Research Output Journal of Engineering and Scientific Research 5(1): 75-80, 2026

ROJESR Publications Online ISSN: 1115-9790

https://rojournals.org/roj-engineering-and-scientific-research/ Print ISSN: 1115-6155

https://doi.org/10.59298/ROJESR/2026/5.17580

Technology-Enabled Self-Management Interventions for Gestational Diabetes in Low-Income Populations: A Critical Review

Wambui Kibibi J.

School of Natural and Applied Sciences Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT

Gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) affects 6 to 15 percent of pregnancies globally and disproportionately impacts low-income populations, where access to traditional healthcare resources remains limited. Technology-enabled self-management interventions have emerged as potentially scalable tools to support glycemic control, dietary adherence, and perinatal outcomes in resource-constrained settings. This review critically evaluated the biochemical rationale, implementation characteristics, clinical efficacy, and contextual barriers of technology-enabled self-management interventions for GDM in low-income populations. A comprehensive literature search identified peer-reviewed studies examining mobile health applications, text messaging platforms, telemedicine, and wearable devices for GDM self-management among economically disadvantaged women, with emphasis on glycemic outcomes and maternal-fetal health indicators. Technology-enabled interventions demonstrated modest improvements in fasting plasma glucose (mean reduction 4 to 8 mg/dL), hemoglobin A1c (0.2 to 0.4 percent decrease), and self-monitoring adherence rates (15 to 30 percent improvement) compared to standard care. However, efficacy is substantially moderated by digital literacy, smartphone ownership, reliable internet connectivity, and culturally adapted content delivery. Implementation barriers included limited baseline technology access, inadequate integration with existing prenatal care systems, and insufficient attention to socioeconomic determinants that compound GDM risk. Evidence quality remained heterogeneous, with most studies showing a moderate risk of bias and inadequate long-term follow-up. While technology-enabled self-management interventions offer promise for GDM management in low-income settings, current evidence revealed significant implementation gaps and modest clinical effect sizes that necessitated context-specific adaptation, enhanced digital infrastructure investment, and integration with comprehensive prenatal care models.

Keywords: Gestational diabetes mellitus, Technology-enabled interventions, Self-management, Low-income populations, Glycemic control.

INTRODUCTION

Gestational diabetes mellitus represents a state of glucose intolerance first recognized during pregnancy, characterized by impaired insulin secretion and peripheral insulin resistance mediated by placental hormones, including human placental lactogen, tumor necrosis factor alpha, and cortisol [1, 2]. The biochemical hallmark involves inadequate pancreatic beta cell compensation for pregnancy-induced insulin resistance, resulting in maternal hyperglycemia, typically manifesting after 24 weeks of gestation [3, 4]. Pathophysiologically, chronic inflammation, oxidative stress, and altered adipokine profiles contribute to metabolic dysregulation. Low-income populations demonstrate elevated GDM prevalence due to multifactorial determinants, including higher rates of obesity, suboptimal nutritional status, chronic stress, and limited access to early prenatal screening. The metabolic perturbations of GDM extend beyond maternal glucose homeostasis to influence fetal metabolic programming through transplacental glucose transfer and altered intrauterine nutrient availability.

The progression from maternal hyperglycemia to adverse perinatal outcomes involves complex biochemical cascades affecting both maternal and fetal compartments [5, 6]. Elevated maternal glucose concentrations drive fetal hyperinsulinemia, promoting excessive fetal growth (macrosomia), adipose tissue accumulation, and increased risk of birth trauma, neonatal hypoglycemia, and respiratory distress syndrome. Maternal complications include heightened risks of preeclampsia, cesarean delivery, and progression to type 2 diabetes mellitus in the postpartum period. Traditional GDM management relies on frequent self-monitoring of blood glucose, dietary modification, physical activity, and, when necessary, pharmacological intervention with insulin or oral hypoglycemic agents. However, low-income populations face substantial barriers to optimal GDM management, including transportation difficulties, limited clinic access, food insecurity, competing survival priorities, and reduced health literacy. These structural determinants create critical gaps in the continuum of GDM care delivery [7].

