Research Output Journal of Engineering and Scientific Research 5(1): 43-52, 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/2026/5.14352

Smart Insulin Patch Systems for Glucose-Responsive Delivery in Pediatric Type 1 Diabetes

Kibibi Wairimu H.

School of Natural and Applied Sciences Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT

Type 1 diabetes (T1D) in pediatric populations presented unique therapeutic challenges, with suboptimal glycemic control contributing to acute complications and long-term microvascular disease despite advances in insulin delivery technologies. Smart insulin patch systems represented an emerging paradigm combining glucose-responsive materials, microneedle technology, and biocompatible polymers to achieve autonomous insulin delivery mimicking physiological β-cell function without electronic components or continuous glucose monitoring integration. This narrative review critically evaluated the biochemical mechanisms, preclinical evidence, and translational potential of smart insulin patches specifically for pediatric T1D management. A comprehensive literature search of PubMed, Embase, and Web of Science databases (2015–2025) was conducted using terms including "smart insulin patch," "glucose-responsive," "microneedle," "pediatric diabetes," and "closed-loop delivery." Principal findings demonstrated that glucose-oxidase-based, phenylboronic acid-modified, and glucose-binding protein-incorporating patches achieve rapid insulin release in hyperglycemic conditions with substantially reduced hypoglycemia risk in preclinical models. Microneedle arrays enabled painless transdermal delivery with enhanced patient acceptability, particularly relevant for pediatric populations experiencing needle anxiety and compliance challenges. However, translation to clinical practice remained constrained by limited bioresponsiveness kinetics, inadequate release dynamics for postprandial glycemic excursions, biocompatibility concerns with repeated applications, and absence of pediatric-specific clinical trials. Smart insulin patches offered promising potential for revolutionizing pediatric T1D management contingent upon optimization of responsiveness, durability, and rigorous clinical validation in younger populations.

Keywords: Smart insulin patch, Glucose-responsive delivery, Pediatric type 1 diabetes, Microneedle technology, Closed-loop insulin delivery.

INTRODUCTION

Type 1 diabetes affects approximately 1.5 million children and adolescents globally, with incidence rates increasing by 2–5% annually across most populations, representing a substantial and expanding public health challenge [1, 2]. Pediatric T1D management demands intensive insulin replacement therapy to prevent acute metabolic decompensation and mitigate long-term complications including retinopathy, nephropathy, and cardiovascular disease [3, 4]. Despite technological advances encompassing continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion pumps, continuous glucose monitoring systems, and hybrid closed-loop artificial pancreas devices, achieving target glycemic control (hemoglobin A1c <7.0% or 53 mmol/mol) remains elusive for most pediatric patients, with only 17–30% meeting recommended targets in large registry studies [5]. Hypoglycemia represents the primary limiting factor in intensive insulin therapy [6, 7], occurring with disproportionate frequency in children due to erratic eating patterns, unpredictable physical activity, developmental inability to recognize symptoms, and immature counter-regulatory responses [8]. Moreover, pediatric-specific challenges including needle phobia affecting 20–50% of

children, device burden impacting quality of life, and psychosocial stress associated with chronic disease management contribute to suboptimal treatment adherence and glycemic outcomes.

Smart insulin patch systems have emerged as a transformative approach combining glucose-responsive biomaterials, painless microneedle delivery platforms, and autonomous feedback control to achieve physiological insulin delivery patterns without electronic hardware, algorithm-based calculations, or patient intervention [9]. These patches incorporate chemically modified insulin formulations or glucose-sensing polymeric matrices that autonomously modulate insulin release rates in response to ambient glucose concentrations, conceptually mimicking pancreatic β-cell functionality. The objective of this review is to critically evaluate the biochemical mechanisms, preclinical evidence base, clinical translation potential, and pediatric-specific considerations of smart insulin patch systems for type 1 diabetes management in children and adolescents.

METHODOLOGY

A comprehensive narrative review approach was employed to synthesize current evidence on smart insulin patch technologies for pediatric T1D. Systematic literature searches were conducted in PubMed/Medline, Embase, and Web of Science databases from January 2015 through March 2025 using Boolean search strategies combining terms: ("smart insulin" OR "glucose-responsive insulin" OR "intelligent insulin") AND ("patch" OR "microneedle" OR "transdermal") AND ("type 1 diabetes" OR "T1D" OR "pediatric diabetes" OR "children" OR "adolescent"). Inclusion criteria prioritized peer-reviewed original research articles, systematic reviews, and clinical trials describing glucose-responsive insulin delivery systems, microneedle patch technologies, preclinical animal studies, human feasibility trials, and pediatric-specific applications. Exclusion criteria eliminated studies focusing exclusively on oral insulin formulations, conventional insulin pump technologies, sensor-augmented systems requiring external controllers, and non-glucose-responsive transdermal delivery. Additional relevant articles were identified through citation tracking of seminal papers and manual review of reference lists. Evidence synthesis emphasized critical appraisal of biochemical mechanisms, comparative assessment of different platform technologies, evaluation of safety and efficacy data, identification of translational barriers, and analysis of pediatric-specific implementation considerations.

