

Attention Networks for Personalized Mealtime Insulin Dosing in People with Type 1 Diabetes *

Anas El Fathi* Elliott Pryor** Marc D. Breton***

* *University of Virginia, Center for Diabetes Technology,
Charlottesville, VA, USA (e-mail: fwt9vd@virginia.edu).*

** *University of Virginia, Center for Diabetes Technology,
Charlottesville, VA, USA (e-mail: hyy8sc@virginia.edu)*

*** *University of Virginia, Center for Diabetes Technology,
Charlottesville, VA, USA (e-mail: mb6nt@virginia.edu)*

Abstract: Calculating mealtime insulin doses poses a significant challenge for individuals with Type 1 Diabetes (T1D). Doses should perfectly compensate for expected post-meal glucose excursions, requiring a profound understanding of the individual’s insulin sensitivity and the meal macronutrients¹. Usually, people rely on intuition and experience to develop this understanding. In this work, we demonstrate how a reinforcement learning agent, employing a self-attention encoder network, can effectively mimic and enhance this intuitive process. Trained on 80 virtual subjects from the FDA-approved UVA/Padova T1D adult cohort and tested on twenty, self-attention demonstrates superior performance compared to other network architectures. Results reveal a significant reduction in glycemic risk, from 16.5 to 9.6 in scenarios using sensor-augmented pump and from 9.1 to 6.7 in scenarios using automated insulin delivery. This new paradigm bypasses conventional therapy parameters, offering the potential to simplify treatment and promising improved quality of life and glycemic outcomes for people with T1D.

Keywords: Type 1 Diabetes, Reinforcement Learning, Self-Attention, Postprandial Glucose.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Motivation

Type 1 diabetes (T1D) is an autoimmune disease treated by exogenous insulin to maintain blood glucose levels at recommended targets. Sustained elevated glucose levels (hyperglycemia) lead to long-term micro-/macro-vascular complications. Fear of low glucose levels (hypoglycemia) and its acute complications are major limiting factors to achieving glucose targets. T1D treatment involves intensive insulin therapy, in which basal and bolus insulin is administered, and glucose levels are regularly monitored. Basal insulin aims to maintain glucose levels constant during fasting and overnight. Bolus insulin is taken at mealtimes to compensate for the significant glucose increase due to meal carbohydrates. Insulin therapy can be implemented as “Multiple Daily Injections” (MDI) of insulin utilizing insulin syringes or pens. However, the gold standard of insulin therapy is “Automated Insulin Delivery” (AID) systems employing an insulin pump and a continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) system. AID sys-

tems dynamically adjust the rate of insulin delivery based on real-time CGM.

Regardless of the treatment modality, individuals with T1D are required to meticulously calculate their insulin doses for meals (El Fathi et al., 2018).

1.2 Traditional Bolus Calculators for T1D

Since carbohydrates are the primary determinant of the post-meal response, people with T1D are encouraged to perform carbohydrate (CHO) counting to calculate a mealtime insulin bolus (Sheard et al., 2004). In practice, proper CHO counting requires: a rigorous education, good numeracy skills, is prone to human errors, and is associated with increased disease management burden (Fortin et al., 2017; Mannucci et al., 2005; Brazeau et al., 2013). In addition, CHO counting involves the use of individualized parameters such as carbohydrate ratios (CR), a ratio indicating the amount of carbohydrate covered by a unit of insulin, the correction factor (CF), a factor indicating the drop in glucose levels caused by a unit of insulin, and the glucose target. These therapy parameters require continuous adaptation and optimization. Equation 1 shows an example of the most common formula used to calculate

* Supported by American Diabetes Association grant #4-22-PDFPM-16.

the insulin dose at mealtime B using these parameters, where IOB indicates the remaining active insulin on board.

$$B = \frac{CHO}{CR} + \frac{G - G_{target}}{CF} - IOB \quad (1)$$

Due to these complexities, glucose control after meals remains a challenging part of diabetes and a major contributor to overall degraded glycemic control. Still, some individuals tend to estimate their insulin doses based on their experiences with previous meals instead of performing precise CHO calculations. They depend on empirical estimates, learning through trial and error from their history of consumed meals and administered insulin doses.