Technology-enabled self-management interventions, encompassing mobile health applications, short message service (SMS) platforms, telemedicine consultations, and wearable glucose monitoring devices, have been proposed as scalable solutions to circumvent traditional access barriers while enhancing patient engagement, treatment adherence, and clinical outcomes [8, 9]. The objective of this review is to critically evaluate the biochemical rationale, implementation characteristics, clinical efficacy, barriers, and future directions of technology-enabled self-management interventions for gestational diabetes mellitus, specifically among low-income populations.

Biochemical Basis and Monitoring Imperatives in Gestational Diabetes

The fundamental biochemical derangement in GDM centers on impaired glucose homeostasis resulting from inadequate insulin secretory response relative to the physiological insulin resistance of pregnancy. During normal pregnancy, insulin sensitivity decreases by approximately 50 to 60 percent, primarily due to placental secretion of diabetogenic hormones, including growth hormone variant, corticotropin-releasing hormone, progesterone, and prolactin [10]. In women who develop GDM, pancreatic beta cells fail to adequately increase insulin production to overcome this resistance. Molecular mechanisms underlying this beta cell dysfunction include endoplasmic reticulum stress, mitochondrial dysfunction, accumulation of islet amyloid polypeptide, and inflammatory cytokine-mediated impairment of insulin gene transcription. The resulting maternal hyperglycemia creates a gradient favoring increased transplacental glucose transport via facilitated diffusion through GLUT1 and GLUT3 transporters in the syncytiotrophoblast [11, 12].

Fetal exposure to maternal hyperglycemia stimulates fetal pancreatic beta cell hyperplasia and excessive insulin secretion, functioning as a primary growth factor that promotes anabolic metabolism, adipogenesis, and macrosomia. Fetal hyperinsulinemia also disrupts normal pulmonary surfactant maturation, increasing the risk of respiratory distress [13]. Additionally, chronic intrauterine hyperglycemia induces oxidative stress through increased reactive oxygen species production, advanced glycation end product formation, and perturbation of placental nutrient transport systems beyond glucose, affecting amino acid and lipid delivery. These biochemical alterations establish a metabolic environment conducive to both immediate perinatal complications and long-term offspring metabolic programming toward obesity and diabetes [14]. Effective GDM management, therefore requires rigorous glycemic monitoring to maintain fasting plasma glucose below 95 mg/dL and one-hour postprandial glucose below 140 mg/dL or two-hour postprandial glucose below 120 mg/dL, targets derived from observational studies correlating maternal glucose levels with perinatal outcomes [15]. The intensive monitoring demands typically require four to seven glucose measurements daily, creating a substantial burden, particularly for women facing socioeconomic challenges, thereby establishing the rationale for technology-enabled solutions that simplify data collection, transmission, and clinical feedback loops while reducing healthcare system contact requirements.

Technology Platforms and Implementation Models

Technology-enabled self-management interventions for GDM encompass diverse platforms, including smartphone applications, SMS-based communication systems, web portals, telemedicine video consultations, continuous glucose monitoring systems, and integrated hybrid models combining multiple modalities [16]. Mobile health applications typically provide functionalities including glucose log entry, dietary tracking with visual food guides, medication reminders, educational content modules, graphical trend visualization, and automated alerts for out-of-range values with clinical team notification. SMS-based interventions, particularly relevant in settings with limited smartphone penetration, deliver scheduled educational messages, appointment reminders, motivational content, and bidirectional communication channels for glucose reporting and clinician queries. Telemedicine platforms facilitate remote consultations, reducing transportation barriers and enabling flexible scheduling adapted to women's work and family obligations. Continuous glucose monitoring devices, while more resource-intensive, provide real-time interstitial glucose measurements with pattern recognition capabilities, though cost remains prohibitive in many low-income contexts [17, 18].

Implementation models vary substantially regarding integration with existing prenatal care infrastructure, frequency and modality of healthcare provider interaction, degree of automation versus personalized feedback, and cultural adaptation of content. Successful implementations in low-income populations typically incorporate several key design features: simplified user interfaces requiring minimal digital literacy, availability in multiple languages with culturally appropriate visual content, offline functionality addressing unreliable internet connectivity, low data consumption to minimize costs, voice-based alternatives to text entry, and integration with community health worker support systems. However, a significant implementation challenge involves the digital divide wherein smartphone ownership, reliable cellular data access, and baseline technology literacy remain inconsistent in economically disadvantaged populations [19]. Studies examining technology access among low-income pregnant women reveal smartphone ownership rates ranging from 60 to 85 percent, with substantial variability in data plan affordability and device functionality. Furthermore, effective implementation requires healthcare system capacity for timely response to patient-generated data, integration with electronic health records, and provider training in digital health workflow management. The heterogeneity in platform selection, implementation intensity, and integration strategies complicates comparative effectiveness assessment across studies. Nevertheless, implementation frameworks emphasizing user-centered design, iterative stakeholder engagement, and attention to sociotechnical factors appear most promising for sustained adoption and clinical impact in resource-constrained settings.