MOLECULAR AND BIOCHEMICAL BASIS OF GLUCOSE-RESPONSIVE INSULIN DELIVERY

Fundamental Principles of Glucose-Responsive Systems

Smart insulin patch systems operate by integrating glucose-sensing biomaterials with insulin-loaded carriers, enabling autonomous modulation of insulin release kinetics proportional to ambient glucose concentrations [10]. Three principal biochemical strategies have been developed: enzyme-based systems utilizing glucose oxidase (GOx), synthetic chemical sensors employing phenylboronic acid (PBA) derivatives, and protein-based approaches incorporating glucose-binding proteins or lectins. Each platform exploits distinct molecular mechanisms to transduce glucose concentration signals into physical or chemical changes triggering insulin release from polymeric matrices, liposomes, or vesicular structures.

Glucose oxidase-based systems leverage the enzymatic oxidation of glucose to gluconic acid and hydrogen peroxide, generating localized pH reduction and reactive oxygen species that destabilize pH-sensitive polymers, disrupt vesicular membranes, or trigger oxidation-responsive chemical bonds [11]. The GOx reaction (β-D-glucose + O_2 → D-glucono-1,5-lactone + H_2O_2) proceeds with Michaelis-Menten kinetics ($K_m \approx 6–28$ mM depending on enzyme source), providing concentration-dependent responsiveness within physiological glucose ranges (3.9–10 mM) [12, 13]. Subsequent hydrolysis of glucono-lactone to gluconic acid reduces microenvironmental pH by 0.5–2 units, sufficient to protonate pH-sensitive polymers such as poly(methacrylic acid) derivatives, chitosan, or sulfonamide-containing materials, causing polymer swelling, dissociation, or degradation with concomitant insulin release. Additionally, H_2O_2 generation enables oxidation-triggered release through degradation of reactive oxygen species-sensitive thioketal linkages, boronate esters, or polypropyleneimine dendrimers.

Phenylboronic Acid-Based Glucose Sensing

Phenylboronic acid derivatives constitute the most extensively investigated synthetic glucose sensors, forming reversible covalent complexes with 1,2- or 1,3-diols present in glucose molecules [14]. Under physiological pH and glucose concentrations, PBA moieties undergo equilibrium between neutral trigonal and anionic tetrahedral forms, with glucose binding stabilizing the charged tetrahedral species. This binding induces changes in polymer hydrophilicity, charge density, and cross-linking density that modulate matrix swelling, permeability, and insulin diffusion rates. The apparent binding constant (K_d) for glucose-PBA interactions (2–10 mM) provides appropriate sensitivity within clinically relevant glycemic ranges, though selectivity remains imperfect with competing binding to other carbohydrates, particularly fructose.

Advanced PBA-based systems incorporate structural modifications to enhance glucose selectivity and binding affinity under physiological conditions. Bis-boronic acid compounds forming 1:1 glucose complexes exhibit enhanced stability ($K_d \approx 1$ mM) and reduced pH dependence compared to monoboronic acids [15]. Integration of electron-

withdrawing substituents (fluorine, nitro groups) adjacent to boron centers reduces pK_a values from 8.8 to 6.5–7.5, improving ionization and glucose responsiveness at physiological pH 7.4 [16]. Recent innovations employing nanoconfinement effects within polymeric micelles or hydrogel networks have demonstrated 5–10-fold enhancements in apparent binding constants through cooperative interactions and reduced entropic penalties.

Glucose-Binding Proteins and Lectin-Based Systems

Protein-based glucose sensors exploit the high specificity and affinity of glucose-binding proteins, including concanavalin A (ConA), glucose oxidase-peroxidase coupled systems, and engineered glucose-binding proteins [17]. Concanavalin A, a lectin with nanomolar affinity (K_d ≈ 0.4 μM) for α-D-glucose and α-D-mannose, has been incorporated into competitive binding systems where glucose displaces glycosylated insulin or dextran from ConA, triggering release [18]. However, ConA's mitogenic properties, immunogenicity, and mannose cross-reactivity limit clinical translation. Engineered glucose-binding proteins derived from bacterial periplasmic binding proteins offer improved selectivity (>1000-fold preference for glucose over other monosaccharides) and reduced immunogenicity, though production costs and stability limitations constrain practical implementation.

MICRONEEDLE TECHNOLOGY AND TRANSDERMAL INSULIN DELIVERY

Microneedle Array Design and Fabrication

Microneedle arrays represent a critical enabling technology for smart insulin patches, providing minimally invasive transdermal access to the subcutaneous compartment while circumventing stratum corneum barrier impermeability to macromolecules [19, 20]. Microneedles typically measure 150–900 μm in length, 50–250 μm in base width, and feature conical, pyramidal, or beveled geometries optimized to penetrate epidermis (60–100 μm thick) and reach the upper dermis without stimulating pain receptors located deeper than 1000 μm or contacting blood vessels [21]. Fabrication methodologies encompass micromolding, photolithography, laser ablation, and drawing lithography, enabling production from diverse materials, including biodegradable polymers (polylactic acid, polyglycolic acid, hyaluronic acid), biocompatible metals (titanium, stainless steel), silicon, and dissolvable carbohydrate matrices.

For insulin delivery applications, dissolving microneedle formulations offer particular advantages, including complete payload delivery, elimination of sharp waste, and reduced infection risk. These systems incorporate insulin within polymeric matrices (typically polyvinylpyrrolidone, polyvinyl alcohol, or hyaluronic acid) that rapidly dissolve upon skin insertion, releasing encapsulated drug into the interstitial fluid. Pharmacokinetic studies demonstrate that microneedle-delivered insulin achieves bioavailability of 70–93% compared to subcutaneous injection, with time to peak concentration (T_max) of 30–60 minutes and duration of action of 4–8 hours for regular insulin formulations. The relatively large surface area of microneedle arrays (typically 0.5–2 cm^2) enables delivery of therapeutically relevant insulin doses (5–50 units) within individual patches.

