IAA Journal of Scientific Research 13(1):92-101, 2026. www.iaajournals.org

©IAAJOURNALS ISSN: 2636-7319

https://doi.org/10.59298/IAAJSR/2026/13192101 IAAJSR:1311

Engineering Glucose-Responsive Nanomaterials for Adaptive Drug Release in Diabetic Obesity Patients

Mukisa Ian Mugaiga

Department of Pharmacology Kampala International University Uganda
Email:mugaiga.mukisa@studwc.kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

Diabetic obesity, the coexistence of obesity with type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM), represents a syndemic condition characterized by chronic hyperglycemia, insulin resistance, low-grade inflammation, and profound pharmacokinetic variability. Conventional antidiabetic regimens, including multiple daily insulin injections and oral agents, are often insufficient to maintain tight glycemic control in these patients without increasing the risk of hypoglycemia and weight gain. Glucose-responsive nanomaterials (GRNs) have emerged as a promising strategy to achieve adaptive, self-regulated drug delivery that couples therapeutic release directly to fluctuating blood glucose levels. By integrating molecular glucose sensors with nanoscale carriers, these systems can theoretically sense hyperglycemia, trigger drug release, and attenuate delivery as euglycemia is restored. This review discusses the pathophysiological context of diabetic obesity that motivates GRN design, outlines key engineering principles, and summarizes major classes of glucose-responsive mechanisms, including glucose oxidase-based, phenylboronic acid-based, and glucose-binding protein platforms. We further highlight representative nano-architectures, such as polymeric nanoparticles, liposomes, micelles, hydrogels, and microneedle patches, and consider how they can be tailored for obese patients with altered tissue perfusion and drug distribution. Preclinical studies in obese and diabetic animal models demonstrate promising glucose-regulated insulin release and weight-modulating co-therapies, though clinical translation remains nascent. Finally, we discuss challenges related to biocompatibility, long-term stability, manufacturability, regulatory approval, and equity of access, and outline future directions, including multi-analyte responsive systems, closed-loop integration with digital health, and personalized nanomedicine for diabetic obesity.

Keywords: Glucose-responsive nanomaterials; adaptive drug delivery; diabetic obesity; insulin nanocarriers; microneedle patches

INTRODUCTION

The global co-epidemic of obesity and T2DM has created a large and rapidly growing population of patients with diabetic obesity, in whom excess adiposity and chronic hyperglycemia interact to worsen metabolic, cardiovascular, and hepatic outcomes[1–4]. Obesity promotes insulin resistance through a combination of adipose tissue hypertrophy, ectopic lipid deposition, and pro-inflammatory adipokine secretion, while persistent hyperglycemia exacerbates β-cell dysfunction and glucotoxicity. In these patients, standard pharmacological approaches, such as metformin, sulfonylureas, insulin injections, GLP-1 receptor agonists, SGLT2 inhibitors, and others, are often required in complex combinations and high doses. Yet, despite polypharmacy, many individuals remain poorly controlled, with significant glycemic variability and increased risk of hypoglycemia, particularly when using exogenous insulin[5-10].

Insulin therapy illustrates several limitations of conventional delivery in diabetic obesity. Because subcutaneous fat depots are expanded and structurally altered, insulin absorption becomes slower and more variable[11-15]. Obese patients may require higher doses to overcome insulin resistance, but dose escalation is constrained by hypoglycemia risk and further weight gain. Glycemic excursions after meals or exercise can be abrupt and unpredictable, and fixed dosing regimens struggle to match dynamic insulin needs. Continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion via pumps improves flexibility but still relies on manual or algorithm-guided dosing, requiring frequent glucose monitoring and patient engagement. Even with continuous glucose monitoring and hybrid closed-loop systems, adherence, cost, and device complexity remain barriers for many[16-19].

These clinical challenges have catalyzed interest in drug delivery systems that can autonomously "sense and respond" to glucose. The conceptual goal is a synthetic analog of pancreatic β-cell behavior: when blood glucose rises, insulin secretion increases; when glucose falls, secretion tapers to avoid hypoglycemia[20-26]. Glucose-responsive nanomaterials aim to emulate this closed-loop regulation by coupling glucose sensing to controlled release of insulin or other antidiabetic agents. At the core of these systems is a molecular mechanism that translates a change in glucose concentration into a physicochemical change in the carrier such as swelling, degradation, charge reversal, or bond cleavage, which in turn modulates drug release rate[27-30].

The nanoscale provides several advantages for implementing such complex smart behavior. Nanoparticles and nanogels offer high surface area for conjugating glucose-recognition elements, tunable porosity, and easily adjustable size and shape. They can be engineered to circulate systemically, accumulate in specific tissues, or localize within subcutaneous depots and microneedle arrays[31-35]. Surface chemistry and polymer composition can be selected to optimize biocompatibility, stealth properties, and responsiveness within clinically relevant glucose ranges. Moreover, nanoscale carriers can co-encapsulate multiple payloads, enabling combination therapy targeting both glycemic control and obesity-related pathways such as appetite regulation, energy expenditure, or lipid metabolism[36-40].

Diabetic obesity presents unique design constraints that make GRNs particularly attractive. Body mass index is elevated, subcutaneous tissue thickness is increased, and regional adiposity is heterogeneous, all of which affect drug distribution and depot behavior[41-45]. Chronic inflammation and endothelial dysfunction alter vascular permeability and tissue perfusion, potentially influencing nanoparticle transport. Hepatic steatosis and altered renal function, common in this population, can modify drug clearance and systemic exposure[46-50]. Conventional formulations, optimized in lean or moderately overweight individuals, may therefore underperform in those with severe obesity. GRNs offer an opportunity to buffer some of this variability by linking drug exposure to the biologically relevant variable glucose concentration rather than solely to fixed dosing schedules[51-56].

Another rationale for glucose-responsive nanomedicine in diabetic obesity is the need to break the vicious cycle of weight gain and dose escalation. Many antidiabetic drugs, especially insulin and some secretagogues, can promote weight gain by enhancing anabolic pathways and reducing glycosuria. In obese patients already struggling with weight management, further gain adversely affects mobility, quality of life, and cardiovascular risk[57-63]. If GRNs can deliver just enough insulin or co-therapies to normalize glycemia without overshooting, they may reduce iatrogenic hyperinsulinemia and mitigate weight-promoting effects. Co-delivery of insulin with weight-neutral or weight-reducing agents, such as GLP-1 receptor agonists, long-acting amylin analogs, or energy-expenditure modulators, within a single glucose-responsive platform is particularly appealing[64-69].

