

When HbA1c and Fasting Glucose Disagree

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 04 · Microvascular and cardiometabolic risk · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

HbA1c estimates glycemic exposure indirectly through hemoglobin glycation; fasting plasma glucose captures concentration at a particular moment. Disagreement between them need not be a laboratory error. This paper examines the biological reasons for discordance and argues that two measures answering different questions should not automatically be forced into a single diagnosis.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

HbA1c depends on both glucose exposure and red-cell lifespan. Hemolysis, recent blood loss, pregnancy-related changes, renal disease, iron deficiency, hemoglobin variants and transfusion can affect interpretation. Fasting glucose is influenced by fasting duration, stress, sleep, medications and hepatic glucose output. Postprandial hyperglycemia may be missed by a fasting value. Continuous glucose monitoring can reveal patterns but is not itself a universal diagnostic replacement.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The clinical concept is triangulation: compare the trajectory of fasting glucose, HbA1c, medication history, anemia and renal measures before drawing conclusions. A mismatch should trigger a question about assay biology, timing and glucose variability. This applies equally to reassuring A1c with unexpected high measured glucose and an elevated A1c with apparently normal home fasting measurements.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

A single marker can be biologically accurate and clinically misleading when its assumptions fail. HbA1c assumes a relationship between erythrocyte exposure time and circulating glucose; conditions that shorten red-cell lifespan can lower measured glycation at the same glucose level, while others can raise it. Fasting glucose has an almost opposite limitation: it captures a narrow time point and may miss substantial postprandial excursions. The two tests therefore occupy different positions on the timeline of metabolic regulation. More data are not automatically better, however, when sensor inaccuracy or laboratory artifacts are ignored.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

There is danger in attributing discordance to occult insulin resistance or “terrain failure” without checking common laboratory and hematological causes. Home sensors have accuracy limitations, especially around rapidly changing glucose or sensor compression. Repeated testing and clinician-guided confirmation may be more informative than an elaborate unsupported endocrine theory.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The discriminating question is whether repeated measurements, renal and hematologic context and appropriately selected glucose testing converge on a coherent picture. If discordance is explained by iron deficiency or hemolysis, invoking a mysterious metabolic subtype adds little. If glucose excursions are genuine despite normal fasting values, the problem is temporal sampling rather than a failed laboratory system.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This paper offers a transferable lesson in diagnosis: a biomarker is not the illness itself, and discrepancies may reveal what the assay actually measures. The appropriate result is better selection and interpretation of measurements, not abandonment of standard glucose evaluation.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Liu et al. [Calorie Restriction with or without Time-Restricted Eating in Weight Loss](#)

Source lineage: Metabolic consultations and clinical blood-work interpretation

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.