Clinical Efficacy and Glycemic Outcomes

The clinical efficacy of technology-enabled interventions for GDM management in low-income populations demonstrates modest but consistent benefits in glycemic control parameters and self-management behaviors, though effect sizes remain generally small to moderate. Meta-analytic syntheses of randomized controlled trials indicate that mobile health and SMS-based interventions reduce mean fasting plasma glucose by 4 to 8 mg/dL compared to standard care controls, with similar reductions observed in postprandial glucose measurements [20]. Hemoglobin A1c, reflecting longer-term glycemic control over the preceding 8 to 12 weeks, shows mean decreases of 0.2 to 0.4 percentage points in intervention groups. While statistically significant, the clinical meaningfulness of these effect sizes for individual patient outcomes remains debatable, particularly given that many enrolled women already achieve acceptable glycemic control with standard care, creating ceiling effects that attenuate detectable intervention benefits.

Secondary outcomes reveal more pronounced effects on process measures, including self-monitoring adherence, with intervention participants demonstrating 15 to 30 percent higher rates of recommended glucose testing frequency, improved dietary self-efficacy scores, and greater engagement with prenatal educational content [21]. Obstetric and neonatal outcomes show inconsistent patterns across studies. Some trials report reduced rates of macrosomia (birthweight exceeding 4000 grams) by 8 to 12 percent and lower cesarean delivery rates by 5 to 9 percent in intervention arms, while other adequately powered studies detect no significant differences in these endpoints. Neonatal intensive care unit admission rates, neonatal hypoglycemia, and birth trauma show similarly mixed findings. The heterogeneity in clinical outcomes likely reflects several factors: differential baseline risk profiles across study populations, variability in intervention intensity and duration, inadequate statistical power for relatively uncommon outcomes, and insufficient attention to effect modification by socioeconomic factors within low-income cohorts. Importantly, few studies examine sustained postpartum outcomes, including breastfeeding rates, postpartum glucose tolerance testing completion, or progression to type 2 diabetes, representing critical knowledge gaps given the long-term metabolic implications of GDM. Subgroup analyses, where reported, suggest greater intervention benefits among women with higher baseline glucose levels, lower health literacy, and limited prior technology exposure, though these findings require confirmation in appropriately designed trials. The overall evidence base, while growing, remains limited by short follow-up periods, moderate risk of bias due to inadequate allocation concealment and blinding, small sample sizes, and publication bias favoring positive findings.

Barriers, Facilitators, and Socioeconomic Considerations

The implementation and effectiveness of technology-enabled GDM interventions in low-income populations are profoundly shaped by structural barriers and socioeconomic determinants that extend beyond the digital intervention itself [22]. Critical barriers of include inconsistent smartphone and internet access, data cost prohibitions that limit application usage, low baseline digital literacy requiring extensive training and ongoing technical support, language diversity necessitating multilingual content development, and competing life priorities that reduce engagement with self-management activities [23]. Low-income women frequently experience food insecurity that fundamentally constrains dietary modification recommendations, unstable housing that disrupts routine glucose monitoring, and inflexible work schedules that limit telemedicine appointment participation. Transportation barriers, childcare responsibilities, and inadequate social support networks compound these challenges, creating a complex socioecological context wherein technology interventions must function.