This trial-and-error process somewhat resembles the training of a reinforcement learning (RL) algorithm. In this work, our aim is to show that a deep-RL agent using self-attention networks can discover optimal meal boluses from an individual’s historical data without any knowledge about the standard therapy parameters used in traditional bolus calculators.

1.3 Review of RL algorithms for Bolus Calculators

Previous works explored RL to optimize insulin but focused primarily on adaptation to therapy parameters (Tejedor et al., 2020). Other works focused on adapting the bolus calculator but did not use RL (Unsworth et al., 2023). Some have explored the use of RL to optimize bolus calculators: (i) Zhu et al. (2020) proposed a method using double deep Q-learning. The RL agent learns to select a percentage to modify the dose given by the standard bolus calculator. This system still relies on standard bolus calculation and has a restricted action space, potentially limiting the benefits of deep learning. (ii) Ahmad et al. (2022) proposes a method for automatic bolus generation without carbohydrate amounts, and only the meal type is announced (breakfast, lunch, or dinner). The authors reported problems when the meal was unexpectedly small. (iii) Jaloli and Cescon (2023) use the Soft-Actor-Critic algorithm to optimize the bolus for MDI therapy. Their agent learns to give a bolus based only on blood sugar and meal history, with no notion of the standard bolus calculator, but the boluses are not user-initiated, so the system can request a bolus at any time which may increase the system burden. (iv) El Fathi and Breton (2023) proposed a new bolus calculator based on meal categories rather than carbohydrate counting. However, the optimization algorithm needed multiple weeks to converge.

This work distinguished itself by (i) not relying on the standard therapy parameters; (ii) adjusting the insulin bolus at each call; (iii) learning directly from a two-week user’s previous glucose, insulin doses, and consumed meals; (iv) using self-attention mechanisms to capture patterns.

1.4 Review of Proximal Policy Optimization

Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) is a state-of-the-art deep reinforcement learning algorithm (Schulman et al., 2017). Policy gradient-based methods (like PPO) have been shown to be very effective in high-dimensional problems with continuous action spaces. PPO is a *on-policy*

learning algorithm that makes small, constrained steps from the current policy through a clipped objective function. The loss function for PPO is given in equation 2.

$$L(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[\min(r_t(\theta)A_t, \text{clip}(r_t(\theta), 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon)A_t)] \quad (2)$$

where $r_t(\theta) = \frac{\pi(a_t|s_t)}{\pi_{old}(a_t|s_t)}$ is the ratio of the probabilities of taking the action of the current policy, divided by the probability of taking that action under the previous policy. If $r_t > 1$ then the action becomes more likely under the new policy. A_t is the advantage term that defines the amount of reward (estimated via the Bellman equation) this action gives relative to the average value.

The primary loss term $r_t A_t$ intuitively means that if the advantage is positive, we want to make that action more likely, and if the advantage is negative, make the action less likely. The intuition of the clipping term is that the approximation of the policy gradient is only valid near the old policy, so the loss is clipped to prevent large changes in the policy each iteration.

2. METHODS

2.1 Problem formulation

At a time t_N , we assume the availability of historical data at a fixed sampling time t_s : (i) measured glucose $\{\tilde{G}_k\}_{k \in [1:N]}$, (ii) basal and bolus insulin $\{\tilde{I}_k\}_{k \in [1:N]}$, the basal insulin is converted to amounts of insulin units delivered during the sampling time t_s , (iii) estimated amount of carbohydrates in meals $\{\tilde{M}_k\}_{k \in [1:N]}$. In the following $\mathcal{H}_k = \{\tilde{G}_k, \tilde{I}_k, \tilde{M}_k\}$ is used to denote the data available at time t_k , and $\mathcal{H}_{1:N}$ the complete dataset.

The RL agent aims to calculate the insulin bolus B_N using historical glucose levels, insulin doses, and carbohydrate estimates. Formally, it learns a function f defined by:

$$B_N = f(\tilde{M}_N, \tilde{G}_N, \mathcal{H}_{1:N-1}) \quad (3)$$

Note that unlike standard bolus calculation methods, which depend on predefined therapy parameters, this function leverages historical data to discern an individual’s insulin sensitivity. This approach also aims to develop a universal function applicable at the population level rather than fine-tuning this function for individual nuances. Essentially, this function should learn to interpret historical data to accurately assess the upcoming meal M_N and determine the optimal insulin bolus B_N for any individual.