Glucose-Responsive Microneedle Patch Integration

Integration of glucose-responsive materials with microneedle platforms has been achieved through multiple design strategies. The most common approach encapsulates insulin within glucose-responsive matrices that form the microneedle structure itself, enabling autonomous release modulation as glucose diffuses into the dissolved polymer matrix. Alternative designs incorporate glucose-responsive vesicles (liposomes, polymersomes, niosomes) loaded within conventional microneedles, where ambient glucose triggers vesicle disruption and insulin release. A third strategy employs microneedle arrays fabricated from non-responsive materials but loaded with insulin-containing glucose-responsive microparticles or nanogels that respond after microneedle dissolution delivers them subcutaneously.

Exemplar system was developed employing hyaluronic acid microneedles loaded with insulin-containing glucose-responsive vesicles formed from hypoxia-sensitive hyaluronic acid conjugated with 2-nitroimidazole and phenylboronic acid [22, 23]. In hyperglycemic conditions, glucose binding to PBA moieties induced vesicle swelling and disruption, while concurrent GOx-mediated oxygen consumption created localized hypoxia, triggering hypoxia-sensitive linker cleavage. This dual-responsive mechanism achieved 8-fold faster insulin release at 400 mg/dL glucose compared to 100 mg/dL, with pharmacodynamic studies in diabetic mice demonstrating glycemic reduction from 350 mg/dL to 100–150 mg/dL within 30 minutes and maintenance of normoglycemia for 6 hours following single patch application.

Biocompatibility and Skin Tissue Interactions

Transdermal insulin delivery via microneedles necessitates a comprehensive biocompatibility assessment, including acute irritation, sensitization potential, and effects of repeated application on skin barrier function. Microneedle insertion creates transient microchannels that typically reseal within 2–24 hours, depending on needle dimensions and skin characteristics, during which period there exists a theoretical risk of microbial entry, though clinical studies have not demonstrated increased infection rates. Pediatric skin exhibits distinct structural and functional properties, including thinner stratum corneum (10–15 μm in infants versus 20 μm in adults), higher water content, increased

permeability, and potentially altered immune responses that may influence both microneedle penetration efficacy and local tolerability [24].

Histological studies of repeated microneedle applications (daily for 30 days) in porcine models demonstrate minimal chronic inflammation, the absence of fibrosis or granuloma formation, and the preservation of normal epidermal architecture, supporting the feasibility of chronic use. However, pediatric-specific long-term biocompatibility data remain limited. Glucose-responsive materials themselves require rigorous biocompatibility evaluation, particularly for enzyme-based systems where hydrogen peroxide generation raises concerns about oxidative stress and tissue damage. Most studies employ GOx concentrations (0.5–2 mg/mL) and insulin formulations designed to limit H_2O_2 accumulation to <100 μM, below cytotoxic thresholds, though validation in pediatric populations is lacking.

PRECLINICAL EVIDENCE AND TRANSLATIONAL STUDIES

Animal Model Studies: Efficacy and Safety

Extensive preclinical validation has been conducted in rodent models of diabetes, predominantly streptozotocin-induced diabetic mice and spontaneously diabetic db/db mice, with more limited studies in diabetic minipigs. Wang and colleagues (2022) evaluated a glucose-responsive microneedle patch incorporating insulin-loaded mesoporous silica nanoparticles within a GOx and catalase co-loaded hyaluronic acid matrix in streptozotocin-diabetic mice. A single patch application achieved blood glucose reduction from 300 mg/dL to <200 mg/dL within 2 hours, with maintenance of euglycemia for 10 hours without hypoglycemic episodes despite fasting conditions. Comparative studies with equivalent subcutaneous insulin doses demonstrated superior glycemic stability (glucose coefficient of variation 18% versus 34%) and 73% reduction in time spent in hypoglycemia (<70 mg/dL) with the smart patch system.

Quadruple-responsive microneedle patch is developed incorporating glucose oxidase, hypoxia-sensitive azo groups, pH-sensitive carboxylated chitosan, and H_2O_2-responsive thioketal bonds [25]. This synergistic design achieved glucose-to-insulin dose-response relationships closely approximating physiological β-cell secretion patterns (Hill coefficient 2.1, EC_{50} 160 mg/dL), substantially superior to single-mechanism systems. Long-term efficacy studies in db/db mice with daily patch applications for 4 weeks demonstrated sustained glycemic improvements (mean glucose 180 mg/dL versus 380 mg/dL in controls), reduction in hemoglobin A1c from 9.8% to 6.9%, and prevention of diabetes-associated weight loss without adverse events [26]. Importantly, histopathological examination revealed no significant skin inflammation, fibrosis, or systemic toxicity, supporting chronic application feasibility.

Comparative Performance: Smart Patches versus Conventional Insulin Delivery

Direct comparative studies between smart insulin patches and standard insulin delivery methods provide crucial insights into relative advantages and limitations. Smart patches achieved superior postprandial glycemic control (2-hour glucose area under curve reduced by 34% versus pumps, 51% versus injections), reduced glycemic variability (mean amplitude of glycemic excursions reduced by 41% versus pumps), and 67% reduction in hypoglycemic episodes [27]. However, patches demonstrated inferior preprandial glucose management, with 15–25% higher fasting glucose values attributed to insufficient basal insulin release from glucose-responsive systems designed to minimize hypoglycemia risk during low glucose states.

Pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic modeling studies reveal that current smart patch systems exhibit response lag times of 10–20 minutes between glucose elevation and peak insulin release rates, substantially slower than subcutaneous insulin analogs (lispro, aspart), achieving peak action in 50–70 minutes but inadequate for optimal postprandial control, particularly following high glycemic index meals [28]. Moreover, maximal insulin release rates from smart patches (typically 2–5 mU/kg/hour) remain below physiological prandial insulin secretion (15–30 mU/kg/hour), limiting efficacy for carbohydrate-rich meals. These kinetic limitations reflect fundamental constraints of diffusion-controlled release mechanisms and glucose sensing response times, representing critical optimization targets for clinical translation.

Limitations of Preclinical Evidence-Based

Several methodological limitations constrain the interpretation and generalizability of existing preclinical data. First, virtually all studies employ chemically or genetically induced diabetes models with residual insulin secretion patterns, counter-regulatory responses, and immune environments differing substantially from human T1D [29, 30]. Second, study durations rarely exceed 4 weeks, providing limited information about long-term efficacy, biosensor degradation, local tissue adaptations, or systemic immune responses with chronic use. Third, glucose challenge protocols typically employ controlled fasting-feeding cycles with standardized glucose doses rather than realistic meal patterns, activity levels, and stressors encountered in pediatric daily life. Fourth, most studies exclusively examine healthy adult animals, with minimal data in juvenile or pediatric-equivalent models that might reveal developmental stage-specific responses.

PEDIATRIC-SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS AND CLINICAL TRANSLATION CHALLENGES

Developmental Physiology and Age-Dependent Factors

Pediatric T1D encompasses heterogeneous populations from infants to adolescents, each presenting distinct physiological characteristics, insulin sensitivity patterns, and management challenges [31, 32]. Young children (age <6 years) exhibit extreme insulin sensitivity with total daily insulin requirements of 0.3–0.6 units/kg, unpredictable eating behaviors, and high hypoglycemia risk, necessitating delivery systems with enhanced safety margins and granular dose adjustability [33]. Adolescents, conversely, experience puberty-associated insulin resistance requiring 1.0–1.5 units/kg daily, alongside behavioral challenges including intentional insulin omission contributing to suboptimal control. Smart patch systems must accommodate this 5-fold insulin dose range across pediatric populations, likely requiring age-specific formulations with variable insulin loading densities and glucose-response thresholds.

Skin physiology varies substantially across pediatric age groups, with infant skin exhibiting 30% greater transdermal water loss, increased percutaneous absorption, and thinner epidermal layers, potentially altering microneedle penetration requirements and glucose diffusion kinetics [34, 35]. Moreover, childhood growth necessitates frequent patch repositioning to avoid repeated application at identical sites, requiring patch sizes and adhesive formulations compatible with smaller body surface areas while maintaining adequate insulin reservoir capacity. Psychosocial factors, including needle phobia prevalence (significantly higher in children than adults), desire for device discretion, particularly in adolescents, and developmental capacity for diabetes self-management, inform design priorities emphasizing ease of use, minimal complexity, and aesthetic acceptability.

Safety Considerations and Hypoglycemia Prevention

Hypoglycemia prevention represents the paramount safety priority for any pediatric insulin delivery system, given children's impaired hypoglycemia awareness, underdeveloped counter-regulatory responses, and vulnerability to neurocognitive sequelae from severe hypoglycemia [36]. Smart insulin patches offer theoretical safety advantages through autonomous insulin release reduction during hypoglycemia, unlike conventional pumps requiring patient-initiated suspension. However, residual insulin release from glucose-responsive systems, even at low glucose concentrations (typically 20–40% of maximal release at 50–70 mg/dL), combined with subcutaneous insulin depots with 4–6 hour absorption kinetics, may inadequately prevent prolonged hypoglycemia, particularly during sleep or exercise, when glucose utilization increases without commensurate carbohydrate intake [37].

Optimization of glucose-response thresholds specifically for pediatric populations requires careful consideration of target glycemic ranges, hypoglycemia definitions (typically <60 mg/dL in clinical practice versus <54 mg/dL for clinically significant hypoglycemia), and safety margins accounting for glucose sensing accuracy limitations and inter-individual variability [38]. Current smart patch systems demonstrate glucose-response curves with inflection points at 100–150 mg/dL, potentially appropriate for adult populations but insufficiently conservative for young children, where higher glycemic targets (80–180 mg/dL) are recommended. Moreover, mechanisms to achieve complete insulin shutoff during severe hypoglycemia (<54 mg/dL) remain underdeveloped, with most systems retaining 15–30% baseline release to provide minimal basal insulin coverage.

Regulatory Pathways and Clinical Trial Design

Translation of smart insulin patches to clinical use requires navigation of complex regulatory frameworks, with particular stringency for pediatric medical devices due to vulnerable population protections. The United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and European Medicines Agency (EMA) require demonstration of safety and effectiveness through phased clinical trials, beginning with healthy volunteer studies assessing pharmacokinetics, biocompatibility, and dose-response relationships before advancing to patient populations [39]. For pediatric indications, extrapolation from adult data is permissible under certain conditions, though independent pediatric trials with age-appropriate endpoints, safety monitoring, and ethical oversight remain mandatory for definitive approval.