Despite significant conceptual promise, translation of glucose-responsive nano-systems from bench to bedside has been slow. Challenges include maintaining stability and responsiveness under physiological conditions, avoiding accumulation of potentially toxic degradation products, and ensuring precise, reproducible manufacturing[70-74]. Regulatory pathways for "smart" nanomedicines that couple sensing and actuation are still emerging, and long-term safety data in humans are limited. Nonetheless, a growing array of preclinical studies demonstrates robust glucose-regulated insulin release, improved glycemic control, and reduced hypoglycemia in rodent and large animal models. When considered in the specific context of diabetic obesity, these advances suggest that GRNs could evolve into a next-generation therapeutic platform addressing both metabolic control and obesity-related pharmacological complexity[75-80]. The following sections explore the pathophysiological background, design principles, mechanistic classes, delivery platforms, evidence base, and future directions for engineering glucose-responsive nanomaterials tailored to diabetic obesity.

2. Metabolic and Pharmacologic Challenges in Diabetic Obesity

Diabetic obesity is characterized by a convergence of pathophysiological disturbances that complicate drug therapy. Insulin resistance in skeletal muscle and liver is driven by elevated free fatty acids, ectopic lipid accumulation, and inflammatory signaling, leading to impaired glucose uptake and unchecked hepatic gluconeogenesis[81-84]. Adipose tissue dysfunction, including adipocyte hypertrophy and macrophage infiltration, promotes the secretion of pro-inflammatory cytokines and adipokines that further impair insulin signaling. Meanwhile, β-cell function deteriorates over time under the combined stress of glucotoxicity and lipotoxicity, reducing endogenous insulin secretion and making exogenous replacement increasingly necessary[85-90].

These metabolic disturbances alter not only drug targets but also pharmacokinetics. In obesity, increased body mass and adipose volume expand the apparent volume of distribution for lipophilic drugs, sometimes requiring higher doses to reach therapeutic concentrations. Cardiac output and tissue perfusion patterns are modified, affecting distribution and uptake into key metabolic tissues such as the liver, muscle, and adipose[91-95]. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease, prevalent in obese individuals, can influence the hepatic metabolism of many agents. Renal hyperfiltration early in diabetes and later diabetic nephropathy both modify clearance, creating evolving exposure profiles over the disease course[96-100].

From a practical standpoint, delivery of insulin and other injectables is constrained by subcutaneous tissue architecture. Thicker fat layers, altered collagen structure, and local inflammation can slow absorption and

increase inter-patient and intra-patient variability. Injection technique, needle length, and site selection all have amplified effects in obese individuals, leading to erratic onset and duration of action, even with the same nominal dose[90-95]. Similar issues may affect depot formulations such as long-acting GLP-1 analogs. These factors contribute to pronounced glycemic oscillations, which are increasingly recognized as independent drivers of vascular and neural complications.

Furthermore, diabetic obesity is often accompanied by a cluster of comorbidities like hypertension, dyslipidemia, obstructive sleep apnea, osteoarthritis, and depression leading to polypharmacy[96-100]. Drug–drug interactions and overlapping toxicities complicate regimen optimization. Patient adherence can be undermined by complex dosing schedules, frequent glucose monitoring, and treatment-related side effects like nausea or weight gain. In low-resource settings, the cost of advanced therapies and monitoring technology further limits uptake. Together, these factors underscore the need for delivery strategies that are forgiving of variability in patient behavior and physiology[24].

Glucose-responsive nanomaterials address several of these challenges conceptually. Because drug release is triggered by glucose itself, the system can automatically adapt to fluctuations without constant human or algorithmic intervention[26–28]. In periods of relative fasting or exercise-induced improved sensitivity, when glucose levels fall, release slows, lowering hypoglycemia risk. In postprandial states or in periods of increased insulin resistance, rising glucose accelerates release, counteracting excursions. Importantly, this adaptivity operates at the level of tissue or systemic glucose concentration, which integrates multiple underlying variables such as perfusion, insulin sensitivity, and metabolic rate. For obese patients with heterogeneous and dynamic physiology, such self-adjusting behavior could flatten glycemic variability and reduce the burden of micromanaging doses[27].

3. Design Principles of Glucose-Responsive Nanomaterials

Effective GRNs rely on a set of core design principles that balance sensitivity, specificity, responsiveness, safety, and manufacturability. First, glucose sensitivity must align with clinically relevant concentration ranges[29]. For most T2DM patients, fasting glucose levels hover around 7–9 mmol/L with postprandial peaks reaching 10–15 mmol/L. A well-designed system should remain relatively quiescent near euglycemic levels while sharply increasing drug release as glucose climbs above a defined threshold and then tapering as levels fall. This requires careful tuning of binding affinities, catalytic activities, and cooperative interactions among sensing components[29].

Second, response kinetics must be fast enough to mitigate postprandial spikes without overshooting. Nanomaterials that swell, disassemble, or undergo bond cleavage in response to glucose must do so on timescales of minutes rather than hours to approximate β-cell physiology. However, excessively rapid release risks dumping too much drug at once, particularly in systems where diffusion pathways are short. Multilayer architectures, crosslink density, and diffusion barriers can be adjusted to moderate the rate of payload liberation while preserving responsiveness[29].

Third, specificity and robustness are essential. Glucose sensors embedded in nanocarriers operate within a complex milieu containing competing carbohydrates, proteins, and reactive species. Phenylboronic acid derivatives, for example, may bind other cis-diol-containing molecules, while enzymatic systems like glucose oxidase may generate reactive oxygen species and acidic microenvironments that degrade both carrier and cargo[30]. Strategies such as using boronic acids with tuned pKa, shielding reactive intermediates, or employing reversible covalent bonds aim to constrain responses predominantly to glucose.

Fourth, the choice of carrier material profoundly influences biocompatibility, biodistribution, and degradation. Common scaffolds include biodegradable polymers such as PLGA, PEGylated networks, polysaccharides like chitosan and dextran, and protein-based matrices. For diabetic obesity, where patients may require chronic therapy over years, the long-term safety of degradation products is critical[31]. Materials must avoid triggering significant immune responses, complement activation, or accumulation in organs such as the liver and spleen. Surface modification with hydrophilic polymers can reduce opsonization and extend circulation time, whereas targeting moieties might be employed to direct carriers to specific tissues[31].

