Research Output Journal of Engineering and Scientific Research 5(1): 36-42, 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/2026/5.13642

Smart Insulin Patch Delivery Systems for Glucose-Responsive Glycemic Control in Diabetic Patients

Kibibi Wairimu H.

School of Natural and Applied Sciences Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT

Diabetes mellitus affects over 537 million adults globally, with inadequate glycemic control contributing to severe microvascular and macrovascular complications. Conventional insulin therapy, including multiple daily injections and continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion, failed to mimic physiological insulin secretion patterns, resulting in hypoglycemic episodes and suboptimal glucose homeostasis. Smart insulin patch delivery systems represented an emerging biomedical engineering approach that integrates glucose-sensing mechanisms with controlled insulin release, offering automated, physiologically responsive treatment modalities. This review critically evaluated the biochemical foundations, technological architectures, clinical efficacy, and translational potential of glucose-responsive smart insulin patches for diabetes management. A comprehensive literature search of peer-reviewed articles published between 2014 and 2024 was conducted across PubMed, Web of Science, and Scopus databases using terms related to glucose-responsive insulin delivery, microneedle patches, and closed-loop systems. Current smart patch platforms employ diverse glucose-sensing mechanisms including phenylboronic acid derivatives, glucose oxidase enzymatic systems, and concanavalin A lectin-based recognition. Microneedle arrays facilitate minimally invasive transdermal delivery while maintaining mechanical integrity and biocompatibility. Preclinical studies demonstrated rapid glucose-responsive insulin release within 30 to 60 minutes, sustained euglycemia for 10 to 20 hours, and reduced hypoglycemic events compared to conventional therapy. However, human clinical trials remain limited, with challenges including long-term biocompatibility, sensor drift, and regulatory pathway complexity. Glucose-responsive insulin patches demonstrated substantial preclinical promise for physiological glycemic control, yet require rigorous clinical validation, standardized performance metrics, and manufacturing scalability before clinical implementation.

Keywords: Glucose-responsive insulin delivery, Smart insulin patch, Microneedle technology, Closed-loop diabetes management, Phenylboronic acid.

INTRODUCTION

Insulin, a 51-amino acid peptide hormone synthesized by pancreatic beta cells, serves as the primary regulator of glucose homeostasis through facilitation of cellular glucose uptake, suppression of hepatic gluconeogenesis, and modulation of lipid metabolism [1, 2]. In healthy individuals, insulin secretion exhibits biphasic kinetics characterized by a rapid first-phase release within 10 minutes of glucose stimulation, followed by sustained second-phase secretion that precisely matches circulating glucose concentrations [3]. This exquisite physiological regulation maintains blood glucose between 70 and 140 mg/dL throughout the day. Disruption of this regulatory axis in diabetes mellitus results from either autoimmune beta cell destruction in type 1 diabetes or progressive insulin resistance coupled with beta cell dysfunction in type 2 diabetes, necessitating exogenous insulin replacement in advanced disease stages [4].

Current insulin delivery modalities, including subcutaneous injections via syringes, pens, or pump-based continuous infusion systems, represent pharmacokinetic approximations rather than true physiological replications of endogenous insulin secretion. These conventional approaches require patient-initiated dosing based on self-monitoring of blood glucose, carbohydrate counting, and algorithmic calculations, imposing substantial cognitive burden and creating temporal mismatches between insulin availability and glycemic demand [5]. Consequently, patients experience glycemic variability characterized by postprandial hyperglycemic excursions alternating with nocturnal or exercise-induced hypoglycemia, with studies demonstrating that up to 40% of type 1 diabetes patients experience severe hypoglycemic events annually [6]. Furthermore, repeated needle insertions cause injection site complications including lipohypertrophy, pain, and psychological distress that compromise treatment adherence [7].

Smart insulin patch delivery systems integrate glucose-sensing biomaterials with controlled-release mechanisms to achieve autonomous, stimulus-responsive insulin administration that mirrors physiological secretion patterns without requiring external electronic components or patient intervention [8]. The objective of this review is to critically evaluate the biochemical principles, technological platforms, preclinical efficacy, clinical translation barriers, and future research priorities for glucose-responsive insulin patches as next-generation diabetes therapeutics.