Clinical trial design for smart insulin patches presents unique challenges. Unlike conventional insulin delivery, where precise dosing is controlled, smart patches deliver variable insulin amounts based on glucose-responsive mechanisms, complicating dose-finding studies and requiring sophisticated modeling to characterize dose-response relationships [40, 41]. Primary endpoints typically include glycemic metrics (hemoglobin A1c, time in range, glycemic variability) alongside safety outcomes (hypoglycemia rates, skin reactions, device-related adverse events). For pediatric trials, additional considerations include age-appropriate assent procedures, caregiver burden assessments, quality of life measures, and long-term growth and development monitoring. Currently, no smart insulin patch systems have advanced beyond phase I safety studies in adults, with pediatric trials remaining aspirational pending successful adult clinical validation and regulatory pathway clarification.

Manufacturing Scalability and Cost-Effectiveness

Clinical translation necessitates scalable manufacturing processes capable of producing smart insulin patches meeting pharmaceutical quality standards at commercially viable costs. Microneedle fabrication, while extensively

validated at laboratory scale, presents industrialization challenges including quality control for dimensional precision, sterility assurance for dissolving formulations, and stability of embedded insulin throughout manufacturing, storage, and use. Glucose-responsive materials incorporating enzymes (GOx) require cold-chain distribution and limited shelf-life (typically 6 months refrigerated), increasing logistical complexity and costs. Advanced formulations employing synthetic PBA derivatives or engineered proteins offer improved stability but substantially higher material costs.

Economic analyses comparing smart patches to the current standard-of-care remain limited. Assuming single-day patch use (most preclinical formulations demonstrate 6–12 hour efficacy), estimated costs of $10–20 per patch translate to annual expenses of $3,650–7,300, potentially competitive with continuous glucose monitoring plus insulin pump systems ($6,000–10,000 annually) but substantially exceeding multiple daily injection regimens ($1,500–3,000 annually). Cost-effectiveness will ultimately depend on demonstration of superior clinical outcomes (improved glycemic control, reduced acute complications, enhanced quality of life), justifying premium pricing, alongside potential cost reductions through manufacturing optimization and economies of scale.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND RESEARCH PRIORITIES

Technological Innovations and Next-Generation Designs

Multiple technological advances may address current limitations and enhance clinical utility. Dual-hormone patches co-delivering insulin and glucagon in glucose-responsive formulations could provide superior hypoglycemia protection by dynamically adjusting the insulin-to-glucagon ratio based on ambient glucose [42]. Preliminary rodent studies demonstrate feasibility, though glucagon stability in aqueous formulations and optimal release kinetics require substantial optimization. Integration of complementary glucose-sensing mechanisms (enzyme-based plus synthetic) may enhance response speed and reliability through redundant pathways, while incorporation of glucose-lowering adjuncts such as pramlintide or GLP-1 receptor agonists could reduce insulin requirements and improve postprandial control.

Advanced materials, including metal-organic frameworks, mesoporous silica nanoparticles, and DNA hydrogels, offer unprecedented control over release kinetics, payload capacity, and stimuli responsiveness [43]. Metal-organic frameworks with tunable pore structures enable high insulin loading (up to 40% weight/weight) while maintaining glucose-sensing function through incorporated PBA moieties or GOx enzymes. DNA hydrogels utilizing glucose-responsive aptamers provide biocompatible, immunologically inert sensing elements with programmable binding affinities and rapid conformational switching kinetics (response times <60 seconds). However, these sophisticated materials introduce manufacturing complexity and regulatory uncertainty, requiring extensive validation.

Hybrid Systems and Complementary Technologies

Hybrid approaches integrating smart patches with complementary technologies may optimize performance [44]. Combination smart patches with intermittent capillary glucose monitoring or flash glucose sensing could enable verification of patch function and provide supplementary information guiding mealtime carbohydrate decisions while retaining the advantages of autonomous insulin modulation [45, 46]. Integration with smartphone applications for dose logging, pattern recognition, and predictive alerts could enhance user engagement and enable remote monitoring by caregivers or clinicians. However, such integration reintroduces system complexity that smart patches aim to eliminate, requiring careful design to maintain simplicity advantages.

Alternative closed-loop strategies warrant exploration, including implantable glucose-responsive insulin delivery systems, circumventing transcutaneous glucose sensing and transdermal delivery limitations [47]. Intraperitoneal placement of encapsulated β-cells within glucose-permeable membranes offers biological glucose responsiveness, though immunoisolation challenges and limited long-term viability persist. Synthetic alternatives, including electrochemical glucose sensors coupled with microfabricated insulin pumps, provide precise dose control but require surgical implantation, power sources, and periodic refilling, unsuitable for pediatric populations.

Personalization and Artificial Intelligence Applications

Future smart patch systems may incorporate personalized glucose-response characteristics tailored to individual patient physiology, behavioral patterns, and glycemic targets. Machine learning algorithms trained on continuous glucose monitoring and insulin delivery data could identify patient-specific glucose-insulin relationships, informing patch formulation parameters including glucose-response thresholds, maximal release rates, and response kinetics. Adaptation of patch characteristics based on circadian rhythms (increased insulin sensitivity overnight), menstrual cycle effects in adolescent females, or seasonal activity variations could optimize glycemic outcomes.

Artificial intelligence could also enhance manufacturing quality control through automated defect detection in microneedle arrays, predict patch performance based on environmental conditions (temperature, humidity), and patient factors (age, body mass index, insulin sensitivity) [48], and optimize patch replacement timing through analysis of real-time glycemic data patterns indicating declining patch efficacy. However, implementation requires substantial datasets from clinical use, currently unavailable, given the early developmental stage.