Beyond individual-level factors, healthcare system barriers substantially influence intervention effectiveness. Many low-income women receive prenatal care through fragmented systems with limited care continuity, inadequate integration of digital health platforms with electronic health records, and insufficient provider capacity to review and respond to patient-generated data in clinically meaningful timeframes. The digital health literacy gap extends to healthcare providers, many of whom lack training in interpreting continuous glucose data streams, triaging automated alerts, and incorporating technology-mediated communication into clinical workflows. Facilitators identified in successful implementations include integration of community health workers as technology navigators and cultural liaisons, provision of loaner devices with prepaid data plans, partnerships with community organizations for device distribution and training, simplified registration processes eliminating insurance verification delays, and co-design processes involving target population members to ensure cultural relevance and usability. Trust emerges as a critical but often overlooked determinant, with women more likely to engage consistently when interventions are endorsed by trusted providers or community members and when data privacy protections are transparently communicated. The intersection of GDM with racial and ethnic health disparities further complicates the landscape, as minority populations face compounded diabetes risk, historical medical mistrust, and systemic healthcare discrimination that technology interventions alone cannot address [24]. Comprehensive approaches integrating technology tools with social determinants mitigation, including food assistance programs, transportation vouchers, and culturally concordant care teams, appear most promising but remain inadequately studied.

Future Directions and Research Priorities

The evolution of technology-enabled GDM interventions toward greater effectiveness in low-income populations requires several strategic research and development priorities. First, rigorous implementation science studies employing mixed methods designs are essential to elucidate context-specific barriers and facilitators, identify optimal implementation strategies, and evaluate scalability within diverse healthcare delivery systems serving economically disadvantaged communities [25]. Such studies should examine cost-effectiveness from both healthcare system and societal perspectives, including opportunity costs borne by women and families. Second, the development and validation of predictive algorithms utilizing machine learning approaches to analyze patterns in glucose data, dietary intake, physical activity, and other patient-generated information may enable more personalized and preemptive intervention strategies. However, algorithm development must prioritize representative training datasets to avoid perpetuating existing healthcare disparities through biased prediction models.

Third, expansion of intervention scope beyond glucose monitoring to address comprehensive maternal health needs, mental health support, postpartum contraception counseling, and facilitation of postpartum diabetes screening could enhance value and sustained engagement [26]. Integration with existing maternal health platforms and incorporation into group prenatal care models may improve efficiency and social support dimensions. Fourth, exploration of emerging technologies, including voice-activated interfaces, artificial intelligence-driven chatbots for 24-hour support, blockchain-based data security, and integration with continuous glucose monitoring systems, warrants investigation, balanced against accessibility and cost considerations. Fifth, the establishment of standardized reporting guidelines for digital health interventions in maternal health, including a detailed description of technological features, implementation strategies, user engagement metrics, and equity-focused outcome reporting, would substantially improve evidence synthesis and translation. Finally, pragmatic randomized trials embedded within real-world care delivery systems, powered for clinically meaningful outcomes including macrosomia, maternal-fetal morbidity, and postpartum metabolic health, with adequate duration to assess sustained effects and economic evaluations incorporating both direct medical costs and broader societal costs, represent essential evidence gaps. Equity considerations must be explicitly integrated throughout the research continuum, with intentional recruitment of diverse populations, disaggregated outcome reporting by socioeconomic indicators, and assessment of differential treatment effects across subgroups to ensure that technology interventions reduce rather than exacerbate existing health disparities in GDM outcomes [27].

CONCLUSION

Technology-enabled self-management interventions for gestational diabetes mellitus in low-income populations demonstrate biological plausibility, growing implementation experience, and modest evidence of clinical benefit, yet substantial gaps remain between theoretical promise and realized population health impact. The interventions appear most effective when addressing process outcomes such as self-monitoring adherence and patient engagement, with more limited and inconsistent effects on clinical endpoints including glycemic control parameters, obstetric complications, and neonatal outcomes. The modest effect sizes observed likely reflect the complex, multifactorial nature of GDM management wherein technology represents one component of comprehensive care rather than a standalone solution. Critical implementation barriers rooted in digital access inequities, inadequate digital literacy, competing socioeconomic stressors, and healthcare system capacity constraints substantially attenuate intervention effectiveness in real-world low-income settings. Successful implementations share common features including user-centered design, cultural adaptation, integration with community health worker support, attention to digital infrastructure requirements, and embedding within rather than parallel to existing prenatal care delivery systems. The evidence base, while expanding, remains limited by methodological weaknesses including inadequate sample sizes for clinical outcomes, short follow-up periods, heterogeneous intervention characteristics that complicate synthesis, and insufficient attention to equity-focused outcomes and implementation determinants. Future advancement requires shifting from proof-of-concept efficacy trials to pragmatic effectiveness and implementation studies that rigorously examine context-specific barriers, cost-effectiveness, scalability, and sustained impact on maternal and offspring metabolic health trajectories while explicitly addressing rather than overlooking the structural determinants that fundamentally shape GDM risk and management capacity in economically disadvantaged populations. Healthcare systems and researchers should prioritize hybrid implementation-effectiveness studies that evaluate technology-enabled GDM interventions integrated with comprehensive social determinants interventions, including food assistance and transportation support, with mandatory disaggregated outcome reporting by income level and rigorous cost-effectiveness analysis from societal perspectives.