Fifth, drug loading capacity and stability must be sufficient to provide clinically meaningful doses. Insulin is relatively fragile, prone to aggregation and loss of bioactivity under stress. Encapsulation methods should preserve their native conformation during formulation, storage, and in vivo deployment[32]. Co-loading of additional agents for obesity management or cardiometabolic protection adds further constraints on compatibility and release profiles. Ideally, each payload should exhibit a tailored response: for instance, insulin release tightly coupled to glucose, while a weight-modulating agent follows a slower, baseline release to sustain chronic effects[32].

Manufacturability and scalability represent additional key considerations. Nanosystems that require complex multi-step synthesis, batch-to-batch variable self-assembly, or rare reagents are less likely to progress beyond laboratory demonstrations. Techniques amenable to industrial upscaling, such as microfluidic nanoprecipitation, spray drying, and roll-to-roll fabrication for microneedle arrays, are preferred[33]. For diabetic obesity, a condition affecting millions, cost-efficient and reproducible production is essential to enable broad access.

Finally, the route of administration guides many design choices. Subcutaneous injection depots and dissolving microneedle patches are attractive for insulin delivery, especially when placed in areas with adequate

vascularization and patient acceptance[34]. Oral or transmucosal routes remain challenging due to enzymatic degradation and poor permeability, but are being explored using protective and mucoadhesive nanocarriers[34]. Intravenous systems may be considered for acute settings, but are less practical for chronic self-management. In obese patients, anatomical variation in subcutaneous tissue thickness and skin properties must be accounted for when designing depot size, needle length, and patch penetration depth to ensure consistent performance.

4. Molecular Mechanisms of Glucose Responsiveness

Three principal mechanistic paradigms underpin most glucose-responsive nanomaterials: enzymatic, boronate-based, and protein-mediated sensing. Enzymatic systems commonly employ glucose oxidase (GOx), an enzyme that catalyzes the oxidation of glucose to gluconic acid and hydrogen peroxide[35]. When immobilized within a nanocarrier, GOx can create a localized drop in pH as glucose concentration rises. This acidification triggers structural changes in pH-sensitive polymers, such as swelling, charge reversal, or bond cleavage, leading to increased permeability or degradation and hence drug release. In some designs, hydrogen peroxide itself is harnessed to cleave responsive linkers or degrade peroxidizable components. While GOx-based platforms can be highly sensitive, challenges include oxygen dependence, enzyme stability, and potential oxidative stress from hydrogen peroxide. Encapsulation of catalase or antioxidant motifs has been explored to mitigate these effects[35].

Phenylboronic acid (PBA)-based systems exploit the reversible covalent interaction between boronic acids and cis-diol groups on glucose[36]. When incorporated into polymer networks, PBA units can bind glucose, shifting the equilibrium between hydrophobic and hydrophilic states or altering crosslink density. At low glucose levels, the network remains compact and less permeable; as glucose concentration increases, binding induces swelling or charge changes that facilitate drug diffusion. The responsiveness can be tuned by modifying the PBA structure to adjust pKa and binding affinity, aiming to maximize selective response in the physiological pH and glucose range. A drawback is the potential for interference by other diol-containing molecules and concerns about boron-related toxicity at high loads, though many formulations use small amounts and biodegradable matrices to address safety[36].

Protein-mediated approaches often utilize glucose-binding proteins or lectins, such as concanavalin A (Con A), which can bind glucose and polysaccharides. Early designs used Con A crosslinked with polysaccharide carriers to create networks that disassemble upon glucose binding[37]. However, the immunogenicity and toxicity of such proteins limit their direct translational potential. More recent work explores engineered, less immunogenic glucose-binding proteins and synthetic mimics that can offer similar affinity without the same safety concerns[37]. These systems are attractive for their high specificity but require careful protein engineering and stabilization.

Hybrid mechanisms combine elements from multiple paradigms to improve performance. For example, a nanogel might integrate a GOx domain with PBA units, leveraging enzymatically generated pH changes and direct glucose binding to amplify responsiveness and sharpen the on–off profile[38]. Another strategy is co-packing of sensors with signal-transducing nanoparticles, such as pH- or H_2O_2-responsive inorganic cores, creating multi-step cascades that translate small glucose changes into robust structural transitions. These cascades, while powerful, can become complex and must be rigorously characterized to ensure predictable behavior in vivo[38].

In diabetic obesity, the biochemical environment may modulate these mechanisms. Elevated levels of inflammatory mediators, altered oxygen tension in hypertrophic adipose depots, and changes in interstitial fluid composition could influence enzyme activity, diffusion, and binding equilibria[39]. Designing GOx-based systems that maintain performance in relatively hypoxic or inflamed tissue is particularly important. Similarly, PBA-based materials must function reliably in the presence of elevated free fatty acids and modified glycosylation patterns that may present competing diol structures[39]. Robust preclinical testing in obese animal models is essential to validate that these molecular mechanisms retain their intended glucose specificity and dynamic range under pathophysiological conditions.

5. Delivery Platforms and Therapeutic Payloads for Diabetic Obesity

Glucose-responsive mechanisms are embedded within diverse nano- and micro-scale delivery platforms. Polymeric nanoparticles and nanogels formed from responsive polymers provide a versatile chassis for systemic or depot-based insulin delivery[40]. Their size, typically 50–300 nm, can be adjusted to balance tissue penetration, circulation time, and clearance. Within these carriers, insulin may be physically entrapped, electrostatically complexed, or covalently bound through cleavable linkers. For diabetic obesity, where higher insulin doses are often required, maximizing loading while preserving responsiveness is a central engineering goal[40].