Biochemical Mechanisms of Glucose-Responsive Insulin Release

The fundamental innovation underlying smart insulin patches involves chemical or biochemical transduction systems that convert ambient glucose concentrations into controlled insulin release rates without external power sources or electronic sensors [9]. Three principal molecular mechanisms dominate current research: phenylboronic acid (PBA)-based reversible glucose binding, glucose oxidase (GOx) enzymatic catalysis generating pH or hypoxic microenvironmental changes, and lectin-mediated competitive displacement systems.

Phenylboronic acid derivatives form reversible covalent bonds with vicinal diols present in glucose molecules, undergoing structural transitions from trigonal planar to tetrahedral geometries that alter polymer network hydrophilicity and mesh size [10]. This glucose-induced swelling increases insulin diffusion coefficients within hydrogel matrices proportionally to ambient glucose concentrations. Studies demonstrate that 3-aminophenylboronic acid (3-APBA) conjugated to alginate or polyacrylamide backbones achieves glucose-responsive swelling ratios of 2.5 to 4.0-fold within physiological pH ranges, with dissociation constants optimized between 2 and 10 mM through strategic fluorine substitution at ortho positions [11]. The reversibility and regenerability of boronate ester formation permit repeated cycling through hyperglycemic and euglycemic states without material degradation over 72-hour periods in vitro.

Glucose oxidase catalyzes beta-D-glucose oxidation to gluconic acid and hydrogen peroxide, generating localized acidification or oxygen depletion that triggers pH-sensitive or hypoxia-responsive insulin release [12]. GOx-loaded vesicles incorporating pH-sensitive polymers such as poly(methacrylic acid-co-ethylene glycol) exhibit insulin release rates increasing 3 to 5-fold when environmental pH decreases from 7.4 to 6.5, corresponding to gluconic acid accumulation during hyperglycemia [13]. Alternatively, catalase co-encapsulation converts hydrogen peroxide to oxygen, creating cyclic redox reactions that drive pulsatile insulin release mimicking physiological secretion patterns. However, enzyme stability represents a critical limitation, with GOx activity declining 40 to 60% after seven days at physiological temperature due to thermal denaturation and oxidative damage [14].

Concanavalin A (ConA), a lectin protein with specific glucose and mannose binding sites, mediates competitive displacement mechanisms wherein glucose competitively dissociates insulin-glycosylated polymer complexes. ConA tetramers crosslink glycosylated insulin or glucose-bearing polymers into stable aggregates; rising glucose concentrations disrupt these interactions through competitive binding, liberating free insulin for diffusion. This mechanism demonstrates rapid response kinetics with half-maximal release at 5 to 8 mM glucose, closely matching physiological thresholds. Nevertheless, ConA immunogenicity and potential mitogenicity raise biocompatibility concerns requiring extensive safety evaluation before clinical translation. These diverse biochemical strategies provide multiple technological pathways toward glucose-responsive systems, each presenting distinct advantages and translational challenges requiring material science innovation and rigorous preclinical validation.

Microneedle Patch Architecture and Transdermal Delivery Platforms

Microneedle arrays constitute the primary structural platform enabling minimally invasive transdermal insulin delivery while maintaining mechanical integrity for skin penetration and providing matrices for glucose-sensing elements and insulin reservoirs. These microscale projections, typically 200 to 1500 micrometers in height with tip diameters of 1 to 50 micrometers, penetrate the stratum corneum and epidermis to access dermal interstitial fluid containing glucose concentrations correlating closely with blood glucose levels [15]. Four principal microneedle architectures have been developed: solid coated needles, hollow microneedles, dissolving polymeric needles, and hydrogel-forming matrices [16].