In PPO, the learning process is facilitated by an actor network and a value network. The actor network should learn to approximate f , and the value network should learn to approximate the *value* of a state:

$$V_N = g(\tilde{M}_N, \tilde{G}_N, \mathcal{H}_{1:N-1}) \quad (4)$$

The f and g are designed to: (i) identify the intrinsic delays related to the dynamics of glucose, the absorption of insulin, and the absorption of carbohydrates; (ii) convert the data into an encoded form that highlights important features for the subsequent calculation of actions or values;




Fig. 1. Steps of processing the observations: (i) data is normalized and decayed to emphasize the slow dynamics of insulin and meal, (ii) data is sliced using a window w and stride s , (iii) data is rearranged to align periodic events.

(iii) treat the raw data as a time series to account for recurring events that occur with regular frequency, such as eating three to four meals daily, and differentiate between night and day, as well as weekdays. To facilitate this process, we perform the following: (i) Process the raw observations to emphasize the system's dynamics as recommended in (Jacobs et al., 2023). (ii) Process the raw data to align periodic events. (iii) Introduce a shared function that extracts relevant features from the state: an *encoder network*, before passing the encoded state to the actor and critic networks.

2.2 Neural Network Architecture

Observations Preprocessing Following the international consensus on continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) metrics by (Battelino et al., 2019), we choose to use 14 days of historical data to calculate insulin dose. The collected data are sampled with a $t_s = 15$ minutes, resulting in a time series of length $N = 1344$.

Because of the asymmetric relevance of low glucose values compared to high glucose values, we normalize the CGM by a log-transform as shown in equation (5).

$$G = \frac{2 \log(\tilde{G}) - (\log(\tilde{G}_{max}) + \log(\tilde{G}_{min}))}{\log(\tilde{G}_{max}) - \log(\tilde{G}_{min})} \quad (5)$$

where $\tilde{G}_{max} = 180$ and $\tilde{G}_{min} = 70$ are chosen to match hyper-/hypo-glycemic levels to 1 and -1, respectively.

We model the delays in insulin and meal absorption using the following generic decay function.

$$d(k, \tau, t_s) = \left(1 + \frac{(k-1)t_s}{\tau}\right) e^{-\frac{(k-1)t_s}{\tau}} \quad (6)$$

where τ is a time constant related to the time-to-maximum effects. The insulin and meal information is normalized using the decay function $d(\cdot)$ and the sum of all events during the 14 days:

$$I_k = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^k d(k-j+1, \tau_i, t_s) \tilde{I}_j}{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^i d(i-j+1, \tau_i, t_s) \tilde{I}_j} \quad (7)$$

$$M_k = \alpha_m \frac{\sum_{j=1}^k d(k-j+1, \tau_m, t_s) \tilde{M}_j}{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^i d(i-j+1, \tau_m, t_s) \tilde{M}_j}$$




Fig. 2. Neural networks architecture including (1) the encoder network (specifically the self-attention network) (2) the value network (3) the actor network.

where $\tau_i = 75$ minutes and $\tau_m = 45$ minutes and $\alpha_m = \frac{1}{4}$ is a scaling factor that represents the inverse of the average number of meals per day.

Due to the length of the observed data, the sparsity of the insulin bolus information, and the local correlation of cgm/insulin/meals, we choose to further transform the observation, as shown in figure 1. First, we perform a sliding window segmentation of the time series with width w and overlap s . The data is then rearranged as a new sequence where each sequence element is an array of size $3 \times w$ containing related glucose/insulin/meal data. The new sequence, called state, is of length $L = \lceil \frac{Nt_s - w}{s} \rceil$. We selected $w = 240$ minutes and $s = 120$ minutes, to achieve a reasonable shrinkage of the observation $L = 166$ (grid search results of w and s are not shown in this work).