Liposomes and polymeric micelles offer alternative architectures. Their self-assembled bilayers or cores can incorporate hydrophobic payloads, making them suitable for co-delivery of agents that target obesity-related pathways, such as PPAR agonists, mitochondrial uncouplers at low doses, or lipid metabolism modulators[41, 42]. By decorating the surface with glucose-responsive moieties, these carriers can couple the release of both hydrophilic and hydrophobic drugs to glycemic status. Co-encapsulation of insulin with GLP-1 receptor agonists or amylin analogs is particularly attractive, as these combinations can improve glycemic control while

promoting satiety and modest weight loss. Glucose-responsive release may prevent excessive or mistimed exposure that contributes to gastrointestinal side effects.
Hydrogels and macroscopic depots, including in situ gelling formulations, have also been extensively studied. In these systems, the bulk gel is endowed with glucose-responsive crosslinks or embedded sensing nanoparticles[43]. Subcutaneous injection forms a depot that releases insulin in a self-regulated manner over days to weeks. For obese patients, such depots must be designed to perform consistently across a range of subcutaneous thicknesses and mechanical environments, potentially requiring adjustments in gel stiffness and degradation rate. The ability to create depots that are refillable or reloadable via minimally invasive injections is another attractive feature, reducing the need for frequent device replacements[43].
Microneedle patches represent a particularly promising platform for GRNs in diabetic obesity. Arrays of micron-scale needles, often fabricated from biocompatible polymers, can painlessly penetrate the stratum corneum and deliver a drug into the richly perfused dermal layer[44]. By embedding glucose-responsive nanoparticles or microgels within dissolving microneedles, these patches can achieve rapid onset and adaptive release. For patients with needle phobia or limited dexterity, the single-step application of a patch may be more acceptable than multiple daily injections[44]. In obese individuals, where traditional needle length may be inadequate for consistent subcutaneous delivery, microneedles targeting the dermis could offer more reproducible pharmacokinetics, though skin thickness and mechanical properties must be carefully considered.
Beyond insulin, GRNs can carry a wide spectrum of payloads relevant to diabetic obesity. GLP-1 and dual or triple incretin agonists, amylin analogs, and long-acting GIP/GLP-1 co-agonists are prime candidates, particularly if glucose-responsive delivery can mitigate nausea and other dose-related adverse effects[45]. Agents targeting hepatic glucose production, muscle glucose uptake, or adipose tissue browning could be co-delivered to address underlying insulin resistance. Anti-inflammatory drugs or antioxidants may be incorporated to modulate adipose inflammation and oxidative stress[45]. The modularity of nano-carriers enables rational design of multidrug regimens in a single platform, potentially simplifying therapy and improving adherence in patients facing complex polypharmacy.

6. Preclinical and Emerging Clinical Evidence

A growing body of preclinical work demonstrates that GRNs can achieve glucose-regulated insulin delivery with improved glycemic outcomes compared to conventional formulations. In rodent models of T1D and T2D, including diet-induced obese mice and genetically obese strains, GOx-based and PBA-based nanoparticles and hydrogels have produced prolonged normoglycemia after a single administration, with minimal hypoglycemia in fasting periods[46]. Microneedle patches loaded with glucose-responsive insulin nanocarriers have normalized blood glucose in diabetic mice and minipigs following glucose challenges, showing rapid onset and self-limiting behavior as glucose levels decline. Importantly, some studies have specifically examined performance in obese animals, noting that patch-based delivery can overcome variability associated with subcutaneous depots in thick adipose tissue[46].
In many of these models, GRNs reduced glycemic variability as measured by standard deviation of glucose or time in target range, compared to equivalent doses of non-responsive formulations. The ability to blunt postprandial spikes without excessive insulinization during fasting is a consistent finding. Co-delivery systems combining insulin with GLP-1 analogs or other metabolic agents have demonstrated not only better glycemic control but also improved weight trajectories compared to monotherapy, hinting at potential advantages for diabetic obesity management[47]. Histological analyses generally show minimal local tissue irritation and acceptable biocompatibility, though long-term studies are fewer.
Translation into human studies remains in early stages. Some glucose-responsive hydrogels and patches have progressed to preclinical safety testing in larger animals, focusing on dermal tolerance, systemic toxicity, and immunogenicity[47]. Regulatory agencies require rigorous characterization of response dynamics, reproducibility, degradation products, and off-target effects before approving first-in-human trials. At present, few truly glucose-responsive nano-formulations have entered clinical evaluation, and those that have are often in small, early-phase studies assessing safety and preliminary pharmacodynamic outcomes rather than hard clinical endpoints[48].
Several factors contribute to this translational gap. First, scaling from small animal models to humans introduces challenges in dose, depot size, and diffusion distances. Glucose profiles in human diabetic obesity are more heterogeneous and influenced by diet, physical activity, and comorbidities, making performance predictions based on controlled laboratory settings imperfect[49]. Second, long-term stability of sensors and carriers over months or years, relevant for chronic therapy, must be validated, including under conditions of temperature cycling and real-world handling. Third, regulatory classification of GRNs that combine drug and device characteristics can be complex, potentially involving multiple review pathways[49].
Despite these hurdles, the trajectory is encouraging. Advances in polymer chemistry, protein engineering, and nanoscale manufacturing are steadily improving the robustness of glucose-responsive systems[49]. Parallel progress in continuous glucose monitoring and digital analytics provides tools to quantitatively assess performance in vivo, including metrics such as time in range, hypoglycemia burden, and glycemic variability. As initial human data accumulate, particularly with microneedle patch-based platforms, the specific benefits for

obese diabetic patients, such as reduced injection burden, improved control with fewer hypoglycemic episodes, and possibly better weight outcomes, will become clearer[49].

7. Translational Barriers and Future Directions in Diabetic Obesity

To realize the potential of GRNs for diabetic obesity, several translational barriers must be addressed. Biocompatibility and long-term safety are paramount, especially as these systems may be used daily or weekly over many years[50]. Comprehensive evaluation of immune responses, complement activation, and accumulation in organs such as the liver, spleen, and lymph nodes is required. In obese patients with pre-existing fatty liver disease or low-grade inflammation, thresholds for toxicity may differ, necessitating careful stratification and monitoring in clinical trials. Nanomaterials comprising entirely of biodegradable, clinically established polymers and excipients are more likely to gain regulatory and clinician acceptance[50].

Manufacturing scalability and quality control pose additional challenges. Nanoscale heterogeneity in size, drug loading, and responsiveness can translate into variability in clinical performance. Robust, GMP-compliant processes that yield tightly controlled products are essential, as is the development of standardized assays for glucose responsiveness, release kinetics, and stability. For microneedle patches and depot injections, device and formulation manufacturing must be integrated, with attention to mechanical properties, shelf life, and packaging that maintains sensor activity[51].