Solid microneedles fabricated from biocompatible metals, silicon, or rigid polymers create microchannels for subsequent insulin diffusion from reservoir patches, offering robust mechanical properties with fracture forces exceeding 1 Newton per needle. However, this two-step application process adds complexity and requires separate insulin formulation stability considerations. Hollow microneedles featuring internal channels permit direct fluid delivery from pressurized reservoirs, yet manufacturing challenges and potential channel occlusion by tissue debris limit reliability. Dissolving microneedles composed of biodegradable polymers, including polyvinylpyrrolidone, hyaluronic acid, or carboxymethylcellulose encapsulate insulin within the needle matrix itself, dissolving completely within 5 to 20 minutes after skin insertion to release drug payload while eliminating sharps waste. These systems demonstrate insulin bioavailability comparable to subcutaneous injection, with pharmacokinetic studies in diabetic rodents showing time to maximum insulin concentration of 30 to 45 minutes and duration of action extending 4 to 8 hours [17].

Hydrogel-forming microneedles represent the most sophisticated integration of sensing and delivery functions, composed of crosslinked hydrophilic polymers that swell upon interstitial fluid uptake while remaining mechanically anchored in skin [18]. These swellable matrices incorporate glucose-responsive elements such as phenylboronic acid groups or GOx-loaded vesicles distributed throughout the three-dimensional network [19]. Upon detecting elevated interstitial glucose, the hydrogel undergoes conformational changes increasing insulin diffusion rates from the patch backing reservoir through the microneedle conduits into dermal tissue. Mathematical modeling demonstrates that optimizing needle density (400 to 900 needles per square centimeter), inter-needle spacing, and hydrogel crosslinking density achieves insulin flux rates of 50 to 200 microunits per square centimeter per minute, sufficient to deliver basal and prandial insulin requirements. Surface modification with cell-penetrating peptides or permeation enhancers further augments insulin absorption, increasing bioavailability from 60% to 85% relative to subcutaneous injection [20]. The convergence of microneedle engineering with glucose-responsive biomaterials creates fully integrated patch systems capable of autonomous glycemic regulation.

Preclinical Efficacy and Animal Model Validation Studies

Extensive preclinical investigations in chemically induced and genetically diabetic rodent models have established proof-of-concept for glucose-responsive insulin patch efficacy, safety, and pharmacodynamic performance [21]. Streptozotocin-induced type 1 diabetic mice, exhibiting baseline blood glucose concentrations of 350 to 500 mg/dL, demonstrate rapid glycemic normalization within 30 to 90 minutes following application of PBA-functionalized microneedle patches loaded with 50 to 100 micrograms of insulin [22]. These patches maintain euglycemia between 80 and 140 mg/dL for durations of 10 to 20 hours without additional interventions, contrasting with conventional insulin injection requiring repeat administration every 4 to 6 hours [23].

Glucose challenge experiments, wherein diabetic animals receive intraperitoneal glucose boluses simulating postprandial glycemic excursions, reveal dose-dependent insulin release kinetics correlating with glucose elevation magnitude [24]. Animals treated with smart patches exhibit peak insulin concentrations 2.5 to 3.5-fold higher during hyperglycemic challenges compared to baseline, whereas control patches without glucose-responsive elements show constitutive insulin release uncoupled from glycemic state [25]. Importantly, hypoglycemic event rates decrease 60 to 80% with responsive patches compared to equivalent-dose conventional therapy, attributed to automatic insulin delivery cessation when euglycemia is achieved. Continuous glucose monitoring data demonstrate reduced glycemic variability with a coefficient of variation declining from 45% to 25%, indicating improved glucose stability approaching non-diabetic physiological patterns [26].

Biocompatibility assessments including histological examination of patch application sites, serum inflammatory marker quantification, and dermal integrity evaluation reveal minimal adverse tissue reactions. Skin irritation scores remain below grade 2 on standardized scales, with transient erythema resolving within 24 hours post-removal and complete epidermal regeneration documented by 72 hours. Insulin structural integrity and bioactivity remain preserved within patch matrices for storage periods exceeding three months at room temperature, addressing critical pharmaceutical stability requirements. Translation to large animal models including diabetic minipigs demonstrates scalability, with proportionally sized patches achieving comparable glycemic control and pharmacokinetic profiles when accounting for body weight-adjusted insulin doses [27]. While these preclinical data establish technical feasibility and short-term efficacy, critical questions regarding long-term biocompatibility, sensing accuracy over extended wearing periods, and human skin penetration characteristics necessitate carefully designed clinical trials.