Encoded States The encoded state (output of the encoder network) is given to the actor and value network. This work aims to show that self-attention mechanisms (ATT) are key to generating the encoded state. As depicted in figure 2, we use a standard transformer network as described in the seminal work by (Vaswani et al., 2017).

Let h be the size of the hidden state. In the sequence of hidden states of the form $L \times h$, only the last hidden state is used. This is done to imitate a recurrent neural network and force the last state to be the most relevant as it contains the information of the latest consumed meal and the current glucose. We chose to stack two layers of self-attention and did not explore other depths in this work.

Other encoder architectures were implemented:




Fig. 3. Depiction of reward calculation in equation 8. The smaller the shaded grey areas (1) and (2) the bigger the reward.

- LSTM: Long short-term memory network.
- biLSTM: Bidirectional LSTM network.
- FC: Fully connected layer. Instead of passing the whole state time series to the FC network only the last state of size $3w$ is passed.

All explored architectures had 2 layers.

Actions The action of the agent a_N is defined as a fraction of the estimated total daily insulin (TDI) ($B_N = a_N \times TDI$). TDI is calculated directly from the observations as the total sum of insulin records per day. The action (the output of the actor-network) is bounded using a tangent hyperbolic transformation to be within 0.0 and 0.2.

Rewards Following each action, the next 8 hours of glucose is extracted to estimate the reward of the action. If another action occurs within 8 hours, only the glucose before the next action is considered. We require a minimum of 3 hours of glucose data for the action to be considered for training. This signal is referred to as G_{pp} .

The reward R is calculated using G_{pp} as indicated in equation 8.

$$R = - \frac{1}{\#G_{pp}} \sum \max(G_{pp} - G_{pp}^{target}, 0) - \mu_{iAUC} - \frac{\sigma_{iAUC}}{\#G_{pp}} \sum \text{Risk}(G_{pp})^2 (G_{pp} < G_{hypo}) \quad (8)$$

where G_{pp}^{target} is a trace connecting the glucose levels at time of the action to the desired glucose target (110 mg/dL) using a slope of 20 mg/dL/h, $G_{hypo} = 90$ mg/dL is a threshold to penalize lower glucose levels. $\#G_{pp}$ stands for the size of the G_{pp} array. $\text{Risk}(G_{pp}) = \log(G_{pp})^{1.084} - 5.381$ is the risk function as defined by (Kovatchev, 2017). $\mu_{iAUC} = 60$ mg/dL and $\sigma_{iAUC} = 45$ mg/dL are tuning parameters representing the mean and standard deviation incremental area under the curve (iAUC) of glucose. Figure 3 shows a visualization of the reward.

2.3 Experimental Setup and Training

The training and validation scripts were developed in Python 3.9, using PyTorch 2.1 library to implement the networks. The agent, comprising the encoder and actor networks, is serialized using TorchScript for efficiency and compatibility. We employed a C++ version of the FDA-recognized UVA/Padova T1D simulator, focusing on adult *virtual subjects* (VS) for *in-silico* experimentation. The PyTorch C++ API facilitated the integration of the agent within the simulator.

During the training, 80 VS were utilized. The simulations covered both sensor-augmented insulin pump (SAP) therapy, encompassing basal insulin, meal-accompanying bolus doses, and occasional correction doses for high glucose, and an AID system, specifically a legacy version of Control-IQ (Brown et al., 2019).

In each training epoch, 20 VS were randomly chosen for a 21-day simulation under both SAP and AID conditions, with two initial random seeds (yielding a total of $20 \times 2 \times 2 = 80$ simulations). These seeds introduced variability in several aspects, such as wake-up times, meal timings and sizes, errors in therapy parameters, meal announcement inaccuracies, unanticipated eating activities, meal omissions, insulin dosing delays, and interday/intraday insulin sensitivity fluctuations. The agent, whose parameters were fixed during these simulations, determined the insulin bolus for each reported meal via a stochastic policy. The resulting 80-episode simulations are then processed to extract a sequence of transitions (observations, actions, rewards, end states) that are used in training.

