent the patient's glucose levels from being affected by macroscopic factors such as food intake, physical activity or strong emotions, which could consequently complicate the analysis, the data set was narrowed to the night-time hours (8 p.m-8a.m).

The procedure used to identify the best model to fit each subject's CGM data and to estimate the corresponding vector of model parameters is detailed

below. Graphical representations and data analysis were computed using Matlab [28] and R [29], respectively.

2.2 Random Ordinary Differential Equations Models

In order to interpret the CGM signal, the following family of mathematical models has been used:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{dG}{dt} = k_G - H(t)G(t) \\ \frac{dH}{dt} = k_H - k_{EH}H(t) + Y(t) \\ \frac{dY}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_Y} Y_i \delta(t - t_i) \\ G(0) = G_0 \\ H(0) = H_0 \\ Y(0) = Y_0 \end{array} \right. \quad (1)$$

where the meaning of all variables and parameters is defined in Tables 1 and 2, and where the symbol $\delta(\cdot)$ indicates the Dirac delta function.

State Variables	Definition	Unit of Measurement
$G(t)$	Blood glucose concentration.	$[mg/dL]$
$H(t)$	Rate of glucose elimination from blood into the external environment.	$[min^{-1}]$
$Y(t)$	Perturbation of the rate of change of the $H(t)$ function.	$[min^{-2}]$

Table 1: State Variables.

Parameters	Definition	Unit of Measurement	Ranges
k_G	Constant entry rate of glucose into the bloodstream.	$[mg/dL min^{-1}]$	$[-10^6, 10^6]$

continued on next page

<i>continued from previous page</i>			
Parameters	Definition	Unit of Measurement	Ranges
k_H	Constant rate of change of H .	$[min^{-2}]$	$[-10^6, 10^6]$
k_{EH}	Constant rate of change of H per minute.	$[min^{-1}]$	$[0.0001, 0.2]$
N_Y	Number of external/internal shocks caused by unknown external/internal factors.	—	$[1, 40]$
$Y_i, \forall i \in S \subseteq \mathbb{N}; S = N_Y < \infty.$	Intensity of external/internal shocks due to unknown external/internal factors.	$[min^{-1}]$	$[-0.01, 0.01]$
$t_i, \forall i \in S \subseteq \mathbb{N}; S = N_Y < \infty.$	Times at which shocks occur.	$[min]$	$[0, 715]$
G_0	Initial blood glucose concentration (more specifically, glycemic value in resting conditions, also known as basal or resting glycemia).	$[mg/dL]$	$[30, 180]$
<i>continued on next page</i>			

<i>continued from previous page</i>			
Parameters	Definition	Unit of Measurement	Ranges
H_0	Initial rate of glucose elimination from blood into the external environment.	$[min^{-1}]$	$[0.0001, 0.2]$
Y_0	Initial rate of change of the first derivative of the $H(t)$ function.	$[min^{-2}]$	$[-1, 1]$

Table 2: Parameters.

As previously mentioned in subsection 2.1, the data set was narrowed to the night-time hours (8 p.m-8 a.m) in order to take into account only spontaneously occurring random oscillations by reducing the impact of major glucose fluctuations induced by life events such as meals and physical activity. Despite this restriction, a considerable degree of variation in the levels of glucose, as monitored, was still recorded. This led naturally to the hypothesis that there are intrinsic unknown factors determining the observed glucose fluctuations. Such perturbations however did not translate into immediate discontinuities in the glycemic levels, but rather into relatively smooth oscillations. The choice was therefore made to model the system by introducing the term $Y(t)$ in the second equation of (1). $Y(t)$ is defined to be a piecewise constant function, with jumps at apparently random times, and with jump intensities $(Y_i)_{i \in S}$, $|S| = N_Y$, which can assume either positive or negative values.

Corresponding with the formalization of Eq. 1, for each patient in the study a family of mathematical models can be envisioned, indexed by the number N_Y of foreseen jumps, where an increase by one jump corresponds to two additional parameters in the model (the timing and the intensity of the new jump).

We opted for a random ordinary differential equations model, where jump i occurs at time t_i and where the solution is smooth between jumps. We indicate with $\Delta t_i = t_{i+1} - t_i, i \in \{1, \dots, N_Y - 1\}$ the time interval between jumps i and $i + 1$. We may assume that these waiting times between jumps follow an exponential distribution of parameter $\lambda(N_Y)$: this assumption is

actually not necessary for the adaptation of the model to data from a given patient, but will be useful after the fit to summarize the results.

It is clear that for any given disturbance function $Y(t) = Y_0 + \sum_{i: t_i \leq t} Y_i$, the rate of glucose elimination from the blood, $H(t)$, tends asymptotically to a value determined by $Y(t)$, which in general is different from the steady-state solution $\frac{k_H}{k_{XH}}$.

If we assume that at the time $t_0 = 0$, $\frac{dG}{dt} = 0$ and $\frac{dH}{dt} = 0$, then $k_G = H_0 G_0$ (G_0 known). If H_0 is estimated, then it follows that $k_H = k_{XH} H_0 - Y_0$ is known. Therefore, k_G and k_H are determined parameters whereas the remaining ones are free. Thus the vector of parameters which needs to be estimated is the following:

$$\theta = [k_{EH}, H_0, Y_0, (Y_i)_{i=1, \dots, N_Y}, (t_i)_{i=1, \dots, N_Y}]. \quad (2)$$

2.3 Numerical Methods

The data set utilized in this work consists of a total of 144 measurements of the interstitial glucose levels (approximately one observation every five minutes for 12 hours) for each of the six patients. As already mentioned in subsection 2.1, these data were collected from CGM devices during the time slot 8:00 PM - 8:00 AM. Depending on the value of N_Y , a family of models was obtained. The present work aimed at finding, for each experimental subject, which value of N_Y gave rise to the model that best fits their CGM tracing according to Akaike's Information Criterion [30].

The procedure which has been followed for each experimental subject consisted of several steps:

- I. For each N_Y the system of differential equations (1) was solved numerically using the Fourth Order Runge-Kutta method with step time equal to 0.5 minutes.
- II. Parameter estimation was carried out by Ordinary Least Squares (OLS). Specifically, the loss function

$$L = \sum_{i=1}^{144} (G_i(t_i) - \hat{G}_i(\theta, t_i))^2$$

was minimized, where $G_i(t_i)$ represents the CGM value recorded at time t_i and $\hat{G}_i(\theta, t_i)$ is the corresponding estimated value obtained by our model. For the minimization, the Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) [31, 32, 33] global optimization method was used. It should be noted that in preliminary runs the Nelder-Mead local optimization algorithm was used. However, due to its lack of performance (inability to vary the time-points of the jumps due to essentially constant values of the loss function around each local optimum) we opted to use the Particle Swarm Optimization method [31, 32, 33].

- III. The parameter $\lambda(N_Y)$ that defines the exponential distribution of the jump times was estimated on the fitted $[t_{i+1} - t_i]$ intervals by Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE).
- IV. Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) values were calculated for all N_Y values tested and the model with the smallest AIC value was picked as the "best" model for that subject. For comparison, we also selected the "best" model using the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) value [34, 35].

3 Results and Discussion


In figures 1a, 2a, 3a, 4a, 5a, 6a, we show the AIC and BIC trends and the best AIC values of N_Y computed for each patient. As previously mentioned in subsection 2.3, the Akaike Information Criterion was preferred and adopted to select the best number of jumps per patient. However, for the sake of completeness, the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) values were also calculated. As expected, the Akaike Information Criterion, suggests in most cases a model with more parameters to be the best one. Indeed, it can be seen that for the majority of subjects the optimal number of jumps N_Y corresponding to the minimum of the AIC values was notably bigger than the one corresponding to the minimum of the BIC values (dashed red and blue lines of figures 1a, 2a, 3a, 4a, 5a, 6a, respectively).

As can be seen from figures 1b, 2b, 3b, 4b, 5b, 6b, the model fits were very good in all cases; with the models corresponding to the minimal AIC values of N_Y being able to capture most of the glucose fluctuations for almost every subject.


Figures 1c, 2c, 3c, 4c, 5c, 6c show the histograms of relative frequencies of jump times, Δt_i $i = 1, \dots, N_Y - 1$, where N_Y is the optimal number of jumps for each patient. The Exponential distribution corresponding to the estimated λ is also plotted and superimposed on the histograms together with the Normal, Gamma, Inverse Gaussian, Log-Normal and Weibull distributions fitted using the R `gamlss` package [36].

The frequency histograms associated with the intensity of the jumps $(Y_i)_{i=1 \dots N_Y}$ are shown in figures 1d, 2d, 3d, 4d, 5d, 6d. In these panels, estimated density distributions obtained through both parametric and non-parametric methods have been superimposed. Unlike the non-parametric Kernel method [37], which makes a mixture of Gaussians generated in correspondence with each statistical unit, the parametric estimation corresponds to a single distribution which we supposed to be a standard normal one. Table 3 shows for each patient the means and the standard deviations extracted from them. As expected, the first method delivers a closer fit to the histograms.


Patient AA01




(a) AIC and BIC trends over the number of jumps.



(b) Gycemia over time, $N_Y = 40$.




(c) Histogram of the Delta Times $(\Delta t_i)_{i=1, \dots, N_Y-1}$.




(d) Estimation of the density of the jumps values.

Figure 1: Results from Patient AA01.


Patient CI01




(a) AIC and BIC trends over the number of jumps.



(b) Gycemia over time, $N_Y = 33$




(c) Histogram of the Delta Times $(\Delta t_i)_{i=1, \dots, N_Y-1}$.




(d) Estimation of the density of the jumps values.

Figure 2: Results from Patient CI01.


Patient LM01




(a) AIC and BIC trends over the number of jumps.



(b) Gycemia over time, $N_Y = 28$.




(c) Histogram of the Delta Times $(\Delta t_i)_{i=1, \dots, N_Y-1}$.




(d) Estimation of the density of the jumps values.

Figure 3: Results from Patient LM01.


Patient LR01




(a) AIC and BIC trends over the number of jumps.



(b) Gycemia over time, $N_Y = 35$.




(c) Histogram of the Delta Times $(\Delta t_i)_{i=1, \dots, N_Y-1}$.




(d) Estimation of the density of the jumps values.