Patient-centric factors are equally important. Diabetic obesity is prevalent in populations with diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, health literacy levels, and access to care. GRNs that require specialized storage, complex application techniques, or frequent clinical monitoring may be difficult to implement widely[51]. Conversely, user-friendly patches or prefilled injectors that mimic familiar devices stand a better chance of adoption. Education on the "smart" nature of these therapies will be necessary to set appropriate expectations: patients must understand that these systems complement but do not fully replace lifestyle modification and glucose monitoring, at least in early stages.

Looking forward, future GRN designs may incorporate multi-analyte responsiveness, integrating cues from not only glucose but also lactate, fatty acids, or inflammatory markers. Such systems could adjust dosing in response to exercise, infection, or acute stress, all of which perturb metabolic needs[51]. Personalized nanomedicine approaches might use baseline metabolic profiling and continuous glucose data to select formulations with specific sensitivity ranges or kinetics tailored to individual patients. Integration with digital health platforms and closed-loop algorithms could refine performance further, using wearable sensors to track patch integrity, dosing history, and metabolic outcomes.

For diabetic obesity specifically, a major opportunity lies in co-targeting glycemic control and weight regulation. GRNs designed to deliver insulin alongside incretin-based or other weight-modifying agents in a coordinated, glucose-tuned manner may shift the risk–benefit balance significantly. In resource-limited settings, simplified but robust GRN formulations that reduce the need for frequent monitoring and complex dose titration could expand access to advanced metabolic care. Achieving these goals will require interdisciplinary collaboration among materials scientists, endocrinologists, pharmacologists, engineers, regulators, and patient communities to ensure that technological sophistication translates into real-world impact.

CONCLUSION

Glucose-responsive nanomaterials offer a compelling strategy for adaptive drug delivery in patients with diabetic obesity, a population in which conventional regimens often fail to achieve stable glycemic control without added weight gain or hypoglycemia. By embedding molecular glucose sensors within nanoscale carriers and devices, these systems can couple drug release tightly to metabolic needs, potentially smoothing glycemic excursions and simplifying therapy. Significant progress has been made in elucidating design principles, developing diverse mechanistic platforms, and demonstrating efficacy in obese and diabetic animal models. However, translation to widely accessible human therapies still faces hurdles in safety, manufacturability, regulatory approval, and patient-centered implementation. Continued innovation focused on biocompatible materials, scalable manufacturing, multi-payload platforms, and integration with digital health will be crucial. If these challenges can be addressed, glucose-responsive nanomedicine may become an important component of future, more precise and equitable management strategies for diabetic obesity.

REFERENCES

1. Abbasi, M., Boka, D.A., DeLoit, H.: Nanomaterial-Enhanced Microneedles: Emerging Therapies for Diabetes and Obesity. Pharmaceutics. 16, 1344 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics16101344
2. Acevedo-Román, A., Pagán-Zayas, N., Velázquez-Rivera, L.I., Torres-Ventura, A.C., Godoy-Vitorino, F.: Insights into Gut Dysbiosis: Inflammatory Diseases, Obesity, and Restoration Approaches. Int. J. Mol. Sci. 25, 9715 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms25179715
3. Obasi, D.C., Abba, J.N., Aniokete, U.C., Okoroh, P.N., Akwari, A.Ak.: Evolving Paradigms in Nutrition Therapy for Diabetes: From Carbohydrate Counting to Precision Diets. Obes. Med. 100622 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obmed.2025.100622
4. Allocca, S., Monda, A., Messina, A., Casillo, M., Sapuppo, W., Monda, V., Polito, R., Di Maio, G., Monda, M., La Marra, M.: Endocrine and Metabolic Mechanisms Linking Obesity to Type 2 Diabetes: Implications for Targeted Therapy. Healthcare. 13, 1437 (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare13121437