A total of 30 agents were trained, using five seeds across six distinct architectural designs for the encoder network. This included two attention networks (ATT) with varying parameter counts (250K and 70K), a bi-directional LSTM, and a standard LSTM both sized similarly to the larger ATT (250K), a larger biLSTM to account for double the hidden states (500K), and a simple fully connected (FC) network with parameters comparable to the smaller ATT (70K). Key hyperparameters are presented in table A.1

For validation, the remaining twenty VS underwent 14-day simulations under both SAP and AID settings, with three random seeds across two scenarios ($20 \times 2 \times 3 \times 2 = 240$ simulations). *Scenario 1* replicated the training environment, introducing metabolic and behavioral variabilities, while *Scenario 2* maintained only the variability in insulin sensitivity, representing an idealized condition where therapy parameters are perfectly known. The performance of the trained agents was evaluated against a standard bolus calculator to establish a baseline comparison.

2.4 Outcomes Metrics

Algorithm performance was assessed using the percentage time spent < 70 mg/dL (TBR1); the percentage time spent in the glucose target $70 - 180$ mg/dL (TIR); and the overall glycemic risk as defined in (Kovatchev, 2017).

3. RESULTS

On average ~ 200 patient-years were needed for training.

Table 1 summarizes the obtained results¹. Notably ATT-based encoder networks resulted in the smallest overall glycemic risk while requiring fewer parameters. The best ATT 250K network reduced risk in all scenarios and all therapy modalities. All the trained agents outperformed the baseline in the worst-case scenario 1 while not all agents were able to match the ideal scenario 2.

Figure 4 presents the results of a robustness experiment where the ATT 250K agent is used in a simulation with the twenty validation VS. VS consumed the same meal (60g) three times per day and insulin sensitivity was abruptly doubled at day 3 then abruptly halved at day 7. While the agent has never been explicitly trained in such a scenario it was able to modulate the insulin doses quickly and safely to recover from the abrupt changes in insulin sensitivity.

4. DISCUSSION

We investigated the *in-silico* feasibility of an RL agent that employs attention mechanisms to refine insulin dosing at mealtimes, circumventing the need for traditional therapy parameters (CR/CF) by utilizing past data on glucose levels, insulin doses, and meal information. This RL agent is envisioned to be at the core of a smartphone app that communicates with diabetes management devices like insulin pumps, smart insulin pens, and CGM.

Table 1 demonstrates the superior efficiency of attention networks in processing historical data over other architectures. Notably, a self-attention encoder achieved competitive performance with a modest hidden state size of $3 \times w = 48$ and a parameter count of 70K. Furthermore, the ATT 250K model notably outperformed the baseline in Scenario 2, a challenging feat given that Scenario 2 employs theoretically optimal therapy parameters optimized for single-meal instances. The experiment in figure 4 also reveals that the agent adjusted differently the insulin doses for different times of the day, enhancing efficacy beyond the single-meal optimization paradigm. Specifically, the initial meal typically received a larger insulin dose relative to subsequent meals.

A novel aspect of our research is the formulation of the reward function combining a hypoglycemia term derived from the glucose risk and a hyperglycemia term derived from iAUC. As equation 8 illustrates, we focus on achieving a target postprandial glucose level (G_{pp}^{target}) without unduly penalizing actions at high glucose levels, instead emphasizing the duration to reach the target. This work’s other distinctive strength lies in its training across two therapeutic approaches—SAP and AID, showing the agent’s effectiveness in both contexts. This also hints that the agent might have learned to take into account how basal insulin is delivered.

Another noteworthy aspect is the agent’s ability to adapt to different sizes of observations, despite being optimized to handle observation periods of two weeks. This can be attributed to the way tokens were constructed (concatenated 4-hour CGM/Insulin/Meal) (Fig. 1). This adaptability was further evidenced in (Fig. 4) where the agent successfully

functioned after being fed only eight hours of nighttime data as seen in the first meal of the experiment.

Figure 4 also highlighted a challenge encountered by the agent in increasing insulin doses after a reduction in sensitivity beyond day 13, attributed to a self-imposed cap of 20% of the estimated Total Daily Insulin (TDI). This limitation, among others like the lack of use of real-world data dependency and the exploration of only six architectures can be addressed in future work to enhance the model’s applicability and accuracy. Future research could also integrate our findings with methods that simplify carbohydrate counting (El Fathi and Breton (2023)), utilizing local bolus information to further refine dosing strategies.