Clinical Translation Challenges and Regulatory Considerations

Despite compelling preclinical evidence, glucose-responsive insulin patches face substantial barriers to clinical implementation encompassing manufacturing complexity, regulatory pathway ambiguity, biocompatibility validation requirements, and health economic considerations. Current prototype fabrication relies on research-scale techniques including photolithography, laser micromachining, and micromolding processes that achieve limited production volumes at costs prohibitive for commercial viability. Transitioning to high-throughput manufacturing

methods such as injection molding or roll-to-roll processing while maintaining quality control over microneedle dimensional tolerances within 5 to 10 micrometers presents significant engineering challenges [28].

Regulatory agencies, including the US Food and Drug Administration classify these devices as combination drug-device products requiring demonstration of safety and efficacy for both insulin formulation and delivery platform components [29]. Establishing appropriate comparator groups for pivotal trials remains contentious, as superiority claims against optimized insulin pump therapy with continuous glucose monitoring necessitate large sample sizes powered to detect modest improvements in hemoglobin A1c or time-in-range metrics [30]. Conversely, non-inferiority designs against standard subcutaneous injection may inadequately capture the purported advantages of glucose-responsive delivery [31]. Biocompatibility testing must address potential sensitization from repeated patch applications, cumulative microneedle insertion trauma, and long-term consequences of polymer degradation products or residual glucose-sensing molecules in dermal tissue [32].

Sensor accuracy and reliability represent critical performance parameters, as erroneous glucose measurements could trigger inappropriate insulin delivery resulting in severe hypoglycemia or diabetic ketoacidosis [33]. Establishing clinical acceptability criteria for glucose-sensing accuracy, such as requiring 95% of readings within 20% of reference values across physiological glucose ranges, necessitates validation against laboratory-grade reference methods in diverse patient populations [34]. Furthermore, individual variability in skin properties including thickness, hydration, temperature, and dermal blood flow affects both glucose sensing in interstitial fluid and insulin absorption kinetics, potentially requiring personalized calibration algorithms [35].

Economic analyses incorporating device manufacturing costs, insulin formulation expenses, and healthcare utilization patterns suggest that smart patches must achieve retail prices below $15 per patch with wear durations exceeding five days to demonstrate cost-effectiveness compared to insulin pump therapy [36]. Reimbursement mechanisms and insurance coverage policies remain undefined, particularly for patients with type 2 diabetes who may benefit from simplified insulin delivery but face access barriers under current payment structures [37]. Addressing these multifaceted translational challenges requires coordinated efforts among biomedical engineers, pharmaceutical scientists, clinical endocrinologists, regulatory specialists, and health economists to establish clear development pathways and evidence standards.

Future Research Directions and Technological Innovations

Advancing glucose-responsive insulin patches from promising prototypes to clinically viable diabetes therapeutics demands focused research addressing current limitations and expanding functional capabilities through materials innovation, miniaturized sensing technologies, and intelligent system integration [38]. Next-generation glucose-sensing mechanisms incorporating electrochemical sensors, optical fluorescence detection, or Raman spectroscopy integrated with microelectromechanical systems offer potential advantages in accuracy, response speed, and calibration stability compared to passive chemical sensing approaches [39]. Flexible printed electronics fabricated via inkjet or screen printing methods enable embedded continuous glucose monitors within patch substrates, providing real-time feedback for adaptive insulin release algorithms [40].

Dual-hormone delivery systems co-incorporating glucagon alongside insulin in separate compartments with reciprocal glucose-responsive release kinetics represent biomimetic approaches to replicating pancreatic alpha and beta cell coordination [41]. During hypoglycemia, glucose-sensitive barriers restrict insulin release while permitting glucagon diffusion to stimulate hepatic glucose production, potentially eliminating hypoglycemic events entirely [42]. Alternatively, incorporating glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists or amylin analogues provides complementary glycemic control mechanisms, including gastric emptying delay and appetite suppression [43].

Personalized patch design informed by machine learning algorithms analyzing continuous glucose monitoring data, meal patterns, physical activity, and insulin sensitivity parameters could optimize glucose-responsive kinetics for individual metabolic phenotypes [44]. Computational models predicting insulin requirements based on real-time physiological inputs enable closed-loop control strategies approaching artificial pancreas performance without electronic components. Biodegradable and environmentally sustainable patch materials addressing the environmental impact of medical waste represent important considerations for long-term product lifecycle management.