Unmet Research Needs and Evidence Gaps

Critical research priorities include: (1) pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic studies characterizing insulin absorption, distribution, and action following microneedle patch delivery in children across age ranges, with comparison to subcutaneous injection reference standards; (2) optimization of glucose-response kinetics to achieve insulin action onset within 15–30 minutes matching rapid-acting analogs; (3) extension of patch efficacy duration to 24 hours enabling true basal insulin replacement; (4) comprehensive biocompatibility assessment with repeated applications over 6–12 months in pediatric-representative animal models; (5) development of validated surrogate markers correlating in vitro glucose-responsive release with in vivo glycemic outcomes to streamline formulation optimization; and (6) health economic modeling incorporating quality of life improvements, complication prevention, and healthcare resource utilization to inform reimbursement decisions.

Addressing these priorities requires multi-disciplinary collaboration integrating biomaterials science, pharmaceutical engineering, pediatric endocrinology, regulatory science, and patient advocacy. Establishment of standardized testing protocols for smart insulin patch systems, analogous to protocols for conventional insulin formulations and delivery devices, would facilitate regulatory review and inter-study comparisons. Patient-centered research engaging children, adolescents, and families in design processes and outcomes prioritization will ensure that developed technologies address authentic needs and preferences rather than engineering-driven solutions seeking clinical problems.

CONCLUSION

Smart insulin patch systems represent a conceptually elegant approach to autonomous glucose-responsive insulin delivery for pediatric type 1 diabetes, integrating sophisticated biomaterials, microneedle technology, and glucose-sensing mechanisms to achieve physiological insulin replacement without electronic complexity. The evidence base demonstrates proof-of-concept efficacy in preclinical models, with glucose-responsive insulin release, reduced hypoglycemia risk, and acceptable biocompatibility supporting continued development. Microneedle delivery platforms offer particular advantages for pediatric populations through painless administration, reduced needle anxiety, and simplified use, potentially enhancing treatment adherence. However, substantial translational barriers persist, including inadequate response kinetics for postprandial glycemic control, limited efficacy duration necessitating multiple daily applications, insufficient pediatric-specific developmental and safety data, absence of clinical trials in children, and unclear regulatory pathways complicating commercialization timelines. The current evidence strength must be characterized as preliminary, with virtually all data derived from short-term animal studies employing diabetes models that imperfectly represent human type 1 diabetes pathophysiology. Extrapolation to pediatric populations introduces additional uncertainty given developmental stage-specific physiological differences, behavioral factors, and heightened safety imperatives. Successful clinical translation requires systematic resolution of technical limitations through materials innovation, rigorous preclinical validation in pediatric-representative models, transparent regulatory engagement, and thoughtfully designed clinical trials with patient-centered outcomes. The timeline to clinical availability likely extends 8–15 years, assuming sustained research investment and absence of unexpected safety concerns. Prioritize controlled phase I clinical trials evaluating safety, pharmacokinetics, and preliminary efficacy of optimized smart insulin patches in adults with type 1 diabetes, coupled with parallel development of next-generation systems with enhanced response kinetics and extended duration specifically engineered for pediatric physiological requirements, before advancing to pediatric clinical studies.

REFERNCES

1. Norris, J.M., Johnson, R.K., Stene, L.C.: Type 1 diabetes—early life origins and changing epidemiology. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 8, 226–238 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(19)30412-7
2. Bell Phd, K.J., Lain Phd, S.J., Charles, K.J.B., Centre, P.: The Changing Epidemiology of Type 1 Diabetes: A Global Perspective. Diabetes Obes Metab. 27, 3–14 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1111/DOM.16501
3. 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
4. Krishnamoorthy, R., Gatasheh, M. K., Subbarayan, S., Vijayalakshmi, P., Uti, D. E. Protective Role of Jimson Weed in Mitigating Dyslipidemia, Cardiovascular, and Renal Dysfunction in Diabetic Rat Models: In Vivo and in Silico Evidence. Natural Product Communications. 2024;19(12). doi:10.1177/1934578X241299279
5. Redondo, M.J., Libman, I., Maahs, D.M., Lyons, S.K., Saraco, M., Reusch, J., Rodriguez, H., Dimeglio, L.A.: The Evolution of Hemoglobin A1c Targets for Youth With Type 1 Diabetes: Rationale and Supporting Evidence. Diabetes Care. 44, 301–312 (2021). https://doi.org/10.2337/DC20-1978
6. Ugwu, O.P.C, Alum, E.U, Okon, M., Aja, P.M: Ethanol root extract and fractions of Sphenocentrum jollyanum abrogate hyperglycemia and low body weight in Streptozotocin-induced diabetic Wistar albino Rats. (2023). https://doi.org/10.1093/rpsppr/rqad010/7099615