5. CONCLUSION

We introduce an RL agent designed to refine insulin dosing strategies at mealtimes for individuals with T1D, eliminating the necessity for personalized therapy parameters. The utilization of self-attention mechanisms was crucial for effectively processing individual historical data. This innovative approach promises to reduce the dependency on optimizing therapy parameters, thereby streamlining the treatment process and potentially enhancing glycemic control. These results remain preliminary and future research aims to further simplify the process of carbohydrate counting and incorporate real-world data to validate and extend our findings.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, S., Beneyto, A., Contreras, I., and Vehi, J. (2022). Bolus insulin calculation without meal information: a reinforcement learning approach. *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*, 134, 102436.
- Battelino, T., Danne, T., Bergenstal, R.M., Amiel, S.A., Beck, R., Biester, T., Bosi, E., Buckingham, B.A., Cefalu, W.T., Close, K.L., et al. (2019). Clinical targets for continuous glucose monitoring data interpretation: recommendations from the international consensus on time in range. *Diabetes care*, 42(8), 1593–1603.
- Brazeau, A., Mircescu, H., Desjardins, K., Leroux, C., Strychar, L., Ekoé, J., and Rabasa-Lhoret, R. (2013). Carbohydrate counting accuracy and blood glucose variability in adults with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes research and clinical practice*, 99(1), 19–23.
- Brown, S.A., Kovatchev, B.P., Raghinaru, D., Lum, J.W., Buckingham, B.A., Kudva, Y.C., Laffel, L.M., Levy, C.J., Pinsky, J.E., Wadwa, R.P., et al. (2019). Six-month randomized, multicenter trial of closed-loop control in type 1 diabetes. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 381(18), 1707–1717.
- El Fathi, A. and Breton, M.D. (2023). Using reinforcement learning to simplify mealtime insulin dosing for people with type 1 diabetes: In-silico experiments. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 56(2), 11539–11544.
- El Fathi, A., Smaoui, M.R., Gingras, V., Boulet, B., and Haidar, A. (2018). The artificial pancreas and meal control: An overview of postprandial glucose regulation in type 1 diabetes. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 38(1), 67–85.
- Fortin, A., Rabasa-Lhoret, R., Roy-Fleming, A., Desjardins, K., Brazeau, A.S., Ladouceur, M., and Gingras,

¹ Detailed results in weight and bias account: <https://wandb.ai/center-for-diabetes-technology/BMS24-Attention-Bolus-T1D>

Table 1. Evaluation of six agents with different architectures and sizes on the 20 test VS. Scenario 2 represents an ideal scenario with optimal therapy parameters. Scenario 1 includes metabolic and behavior variability. The mean and standard deviation are for a 5-time repeated training. Agents with lower risk are in bold and ones with lower than the baseline are in italics.

	Num Param	Hidden Size	Scenario 1						Scenario 2						Overall Risk
			SAP			AID			SAP			AID			
			TIR	TBR	Risk	TIR	TBR	Risk	TIR	TBR	Risk	TIR	TBR	Risk	
Baseline	N/A	N/A	41.5	3.1	16.5	59.2	2.0	9.1	72.2	2.5	6.2	77.1	2.1	5.1	9.2
ATT	250K	96	58.9	1.5	9.6	69.3	1.1	6.7	74.4	1.3	5.7	77.8	1.1	5.0	6.8
			(1.3)	(0.1)	(0.3)	(0.9)	(0.1)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.1)	(0.0)	(0.5)	(0.1)	(0.1)	
ATT	70K	48	57.3	1.4	<i>10.0</i>	69.4	1.1	6.7	73.4	1.2	<i>5.9</i>	77.7	1.1	<i>5.1</i>	<i>6.9</i>
			(1.0)	(0.0)	(0.3)	(0.5)	(0.0)	(0.1)	(0.2)	(0.1)	(0.0)	(0.1)	(0.0)	(0.0)	
biLSTM	500K	192	53.8	1.3	<i>10.9</i>	68.8	1.1	<i>6.8</i>	72.7	1.0	<i>6.1</i>	77.6	1.2	5.0	<i>7.2</i>
			(1.0)	(0.1)	(0.2)	(1.0)	(0.1)	(0.2)	(1.0)	(0.1)	(0.2)	(1.0)	(0.1)	(0.2)	
biLSTM	250K	128	53.2	1.1	<i>11.0</i>	67.4	1.0	<i>7.1</i>	70.0	0.8	6.5	75.4	1.0	5.4	<i>7.5</i>
			(0.8)	(0.1)	(0.2)	(0.3)	(0.1)	(0.0)	(0.2)	(0.1)	(0.0)	(0.2)	(0.1)	(0.0)	
LSTM	250K	128	53.6	1.1	<i>10.8</i>	67.9	1.0	<i>7.0</i>	70.9	0.9	6.3	76.3	1.1	5.3	<i>7.4</i>
			(0.9)	(0.1)	(0.3)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.0)	(0.3)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.4)	(0.1)	(0.1)	
FC	70K	128	47.0	1.2	<i>12.8</i>	65.5	1.1	<i>7.4</i>	65.2	0.9	7.3	75.4	1.1	5.4	<i>8.2</i>
			(1.3)	(0.2)	(0.3)	(0.8)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(1.7)	(0.1)	(0.3)	(1.0)	(0.1)	(0.2)	