Figure 4: Results from Patient LR01.


Patient MA01




(a) AIC and BIC trends over the number of jumps.



(b) Gycemia over time, $N_Y = 37$.




(c) Histogram of the Delta Times $(\Delta t_i)_{i=1, \dots, N_Y-1}$.




(d) Estimation of the density of the jumps values.

Figure 5: Results from Patient MA01.


Patient TO01




(a) AIC and BIC trends over the number of jumps.



(b) Gycemia over time, $N_Y = 36$.



(c) Histogram of the Delta Times $(\Delta t_i)_{i=1, \dots, N_Y-1}$.



(d) Estimation of the density of the jumps values.

Figure 6: Results from Patient TO01.

Patient	Expectation μ	Standard Deviation σ
AA01	0.0006309383	0.006499121
CI01	-0.0002030683	0.006237878
LM01	-0.0002734351	0.008314626
LR01	-0.0001384163	0.006686395
MA01	-0.0004833903	0.00666078
TO01	0.0004643832	0.007119182

Table 3: Means and the standard deviations obtained from the normal parametric density for each patient.

In order to assess whether or not an exponential distribution was suited to fit the waiting times, a goodness of fit test was conducted and its results were compared with those we would have obtained if the Gamma, Normal, Log-Normal, Weibull and Inverse Gaussian distributions were used. According to Tables 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, the exponential distribution does not appear to be the optimal one. While we may speculate that the relatively poorer adaptation of the exponential distribution to the waiting times might be due to the small number of jumps identified in a 12 hours period, the parameter λ thus estimated may be taken as a first approximation to the assessment of the subject's profile insofar as frequency of perturbations is concerned: the higher the value of λ the lower the average waiting time between jumps and the higher the frequency of (clinically significant) perturbations.

Distribution	AIC
Gamma	246.6720
Weibull	260.6177
Log-Normal	297.2971
Exponential	312.6722
Normal	367.6999
Inverse-Gaussian	727.7363

Table 4: Goodness of fit Δt_i Patient AA01

Distribution	AIC
Gamma	247.8040
Weibull	250.4277
Exponential	257.2382
Log-Normal	273.1504
Normal	292.7365
Inverse Gaussian	492.7533

Table 5: Goodness of fit Δt_i Patient CI01

Distribution	AIC
Gamma	213.0493
Weibull	214.9193
Log-Normal	222.2184
Exponential	239.4443
Normal	282.5976
Inverse Gaussian	311.6700

Table 6: Goodness of fit Δt_i Patient LM01

Distribution	AIC
Gamma	278.8939
Weibull	281.6976
Exponential	283.1854
Log-Normal	300.3641
Normal	311.1622
Inverse Gaussian	369.3778

Table 7: Goodness of fit Δt_i Patient LR01

Distribution	AIC
Gamma	283.1995
Weibull	286.1157
Exponential	294.8392
Log-Normal	316.6493
Normal	340.0757
Inverse Gaussian	642.0360

Table 8: Goodness of fit Δt_i Patient MA01

Distribution	AIC
Gamma	281.9684
Weibull	285.0734
Exponential	288.9915
Log-Normal	310.3724
Normal	319.8319
Inverse Gaussian	535.8345

Table 9: Goodness of fit Δt_i Patient TO01

For the sake of completeness, the best fit of parameter values for each subject (according to the Akaike Information Criterion) are shown in tables 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16.

Patient	N_Y	k_{EH}	H_0	Y_0
AA01	40	1.7040836e-01	1.8362950e-01	1.9804910e-01
CI01	33	1.3576304e-01	2.0000000e-01	-1.8709505e-02
LM01	28	1.8288960e-01	1.5486807e-01	-1.9716001e-01
LR01	35	1.9436799e-01	1.2964056e-01	-9.4738384e-02
MA01	37	1.9528735e-01	1.7274300e-01	6.5454601e-02
TO01	36	1.5440513e-01	1.3130390e-01	1.7878761e-02

Table 10: Kinetic parameters per patient according to the best number of Jumps N_Y .

Y_1	Y_2	Y_3	Y_4	Y_5
-0.0008522	0.0082079	-0.0027529	0.0100000	-0.0020453
t_1	t_2	t_3	t_4	t_5
96.4694240	41.0126743	521.2257670	0.0000047	536.1852475
Y_6	Y_7	Y_8	Y_9	Y_{10}
-0.0027914	0.0056947	0.0079354	-0.0051790	0.0100000
t_6	t_7	t_8	t_9	t_{10}
670.5415249	651.5779089	592.1908401	653.0546694	553.4489211
Y_{11}	Y_{12}	Y_{13}	Y_{14}	Y_{15}
-0.0076626	0.0026771	-0.0042698	0.0026999	-0.0008454
t_{11}	t_{12}	t_{13}	t_{14}	t_{15}
2.0046982	269.1692686	269.8438523	606.0212146	8.7451825
Y_{16}	Y_{17}	Y_{18}	Y_{19}	Y_{20}
-0.0011373	-0.0061638	0.0100000	-0.0055480	0.0100000
t_{16}	t_{17}	t_{18}	t_{19}	t_{20}
479.3534315	594.9283680	7e-7.0000000	11.9074076	0.0000050
Y_{21}	Y_{22}	Y_{23}	Y_{24}	Y_{25}
-0.0030257	0.0016332	0.0049510	0.0046375	0.0090030
t_{21}	t_{22}	t_{23}	t_{24}	t_{25}
427.4210142	470.3012091	574.5025867	193.9288938	701.1254916
Y_{26}	Y_{27}	Y_{28}	Y_{29}	Y_{30}
-0.0094768	-0.0046071	-0.0031690	-0.0099815	0.0100000
t_{26}	t_{27}	t_{28}	t_{29}	t_{30}
555.1121206	183.5776477	451.2321225	715.0000000	381.5255252
Y_{31}	Y_{32}	Y_{33}	Y_{34}	Y_{35}
-0.0098327	0.0040016	-0.0037268	0.0033771	0.0092296
t_{31}	t_{32}	t_{33}	t_{34}	t_{35}
669.3672518	684.4704766	624.9619032	3.0154228	426.4555740
Y_{36}	Y_{37}	Y_{38}	Y_{39}	Y_{40}
-0.0099771	-0.0042031	0.0100000	0.0032312	-0.0047940
t_{36}	t_{37}	t_{38}	t_{39}	t_{40}
715.0000000	390.5302787	503.2713883	227.1387811	12.5288597

Table 11: Patient AA01: Jump Times and Intensities of the Jumps , $N_Y=40$.

Y_1	Y_2	Y_3	Y_4	Y_5
0.0077927	0.0039879	0.0075872	-0.0044712	-0.0018787
t_1	t_2	t_3	t_4	t_5
316.7990818	210.6308053	470.7146924	71.4547367	643.8988914
Y_6	Y_7	Y_8	Y_9	Y_{10}
-0.0057426	0.0089106	-0.0015786	-0.0098366	-0.0081581
t_6	t_7	t_8	t_9	t_{10}
120.3768331	116.8023766	39.5265763	256.3662735	546.0721041
Y_{11}	Y_{12}	Y_{13}	Y_{14}	Y_{15}
0.0012285	0.0099038	-0.0040532	0.0019110	-0.0099999
t_{11}	t_{12}	t_{13}	t_{14}	t_{15}
311.2037399	0.0000000	154.5436777	674.9559585	316.5662710
Y_{16}	Y_{17}	Y_{18}	Y_{19}	Y_{20}
-0.0013553	0.0096572	-0.0089628	0.0047832	-0.0011290
t_{16}	t_{17}	t_{18}	t_{19}	t_{20}
20.0562645	546.8284301	0.0000242	5.1327393	548.0438123
Y_{21}	Y_{22}	Y_{23}	Y_{24}	Y_{25}
-0.0005266	0.0028415	0.0022489	0.0099996	-0.0038709
t_{21}	t_{22}	t_{23}	t_{24}	t_{25}
369.1501845	74.3849633	491.4162120	228.5613707	492.0329049
Y_{26}	Y_{27}	Y_{28}	Y_{29}	Y_{30}
-0.0074401	-0.0028609	-0.0060563	-0.0074551	0.0088227
t_{26}	t_{27}	t_{28}	t_{29}	t_{30}
0.0000000	699.7567081	471.9747770	651.8711153	640.1461712
Y_{31}	Y_{32}	Y_{33}		
-0.0085584	0.0023706	0.0080574		
t_{31}	t_{32}	t_{33}		
205.4890669	179.0890959	200.0283621		

Table 12: Patient CI01: Jump Times and Intensities of the Jumps , $N_Y=33$.

Y_1	Y_2	Y_3	Y_4	Y_5
0.0094199	-0.0080587	0.0021961	0.0100000	-0.0028866
t_1	t_2	t_3	t_4	t_5
654.1512862	585.5464944	644.3370410	417.9293262	542.0126031
Y_6	Y_7	Y_8	Y_9	Y_{10}
-0.0100000	-0.0099631	0.0046941	-0.0100000	0.0095006
t_6	t_7	t_8	t_9	t_{10}
434.3627183	684.0864226	400.3745915	654.5222074	714.9990446
Y_{11}	Y_{12}	Y_{13}	Y_{14}	Y_{15}
-0.0094130	0.0099997	-0.0099937	0.0020846	-0.0096301
t_{11}	t_{12}	t_{13}	t_{14}	t_{15}
66.8214993	418.0864229	106.6886704	330.1001502	434.4440153
Y_{16}	Y_{17}	Y_{18}	Y_{19}	Y_{20}
0.0087614	-0.0084045	0.0068031	0.0100000	0.0020464
t_{16}	t_{17}	t_{18}	t_{19}	t_{20}
681.4718820	251.6292575	416.4250369	423.3263392	67.5749099
Y_{21}	Y_{22}	Y_{23}	Y_{24}	Y_{25}
0.0100000	-0.0099337	0.0035321	0.0066839	-0.0100000
t_{21}	t_{22}	t_{23}	t_{24}	t_{25}
577.0673031	0.0008545	0.8109347	45.4162305	434.1659324
Y_{26}	Y_{27}	Y_{28}		
0.0098063	-0.0100000	-0.0049008		
t_{26}	t_{27}	t_{28}		
244.6704407	434.1057985	47.3518475		

Table 13: Patient LM01: Jump Times and Intensities of the Jumps , $N_Y=28$.