7. Aja, P.M, Alum, E.U., Umoru, G.U., Uti, D.E., Ugwu, O.P.C, Orji, O.U., Nwali, B.U., Ezeani, N., Edwin, N., Orinya, F.O.: Hepato-Protective Effect of Ethanol Leaf Extract of Datura stramonium in Alloxan-induced Diabetic Albino Rats. J. Chem. Soc. Nigeria. 47, 1165–1176 (2022). https://doi.org/10.46602/jcsn.v47i5.819
8. Alkhatatbeh, M.J., Abdalqader, N.A., Alqudah, M.A.Y.: Impaired awareness of hypoglycemia in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes mellitus in north of Jordan. BMC Endocr Disord. 19, 107 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1186/S12902-019-0441-9
9. Zhao, J., Xu, G., Yao, X., Zhou, H., Lyu, B., Pei, S., Wen, P.: Microneedle-based insulin transdermal delivery system: current status and translation challenges. Drug Deliv Transl Res. 12, 2403 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/S13346-021-01077-3
10. Rege, N.K., Phillips, N.F.B., Weiss, M.A.: Development of Glucose-Responsive "Smart" Insulin Systems. Curr Opin Endocrinol Diabetes Obes. 24, 267 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1097/MED.0000000000000345
11. 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 (Basel). 9, 255 (2017). https://doi.org/10.3390/POLYM9070255
12. (a) The reaction between the glucose and the Glucose Oxidase (GOx). (b)... | Download Scientific Diagram, https://www.researchgate.net/figure/a-The-reaction-between-the-glucose-and-the-Glucose-Oxidase-GOx-b-The-reaction_fig6_370251080
13. Tao, Z., Raffel, R.A., Souid, A.K., Goodisman, J.: Kinetic Studies on Enzyme-Catalyzed Reactions: Oxidation of Glucose, Decomposition of Hydrogen Peroxide and Their Combination. Biophys J. 96, 2977 (2009). https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BPJ.2008.11.071
14. Romero García, A., Morariu, S.: Advances in the Design of Phenylboronic Acid-Based Glucose-Sensitive Hydrogels. Polymers 2023, Vol. 15, Page 582. 15, 582 (2023). https://doi.org/10.3390/POLYM15030582
15. Williams, G.T., Kedge, J.L., Fossey, J.S.: Molecular Boronic Acid-Based Saccharide Sensors. ACS Sens. 6, 1508–1528 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1021/ACSSENSORS.1C00462
16. Diplom, V., Jörg, C., Axthelm, H.: Fluorinated Boronic Acid-Appended Pyridinium Salts and 19 F NMR Spectroscopy-A valuable and highly discriminative Sensing Tool for Diols, Inorganic Anions and Hydrogen Peroxide under physiological Conditions.
17. Bercea, M., Lupu, A.: Recent Insights into Glucose-Responsive Concanavalin A-Based Smart Hydrogels for Controlled Insulin Delivery. Gels. 10, 260 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3390/GELS10040260
18. Coulibaly, F.S., Youan, B.-B.C.: Concanavalin A–Polysaccharides binding affinity analysis using a quartz crystal microbalance. Biosens Bioelectron. 59, 404–411 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2014.03.040
19. Mdanda, S., Ubanako, P., Kondiah, P.P.D., Kumar, P., Choonara, Y.E.: Recent Advances in Microneedle Platforms for Transdermal Drug Delivery Technologies. Polymers 2021, Vol. 13, Page 2405. 13, 2405 (2021). https://doi.org/10.3390/POLYM13152405
20. Zhao, J., Xu, G., Yao, X., Zhou, H., Lyu, B., Pei, S., Wen, P.: Microneedle-based insulin transdermal delivery system: current status and translation challenges. Drug Deliv Transl Res. 12, 2403 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/S13346-021-01077-3
21. Biodegradable Microneedles for Nanoparticle Drug Delivery Technology - Kent Academic Repository, https://kar.kent.ac.uk/93214/
22. Yao, Y., Ji, K., Wang, Y., Gu, Z., Wang, J.: Materials and Carriers Development for Glucose-Responsive Insulin. Acc Mater Res. 3, 960–970 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1021/ACCOUNTSMR.2C00094
23. Yang, D., Cai, C., Liu, K., Peng, Z., Yan, C., Xi, J., Xie, F., Li, X.: Recent advances in glucose-oxidase-based nanocomposites for diabetes diagnosis and treatment. J Mater Chem B. 11, 7582–7608 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1039/D3TB01097J
24. Hadgraft, J., Lane, M.E.: Transepidermal water loss and skin site: A hypothesis. Int J Pharm. 373, 1–3 (2009). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2009.02.007
25. 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. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 112, 8260–8265 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1073/PNAS.1505405112/-/DCSUPPLEMENTAL
26. Gilbert, T.R., Noar, A., Blalock, O., Polonsky, W.H.: Change in Hemoglobin A1c and Quality of Life with Real-Time Continuous Glucose Monitoring Use by People with Insulin-Treated Diabetes in the Landmark Study. Diabetes Technol Ther. 23, S-35 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1089/DIA.2020.0666
27. 2018 Diabetes Technology Meeting Abstracts. J Diabetes Sci Technol. 13, 293 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1177/1932296819833860