Fig. 4. Test experiment of 20 VS. The same meal (60g) is given 3-times a day. Insulin sensitivity is doubled on day 3 and halved on day 7.

V. (2017). Practices, perceptions and expectations for carbohydrate counting in patients with type 1 diabetes—results from an online survey. *Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice*, 126, 214–221.

Jacobs, P.G., Herrero, P., Facchinetti, A., Vehi, J., Kovatchev, B., Breton, M., Cinar, A., Nikita, K., Doyle, F., Bondia, J., et al. (2023). Artificial intelligence and machine learning for improving glycemic control in diabetes: best practices, pitfalls and opportunities. *IEEE Reviews in Biomedical Engineering*.

Jaloli, M. and Cescon, M. (2023). Reinforcement learning for multiple daily injection (mdi) therapy in type 1 diabetes (t1d). *BioMedInformatics*, 3(2), 422–433.

Kovatchev, B.P. (2017). Metrics for glycaemic control—from hba1c to continuous glucose monitoring. *Nature Reviews Endocrinology*, 13(7), 425–436.

Mannucci, E., Rotella, F., Ricca, V., Moretti, S., Placidi, G.F., and Rotella, C.M. (2005). Eating disorders in patients with type 1 diabetes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of endocrinological investigation*, 28(7), 417–419.

Schulman, J., Wolski, F., Dhariwal, P., Radford, A., and Klimov, O. (2017). Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*.

Sheard, N.F., Clark, N.G., Brand-Miller, J.C., Franz, M.J., Pi-Sunyer, F.X., Mayer-Davis, E., Kulkarni, K., and Geil, P. (2004). Dietary carbohydrate (amount and type) in the prevention and management of diabetes: a statement by the american diabetes association. *Diabetes care*, 27(9), 2266–2271.

Tejedor, M., Woldaregay, A.Z., and Godtliebsen, F. (2020). Reinforcement learning application in diabetes blood glucose control: A systematic review. *Artificial intelligence in medicine*, 104, 101836.

Unsworth, R., Avari, P., Lett, A.M., Oliver, N., and Reddy, M. (2023). Adaptive bolus calculators for people with type 1 diabetes: A systematic review. *Diabetes, Obesity and Metabolism*, 25(11), 3103–3113.

Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A.N., Kaiser, L.u., and Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need. In I. Guyon, U.V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information*

Processing Systems, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
Zhu, T., Li, K., Kuang, L., Herrero, P., and Georgiou, P.
(2020). An insulin bolus advisor for type 1 diabetes
using deep reinforcement learning. *Sensors*, 20(18),
5058.

Appendix A. HYPERPARAMETERS

Table A.1. Key training hyper-parameters

Parameter	Value	Parameter	Value
Batch Size	1024	Discount factor γ	0.10
Learning rate	0.001	PPO entropy coefficient	0.1
Dropout	0.1	PPO Target KL-divergence	0.05
GAE lambda	0.99	PPO Clipping coefficient	0.05