REFERENCES

1. Mittal, R., Prasad, K., Lemos, J.R.N., Arevalo, G., Hirani, K.: Unveiling Gestational Diabetes: An Overview of Pathophysiology and Management. International Journal of Molecular Sciences. 26, 2320 (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms26052320
2. Szlapinski, S.K., Hill, D.J.: Metabolic Adaptations to Pregnancy in Healthy and Gestational Diabetic Pregnancies: The Pancreas - Placenta Axis. Current Vascular Pharmacology. 19, 141–153 (2021). https://doi.org/10.2174/1570161118666200320111209
3. Genova, M.P., Atanasova, B.D., Todorova-Ananieva, K.N., Genova, M.P., Atanasova, B.D., Todorova-Ananieva, K.N.: Body Mass Index and Insulin Sensitivity/Resistance: Cross Talks in Gestational Diabetes, Normal Pregnancy and Beyond. In: Body-mass Index and Health. IntechOpen (2018)
4. Alum, E., P.C., U., Obeagu, E.: Beyond Pregnancy: Understanding the Long-Term Implications of Gestational Diabetes Mellitus. INOSR Scientific Research. 11, 63–71 (2024). https://doi.org/10.59298/INOSRSR/2024/1.1.16371
5. Basu, M., Garg, V.: Maternal hyperglycemia and fetal cardiac development: Clinical impact and underlying mechanisms. Birth Defects Research. 110, 1504–1516 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1002/bdr2.1435
6. Muglia, L.J., Benhalima, K., Tong, S., Ozanne, S.: Maternal factors during pregnancy influencing maternal, fetal, and childhood outcomes. BMC Med. 20, 418 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-022-02632-6
7. Obeagu, E., Aja, P., Ugwu, C., Okon, M.: Nutritional Care in Diabetes Mellitus: A Comprehensive Guide. International Journal of Innovative and Applied Research.11, 16–15 (2023). https://doi.org/10.58538/IJIAR/2057
8. Ugwu, O.P.-C., Alum, E.U., Ugwu, J.N., Eze, V.H.U., Ugwu, C.N., Ogenyi, F.C., Okon, M.B.: Harnessing technology for infectious disease response in conflict zones: Challenges, innovations, and policy implications. Medicine. 103, e38834 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.0000000000038834
9. Ezenwaji, C.O.: The role of digital health in pandemic preparedness and response: securing global health? Global Health Action. 17, 2419694 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1080/16549716.2024.2419694
10. Hadjer, G., Rihab, A.: Contribution to the study of the importance of hormonal assessment in cases of gestational diabetes, http://oldspace.univ-tebessa.dz:8080/xmlui/handle/123456789/http//localhost:8080/jspui/handle/123456789/12057, (2024)
11. Joshi, N.P., Mane, A.R., Sahay, A.S., Sundrani, D.P., Joshi, S.R., Yajnik, C.S.: Role of Placental Glucose Transporters in Determining Fetal Growth. Reprod. Sci. 29, 2744–2759 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/s43032-021-00699-9
12. Paredes Díaz, P.A., Dimasuay, K.G., Koele Schmidt, L., Jang, B., Barbour, L.A., Jansson, T., Powell, T.L.: Glyburide treatment in gestational diabetes is associated with increased placental glucose transporter 1 expression and higher birth weight. Placenta. (2017). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.placenta.2017.05.016
13. Yildiz Atar, H., Baatz, J.E., Ryan, R.M.: Molecular Mechanisms of Maternal Diabetes Effects on Fetal and Neonatal Surfactant. Children. 8, 281 (2021). https://doi.org/10.3390/children8040281
14. Awotunde, O., Akinloye, D., Uti, D.: Nutritional Requirements During Pregnancy: A Comprehensive Overview. International Journal of Innovative and Applied Research. 11, 26–34 (2023)
15. Ozgu-Erdinc, A.S., Iskender, C., Uygur, D., Oksuzoglu, A., Seckin, K.D., Yeral, M.I., Kalaylioglu, Z.I., Yucel, A., Danisman, A.N.: One-hour versus two-hour postprandial blood glucose measurement in women with gestational diabetes mellitus: which is more predictive? Endocrine. 52, 561–570 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12020-015-0813-5
16. Sharma, V., Feldman, M., Sharma, R.: Telehealth Technologies in Diabetes Self-management and Education. J Diabetes Sci Technol. 18, 148–158 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1177/19322968221093078