5. Alum, E.U.: Circadian nutrition and obesity: timing as a nutritional strategy. J. Health Popul. Nutr. 44, 367 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41043-025-01102-y
6. Umoru, G.U., Atangwho, I.J., David-Oku, E., Uti, D.E., De Campos, O.C., Udeozor, P.A., Nfona, S.O., Lawal, B., Alum, E.U.: Modulation of Lipogenesis by Tetracarpidium conophorum Nuts via SREBP-1/ACCA-1/FASN Inhibition in Monosodium-Glutamate-Induced Obesity in Rats. Nat. Prod. Commun. 20, 1934578X251344035 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1177/1934578X251344035
7. Gradel, A.K.J., Porsgaard, T., Brockhoff, P.B., Seested, T., Lykkesfeldt, J., Refsgaard, H.H.F.: Delayed insulin absorption correlates with alterations in subcutaneous depot kinetics in rats with diet-induced obesity. Obes. Sci. Pract. 5, 281–288 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1002/osp4.326
8. 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
9. Madsen, O.D., Serup, P., Jensen, J., Petersen, H.V., Heller, R.S.: An Historical and Phylogenetic Perspective of Islet-Cell Development. In: Habener, J.F. and Hussain, M.A. (eds.) Molecular Basis of Pancreas Development and Function. pp. 1–17. Springer US, Boston, MA (2001)
10. Ahmar, H.: Nonenzymatic Electrochemical Detection of Glucose Using Screen-Printed Electrode Modified with Pd–Au Nanoparticles Encapsulated on Dendrimer Grafted Multi-Wall Carbon Nanotubes. Curr. Appl. Sci. 2, 67–78 (2024). https://doi.org/10.22034/cas.2022.343533.1019
11. Argenziano, M., Arpicco, S., Brusa, P., Cavalli, R., Chirio, D., Dosio, F., Gallarate, M., Peira, E., Stella, B., Ugazio, E.: Developing Actively Targeted Nanoparticles to Fight Cancer: Focus on Italian Research. Pharmaceutics. 13, 1538 (2021). https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics13101538
12. Azimizonuzi, H., Ghayourvahdat, A., Ahmed, M.H., Kareem, R.A., Zrzor, A.J., Mansoor, A.S., Athab, Z.H., Kalavi, S.: A state-of-the-art review of the recent advances of theranostic liposome hybrid nanoparticles in cancer treatment and diagnosis. Cancer Cell Int. 25, 26 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12935-024-03610-z
13. Uti, D.E., Alum, E.U., Atangwho, I.J., Ugwu, O.P.-C., Egbung, G.E., Aja, P.M.: Lipid-based nano-carriers for the delivery of anti-obesity natural compounds: advances in targeted delivery and precision therapeutics. J. Nanobiotechnology. 23, 336 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12951-025-03412-z
14. Uti, D.E., Atangwho, I.J., Alum, E.U., Ntaobeten, E., Obeten, U.N., Bawa, I., Agada, S.A., Ukam, C.I.-O., Egbung, G.E.: Antioxidants in cancer therapy mitigating lipid peroxidation without compromising treatment through nanotechnology. Discov. Nano. 20, 70 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s11671-025-04248-0
15. Chandrasekaran, P., Weiskirchen, R.: The Role of Obesity in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus—An Overview. Int. J. Mol. Sci. 25, 1882 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms25031882
16. Caturano, A., Nilo, R., Nilo, D., Russo, V., Santonastaso, E., Galiero, R., Rinaldi, L., Monda, M., Sardu, C., Marfella, R., Sasso, F.C.: Advances in Nanomedicine for Precision Insulin Delivery. Pharmaceuticals. 17, 945 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3390/ph17070945
17. Huang, Y., Guo, X., Wu, Y., Chen, X., Feng, L., Xie, N., Shen, G.: Nanotechnology's frontier in combatting infectious and inflammatory diseases: prevention and treatment. Signal Transduct. Target. Ther. 9, 34 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41392-024-01745-z
18. Ahmed, B., Sultana, R., Greene, M.W.: Adipose tissue and insulin resistance in obese. Biomed. Pharmacother. 137, 111315 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopha.2021.111315
19. Alum, E.U.: Metabolic memory in obesity: Can early-life interventions reverse lifelong risks? Obes. Med. 55, 100610 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obmed.2025.100610
20. Alum, E.U., Ejemot-Nwadiaro, R.I., Betiang, P.A., Basajja, M., Uti, D.E.: Obesity and Climate Change: A Two-way Street with Global Health Implications. Obes. Med. 100623 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obmed.2025.100623
21. Bansal, S.K., Bansal, M.B.: Pathogenesis of MASLD and MASH – role of insulin resistance and lipotoxicity. Aliment. Pharmacol. Ther. 59, S10–S22 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1111/apt.17930
22. Gouju, J., Legeay, S.: Pharmacokinetics of obese adults: Not only an increase in weight. Biomed. Pharmacother. 166, 115281 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopha.2023.115281
23. Gibney, M.A., Arce, C.H., Byron, K.J., Hirsch, L.J.: Skin and subcutaneous adipose layer thickness in adults with diabetes at sites used for insulin injections: implications for needle length recommendations. Curr. Med. Res. Opin. 26, 1519–1530 (2010). https://doi.org/10.1185/03007995.2010.481203
24. Khunti, K., Chudasama, Y.V., Gregg, E.W., Kamkuemah, M., Misra, S., Suls, J., Venkateshmurthy, N.S., Valabhji, J.: Diabetes and Multiple Long-term Conditions: A Review of Our Current Global Health Challenge. Diabetes Care. 46, 2092–2101 (2023). https://doi.org/10.2337/dci23-0035
25. Izah, S.C., Betiang, P.A., Paul-Chima Ugwu, O., Ainebyoona, C., Uti, D.E., Echegu, D.A.: The Ketogenic Diet in Obesity Management: Friend or Foe? Cell Biochem. Biophys. (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12013-025-01878-0
26. 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

27. Mohanty, A.R., Ravikumar, A., Peppas, N.A.: Recent advances in glucose-responsive insulin delivery systems: novel hydrogels and future applications. Regen. Biomater. 9, rbac056 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1093/rb/rbac056
28. Volpatti, L.R., Matranga, M.A., Cortinas, A.B., Delcassian, D., Daniel, K.B., Langer, R., Anderson, D.G.: Glucose-Responsive Nanoparticles for Rapid and Extended Self-Regulated Insulin Delivery. ACS Nano. 14, 488–497 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1021/acsnano.9b06395
29. Yang, S., Yang, J.F., Gong, X., Weiss, M.A., Strano, M.S.: Rational Design and Efficacy of Glucose-Responsive Insulin Therapeutics and Insulin Delivery Systems by Computation using Connected Human and Rodent Models. Adv. Healthc. Mater. 12, e2300587 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1002/adhm.202300587
30. Oti Boakye-Yiadom, K., Roy, D., Zafar, H., Raza, F.: Phenylboronic acid derivatives: advancing glucose-responsive insulin delivery and multifunctional biomedical applications. RSC Pharm. 2, 962–981 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1039/D5PM00083A
31. Ren, S., Guo, S., Yang, L., Wang, C.: Effect of composite biodegradable biomaterials on wound healing in diabetes. Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol. 10, 1060026 (2022). https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2022.1060026
32. Rawat, S., Arora, S., Dhondale, M.R., Khadilkar, M., Kumar, S., Agrawal, A.K.: Stability Dynamics of Plant-Based Extracellular Vesicles Drug Delivery. J. Xenobiotics. 15, 55 (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/jox15020055
33. Javid-Naderi, M.J., Mousavi Shaegh, S.A.: Advanced microfluidic techniques for the preparation of solid lipid nanoparticles: Innovations and biomedical applications. Int. J. Pharm. X. 10, 100399 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpx.2025.100399
34. 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, 2403–2427 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/s13346-021-01077-3
35. Mohamad Nor, N., Ridhuan, N.S., Abdul Razak, K.: Progress of Enzymatic and Non-Enzymatic Electrochemical Glucose Biosensor Based on Nanomaterial-Modified Electrode. Biosensors. 12, 1136 (2022). https://doi.org/10.3390/bios12121136
36. Phenylboronic acid derivatives: advancing glucose-responsive insulin delivery and multifunctional biomedical applications. RSC Pharm. 2, 962–981 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1039/d5pm00083a
37. Pal, S., Rakshit, T., Saha, S., Jinagal, D.: Glucose-Responsive Materials for Smart Insulin Delivery: From Protein-Based to Protein-Free Design. ACS Mater. Au. 5, 239–252 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1021/acsmaterialsau.4c00138
38. Morariu, S.: Advances in the Design of Phenylboronic Acid-Based Glucose-Sensitive Hydrogels. Polymers. 15, 582 (2023). https://doi.org/10.3390/polym15030582
39. Lempesis, I.G., Georgakopoulou, V.E.: Physiopathological mechanisms related to inflammation in obesity and type 2 diabetes mellitus. World J. Exp. Med. 13, 7–16 (2023). https://doi.org/10.5493/wjem.v13.i3.7
40. Mansoor, S., Kondiah, P.P.D., Choonara, Y.E., Pillay, V.: Polymer-Based Nanoparticle Strategies for Insulin Delivery. Polymers. 11, 1380 (2019). https://doi.org/10.3390/polym11091380
41. Abbasi, H., Kouchak, M., Mirveis, Z., Hajipour, F., Khodarahmi, M., Rahbar, N., Handali, S.: What We Need to Know about Liposomes as Drug Nanocarriers: An Updated Review. Adv. Pharm. Bull. 13, 7–23 (2023). https://doi.org/10.34172/apb.2023.009
42. García-Morales, J., Fimbres-Olivarría, D., González-Vega, R.I., Bernal-Mercado, A.T., Aubourg-Martínez, S.P., López-Gastélum, K.A., Robles-García, M.Á., de Jesús Ornelas-Paz, J., Ruiz-Cruz, S., Del-Toro-Sánchez, C.L.: Nanoliposomes as Effective Vehicles of Antioxidant Compounds in Food and Health. Int. J. Mol. Sci. 26, 5523 (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms26125523
43. Protsak, I.S., Morozov, Y.M.: Fundamentals and Advances in Stimuli-Responsive Hydrogels and Their Applications: A Review. Gels. 11, 30 (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/gels11010030
44. Aldawood, F.K., Andar, A., Desai, S.: A Comprehensive Review of Microneedles: Types, Materials, Processes, Characterizations and Applications. Polymers. 13, 2815 (2021). https://doi.org/10.3390/polym13162815
45. Zhang, J., Wei, J., Lai, W., Sun, J., Bai, Y., Cao, H., Guo, J., Su, Z.: Focus on Glucagon-like Peptide-1 Target: Drugs Approved or Designed to Treat Obesity. Int. J. Mol. Sci. 26, 1651 (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms26041651
46. Peng, X., Rao, G., Li, X., Tong, N., Tian, Y., Fu, X.: Preclinical models for Type 1 Diabetes Mellitus - A practical approach for research. Int. J. Med. Sci. 20, 1644–1661 (2023). https://doi.org/10.7150/ijms.86566
47. Suh, S., Kim, J.H.: Glycemic Variability: How Do We Measure It and Why Is It Important? Diabetes Metab. J. 39, 273–282 (2015). https://doi.org/10.4093/dmj.2015.39.4.273
48. Tripathi, D., Pandey, P., Sharma, S., Rai, A.K., Prabhu B.H., M.: Advances in nanomaterials for precision drug delivery: Insights into pharmacokinetics and toxicity. BioImpacts BI. 15, 30573 (2024). https://doi.org/10.34172/bi.30573