Exploring alternative administration sites, including oral mucosa, gastrointestinal tract, using ingestible patches, or intravascular delivery via minimally invasive catheters, expands therapeutic options for patients with dermal contraindications [45]. Combination strategies pairing smart patches with adjunctive diabetes technologies such as smartphone connectivity for data logging, telehealth integration, or artificial intelligence-assisted decision support systems create comprehensive digital health ecosystems [46]. Rigorous comparative effectiveness research evaluating patient-reported outcomes, including quality of life, treatment satisfaction, and diabetes distress, alongside traditional glycemic metrics, will illuminate the holistic value proposition of smart patch technology. Continued interdisciplinary collaboration and sustained research investment position glucose-responsive insulin

patches as transformational innovations addressing the unmet need for physiologically intelligent diabetes therapeutics.

CONCLUSION

Glucose-responsive smart insulin patch delivery systems represent a paradigm shift in diabetes pharmacotherapy, integrating sophisticated biomaterials engineering with physiological sensing mechanisms to achieve autonomous glycemic regulation. The convergence of phenylboronic acid chemistry, glucose oxidase enzymatic systems, or lectin-based recognition elements with microneedle transdermal platforms creates minimally invasive devices capable of real-time insulin delivery modulation without external electronics or patient intervention. Extensive preclinical investigations demonstrate compelling efficacy, including rapid glucose normalization within 30 to 60 minutes, sustained euglycemia exceeding 10 hours, reduced hypoglycemic event rates, and excellent biocompatibility profiles. However, translating these promising prototypes into approved clinical therapies requires overcoming substantial manufacturing scalability challenges, establishing regulatory frameworks for combination products, validating long-term safety and sensing accuracy in human trials, and demonstrating cost-effectiveness compared to existing insulin delivery modalities. The limited human clinical data currently available necessitate cautious optimism tempered by recognition of the substantial development pathway remaining. Nevertheless, ongoing technological innovations, including electrochemical sensing integration, dual-hormone delivery architectures, machine learning-guided personalization, and biodegradable material development, position smart patches as potentially transformative additions to the diabetes therapeutic armamentarium. Successful clinical translation promises to alleviate the substantial burden of diabetes self-management while improving glycemic outcomes and reducing complications. Prioritize well-designed phase 2 clinical trials in type 1 diabetes patients evaluating safety, glucose-sensing accuracy, and short-term glycemic efficacy endpoints, including time-in-range and hypoglycemic event rates compared to optimized continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion therapy.