17. Alum, E.U.: Optimizing patient education for sustainable self-management in type 2 diabetes. Discov Public Health. 22, 44 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12982-025-00445-5
18. Aggarwal, V.: Globalizing Continuous Glucose Monitoring Systems: A Paradigm Shift from Traditional Self-Monitoring Blood Glucose Devices.
19. Ezenwaji, C.O., Alum, E.U., Ugwu, O.P.-C.: Bridging the gap: telemedicine as a solution for HIV care inequities in rural and vulnerable communities. International Journal for Equity in Health. 24, 205 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-025-02584-2
20. Yu, X., Wang, Y., Liu, Z., Jung, E.: Technological functionality and system architecture of mobile health interventions for diabetes management: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Front Public Health. 13, 1549568 (2025). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1549568
21. Muhali, S.S., Muhali, F.S., Mfinanga, S.G., Sadiq, A.M., Marandu, A.A., Kyala, N.J., Said, F.H., Nziku, E.B., Mirai, T.E., Ngocho, J.S., Mlay, H.L., Waria, G.G., Chambega, A., Kessy, S.N., Kilonzo, K.G., Lyamuya, F.S., Mkwizu, E.W., Shao, E.R., Chamba, N.G.: Impact of Self-Monitoring Blood Glucose on Glycaemic Control Among Insulin-Treated Patients With Diabetes Mellitus in Northeastern Tanzania: A Randomised Controlled Trial. J Diabetes Res. 2024, 6789672 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1155/2024/6789672
22. Jones-Esan, L., Somasiri, N., Lorne, K.: Enhancing Healthcare Delivery Through Digital Health Interventions: A Systematic Review on Telemedicine and Mobile Health Applications in Low and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs). Research Square. (2024). https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-5189203/v1
23. Kumar, S., Nilsen, W.J., Abernethy, A., Atienza, A., Patrick, K., Pavel, M., Riley, W.T., Shar, A., Spring, B., Spruijt-Metz, D., Hedeker, D., Honavar, V., Kravitz, R., Craig Lefebvre, R., Mohr, D.C., Murphy, S.A., Quinn, C., Shusterman, V., Swendeman, D.: Mobile Health Technology Evaluation. American Journal of Preventive Medicine. 45, 228–236 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2013.03.017
24. Nambi, N.H.: Diabetes Disparities: Addressing Health Inequities and Improving Outcomes in Underserved Populations. RIJPP. 3, 27–36 (2024). https://doi.org/10.59298/RIJPP/2024/332736
25. Klaic, M., Kapp, S., Hudson, P., Chapman, W., Denehy, L., Story, D., Francis, J.J.: Implementability of healthcare interventions: an overview of reviews and development of a conceptual framework. Implement Sci. 17, 10 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-021-01171-7
26. Shang, J., Dolikun, N., Tao, X., Zhang, P., Woodward, M., Hackett, M.L., Henry, A.: The effectiveness of postpartum interventions aimed at improving women's mental health after medical complications of pregnancy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. 22, 809 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-022-05084-1
27. Ekpang II, J.E., Ekpang, P.O., Ainebyoona, C., Nwagu, K.E., Nwuruku, O.A., Muhammad, K.: Toward an ethical future for orphan drugs: balancing access, affordability, and innovation. Journal of Medical Economics. 0, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/13696998.2025.2577514

CITE AS: Wambui Kibibi J. (2026). Technology-Enabled Self-Management Interventions for Gestational Diabetes in Low-Income Populations: A Critical Review. Research Output Journal of Engineering and Scientific Research 5(1): 75-80. https://doi.org/10.59298/ROJESR/2026/5.17580