

When HbA1c and Fasting Glucose Disagree

ABSURD Health Institute · Volume Two · Research Essay 29

Research series: 04 · Microvascular and cardiometabolic risk

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.

Why two glucose tests disagree

HbA1c and fasting glucose answer different questions, and disagreement between them may reveal biology rather than measurement failure.

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.

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.

Glycemia, erythrocytes and false concordance

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.

HbA1c reflects glycation of circulating hemoglobin over the lifespan of red blood cells, while fasting glucose samples glycemia at a particular moment. They can disagree because postprandial excursions, altered erythrocyte turnover, anemia, kidney disease, hemoglobin variants, recent treatment changes and assay limitations affect one or both measurements. Consequently, a discrepancy is not itself evidence of insulin resistance, nor does it prove that a patient is metabolically well. The discordance is a diagnostic question with several testable explanations.

One way to resolve it is to examine repeat measurements and appropriate direct glucose data, including self-monitoring or continuous monitoring when indicated. The comparison should be temporally aligned: a recently changed diet can alter fasting glucose rapidly while HbA1c still represents prior weeks. Interpretation also depends on whether the patient is pregnant, anemic, transfused or experiencing altered renal function. These contexts cannot be reduced to a single hidden terrain condition.

Fasting glucose reflects one time point; HbA1c integrates glycation over red-cell lifespan and can be distorted by anemia, altered erythrocyte turnover, hemoglobin variants or advanced kidney disease. Postprandial glucose excursions offer another explanation for discordance. The practical thesis is that a patient can have clinically important glycemic variability even when fasting values look acceptable, but an anomalous HbA1c is not automatically evidence of concealed diabetes.

Sorting biological variability from analytic distortion

The novel systems insight is that different tests integrate physiology across different time windows. A short-term reading may reveal the current state; a cumulative marker may reveal previous exposure; a dynamic challenge can reveal reserve. A model that explicitly includes timescale should better predict disagreement than one that insists one measurement is “true.” The correct next step is contextual verification rather than routinely labeling standard glucose tests defective.

Time windows create disagreement. A fasting glucose measurement is a snapshot of one moment; HbA1c integrates glycemic exposure over a period influenced by red-cell turnover. Someone who recently made a major dietary change could show a low current fasting glucose while HbA1c still reflects the preceding weeks. Another person may have normal fasting values but elevated postprandial glucose. These are different mechanisms, and they suggest different follow-up questions.

Non-glycemic reasons matter. Anemia, recent blood loss, kidney disease, altered erythrocyte lifespan and certain hemoglobin variants can undermine the ordinary interpretation of HbA1c. Researchers investigating apparent metabolic paradoxes must record these conditions rather than declare that standard tests conceal a mysterious disorder. Alternative measures may be useful in selected clinical contexts, but they too have limitations.

A systems model of the discrepancy. Treat each test as a measurement function with its own timescale and nuisance variables. A hypothesis predicts a specific direction of discordance under specific conditions; it does not merely observe that numbers disagree. This conceptual move could improve diagnostic reasoning because it explains why different laboratory results can both be technically correct while describing different aspects of physiology. The appropriate resolution uses history and validated tests, not unproven metabolic treatments.

Compare continuous glucose monitoring, oral glucose testing where indicated, hemoglobin indices and kidney function in patients with large discrepancies. The prediction is that some disagreements resolve into a recognizable red-cell artifact while others reveal high postmeal glycemia. Correctly identifying which category applies is more useful than repeating a generic claim that standard laboratory tests are misleading.

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.

The misleading promise of one perfect glucose number

A fasting glucose measured after an uneventful night's sleep can be normal even if meals routinely cause substantial excursions; conversely an HbA1c can be higher than expected because red cells survive longer or laboratory assumptions do not fit the patient. The two results can disagree without either being fraudulent or universally superior. An article arguing that glycemic disease hides behind normal tests needs to distinguish true hyperglycemia from altered measurement biology. Continuous monitoring may clarify the pattern in a selected patient, but sensor data also contain noise and should not be substituted blindly for diagnostic testing. A useful case analysis compares several possible mechanisms: postprandial excursions, recent major diet changes, iron deficiency, kidney disease and variant hemoglobin. Each predicts a different pattern across glucose, erythrocyte and glycation measurements. This is a more powerful explanation of discordance than the general claim that clinical laboratories are often misleading; it tells researchers what to check next.

A mismatch is a diagnostic question

A discordance between HbA1c and fasting glucose is especially instructive because neither measure is necessarily false. A person may have high postprandial glucose despite an acceptable fasting value; another may have recently improved glucose while HbA1c still reflects prior exposure. Meanwhile anemia or altered erythrocyte lifespan can change the relationship between glycemia and hemoglobin glycation. A mechanistic paper should specify which scenario it predicts and how to discriminate it using appropriate independent measurements. Continuous glucose data may clarify patterns when clinically indicated, but sensor accuracy and behavior must be considered. The systems insight is not that standard medicine overlooks an invisible universal disorder, but that measurements integrate different timescales and compartments. It is possible for several observations to be accurate while telling different parts of a physiological story. Clinical interpretation improves when these parts are reconciled rather than ranked according to a preferred theory.

A further distinction is between measurement disagreement and biological instability. The former may be explained by known assay properties or red-cell turnover, while the latter may reveal large swings in postprandial glucose. They require different follow-up investigations, and the paper should not infer a diagnosis from discordance alone.

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.

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.

Sources and research leads

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

- [American Diabetes Association, 2026 diagnosis and classification guidance](#)

Editorial status: Third-pass conceptual research manuscript. The argument has been individually strengthened and shared boilerplate removed. Original reference leads were retained; a complete independent source-by-source scholarly verification has not been performed. No new clinical trial data are presented.