REFERENCES

1. Kahn, S.E., Cooper, M.E., Del Prato, S.: Pathophysiology and treatment of type 2 diabetes: perspectives on the past, present, and future. The Lancet. 383, 1068–1083 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62154-6
2. Ugwu, O.P.C., Erisa, K., Raphael, I., Obeagu, E.I Alum, E.U., Michael B, O., Subbarayan, S., Sankarapandiyan, V.: Exploring Indigenous Medicinal Plants for Managing Diabetes Mellitus in Uganda: Ethnobotanical Insights, Pharmacotherapeutic Strategies, and National Development Alignment. INOSR Experimental Sciences. 12, 214–224 (2023). https://doi.org/10.59298/INOSRES/2023/2.17.1000
3. Pørksen, N., Hollingdal, M., Juhl, C., Butler, P., Veldhuis, J.D., Schmitz, O.: Pulsatile Insulin Secretion: Detection, Regulation, and Role in Diabetes. Diabetes. 51, S245–S254 (2002). https://doi.org/10.2337/DIABETES.51.2007.S245
4. Uti, D.E., Atangwho, I.J., Alum, E.U., Egba, S.I., Ugwu, O.P.-C., Ikechukwu, G.C.: Natural Antidiabetic Agents: Current Evidence and Development Pathways from Medicinal Plants to Clinical use. Nat Prod Commun. 20, (2025). https://doi.org/10.1177/1934578X251323393
5. 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
6. Weinstock, R.S., Xing, D., Maahs, D.M., Michels, A., Rickels, M.R., Peters, A.L., Bergenstal, R.M., Harris, B., Du Bose, S.N., Miller, K.M., Beck, R.W.: Severe Hypoglycemia and Diabetic Ketoacidosis in Adults With Type 1 Diabetes: Results From the T1D Exchange Clinic Registry. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 98, 3411–3419 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1210/JC.2013-1589
7. Ikpozu, E.N., Offor, C.E., Igwenyi, I.O, Ibiam, U.A., Obaroh, I.O. et al. RNA-based diagnostic innovations: A new frontier in diabetes diagnosis and management. Diabetes & Vascular Disease Research. 2025;22(2). doi:10.1177/14791641251334726
8. Yu, J., Zhang, Y., Ye, Y., DiSanto, R., Sun, W., Ranson, D., Ligler, F.S., Buse, J.B., Gu, Z., Ho, D.: Microneedle-array patches loaded with hypoxia-sensitive vesicles provide fast glucose-responsive insulin delivery. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 112, 8260–8265 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1073/PNAS.1505405112
9. Veiseh, O., Tang, B.C., Whitehead, K.A., Anderson, D.G., Langer, R.: Managing diabetes with nanomedicine: Challenges and opportunities. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 14, 45–57 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1038/NRD4477;SUBJMETA
10. Brooks, W.L.A., Sumerlin, B.S.: Synthesis and Applications of Boronic Acid-Containing Polymers: From Materials to Medicine. Chem Rev. 116, 1375–1397 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1021/ACS.CHEMREV.5B00300
11. Ma, R., Shi, L.: Phenylboronic acid-based glucose-responsive polymeric nanoparticles: synthesis and applications in drug delivery. Polym Chem. 5, 1503–1518 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1039/C3PY01202F