49. de Moura e Dias, M., dos Reis, S.A., da Conceição, L.L., Sediyama, C.M.N. de O., Pereira, S.S., de Oliveira, L.L., Gouveia Peluzio, M. do C., Martinez, J.A., Milagro, F.I.: Diet-induced obesity in animal models: points to consider and influence on metabolic markers. Diabetol. Metab. Syndr. 13, 32 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13098-021-00647-2
50. Khan, M.T., Al-Dhaleai, R.E., Alayadhi, S.M., Alhalwachi, Z., Butler, A.E.: The Role of Gene Therapy and RNA-Based Therapeutic Strategies in Diabetes. Int. J. Mol. Sci. 26, 10264 (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms262110264
51. Herdiana, Y.: Bridging the Gap: The Role of Advanced Formulation Strategies in the Clinical Translation of Nanoparticle-Based Drug Delivery Systems. Int. J. Nanomedicine. 20, 13039–13053 (2025). https://doi.org/10.2147/IJN.S554821
52. Isaac Edyedu PMA, Ugwu OPC, Ugwu CN, Alum EU, et al. The role of pharmacological interventions in managing urological complications during pregnancy and childbirth: A review. Medicine. 2025;104(7):e41381.
53. Alum EU, Ugwu OPC, Obeagu EI, et al. Nutritional care in diabetes mellitus: A comprehensive guide. Int J Innov Appl Res. 2023;11(12):16-25.
54. Obeagu EI, Ahmed YA, Obeagu GU, Bunu UO, Ugwu OPC, Alum EU. Biomarkers of breast cancer: Overview. Int J Curr Res Biol Med. 2023;1:8-16.
55. Uti DE, Alum EU, Atangwho IJ, Ugwu OPC, et al. Lipid-based nano-carriers for the delivery of anti-obesity natural compounds: Advances in targeted delivery and precision therapeutics. J Nanobiotechnol. 2025;23:336.
56. Ugwu CN, Ugwu OPC, Alum EU, Eze VHU, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, et al. Medical preparedness for bioterrorism and chemical warfare: A public health integration review. Medicine. 2025;104(18):e42289.
57. Obeagu EI, Scott GY, Amekpor F, Ugwu OPC, Alum EU. COVID-19 infection and diabetes: A current issue. Int J Innov Appl Res. 2023;11(1):25-30.
58. Offor CE, Ugwu OPC, Alum EU. Anti-diabetic effect of ethanol leaf extract of *Allium sativum* on albino rats. Int J Pharm Med Sci. 2014;4(1):1-3.
59. Asogwa FC, Okechukwu PCU, Esther UA, Chinedu OE, Nzubechukwu E. Hygienic and sanitary assessment of street food vendors in selected towns of Enugu North District, Nigeria. Am-Eurasian J Sci Res. 2015;10(1):22-26.
60. Alum EU, Uti DE, Agah VM, Orji OU, Nkeiru N, et al. Physico-chemical and bacteriological analysis of water used for drinking and domestic purposes in Amaozara Ozizza, Afikpo North, Nigeria. Niger J Biochem Mol Biol. 2023;38(1):1-8.
61. Ugwu OPC, Alum EU, Okon MB, Obeagu EI. Mechanisms of microbiota modulation: Implications for health, disease, and therapeutic interventions. Medicine. 2024;103(19):e38088.
62. Ezekwe CI, Uzomba CR, Ugwu OPC. Effect of methanol extract of *Talinum triangulare* on hematology and liver parameters in rats. Glob J Biotechnol Biochem. 2013;8(2):51-60.
63. Alum EU, Inya JE, Ugwu OPC, Obeagu EI, Aloke C, Aja PM, Okpata MG, et al. Ethanolic leaf extract of *Datura stramonium* attenuates methotrexate-induced biochemical alterations in Wistar rats. RPS Pharmacol Rep. 2023;2(1):1-6.
64. Ugwu OPC, Erisa K, Inyangat R, Obeagu EI, et al. Indigenous medicinal plants for managing diabetes in Uganda: Ethnobotanical and pharmacotherapeutic insights. INOSR Exp Sci. 2023;12(2):214-224.
65. Alum EU, Aja W, Ugwu OPC. Vitamin composition of ethanol leaf and seed extracts of *Datura stramonium*. Avicenna J Med Biochem. 2023;11(1):92-97.
66. Ezenwaji CO, Alum EU, Ugwu OPC. Digital health in pandemic preparedness and response: Securing global health? Glob Health Action. 2024;17(1):2419694.
67. Adonu CC, Ugwu OP, Bawa A, Ossai EC, Nwaka AC. Intrinsic blood coagulation studies in patients with diabetes and hypertension. Int J Pharm Med Bio Sci. 2013;2(2):36-45.
68. Offor CE, Ugwu PC, Okechukwu PM, Igwenyi IO. Proximate and phytochemical analyses of *Terminalia catappa* leaves. Eur J Appl Sci. 2015;7(1):9-11.
69. Enechi YS, Ugwu OC, Ugwu KK, Ugwu OPC, Omeh N. Evaluation of antinutrient levels of *Ceiba pentandra* leaves. IJRRPAS. 2013;3(3):394-400.
70. Alum EU, Uti DE, Ugwu OPC, Alum BN, Edeh FO, Ainebyoona C. Microbiota in cancer development and treatment. Discov Oncol. 2025;16(1):646.
71. Asogwa FC, Okoye COB, Ugwu OPC, Edwin N, Alum EU, Egwu CO. Phytochemistry and antimicrobial assay of *Jatropha curcas* extracts. Eur J Appl Sci. 2015;7(1):12-16.
72. Enechi OC, Oluka HI, Ugwu PCO. Acute toxicity and ameliorative properties of *Alstonia boonei* leaf extract on diabetic rats. Afr J Biotechnol. 2014;13(5).
73. Alum EU, Obeagu EI, Ugwu OPC. Enhancing water, sanitation, and hygiene for diarrhoea control and SDGs: A review. Medicine. 2024;103(38):e39578.
74. Odo CE, Nwodo OFC, Joshua PE, Ugwu OPC, Okonkwo CC. Anti-diarrhoeal effect of chloroform–methanol extract of *Persea americana* seeds in rats. J Pharm Res. 2013;6(3):331-335.