Y_1	Y_2	Y_3	Y_4	Y_5
-0.0042423	0.0089271	0.0034352	0.0030308	-0.0091485
t_1	t_2	t_3	t_4	t_5
9.4055928	309.1046599	219.3932734	678.8751052	323.3457991
Y_6	Y_7	Y_8	Y_9	Y_{10}
0.0037261	-0.0064810	0.0100000	-0.0033406	0.0099993
t_6	t_7	t_8	t_9	t_{10}
81.2049773	668.3849564	548.3514444	236.1334994	710.8674100
Y_{11}	Y_{12}	Y_{13}	Y_{14}	Y_{15}
-0.0084567	-0.0061738	-0.0074910	-0.0022503	0.0053412
t_{11}	t_{12}	t_{13}	t_{14}	t_{15}
323.4165964	399.2105498	568.4781126	714.9999987	424.4191646
Y_{16}	Y_{17}	Y_{18}	Y_{19}	Y_{20}
0.0057334	0.0100000	0.0052418	-0.0090365	-0.0054880
t_{16}	t_{17}	t_{18}	t_{19}	t_{20}
379.4083149	334.7219640	309.5408225	390.0398516	693.8667357
Y_{21}	Y_{22}	Y_{23}	Y_{24}	Y_{25}
-0.0098827	-0.0084542	0.0053518	0.0067853	-0.0041307
t_{21}	t_{22}	t_{23}	t_{24}	t_{25}
568.0084955	508.1057122	262.1275647	373.7757574	9.3947358
Y_{26}	Y_{27}	Y_{28}	Y_{29}	Y_{30}
-0.0031064	0.0070014	-0.0040320	0.0100000	0.0079578
t_{26}	t_{27}	t_{28}	t_{29}	t_{30}
606.6556673	61.7788242	9.0961759	504.5462696	588.5114092
Y_{31}	Y_{32}	Y_{33}	Y_{34}	Y_{35}
-0.0011048	-0.0036827	-0.0099997	-0.0027045	0.0018297
t_{31}	t_{32}	t_{33}	t_{34}	t_{35}
127.6193246	103.6202159	323.3762512	466.1816449	46.9876567

Table 14: Patient LR01: Jump Times and Intensities of the Jumps , $N_Y=35$.

Y_1	Y_2	Y_3	Y_4	Y_5
0.0047114	-0.0100000	-0.0100000	0.0022796	0.0100000
t_1	t_2	t_3	t_4	t_5
504.5402603	19.2206631	340.5650733	291.9347122	227.3564986
Y_6	Y_7	Y_8	Y_9	Y_{10}
-0.0037126	-0.0074433	-0.0079552	0.0100000	0.0100000
t_6	t_7	t_8	t_9	t_{10}
101.3667313	653.6070749	227.8899619	62.1959047	285.6977458
Y_{11}	Y_{12}	Y_{13}	Y_{14}	Y_{15}
-0.0073874	0.0026086	-0.0051889	0.0032490	-0.0064170
t_{11}	t_{12}	t_{13}	t_{14}	t_{15}
290.5510609	712.0901951	562.3141688	364.8049420	187.2241304
Y_{16}	Y_{17}	Y_{18}	Y_{19}	Y_{20}
-0.0076436	0.0055584	-0.0100000	-0.0024819	-0.0099993
t_{16}	t_{17}	t_{18}	t_{19}	t_{20}
99.2607925	48.1505895	105.8793258	711.5674463	691.9279768
Y_{21}	Y_{22}	Y_{23}	Y_{24}	Y_{25}
-0.0026019	-0.0044595	-0.0032370	0.0080164	-0.0028053
t_{21}	t_{22}	t_{23}	t_{24}	t_{25}
3.9437386	11.9697234	600.2841579	336.5955731	249.8851829
Y_{26}	Y_{27}	Y_{28}	Y_{29}	Y_{30}
0.0051638	-0.0037874	0.0074059	-0.0041905	0.0099951
t_{26}	t_{27}	t_{28}	t_{29}	t_{30}
190.0227212	646.1436935	77.3406559	99.1960534	89.3734407
Y_{31}	Y_{32}	Y_{33}	Y_{34}	Y_{35}
0.0044119	-0.0067805	0.0079108	-0.0020569	0.0094297
t_{31}	t_{32}	t_{33}	t_{34}	t_{35}
109.4922592	522.7556798	563.9397321	697.5215067	648.5563003
Y_{36}	Y_{37}			
-0.0025781	0.0021004			
t_{36}	t_{37}			
469.7168864	0.0000029			

Table 15: Patient MA01: Jump Times and Intensities of the Jumps , $N_Y=37$.

Y_1	Y_2	Y_3	Y_4	Y_5
0.0027853	-0.0057416	0.0073313	-0.0069012	0.0085468
t_1	t_2	t_3	t_4	t_5
228.2319172	248.3301603	359.0555169	656.9703580	261.8357683
Y_6	Y_7	Y_8	Y_9	Y_{10}
-0.0052059	0.0064098	0.0046504	0.0028948	0.0100000
t_6	t_7	t_8	t_9	t_{10}
78.3418665	2.9513457	296.0632154	97.0371717	546.4371095
Y_{11}	Y_{12}	Y_{13}	Y_{14}	Y_{15}
0.0051375	-0.0042564	0.0099955	0.0022252	-0.0100000
t_{11}	t_{12}	t_{13}	t_{14}	t_{15}
338.4239552	326.2879809	711.8950545	523.6578338	561.1899071
Y_{16}	Y_{17}	Y_{18}	Y_{19}	Y_{20}
0.0088683	-0.0086301	0.0035970	0.0021650	-0.0077132
t_{16}	t_{17}	t_{18}	t_{19}	t_{20}
131.1947630	706.2804723	2.5825097	200.0996041	24.6922370
Y_{21}	Y_{22}	Y_{23}	Y_{24}	Y_{25}
-0.0100000	-0.0100000	0.0066459	0.0023922	0.0026157
t_{21}	t_{22}	t_{23}	t_{24}	t_{25}
328.4215277	561.4266288	24.0057224	414.4989552	473.3040019
Y_{26}	Y_{27}	Y_{28}	Y_{29}	Y_{30}
-0.0100000	-0.0054074	-0.0100000	0.0076432	0.0004875
t_{26}	t_{27}	t_{28}	t_{29}	t_{30}
132.8993055	389.7747158	568.3069074	671.5908276	183.3124811
Y_{31}	Y_{32}	Y_{33}	Y_{34}	Y_{35}
-0.0100000	0.0046726	-0.0052363	0.0100000	0.0067460
t_{31}	t_{32}	t_{33}	t_{34}	t_{35}
0.0000565	200.3293718	222.9699054	558.0978878	576.0280566
Y_{36}				
0.0100000				
t_{36}				
713.0214862				

Table 16: Patient TO01: Jump Times and Intensities of the Jumps , $N_Y=36$.

It was noteworthy that the parameters k_{EH} and H_0 tended to stabilize at the value 0.19 for almost all subjects, independently of the number of jumps

(see Appendix).

4 Conclusion

In the present work a simple random ODE model of night-time CGM data has been identified for each of six experimental subjects with type 2 diabetes in good metabolic control. The (meta-)parameters estimated on the samples of waiting times (λ) and on the sample of jump intensities (μ and σ), together with such directly interpretable kinetic parameters such as k_G may represent a first-line assessment of the status of the subject. These (meta-)parameters are easy to obtain repeatedly on non-invasive CGM tracings and could be useful in following a subject's clinical course. Routine, automated incorporation of the model within glycemia-tracking software apps may help to continuously monitor the state of health of a patient at no extra cost and with no added invasiveness.

5 Appendix

For interested readers, supplementary data associated with this article can be found in the tables below. The red and blue lines correspond to the values obtained according respectively to the smallest values of AIC and BIC, whereas the bold black lines correspond to agreement of the smallest AIC and BIC values.

5.0.1 Patient AA01

#Jumps	k_{EH}	H_0	Y_0	λ
2	1.9529958e-01	2.0000000e-01	1.2165521e-01	3.0063572e-03
3	1.6592730e-01	2.0000000e-01	2.0344909e-01	4.5264913e-03
4	1.4560093e-01	1.7798691e-01	1.3108839e-01	5.7322689e-03
5	1.6496873e-01	2.0000000e-01	-3.8078165e-02	7.5438393e-03
6	1.2970784e-01	1.7711280e-01	-2.6898489e-02	9.0626253e-03
7	1.5877344e-01	1.9609149e-01	-1.1679627e-01	9.7902098e-03
8	1.3961334e-01	1.7942557e-01	-9.8098993e-03	1.1482495e-02
9	1.3608723e-01	1.8262987e-01	-1.0772807e-01	1.2587413e-02