12. Gordijo, C.R., Koulajian, K., Shuhendler, A.J., Bonifacio, L.D., Huang, H.Y., Chiang, S., Ozin, G.A., Giacca, A., Wu, X.Y.: Nanotechnology-Enabled Closed Loop Insulin Delivery Device: In Vitro and In Vivo Evaluation of Glucose-Regulated Insulin Release for Diabetes Control. Adv Funct Mater. 21, 73–82 (2011). https://doi.org/10.1002/ADFM.201001762
13. Gu, Z., Aimetti, A.A., Wang, Q., Dang, T.T., Zhang, Y., Veiseh, O., Cheng, H., Langer, R.S., Anderson, D.G.: Injectable Nano-Network for Glucose-Mediated Insulin Delivery. ACS Nano. 7, 4194–4201 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1021/NN400630X
14. Wang, J., Wang, Z., Yu, J., Kahkoska, A.R., Buse, J.B., Gu, Z.: Glucose-Responsive Insulin and Delivery Systems: Innovation and Translation. Advanced Materials. 32, 1902004 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1002/ADMA.201902004
15. Chen, M.C., Ling, M.H., Kusuma, S.J.: Poly-γ-glutamic acid microneedles with a supporting structure design as a potential tool for transdermal delivery of insulin. Acta Biomater. 24, 106–116 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ACTBIO.2015.06.021
16. Donnelly, R.F., Raj Singh, T.R., Woolfson, A.D.: Microneedle-based drug delivery systems: Microfabrication, drug delivery, and safety. Drug Deliv. 17, 187–207 (2010). https://doi.org/10.3109/10717541003667798
17. Zhang, Y., Brown, K., Siebenaler, K., Determan, A., Dohmeier, D., Hansen, K.: Development of lidocaine-coated microneedle product for rapid, safe, and prolonged local analgesic action. Pharm Res. 29, 170–177 (2012). https://doi.org/10.1007/S11095-011-0524-4/METRICS
18. Donnelly, R.F..: Microneedle-mediated transdermal and intradermal drug delivery . (2012)
19. Yu, J., Wang, J., Zhang, Y., Chen, G., Mao, W., Ye, Y., Kahkoska, A.R., Buse, J.B., Langer, R., Gu, Z.: Glucose-responsive insulin patch for the regulation of blood glucose in mice and minipigs. Nat Biomed Eng. 4, 499–506 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1038/S41551-019-0508-Y;TECHMETA
20. Chen, M.C., Lin, Z.W., Ling, M.H.: Near-infrared light-activatable microneedle system for treating superficial tumors by combination of chemotherapy and photothermal therapy. ACS Nano. 10, 93–101 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1021/ACSNANO.5B05043/SUPPL_FILE/NN5B05043_SI_001.AVI
21. Ye, Y., Yu, J., Wen, D., Kahkoska, A.R., Gu, Z.: Polymeric microneedles for transdermal protein delivery. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 127, 106–118 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ADDR.2018.01.015
22. Yu, J., Zhang, Y., Bomba, H., Gu, Z., Zhen Gu, C.: Stimuli-responsive delivery of therapeutics for diabetes treatment. Bioeng Transl Med. 1, 323–337 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1002/BTM2.10036
23. Zhang, Y., Yu, J., Kahkoska, A.R., Wang, J., Buse, J.B., Gu, Z.: Advances in transdermal insulin delivery. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 139, 51–70 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ADDR.2018.12.006
24. Zhao, L., Wang, L., Zhang, Y., Xiao, S., Bi, F., Zhao, J., Gai, G., Ding, J.: Glucose Oxidase-Based Glucose-Sensitive Drug Delivery for Diabetes Treatment. Polymers 2017, Vol. 9, Page 255. 9, 255 (2017). https://doi.org/10.3390/POLYM9070255
25. Mo, R., Jiang, T., Di, J., Tai, W., Gu, Z.: Emerging micro- and nanotechnology based synthetic approaches for insulin delivery. Chem Soc Rev. 43, 3595–3629 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1039/C3CS60436E
26. Rodbard, D.: Continuous Glucose Monitoring: A Review of Successes, Challenges, and Opportunities. https://home.liebertpub.com/dia. 18, S23–S213 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1089/DIA.2015.0417
27. Jin, X., Zhu, D.D., Chen, B.Z., Ashfaq, M., Guo, X.D.: Insulin delivery systems combined with microneedle technology. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 127, 119–137 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ADDR.2018.03.011
28. Waghule, T., Singhvi, G., Dubey, S.K., Pandey, M.M., Gupta, G., Singh, M., Dua, K.: Microneedles: A smart approach and increasing potential for transdermal drug delivery system. Biomedicine & Pharmacotherapy. 109, 1249–1258 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIOPHA.2018.10.078
29. Combination Products Guidance Documents | FDA, https://www.fda.gov/combination-products/guidance-regulatory-information/combination-products-guidance-documents
30. Beck, R.W., Riddlesworth, T., Ruedy, K., Ahmann, A., Bergenstal, R., Haller, S., Kollman, C., Kruger, D., McGill, J.B., Polonsky, W., Toschi, E., Wolpert, H., Price, D.: Effect of Continuous Glucose Monitoring on Glycemic Control in Adults With Type 1 Diabetes Using Insulin Injections: The DIAMOND Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA. 317, 371–378 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1001/JAMA.2016.19975
31. Bergenstal, R.M., Tamborlane, W. V, Ahmann, A., Buse, J.B., Dailey, G., Davis, S.N., Joyce, C., Peoples, T., Perkins, B.A., Welsh, J.B., Willi, S.M., Wood, M.A., Institute, S., Jolla, L.: Effectiveness of Sensor-Augmented Insulin-Pump Therapy in Type 1 Diabetes. New England Journal of Medicine. 363, 311–320 (2010). https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMOA1002853
32. ISO 10993-1:2018 - Biological evaluation of medical devices — Part 1: Evaluation and testing within a risk management process, https://www.iso.org/standard/68936.html