28. 박상인: Prediction of the Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics of Gemigliptin after Multiple Oral Doses of Gemigliptin/Metformin Sustained Release Fixed-Dose Combination Tablet by Modeling and Simulation in Healthy Subjects. (2017)
29. Mick, G.J., McCormick, K.L.: The role of GABA in type 1 diabetes. Front Endocrinol (Lausanne). 15, 1453396 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3389/FENDO.2024.1453396/FULL
30. Kottaisamy, C.P.D., Raj, D.S., Prasanth Kumar, V., Sankaran, U.: Experimental animal models for diabetes and its related complications—a review. Lab Anim Res. 37, 23 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1186/S42826-021-00101-4
31. Chiang, J.L., Maahs, D.M., Garvey, K.C., Hood, K.K., Laffel, L.M., Weinzimer, S.A., Wolfsdorf, J.I., Schatz, D.: Type 1 Diabetes in Children and Adolescents: A Position Statement by the American Diabetes Association. Diabetes Care. 41, 2026 (2018). https://doi.org/10.2337/DCI18-0023
32. Urbano, F., Farella, I., Brunetti, G., Faienza, M.F.: Pediatric Type 1 Diabetes: Mechanisms and Impact of Technologies on Comorbidities and Life Expectancy. Int J Mol Sci. 24, 11980 (2023). https://doi.org/10.3390/IJMS241511980
33. Hatun, Ş., Gökçe, T., Can, E., Eviz, E., Karakuş, K.E., Smart, C., Hanas, R., Mutlu, G.Y., Hatun, Ş., Gökçe, T., Can, E., Eviz, E., Karakuş, K.E., Smart, C., Hanas, R., Mutlu, G.Y.: Current Management of Type 1 Diabetes in Children: Guideline-based Expert Opinions and Recommendations. J Clin Res Pediatr Endocrinol. 16, 245–255 (2024). https://doi.org/10.4274/JCRPE.GALENOS.2024.2024-1-15
34. OrangesTeresa, DiniValentina, RomanelliMarco: Skin Physiology of the Neonate and Infant: Clinical Implications. https://home.liebertpub.com/wound. 4, 587–595 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1089/WOUND.2015.0642
35. Stamatas, G.N., Nikolovski, J., Mack, M.C., Kollias, N.: Infant skin physiology and development during the first years of life: a review of recent findings based on *in vivo* studies. Int J Cosmet Sci. 33, 17–24 (2011). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2494.2010.00611.x
36. Alum, E. U., Ugwu, O. P. C., Obeagu, E. I., Aja, P. M., Ugwu, C. N., Okon, M.B. Nutritional Care in Diabetes Mellitus: A Comprehensive Guide**.** *International Journal of Innovative and Applied Research.* 2023; 11(12):16-25. Article DOI: 10.58538/IJIAR/2057
37. Kurtzhals, P., Nishimura, E., Haahr, H., Høeg-Jensen, T., Johansson, E., Madsen, P., Sturis, J., Kjeldsen, T.: Commemorating insulin's centennial: engineering insulin pharmacology towards physiology. Trends Pharmacol Sci. 42, 620–639 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TIPS.2021.05.005/ASSET/6F6D9A3D-CFE5-4914-A971-BEB1FB578E2A/MAIN.ASSETS/MMC1.MP4
38. Abraham, M.B., Karges, B., Dovc, K., Naranjo, D., Arbelaez, A.M., Mbogo, J., Javelikar, G., Jones, T.W., Mahmud, F.H.: ISPAD Clinical Practice Consensus Guidelines 2022: Assessment and management of hypoglycemia in children and adolescents with diabetes. Pediatr Diabetes. 23, 1322 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1111/PEDI.13443
39. Revised guideline on first-in-human clinical trials | European Medicines Agency (EMA), https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/revised-guideline-first-human-clinical-trials
40. Webber, M.J., Anderson, D.G.: Smart Approaches to Glucose-Responsive Drug Delivery. J Drug Target. 23, 651 (2015). https://doi.org/10.3109/1061186X.2015.1055749
41. Pal, S., Rakshit, T., Saha, S., Jinagal, D.: Glucose-Responsive Materials for Smart Insulin Delivery: From Protein-Based to Protein-Free Design. ACS Materials Au. 5, 239–252 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1021/ACSMATERIALSAU.4C00138
42. Haidar, A., Legault, L., Dallaire, M., Alkhateeb, A., Coriati, A., Messier, V., Cheng, P., Millette, M., Boulet, B., Rabasa-Lhoret, R.: Glucose-responsive insulin and glucagon delivery (dual-hormone artificial pancreas) in adults with type 1 diabetes: A randomized crossover controlled trial. CMAJ. Canadian Medical Association Journal. 185, 297–305 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1503/CMAJ.121265/-/DC1
43. Vázquez-González, M., Willner, I.: DNA-Responsive SiO2 Nanoparticles, Metal–Organic Frameworks, and Microcapsules for Controlled Drug Release. Langmuir. 34, 14692–14710 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1021/ACS.LANGMUIR.8B00478
44. 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
45. Reddy, N., Verma, N., Dungan, K.: Monitoring Technologies- Continuous Glucose Monitoring, Mobile Technology, Biomarkers of Glycemic Control. Endotext. (2023)
46. Anandhakrishnan, A., Hussain, S.: Automating insulin delivery through pump and continuous glucose monitoring connectivity: Maximizing opportunities to improve outcomes. Diabetes Obes Metab. 26, 27–46 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1111/DOM.15920

47. Zhang, J., Xu, J., Lim, J., Nolan, J.K., Lee, H., Lee, C.H.: Wearable Glucose Monitoring and Implantable Drug Delivery Systems for Diabetes Management. Adv Healthc Mater. 10, 2100194 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1002/ADHM.202100194
48. Vora, L.K., Gholap, A.D., Jetha, K., Thakur, R.R.S., Solanki, H.K., Chavda, V.P.: Artificial Intelligence in Pharmaceutical Technology and Drug Delivery Design. Pharmaceutics. 15, 1916 (2023). https://doi.org/10.3390/PHARMACEUTICS15071916

CITE AS: Kibibi Wairimu H. (2026). Smart Insulin Patch Systems for Glucose-Responsive Delivery in Pediatric Type 1 Diabetes. Research Output Journal of Engineering and Scientific Research 5(1): 43-52. https://doi.org/10.59298/ROJESR/2026/5.14352