continued on next page

continued from previous page

#Jumps	k_{EH}	H_0	Y_0	λ
10	1.9997807e-01	1.9999704e-01	9.2830074e-02	1.4105194e-02
11	1.2410190e-01	1.9996286e-01	-8.8456452e-02	1.5776672e-02
12	1.6641787e-01	2.0000000e-01	-1.3200046e-01	1.6981956e-02
13	1.3148829e-01	1.9999974e-01	6.0608134e-02	1.8181818e-02
14	1.8792864e-01	2.0000000e-01	1.8335703e-01	1.9983454e-02
15	1.9998048e-01	1.3991264e-01	-1.0678712e-01	2.0979025e-02
16	1.9999531e-01	1.9999999e-01	-9.1893747e-02	2.4028399e-02
17	1.5103661e-01	2.0000000e-01	9.3136218e-02	2.3776224e-02
18	1.9127423e-01	1.9999946e-01	1.7161837e-01	2.5175343e-02
19	1.9999953e-01	1.9999995e-01	-1.4012571e-01	2.8562053e-02
20	1.9483978e-01	2.0000000e-01	-5.5543141e-02	2.7975066e-02
21	1.9652983e-01	1.9999991e-01	-2.8980208e-02	2.9374628e-02
22	1.7169240e-01	2.0000000e-01	-1.6743588e-01	3.1108420e-02
23	1.9091430e-01	1.9999978e-01	6.4476308e-02	3.2167832e-02
24	2.0000000e-01	1.9626347e-01	-6.8683656e-02	3.3566434e-02
25	1.4770315e-01	1.9645403e-01	1.1525279e-01	3.4965035e-02
26	2.0000000e-01	1.9995758e-01	8.6635973e-02	3.6363636e-02
27	1.3320758e-01	2.0000000e-01	-7.2195962e-02	3.7762239e-02
28	2.0000000e-01	1.8837665e-01	1.6561249e-01	3.9160839e-02
29	1.6864952e-01	1.9995528e-01	-4.6008922e-03	4.0559441e-02
30	1.8916764e-01	1.9999999e-01	-7.5987742e-02	4.1958042e-02
31	1.9999988e-01	2.0000000e-01	8.9451840e-02	4.3357992e-02
32	1.5279204e-01	1.8951541e-01	1.6282339e-01	4.4755245e-02
33	1.9886072e-01	1.9623147e-01	9.8902090e-02	4.6153846e-02
34	1.9649169e-01	1.9999994e-01	-6.2335814e-02	4.7992004e-02
35	1.9734995e-01	1.9530984e-01	1.6080905e-01	4.8951078e-02
36	1.6353961e-01	1.8772381e-01	2.0101179e-01	5.0353499e-02
37	2.0000000e-01	1.9999898e-01	-1.7908527e-01	5.1748252e-02
38	2.0000000e-01	1.9517726e-01	1.3053332e-01	5.3146853e-02
39	1.9745944e-01	1.9662842e-01	-7.0373277e-02	5.4545458e-02
40	1.7040836e-01	1.8362950e-01	1.9804910e-01	5.5944056e-02

Table 17: Vector of kinetic parameters, Patient AA01.

#Jumps	#Parameters	min(S)	AIC	BIC
2	10	1.7168103e+04	7.0246330e+02	7.2325199e+02
3	12	9.5764438e+03	6.2240375e+02	6.4913207e+02
4	14	7.9684548e+03	5.9993429e+02	6.3260224e+02
5	16	5.0086365e+03	5.3707122e+02	5.7567879e+02
6	18	5.1281220e+03	5.4446614e+02	5.8901334e+02
7	20	7.1818411e+03	5.9696768e+02	6.4745450e+02
8	22	3.0788168e+03	4.7899818e+02	5.3542463e+02
9	24	3.0854167e+03	4.8330653e+02	5.4567261e+02
10	26	6.1520527e+03	5.8668080e+02	6.5498651e+02
11	28	2.8007806e+03	4.7736898e+02	5.5161431e+02
12	30	2.4791157e+03	4.6380152e+02	5.4398648e+02
13	32	3.6851165e+03	5.2488315e+02	6.1100774e+02
14	34	2.3343076e+03	4.6313465e+02	5.5519886e+02
15	36	1.8687478e+03	4.3510232e+02	5.3310616e+02
16	38	4.0986643e+03	5.5219885e+02	6.5614232e+02
17	40	2.1467624e+03	4.6307401e+02	5.7295710e+02
18	42	2.3317657e+03	4.7897776e+02	5.9480048e+02
19	44	3.3231199e+03	5.3399383e+02	6.5575617e+02
20	46	8.9037660e+02	3.4834370e+02	4.7604567e+02
21	48	3.1696637e+03	5.3518572e+02	6.6882731e+02
22	50	8.1012832e+02	3.4274263e+02	4.8232385e+02
23	52	8.7251631e+02	3.5742580e+02	5.0294665e+02
24	54	1.2343631e+03	4.1138358e+02	5.6284406e+02
25	56	1.4308069e+03	4.3665000e+02	5.9405011e+02
26	58	1.6811403e+04	7.9543991e+02	9.5877964e+02
27	60	1.2713550e+03	4.2763564e+02	5.9691499e+02
28	62	1.2170300e+03	4.2534718e+02	6.0056617e+02
29	64	1.1210401e+03	4.1751665e+02	5.9867526e+02
30	66	1.0472781e+03	4.1171566e+02	5.9881390e+02
31	68	5.6062953e+02	3.2573157e+02	5.1876943e+02
32	70	5.3616168e+02	3.2330563e+02	5.2228313e+02
33	72	7.4963455e+02	3.7556724e+02	5.8048436e+02
34	74	8.3230402e+02	3.9463137e+02	6.0548811e+02
35	76	4.2369020e+02	3.0140325e+02	5.1819962e+02

continued on next page

<i>continued from previous page</i>				
#Jumps	#Parameters	min(S)	AIC	BIC
36	78	6.1008629e+02	3.5790534e+02	5.8064134e+02
37	80	5.3409327e+02	3.4274903e+02	5.7142466e+02
38	82	4.2895812e+02	3.1518262e+02	5.4979787e+02
39	84	3.8863071e+02	3.0496554e+02	5.4552042e+02
40	86	3.4551571e+02	2.9203237e+02	5.3852688e+02

Table 18: AIC and BIC Values, Patient AA01.

5.0.2 Patient CI01

#Jumps	k_{EH}	H_0	Y_0	λ
2	2.0000000e-01	1.9768866e-01	1.8936097e-01	3.4108308e-03
3	1.8698643e-01	1.9912237e-01	2.0012832e-01	9.3856445e-03
4	6.7485244e-02	2.0000000e-01	-1.0854681e-02	5.7613490e-03
5	1.3282090e-01	1.5134990e-01	-3.3357762e-02	7.0283955e-03
6	3.6362229e-02	1.9999964e-01	-1.0397274e-02	8.3916084e-03
7	1.4056425e-01	1.9999903e-01	2.0033033e-01	9.7904462e-03
8	3.8208247e-02	1.9999999e-01	-7.0768525e-02	1.1189058e-02
9	3.7096052e-02	2.0000000e-01	1.1559668e-01	1.2587413e-02
10	1.9999994e-01	1.9588432e-01	9.8027757e-02	1.3986056e-02
11	1.1537642e-01	1.9999630e-01	5.9705917e-02	1.5577559e-02
12	8.3170710e-02	2.0000000e-01	-9.0269424e-04	1.7285278e-02
13	3.0240072e-02	1.9650433e-01	1.9893929e-01	1.8181818e-02
14	1.6773373e-01	1.9999999e-01	1.1025639e-03	1.9580429e-02
15	1.9999508e-01	1.3037272e-01	1.0784031e-01	2.0979027e-02
16	1.4965283e-01	1.9589268e-01	4.4428153e-02	2.2387489e-02
17	2.0000000e-01	1.3091745e-01	1.7403945e-01	2.3778116e-02
18	1.1518259e-01	1.9916422e-01	-1.5346503e-01	2.5177766e-02
19	9.5741932e-02	1.9999988e-01	-1.9633795e-01	2.6573580e-02
20	2.0000000e-01	2.0000000e-01	3.9758014e-02	2.7978356e-02
21	1.6469457e-01	2.0000000e-01	2.1669005e-02	2.9370629e-02
22	4.4582433e-02	1.9766806e-01	-1.9109981e-01	3.0769339e-02
23	9.6226059e-02	1.9605474e-01	-1.3352619e-01	3.2167832e-02

continued on next page

continued from previous page

#Jumps	k_{EH}	H_0	Y_0	λ
24	1.0546548e-01	1.9725669e-01	-1.5316463e-01	3.3566434e-02
25	1.9999533e-01	2.0000000e-01	8.0019894e-02	3.4965035e-02
26	1.0062013e-01	1.9999940e-01	-1.7293436e-01	3.6363636e-02
27	1.1603344e-01	1.9442279e-01	-4.8071295e-02	3.7762238e-02
28	1.2872974e-01	1.9795825e-01	-1.6253727e-01	3.9160842e-02
29	1.6866908e-01	1.9665676e-01	7.2359796e-02	4.0559441e-02
30	8.3221624e-02	1.9840684e-01	-1.9479598e-01	4.1958042e-02
31	1.7562101e-01	1.9999976e-01	1.9768465e-02	4.3356646e-02
32	6.7787754e-02	1.9835587e-01	-1.9632531e-01	4.4755245e-02
33	1.3576304e-01	2.0000000e-01	-1.8709505e-02	4.7159248e-02
34	1.8699356e-01	2.0000000e-01	2.0142337e-01	4.7552448e-02
35	1.9989293e-01	1.7652580e-01	1.0183309e-01	4.8951094e-02
36	9.9680658e-02	2.0000000e-01	4.5306439e-02	5.0349650e-02
37	1.0154646e-01	2.0000000e-01	1.6415655e-01	5.1749362e-02
38	1.8783372e-01	2.0000000e-01	-7.2897837e-03	5.3698905e-02
39	1.9999709e-01	2.0000000e-01	-1.8702449e-01	5.4545455e-02
40	1.8003408e-01	2.0000000e-01	-1.6491628e-01	5.5944056e-02

Table 19: Vector of kinetic parameters, Patient CI01.