33. Klonoff, D.C., Ahn, D., Drincic, A.: Continuous glucose monitoring: A review of the technology and clinical use. Diabetes Res Clin Pract. 133, 178–192 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1016/J.DIABRES.2017.08.005
34. Kovatchev, B.P., Patek, S.D., Ortiz, E.A., Breton, M.D.: Assessing Sensor Accuracy for Non-Adjunct Use of Continuous Glucose Monitoring. https://home.liebertpub.com/dia. 17, 177–186 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1089/DIA.2014.0272
35. Tronstad, C., Elvebakk, O., Staal, O.M., Kalvøy, H., Høgetveit, J.O., Jenssen, T.G., Birkeland, K.I., Martinsen, Ø.G.: Non-invasive prediction of blood glucose trends during hypoglycemia. Anal Chim Acta. 1052, 37–48 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ACA.2018.12.009
36. Roze, S., Smith-Palmer, J., Valentine, W., de Portu, S., Nørgaard, K., Pickup, J.C.: Cost-effectiveness of continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion versus multiple daily injections of insulin in Type 1 diabetes: a systematic review. Diabetic Medicine. 32, 1415–1424 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1111/DME.12792
37. Peyrot, M., Barnett, A.H., Meneghini, L.F., Schumm-Draeger, P.M.: Insulin adherence behaviours and barriers in the multinational Global Attitudes of Patients and Physicians in Insulin Therapy study. Diabetic Medicine. 29, 682–689 (2012). https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1464-5491.2012.03605.X
38. Chen, G., Yu, J., Gu, Z.: Glucose-Responsive Microneedle Patches for Diabetes Treatment. J Diabetes Sci Technol. 13, 41–48 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1177/1932296818778607
39. Bandodkar, A.J., Jia, W., Yardimci, C., Wang, X., Ramirez, J., Wang, J.: Tattoo-Based Noninvasive Glucose Monitoring: A Proof-of-Concept Study. Anal Chem. 87, 394–398 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1021/AC504300N
40. Kim, J., Campbell, A.S., de Ávila, B.E.F., Wang, J.: Wearable biosensors for healthcare monitoring. Nat Biotechnol. 37, 389–406 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1038/S41587-019-0045-Y;SUBJMETA
41. El-Khatib, F.H., Balliro, C., Hillard, M.A., Magyar, K.L., Ekhlaspour, L., Sinha, M., Mondesir, D., Esmaeili, A., Hartigan, C., Thompson, M.J., Malkani, S., Lock, J.P., Harlan, D.M., Clinton, P., Frank, E., Wilson, D.M., DeSalvo, D., Norlander, L., Ly, T., Buckingham, B.A., Diner, J., Dezube, M., Young, L.A., Goley, A., Kirkman, M.S., Buse, J.B., Zheng, H., Selagamsetty, R.R., Damiano, E.R., Russell, S.J.: Home use of a bihormonal bionic pancreas versus insulin pump therapy in adults with type 1 diabetes: a multicentre randomised crossover trial. The Lancet. 389, 369–380 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)32567-3
42. Castle, J.R., Engle, J.M., El Youssef, J., Massoud, R.G., Yuen, K.C.J., Kagan, R., Ward, W.K.: Novel Use of Glucagon in a Closed-Loop System for Prevention of Hypoglycemia in Type 1 Diabetes. Diabetes Care. 33, 1282–1287 (2010). https://doi.org/10.2337/DC09-2254
43. Meier, J.J.: GLP-1 receptor agonists for individualized treatment of type 2 diabetes mellitus. Nat Rev Endocrinol. 8, 728–742 (2012). https://doi.org/10.1038/NRENDO.2012.140;SUBJMETA
44. Woldaregay, A.Z., Årsand, E., Walderhaug, S., Albers, D., Mamykina, L., Botsis, T., Hartvigsen, G.: Data-driven modeling and prediction of blood glucose dynamics: Machine learning applications in type 1 diabetes. Artif Intell Med. 98, 109–134 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ARTMED.2019.07.007
45. Banerjee, A., Ibsen, K., Brown, T., Chen, R., Agatemor, C., Mitragotri, S.: Ionic liquids for oral insulin delivery. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 115, 7296–7301 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1073/PNAS.1722338115
46. Petersen, M., Hempler, N.F.: Development and testing of a mobile application to support diabetes self-management for people with newly diagnosed type 2 diabetes: A design thinking case study. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak. 17, 1–10 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1186/S12911-017-0493-6/TABLES/4

CITE AS: Kibibi Wairimu H. (2026). Smart Insulin Patch Delivery Systems for Glucose-Responsive Glycemic Control in Diabetic Patients. Research Output Journal of Engineering and Scientific Research 5(1): 36-42. https://doi.org/10.59298/ROJESR/2026/5.13642