#Jumps	#Parameters	min(S)	AIC	BIC
2	10	1.1424918e+04	6.4381837e+02	6.6460707e+02
3	12	3.5764244e+03	4.8057200e+02	5.0730031e+02
4	14	4.3208918e+03	5.1180215e+02	5.4447009e+02
5	16	2.8856858e+03	4.5766946e+02	4.9627703e+02
6	18	3.3478982e+03	4.8306356e+02	5.2761076e+02
7	20	3.2710954e+03	4.8372163e+02	5.3420846e+02
8	22	2.4176989e+03	4.4418918e+02	5.0061563e+02
9	24	3.2210421e+03	4.8950115e+02	5.5186723e+02
10	26	2.4056252e+03	4.5146826e+02	5.1977396e+02

continued on next page

<i>continued from previous page</i>				
#Jumps	#Parameters	min(S)	AIC	BIC
11	28	2.6729772e+03	4.7064342e+02	5.4488875e+02
12	30	2.0554813e+03	4.3681709e+02	5.1700205e+02
13	32	2.7595941e+03	4.8323569e+02	5.6936027e+02
14	34	2.1835263e+03	4.5351917e+02	5.4558338e+02
15	36	2.6226618e+03	4.8390697e+02	5.8191081e+02
16	38	2.2653933e+03	4.6681941e+02	5.7076288e+02
17	40	2.1964800e+03	4.6637092e+02	5.7625401e+02
18	42	2.3400889e+03	4.7949085e+02	5.9531357e+02
19	44	2.4784145e+03	4.9176079e+02	6.1352313e+02
20	46	2.5151789e+03	4.9788117e+02	6.2558314e+02
21	48	2.3318644e+03	4.9098385e+02	6.2462545e+02
22	50	1.9765472e+03	4.7117826e+02	6.1075948e+02
23	52	3.5679319e+02	2.2865739e+02	3.7417824e+02
24	54	2.4819459e+03	5.1196582e+02	6.6342630e+02
25	56	1.8112475e+03	4.7060192e+02	6.2800203e+02
26	58	2.7531109e+03	5.3489698e+02	6.9823672e+02
27	60	4.4229177e+02	2.7559053e+02	4.4486989e+02
28	62	5.0442468e+02	2.9851915e+02	4.7373814e+02
29	64	3.9807590e+02	2.6842343e+02	4.4958204e+02
30	66	4.2864750e+02	2.8307831e+02	4.7017655e+02
31	68	2.0564693e+03	5.1288629e+02	7.0592416e+02
32	70	3.5637132e+02	2.6448703e+02	4.6346452e+02
33	72	2.0575523e+02	1.8938985e+02	3.9430697e+02
34	74	1.0158244e+03	4.2332452e+02	6.3418126e+02
35	76	1.7989473e+03	5.0962068e+02	7.2641705e+02
36	78	4.1896730e+02	3.0378906e+02	5.2652506e+02
37	80	3.8386018e+02	2.9518697e+02	5.2386259e+02
38	82	3.5234032e+02	2.8684893e+02	5.2146418e+02
39	84	2.6778913e+02	2.5133566e+02	4.9189054e+02
40	86	3.2177759e+02	2.8178281e+02	5.2827731e+02

Table 20: AIC and BIC Values, Patient CI01.

5.0.3 Patient LM01

#Jumps	k_{EH}	H_0	Y_0	λ
2	3.6014968e-02	1.8291457e-01	1.1404956e-01	6.1183830e-03
3	1.7194664e-01	1.8199468e-01	-7.1279704e-03	7.7631031e-03
4	1.9999954e-01	1.4627050e-01	4.3111073e-03	9.2529642e-03
5	2.0000000e-01	1.8337686e-01	-3.6166245e-02	7.6835308e-03
6	4.4928367e-02	1.8379666e-01	-2.6744923e-02	8.6399690e-03
7	1.6805574e-01	1.2860853e-01	-4.2968568e-02	9.7904073e-03
8	1.9999937e-01	1.8421009e-01	-6.1397623e-02	1.1192339e-02
9	1.9999989e-01	1.7301358e-01	1.8748798e-01	1.3714248e-02
10	1.3796656e-01	1.8428434e-01	-8.0345539e-02	1.4400438e-02
11	5.9134101e-02	1.4743084e-01	1.8942310e-01	1.7239545e-02
12	2.0000000e-01	1.8762614e-01	1.7194557e-01	2.9554438e-02
13	1.9999968e-01	1.4897830e-01	1.7535927e-01	1.8183728e-02
14	1.9999990e-01	1.3439652e-01	1.3052987e-01	1.9580420e-02
15	1.9999997e-01	1.4858700e-01	-2.3026407e-02	2.0979650e-02
16	2.3795192e-02	1.9574432e-01	-3.2736887e-02	2.3036122e-02
17	7.1510323e-02	1.9221609e-01	6.0895109e-02	2.3776470e-02
18	5.7783144e-02	1.9396357e-01	3.7283120e-02	2.5174827e-02
19	1.4564020e-01	1.9234385e-01	1.5405995e-01	2.6573532e-02
20	3.4628926e-02	1.9385212e-01	-5.9425181e-03	2.8603934e-02
21	6.1017957e-02	1.9432269e-01	1.3321629e-01	2.9370629e-02
22	1.9999974e-01	1.9442004e-01	3.9833569e-02	3.0769523e-02
23	1.9999667e-01	1.9276940e-01	2.9400997e-02	3.2168948e-02
24	1.4902525e-01	1.8872603e-01	-1.3670730e-01	3.3566434e-02
25	1.8439091e-01	1.9416318e-01	-1.5511148e-01	3.5771601e-02
26	7.1723402e-02	1.9361098e-01	4.1579752e-02	3.6363639e-02
27	1.9999951e-01	1.7979595e-01	1.6045565e-01	3.7762288e-02
28	1.8288960e-01	1.5486807e-01	-1.9716010e-01	3.9160891e-02
29	5.2322852e-02	2.0000000e-01	-3.0992236e-02	4.0559441e-02
30	1.9351950e-01	1.9536695e-01	7.4731543e-02	4.1958042e-02
31	8.0548963e-02	1.9042325e-01	3.3649249e-05	4.4374431e-02
32	1.9307679e-02	1.9486954e-01	-1.5514077e-01	4.5756010e-02
33	2.0000000e-01	1.8328578e-01	6.2010402e-02	4.7546966e-02

continued on next page

continued from previous page

#Jumps	k_{EH}	H_0	Y_0	λ
34	1.3288024e-01	1.8001933e-01	1.5035323e-01	4.7797138e-02
35	1.5035896e-01	1.8762750e-01	1.4552547e-01	4.8951951e-02
36	4.9384446e-02	1.9999194e-01	8.8541455e-02	5.0743913e-02
37	2.8865096e-02	1.9483408e-01	-9.8570968e-02	5.1748252e-02
38	2.0371105e-02	1.9576109e-01	8.6963812e-02	5.3148343e-02
39	3.3087567e-02	1.9469561e-01	3.3319590e-02	5.4545455e-02
40	2.0000000e-01	1.9820645e-01	1.9248086e-02	5.5944139e-02

Table 21: Vector of kinetic parameters, Patient LM01.

#Jumps	#Parameters	min(S)	AIC	BIC
2	10	3.2951678e+03	4.6477747e+02	4.8556616e+02
3	12	2.6016862e+03	4.3475065e+02	4.6147897e+02
4	14	4.8192179e+03	5.2751972e+02	5.6018767e+02
5	16	2.4219889e+03	4.3244447e+02	4.7105204e+02
6	18	2.9717453e+03	4.6590116e+02	5.1044836e+02
7	20	1.4460803e+03	3.6617901e+02	4.1666583e+02
8	22	2.4038426e+03	4.4336152e+02	4.9978797e+02
9	24	1.7814740e+03	4.0421516e+02	4.6658124e+02
10	26	2.2575625e+03	4.4232079e+02	5.1062649e+02
11	28	8.6077577e+02	3.0747499e+02	3.8172032e+02
12	30	2.1240488e+03	4.4154231e+02	5.2172727e+02
13	32	1.1756966e+03	3.6037161e+02	4.4649620e+02
14	34	6.9775278e+02	2.8923942e+02	3.8130364e+02
15	36	1.1624526e+03	3.6674027e+02	4.6474411e+02
16	38	1.9684100e+03	4.4658421e+02	5.5052767e+02
17	40	2.4829676e+03	4.8402509e+02	5.9390818e+02
18	42	1.8909408e+03	4.4880237e+02	5.6462509e+02
19	44	2.1228016e+03	4.6945774e+02	5.9122008e+02
20	46	1.6681890e+03	4.3875400e+02	5.6645598e+02
21	48	1.6606162e+03	4.4209882e+02	5.7574042e+02
22	50	1.9773976e+03	4.7124020e+02	6.1082143e+02

continued on next page

<i>continued from previous page</i>				
#Jumps	#Parameters	min(S)	AIC	BIC
23	52	1.7524952e+03	4.5785349e+02	6.0337435e+02
24	54	3.0410518e+03	5.4122094e+02	6.9268142e+02
25	56	1.7951486e+03	4.6931629e+02	6.2671640e+02
26	58	1.6649164e+03	4.6247123e+02	6.2581096e+02
27	60	1.0885471e+03	4.0528116e+02	5.7456052e+02
28	62	2.5730985e+02	2.0158735e+02	3.7680633e+02
29	64	1.7248412e+03	4.7956308e+02	6.6072170e+02
30	66	1.6643672e+03	4.7842372e+02	6.6552196e+02
31	68	1.3100292e+03	4.4795076e+02	6.4098862e+02
32	70	1.2933450e+03	4.5010503e+02	6.4908252e+02
33	72	8.2410522e+02	3.8920583e+02	5.9412295e+02
34	74	6.6725201e+02	3.6280305e+02	5.7365979e+02
35	76	1.2528845e+03	4.5752823e+02	6.7432460e+02
36	78	1.6273542e+03	4.9918523e+02	7.2192123e+02
37	80	1.2562719e+03	4.6591703e+02	6.9459266e+02
38	82	1.0674788e+03	4.4646678e+02	6.8108203e+02
39	84	1.4290791e+03	4.9247600e+02	7.3303088e+02
40	86	1.8381012e+03	5.3272121e+02	7.7921571e+02

Table 22: AIC and BIC Values, Patient LM01.

5.0.4 Patient LR01

#Jumps	k_{EH}	H_0	Y_0	λ
2	1.2917835e-01	1.4929295e-01	-5.2505304e-02	3.3656022e-02
3	1.4165991e-01	1.3094488e-01	1.8221120e-02	4.5130750e-03
4	1.6764526e-01	1.2334991e-01	-1.6493008e-01	6.0138152e-03
5	8.8176803e-02	1.3415355e-01	1.4589924e-01	7.2425918e-03
6	1.2855249e-01	1.6343316e-01	-1.3034339e-01	8.4378552e-03
7	1.0446757e-01	1.9999988e-01	-1.4281157e-01	9.9388981e-03
8	1.0391227e-01	2.0000000e-01	-1.1996958e-02	1.1971838e-02
9	1.6535462e-01	1.9138263e-01	-1.2598699e-01	1.2587417e-02
10	1.2148622e-01	1.3420586e-01	-1.0559152e-01	1.3986014e-02

continued on next page

continued from previous page

#Jumps	k_{EH}	H_0	Y_0	λ
11	1.0528538e-01	1.9999999e-01	-1.3520848e-01	1.5385245e-02
12	1.3009472e-01	1.9999931e-01	-9.2339373e-02	1.6783217e-02
13	1.5837953e-01	1.5118941e-01	-1.6318572e-01	1.8181979e-02
14	1.3582256e-01	2.0000000e-01	-1.2697489e-02	1.9580421e-02
15	1.3526070e-01	1.8320693e-01	1.0739744e-01	2.0979022e-02
16	1.9642320e-01	1.6623678e-01	1.9831580e-01	2.2377622e-02
17	1.6157222e-01	1.4999819e-01	-1.2192736e-01	2.3901948e-02
18	1.6226726e-01	1.5785461e-01	1.9292923e-01	2.5174825e-02
19	1.7096064e-01	1.7203784e-01	7.9505496e-02	2.6573427e-02
20	1.8080655e-01	1.9687800e-01	4.9381315e-02	2.8814736e-02
21	1.5912371e-01	1.5556649e-01	4.6526042e-02	2.9456773e-02
22	1.6904665e-01	1.5180238e-01	7.1916147e-04	3.0769231e-02
23	1.3315750e-01	1.3573936e-01	1.2696685e-01	3.2167832e-02
24	2.0000000e-01	1.0351079e-01	-1.0989045e-01	3.3566434e-02
25	1.7449701e-01	2.0000000e-01	-1.0222845e-01	3.4967521e-02
26	1.6211805e-01	2.0000000e-01	-9.1386325e-03	3.6363636e-02
27	1.5989036e-01	1.5280628e-01	-3.8155857e-02	3.7762238e-02
28	1.3380414e-01	1.3303498e-01	1.0380378e-01	3.9403755e-02
29	1.9173848e-01	1.9999968e-01	7.7679035e-02	4.0559441e-02
30	1.9998234e-01	1.5588068e-01	-2.1682098e-02	4.1958042e-02
31	1.7309997e-01	1.5996966e-01	9.2388276e-02	4.3356648e-02
32	1.2976644e-01	2.0000000e-01	-1.5951541e-01	4.4755245e-02
33	1.5640537e-01	1.4916313e-01	1.8766304e-01	4.6153846e-02
34	2.0000000e-01	1.0902677e-01	4.9102916e-02	4.7552448e-02
35	1.9436799e-01	1.2964056e-01	-9.4738384e-02	4.8951049e-02
36	1.8715804e-01	1.6239735e-01	3.1938741e-02	5.0349871e-02
37	1.7388107e-01	1.3608971e-01	1.4548581e-01	5.1748652e-02
38	1.6758018e-01	1.4342781e-01	1.6212344e-01	5.3146853e-02
39	1.6287785e-01	1.3197374e-01	1.7697658e-01	5.4545455e-02
40	1.8494268e-01	2.0000000e-01	-1.0707652e-01	5.6277911e-02

Table 23: Vector of kinetic parameters, Patient LR01.

#Jumps	#Parameters	min(S)	AIC	BIC
2	10	1.8066007e+04	7.0980427e+02	7.3059296e+02
3	12	1.0442030e+04	6.3486446e+02	6.6159278e+02
4	14	1.0440839e+04	6.3884803e+02	6.7151598e+02
5	16	8.8352850e+03	6.1880413e+02	6.5741170e+02
6	18	8.2535565e+03	6.1299641e+02	6.5754361e+02
7	20	6.9473018e+03	5.9218653e+02	6.4267335e+02
8	22	6.4662482e+03	5.8585348e+02	6.4227993e+02
9	24	6.7330661e+03	5.9567606e+02	6.5804213e+02
10	26	7.8795367e+03	6.2231840e+02	6.9062410e+02
11	28	6.6990546e+03	6.0294681e+02	6.7719214e+02
12	30	5.3981424e+03	5.7585555e+02	6.5604051e+02
13	32	4.2843507e+03	5.4657918e+02	6.3270377e+02
14	34	5.9514137e+03	5.9790619e+02	6.8997040e+02
15	36	5.2781096e+03	5.8461744e+02	6.8262128e+02
16	38	5.9010586e+03	6.0468262e+02	7.0862608e+02
17	40	3.3315515e+03	5.2635873e+02	6.3624183e+02
18	42	4.1000287e+03	5.6024678e+02	6.7606949e+02
19	44	3.3367304e+03	5.3458241e+02	6.5634475e+02
20	46	5.0634723e+03	5.9863920e+02	7.2634117e+02
21	48	3.7382139e+03	5.5894319e+02	6.9258479e+02
22	50	2.2448012e+03	4.8950449e+02	6.2908571e+02
23	52	3.2020901e+03	5.4465138e+02	6.9017224e+02
24	54	3.0986681e+03	5.4392367e+02	6.9538415e+02
25	56	3.5752554e+03	5.6852492e+02	7.2592502e+02
26	58	1.0942575e+04	7.3360684e+02	8.9694657e+02
27	60	2.5356011e+03	5.2704567e+02	6.9632503e+02
28	62	9.9081755e+02	3.9573526e+02	5.7095425e+02
29	64	4.5148358e+03	6.1812475e+02	7.9928337e+02
30	66	2.6849595e+03	5.4728750e+02	7.3438573e+02
31	68	3.6101906e+03	5.9392517e+02	7.8696303e+02
32	70	3.9239929e+03	6.0992744e+02	8.0890494e+02
33	72	1.6509295e+03	4.8925638e+02	6.9417350e+02
34	74	1.2157890e+03	4.4920028e+02	6.6005702e+02
<i>continued on next page</i>				

<i>continued from previous page</i>				
#Jumps	#Parameters	min(S)	AIC	BIC
35	76	6.3437478e+02	3.5952703e+02	5.7632340e+02
36	78	2.4781946e+03	5.5974801e+02	7.8248400e+02
37	80	1.1622413e+03	4.5471409e+02	6.8338972e+02
38	82	1.7450236e+03	5.1723825e+02	7.5185350e+02
39	84	7.3574914e+02	3.9687493e+02	6.3742981e+02
40	86	3.1173471e+03	6.0878910e+02	8.5528361e+02

Table 24: AIC and BIC Values, Patient LR01.

5.0.5 Patient MA01

#Jumps	k_{EH}	H_0	Y_0	λ
2	1.4142138e-01	1.5784682e-01	1.2215215e-01	2.9099763e-03
3	1.3083379e-01	1.6214947e-01	-1.1698349e-01	4.3748160e-03
4	1.2168102e-01	1.9893875e-01	-2.2149799e-02	5.8121008e-03
5	1.3091867e-01	1.6602715e-01	-1.1136320e-01	7.2973691e-03
6	1.1332139e-01	1.9995562e-01	1.3042952e-01	8.7169514e-03
7	1.0834579e-01	2.0000000e-01	-9.6038185e-02	1.0169869e-02
8	1.2051185e-01	1.7047039e-01	-9.7412282e-02	1.1671987e-02
9	1.7228721e-01	9.1275490e-02	1.0315689e-01	1.2587427e-02
10	1.4349780e-01	1.9935488e-01	2.0398938e-02	1.4004817e-02
11	1.0281216e-01	1.9999995e-01	-1.6653070e-02	1.5385019e-02
12	1.3395949e-01	1.0634226e-01	-2.4561617e-02	1.6783217e-02
13	1.6824749e-01	9.3661003e-02	1.0334528e-02	1.8861640e-02
14	1.4376906e-01	1.9535832e-01	-1.7740156e-01	1.9580421e-02
15	1.0282898e-01	1.9693634e-01	3.2371726e-02	2.0979021e-02
16	1.9999744e-01	1.6965727e-01	-9.9894314e-04	2.3063115e-02
17	1.4955475e-01	2.0000000e-01	-8.0157591e-02	2.3776662e-02
18	1.4027505e-01	1.7439513e-01	-1.8646778e-01	2.6032096e-02
19	1.6257897e-01	1.7009113e-01	-5.8160623e-02	2.6573530e-02
20	1.2661104e-01	2.0000000e-01	5.1080548e-02	2.7980239e-02
21	1.5493101e-01	1.9949963e-01	-3.7247336e-02	2.9370635e-02
<i>continued on next page</i>				

continued from previous page

#Jumps	k_{EH}	H_0	Y_0	λ
22	1.1319841e-01	1.7474847e-01	1.5857885e-01	3.0769231e-02
23	1.6802336e-01	1.6546195e-01	8.5476175e-02	3.2220485e-02
24	1.7472002e-01	1.9082806e-01	-6.5370293e-02	3.3600882e-02
25	1.7618962e-01	2.0000000e-01	-1.0403067e-01	3.4965035e-02
26	1.1149277e-01	2.0000000e-01	1.2810835e-01	3.6551489e-02
27	1.9750605e-01	1.7021290e-01	1.2251047e-01	3.7762238e-02
28	1.9513833e-01	1.7284512e-01	1.7756126e-01	4.0409481e-02
29	1.8394667e-01	1.5020932e-01	-1.8305816e-01	4.0559441e-02
30	1.9389138e-01	1.7644122e-01	8.8800244e-02	4.2173543e-02
31	9.6414982e-02	2.0000000e-01	-1.3100803e-01	4.4962499e-02
32	1.4416233e-01	1.9999740e-01	-6.1326007e-02	4.4755245e-02
33	2.0000000e-01	1.9038997e-01	1.9490168e-01	4.6153846e-02
34	1.5954495e-01	2.0000000e-01	9.6342514e-02	4.7552448e-02
35	1.9999990e-01	1.7039466e-01	-5.6103084e-02	4.8951049e-02
36	1.9999996e-01	1.7152494e-01	-7.3432053e-02	5.0349650e-02
37	1.9528735e-01	1.7274300e-01	6.5454601e-02	5.1959710e-02
38	1.5991396e-01	2.0000000e-01	-1.3233895e-01	5.3146853e-02
39	1.0619040e-01	1.9829646e-01	-1.3434438e-01	5.4545455e-02
40	1.9359418e-01	1.9362194e-01	-1.7243380e-01	5.5944057e-02

Table 25: Vector of kinetic parameters, Patient MA01.

#Jumps	#Parameters	min(S)	AIC	BIC
2	10	1.6662725e+04	6.9816072e+02	7.1894942e+02
3	12	4.7866595e+03	5.2254356e+02	5.4927188e+02
4	14	1.2533531e+04	6.6515433e+02	6.9782228e+02
5	16	4.7485172e+03	5.2939151e+02	5.6799908e+02
6	18	2.9733711e+03	4.6597992e+02	5.1052712e+02
7	20	1.5738626e+03	3.7837237e+02	4.2885920e+02
8	22	2.6401256e+03	4.5686266e+02	5.1328911e+02
9	24	1.1573419e+03	3.4210577e+02	4.0447185e+02

continued on next page

<i>continued from previous page</i>				
#Jumps	#Parameters	min(S)	AIC	BIC
10	26	2.6647780e+03	4.6620103e+02	5.3450674e+02
11	28	1.1886280e+03	3.5394680e+02	4.2819213e+02
12	30	7.7260866e+02	2.9591415e+02	3.7609911e+02
13	32	7.9772270e+02	3.0452048e+02	3.9064506e+02
14	34	2.4066002e+03	4.6752661e+02	5.5959082e+02
15	36	1.3743835e+03	3.9085640e+02	4.8886024e+02
16	38	5.8596435e+02	2.7209617e+02	3.7603964e+02
17	40	1.3369957e+03	3.9488485e+02	5.0476794e+02
18	42	3.3188060e+02	1.9823452e+02	3.1405724e+02
19	44	4.7213418e+02	2.5299279e+02	3.7475514e+02
20	46	1.5491517e+03	4.2809352e+02	5.5579549e+02
21	48	2.2236397e+03	4.8414058e+02	6.1778217e+02
22	50	4.1147490e+02	2.4519060e+02	3.8477182e+02
23	52	5.8123635e+02	2.9892956e+02	4.4445041e+02
24	54	7.8510050e+02	3.4622377e+02	4.9768425e+02
25	56	7.6113657e+02	3.4575993e+02	5.0316003e+02
26	58	8.9277001e+02	3.7273026e+02	5.3606999e+02
27	60	3.6384111e+02	2.4747417e+02	4.1675353e+02
28	62	4.2490499e+02	2.7381553e+02	4.4903451e+02
29	64	4.8947559e+02	2.9818707e+02	4.7934568e+02
30	66	4.3534939e+02	2.8531233e+02	4.7241056e+02
31	68	5.7624176e+02	3.2968681e+02	5.2272468e+02
32	70	9.9063329e+02	4.1170848e+02	6.1068597e+02
33	72	4.3820688e+02	2.9825441e+02	5.0317152e+02
34	74	8.1553017e+02	3.9169962e+02	6.0255636e+02
35	76	3.0242840e+02	2.5285250e+02	4.6964887e+02
36	78	3.4614910e+02	2.7629611e+02	4.9903210e+02
37	80	1.5972200e+02	1.6892150e+02	3.9759712e+02
38	82	1.3823619e+03	4.8368992e+02	7.1830517e+02
39	84	7.8564527e+02	4.0632366e+02	6.4687854e+02
40	86	7.1951252e+02	3.9766153e+02	6.4415603e+02

Table 26: AIC and BIC Values, Patient MA01.

5.0.6 Patient TO01

#Jumps	k_{EH}	H_0	Y_0	λ
2	2.0000000e-01	1.6268172e-01	1.3691073e-01	4.2050170e-03
3	1.6604102e-01	1.6655149e-01	1.2939891e-01	8.1852450e-03
4	1.7716816e-01	1.5650532e-01	-1.9237028e-02	6.2052916e-03
5	1.9999999e-01	1.6220126e-01	9.4475646e-02	7.1018449e-03
6	2.0000000e-01	1.6179077e-01	1.8220156e-01	8.4943327e-03
7	1.9999997e-01	1.6691533e-01	-2.0623523e-02	9.9407786e-03
8	1.6578222e-01	1.6082824e-01	1.9328976e-01	1.6635183e-02
9	1.9999999e-01	1.4895092e-01	-8.9071324e-02	1.3387240e-02
10	2.0000000e-01	1.5653837e-01	-1.8605698e-02	1.4842520e-02
11	2.0000000e-01	1.4902640e-01	1.7950006e-01	1.5388466e-02
12	1.9999998e-01	1.3400689e-01	9.8700526e-02	1.7885637e-02
13	1.5340573e-01	1.5834757e-01	1.8250994e-01	1.9113502e-02
14	1.6782146e-01	1.3834278e-01	1.7510367e-01	2.0906207e-02
15	1.7352015e-01	1.4971282e-01	-4.1496379e-03	2.0983753e-02
16	1.6263195e-01	1.5714111e-01	1.8642084e-01	2.2377712e-02
17	1.7189713e-01	1.4008756e-01	-1.6303098e-01	2.3777673e-02
18	1.4804720e-01	1.3489042e-01	9.2069926e-02	2.7896120e-02
19	1.5890584e-01	1.3955470e-01	1.4200635e-02	2.9846091e-02
20	1.6599147e-01	1.4976220e-01	-7.4092399e-02	2.7972028e-02
21	1.9998723e-01	1.3942387e-01	1.8400099e-02	3.2692118e-02
22	2.0000000e-01	1.6900164e-01	8.4237860e-02	3.0769260e-02
23	1.9692159e-01	1.3853512e-01	9.6576794e-02	3.2302881e-02
24	1.9999905e-01	1.5920364e-01	1.7028981e-01	3.3566434e-02
25	1.9176735e-01	1.4289465e-01	1.5426655e-01	3.7313354e-02
26	1.4678825e-01	1.4147893e-01	-9.8631957e-02	3.8864331e-02
27	1.7989018e-01	1.8554628e-01	1.5038579e-02	3.8331333e-02
28	1.6739587e-01	1.6075065e-01	-1.0063292e-01	3.9296352e-02
29	1.9584231e-01	1.9292301e-01	-4.3457551e-02	5.9869254e-02
30	1.4609540e-01	1.5092757e-01	1.6533254e-01	4.1958134e-02
31	1.4788689e-01	1.3955031e-01	-1.4451545e-02	4.6306077e-02
32	1.9999804e-01	1.7117372e-01	-1.9212866e-01	4.4756552e-02
33	1.9379245e-01	1.2957640e-01	-1.9243751e-01	4.9003289e-02
34	1.9875669e-01	1.8798670e-01	-1.9309241e-01	4.8752341e-02
35	1.9999988e-01	1.5021079e-01	-1.9389446e-01	4.9476625e-02

continued on next page

continued from previous page

#Jumps	k_{EH}	H_0	Y_0	λ
36	1.5440513e-01	1.3130390e-01	1.7878761e-02	5.0489362e-02
37	1.5375858e-01	1.5292882e-01	-1.8256808e-01	5.1748252e-02
38	1.9999952e-01	1.9121556e-01	1.5895855e-02	5.3949432e-02
39	1.9999980e-01	1.3366159e-01	1.8449344e-01	5.4545455e-02
40	2.0000000e-01	1.4206727e-01	6.3020518e-03	5.6223444e-02

Table 27: Vector of kinetic parameters, Patient T001.

#Jumps	#Parameters	min(S)	AIC	BIC
2	10	3.9841921e+04	8.2369207e+02	8.4448077e+02
3	12	1.5434007e+04	6.9113020e+02	7.1785852e+02
4	14	1.4132953e+04	6.8244896e+02	7.1511691e+02
5	16	1.2686591e+04	6.7090221e+02	7.0950978e+02
6	18	1.2498612e+04	6.7275258e+02	7.1729978e+02
7	20	1.2715934e+04	6.7923489e+02	7.2972172e+02
8	22	7.2851637e+03	6.0302459e+02	6.5945105e+02
9	24	9.1777323e+03	6.4027999e+02	7.0264607e+02
10	26	1.0124125e+04	6.5841229e+02	7.2671800e+02
11	28	9.4455551e+03	6.5242202e+02	7.2666735e+02
12	30	8.6431617e+03	6.4363830e+02	7.2382326e+02
13	32	5.0741475e+03	5.7094247e+02	6.5706706e+02
14	34	4.5947336e+03	5.6065080e+02	6.5271501e+02
15	36	4.9578910e+03	5.7560483e+02	6.7360867e+02
16	38	5.7989258e+03	6.0216851e+02	7.0611198e+02
17	40	5.0869510e+03	5.8730537e+02	6.9718846e+02
18	42	3.4511163e+03	5.3543612e+02	6.5125884e+02
19	44	4.2097399e+03	5.6804937e+02	6.8981171e+02
20	46	2.6592874e+03	5.0590403e+02	6.3360600e+02
21	48	3.1315607e+03	5.3344418e+02	6.6708578e+02
22	50	1.1065714e+04	7.1921826e+02	8.5879948e+02
23	52	5.9859107e+03	6.3473847e+02	7.8025932e+02
24	54	8.2974958e+03	6.8576099e+02	8.3722146e+02

continued on next page

<i>continued from previous page</i>				
#Jumps	#Parameters	min(S)	AIC	BIC
25	56	2.3867532e+03	5.1033413e+02	6.6773424e+02
26	58	2.2774114e+03	5.0758132e+02	6.7092106e+02
27	60	1.0022965e+04	7.2496622e+02	8.9424557e+02
28	62	4.7668902e+03	6.2194760e+02	7.9716659e+02
29	64	1.0374504e+04	7.3793023e+02	9.1908884e+02
30	66	1.8820278e+03	4.9612202e+02	6.8322025e+02
31	68	1.7898933e+03	4.9289411e+02	6.8593198e+02
32	70	9.8872454e+03	7.4300301e+02	9.4198050e+02
33	72	1.1159018e+03	4.3285510e+02	6.3777221e+02
34	74	1.6974728e+04	8.2883214e+02	1.0396889e+03
35	76	1.9217462e+03	5.1912938e+02	7.3592575e+02
36	78	6.4911629e+02	3.6683500e+02	5.8957099e+02
37	80	3.8206891e+03	6.2608568e+02	8.5476130e+02
38	82	9.0046591e+03	7.5353851e+02	9.8815376e+02
39	84	1.0089418e+03	4.4234554e+02	6.8290042e+02
40	86	1.3845459e+03	4.9191724e+02	7.3841175e+02

Table 28: AIC and BIC Values, Patient TO01.

Acknowledgements

The authors Giulia Elena Aliffi, Giovanni Nastasi and Vittorio Romano acknowledge the support from INdAM (GNFM).

Declaration of Interests

None

Fundings

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Credit authorship contribution statement

Giulia Elena Aliffi: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Writing-original draft, Writing-review & editing. **Giovanni Nastasi:** Methodology, Writing-review & editing. **Vittorio Romano:** Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing-review & editing, Supervision, Project Administration. **Dario Pitocco:** Resources, Data curation, Writing-review & editing. **Alessandro Rizzi:** Resources, Data curation, Writing-review & editing. **Elvin J. Moore:** Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing-review & editing. **Andrea De Gaetano:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing-review & editing, Supervision. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

References

- [1] Alam S, Hasan MK, Neaz S, Hussain N, Hossain MF, Rahman T. Diabetes Mellitus: Insights from Epidemiology, Biochemistry, Risk Factors, Diagnosis, Complications and Comprehensive Management. *Diabetology*. 2021; 2(2):36-50. <https://doi.org/10.3390/diabetology2020004>.
- [2] World Health Organizatin (WHO. *Global Report on Diabetes*; WHO: Geneva, Switzerlan, 2017. Available online:<http://www.who.int/diabetes/global-report/en>.
- [3] Kharroubi AT, Darwish HM. Diabetes mellitus: The epidemic of the century. *World J Diabetes*. 2015;6(6):850-867. doi:10.4239/wjd.v6.i6.850.
- [4] Rafique I, Mir A, Saqib MAN, Naeem M, Marchand L, Polychronakos C. Causal variants in Maturity Onset Diabetes of the Young (MODY) - A systematic review. *BMC Endocr Disord*. 2021 Nov 11;21(1):223. doi: 10.1186/s12902-021-00891-7. PMID: 34763692; PMCID: PMC8582101.
- [5] Thanabalasingham G, Owen KR. Diagnosis and management of maturity onset diabetes of the young (MODY). *BMJ*. 2011 Oct 19;343:d6044. doi: 10.1136/bmj.d6044. PMID: 22012810.

- [6] Dovč K, Bratina N, Battelino T. A new horizon for glucose monitoring. *Horm Res Paediatr.* 2015;83(3):149-56. doi: 10.1159/000368924. Epub 2015 Feb 5. PMID: 25660230.
- [7] National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases. Continuous Glucose Monitoring. Available from: <https://www.niddk.nih.gov/health-information/diabetes/overview/managing-diabetes/continuous-glucose-monitoring>.
- [8] Rodbard D. Continuous Glucose Monitoring: A Review of Successes, Challenges, and Opportunities. *Diabetes Technol Ther.* 2016 Feb;18 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):S3-S13. doi: 10.1089/dia.2015.0417. PMID: 26784127; PMCID: PMC4717493.
- [9] Huard B, Kirkham G. Mathematical modelling of glucose dynamics, *Current Opinion in Endocrine and Metabolic Research*, Volume 25, 2022, 100379, ISSN 2451-9650, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coemr.2022.100379>.
- [10] Palumbo P, Ditlevsen S, Bertuzzi A, De Gaetano A. Mathematical modeling of the glucose-insulin system: a review. *Math Biosci.* 2013 Aug;244(2):69-81. doi: 10.1016/j.mbs.2013.05.006. Epub 2013 Jun 1. PMID: 23733079.
- [11] De Gaetano A, Arino O. Mathematical modelling of the intravenous glucose tolerance test. *J Math Biol.* 2000 Feb;40(2):136-68. doi: 10.1007/s002850050007. PMID: 10743599.
- [12] Panunzi S, Palumbo P, De Gaetano A. A discrete Single Delay Model for the Intra-Venous Glucose Tolerance Test. *Theor Biol Med Model.* 2007 Sep 12;4:35. doi: 10.1186/1742-4682-4-35. PMID: 17850652; PMCID: PMC2072949.
- [13] Pacini G, Bergman RN. MINMOD: a computer program to calculate insulin sensitivity and pancreatic responsivity from the frequently sampled intravenous glucose tolerance test. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed.* 1986 Oct;23(2):113-22. doi: 10.1016/0169-2607(86)90106-9. PMID: 3640682.

- [14] Bergman RN, Ider YZ, Bowden CR, Cobelli C. Quantitative estimation of insulin sensitivity. *Am J Physiol.* 1979 Jun;236(6):E667-77. doi: 10.1152/ajpendo.1979.236.6.E667. PMID: 443421.
- [15] Boston RC, Stefanovski D, Moate PJ, Sumner AE, Watanabe RM, Bergman RN. MINMOD Millennium: a computer program to calculate glucose effectiveness and insulin sensitivity from the frequently sampled intravenous glucose tolerance test. *Diabetes Technol Ther.* 2003;5(6):1003-15. doi: 10.1089/152091503322641060. PMID: 14709204.
- [16] Cho Y, Kim I, Sheen D. A fractional-order model for MINMOD Millennium, *Mathematical Biosciences*, Volume 262, 2015, Pages 36-45, ISSN 0025-5564, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mbs.2014.11.008>.
- [17] Coman S, Boldisor C, Floroian L. Fractional adaptive control for a fractional - order insuline - glucose dynamic model, 2017 International Conference on Optimization of Electrical and Electronic Equipment (OPTIM) & 2017 Intl Aegean Conference on Electrical Machines and Power Electronics (ACEMP), 2017, pp. 887-892, doi: 10.1109/OPTIM.2017.7975082.
- [18] Rooka S, Ghasemi R. Designing Fractional Ts Observers For A Class Of Fractional Model Of The Blood Glucose For Type I Diabetes, *International Journal of Advances in Science, Engineering and Technology(IJASEAT)* 2015, pp. 116-123, Volume-3, issue-4, Spl. Iss-3. Available from: http://www.iraaj.in/journal/journal_file/journal_pdf/6-205-1449213837116-123.pdf
- [19] Pompa M, Panunzi S, Borri A, De Gaetano A. A comparison among three maximal mathematical models of the glucose-insulin system. *PLoS One.* 2021 Sep 27;16(9):e0257789. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0257789. PMID: 34570804; PMCID: PMC8476045.
- [20] Boiroux D, Hagdrup M, Mahmoudi Z, Poulsen NK, Madsen H, Jørgensen JB. Model Identification using Continuous Glucose Monitoring Data for Type 1 Diabetes**This work has been funded by the Danish Diabetes Academy supported by the Novo Nordisk Foundation., *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, Volume 49, Issue 7, 2016, Pages 759-764, ISSN 2405-8963, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2016.07.279>.

- [21] Kanderian SS, Weinzimer S, Voskanyan G, Steil GM. Identification of intraday metabolic profiles during closed-loop glucose control in individuals with type 1 diabetes. *J Diabetes Sci Technol*. 2009 Sep 1;3(5):1047-57. doi: 10.1177/193229680900300508. PMID: 20144418; PMCID: PMC2769900.
- [22] Palumbo P, De Gaetano A. (2007). State Feedback Control of the Glucose-Insulin System. In: Aletti G., Micheletti A., Morale D., Burger M. (eds) *Math Everywhere*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-44446-6_20
- [23] Panunzi S, De Gaetano A, Mingrone G. Advantages of the single delay model for the assessment of insulin sensitivity from the intravenous glucose tolerance test. *Theor Biol Med Model*. 2010 Mar 18;7:9. doi: 10.1186/1742-4682-7-9. PMID: 20298586; PMCID: PMC2858103.
- [24] Saleem MU, Farman M, Ahmad A, Haque EU, Ahmad MO, A Caputo-Fabrizio fractional order model for control of glucose in insulin therapies for diabetes, *Ain Shams Engineering Journal*, Volume 11, Issue 4, 2020, Pages 1309-1316, ISSN 2090-4479, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asej.2020.03.006>.
- [25] De Gaetano A, Sakulrang S, Borri A, Pitocco D, Sungnul S, Moore EJ. Modeling continuous glucose monitoring with fractional differential equations subject to shocks. *J Theor Biol*. 2021 Oct 7;526:110776. doi: 10.1016/j.jtbi.2021.110776. Epub 2021 May 28. PMID: 34058226.
- [26] De Gaetano A, Panunzi S, Matone A, Samson A, Vrbikova J, Bendlova B, Pacini G. Routine OGTT: a robust model including incretin effect for precise identification of insulin sensitivity and secretion in a single individual. *PLoS One*. 2013 Aug 29;8(8):e70875. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0070875. PMID: 24009656; PMCID: PMC3756988.
- [27] Sakulrang S, Moore EJ, Sungnul S, De Gaetano A. A fractional differential equation model for continuous glucose monitoring data. *Adv Differ Equ* 2017, 150 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13662-017-1207-1>
- [28] MATLAB. (2018). 9.7.0.1216025 (R2019b). Natick, Massachusetts: The MathWorks Inc.

- [29] R Core Team (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- [30] Bozdogan, H. Model selection and Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC): The general theory and its analytical extensions. *Psychometrika* 52, 345-370 (1987). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02294361>
- [31] Kennedy J, Eberhart R. Particle swarm optimization, Proceedings of ICNN'95 - International Conference on Neural Networks, 1995, pp. 1942-1948 vol.4, doi: 10.1109/ICNN.1995.488968.
- [32] Mezura-Montes E, Carlos A. Coello Coello, Constraint-handling in nature-inspired numerical optimization: Past, present and future, *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation*, Volume 1, Issue 4, 2011, Pages 173-194, ISSN 2210-6502, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.swevo.2011.10.001>.
- [33] Pedersen ME. Good Parameters for Particle Swarm Optimization. Luxembourg: Hvass Laboratories, 2010. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mohamed_Mourad_Laffi/post/Which-is-the-best-swarm-size-in-PSO/attachment/5b5b6f85b53d2f89289c14e1/AS%3A653084896288
- [34] Schwarz G. Estimating the Dimension of a Model. *Ann. Statist.* 6 (2) 461 - 464, March, 1978. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176344136>
- [35] Wit, E, van den Heuvel E, Romeijn J-W. All models are wrong...': an introduction to model uncertainty. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 2012, 66(3), 217-236. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9574.2012.00530.x>
- [36] Rigby RA, Stasinopoulos DM (2005). Generalized additive models for location, scale and shape,(with discussion). *Applied Statistics*, 2005, 54, 507-554. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9876.2005.00510.x>
- [37] Silverman, B W. Density Estimation for Statistics and Data Analysis, 1986. Chapman & Hall, London <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-3324-9>