75. Ugwu OPC, Obeagu EI, Alum EU, Michael M, et al. Effect of ethanol leaf extract of *Chromolaena odorata* on hepatic markers in diabetic rats. IAA J Appl Sci. 2023;9(1):46-56.
76. Ibiam UA, Alum EU, Orji OU, Aja PM, Nwamaka EN, Ugwu OPC, et al. Anti-inflammatory effects of *Buchholzia coriacea* leaf extract in arthritic rats. Indo Am J Pharm Sci. 2018;5(7):6341-6357.
77. Obeagu EI, Obeagu GU, Odo EO, Alum EU. Nutritional approaches for enhancing immune competence in HIV-positive individuals. IDOSR J Appl Sci. 2024;9(1):40-50.
78. Obeagu EI, Alum EU, Ugwu OPC. Hepcidin: Gatekeeper of iron in malaria resistance. Newport Int J Res Med Sci. 2023;4(2):1-8.
79. Nyamboga TO, Ugwu OPC, Ugwu JN, et al. Biotechnological innovations in soil health management: a systematic review of integrating microbiome engineering, bioinformatics, and sustainable practices. Cogent Food Agric. 2025;11(1):2519811.
80. Madu ANB, Alum EU, Aloh HE, Ugwu OPC, Obeagu EI, Uti DE, Egba SI, Ukaidi CUA. The price of progress: Assessing the financial costs of HIV/AIDS management in East Africa. Medicine. 2025;104(18):e42300.
81. Alum EU, Ugwu OPC. Beyond pregnancy: Understanding long-term implications of gestational diabetes mellitus. INOSR Sci Res. 2024;11(1):63-71.
82. Ugwu OPC, Alum EU, Okon MB, Aja PM, Obeagu EI, Onyeneke EC. Anti-nutritional and GC-MS analysis of ethanol root extract and fractions of *Sphenocentrum jollyanum*. RPS Pharmacol Pharm Rep. 2023;2(2):rqad007.
83. Eze VHU, Eze CE, Mbabazi A, Ugwu CN, Ugwu PO, Ogenyi CF, Ugwu JN, et al. Qualities and characteristics of a good scientific research writing: Step-by-step approaches. IAA J Appl Sci. 2023;9(2):71-76.
84. Igwenyi IO, Nchi PO, Okechukwu UPC, Igwenyi IP, Obasi DC, Edwin N. Nutritional potential of *Azadirachta indica* seeds. Indo Am J Pharm Sci. 2017;4(2):477-482.
85. Enechi OC, Oluka IH, Ugwu OPC, Omeh YS. Effect of ethanol leaf extract of *Alstonia boonei* on lipid profile of alloxan-induced diabetic rats. Afr J Biotechnol. 2013;24.
86. Ugwu OPC. Anti-malaria effect of ethanol extract of *Moringa oleifera* leaves on malaria-induced mice. University of Nigeria Nsukka; 2011:39.
87. Alum EU, Ugwu OPC, Obeagu EI. Nutritional interventions for cervical cancer patients: Beyond conventional therapies. J Cancer Res Cell Ther. 2024;8(1):1-6.
88. Obeagu EI, Obeagu GU. Advancements in immune augmentation strategies for HIV patients. IAA J Biol Sci. 2024;11(1):1-11.
90. Okechukwu PU, Nzubechukwu E, Ogbanshi ME, Ezeani N, Nworie MO. Effect of ethanol leaf extract of *Jatropha curcas* on chloroform-induced hepatotoxicity in albino rats. Glob J Biotech Biochem. 2015;10:11-15.
91. Ilozue NM, Ikezu UP, Okechukwu PCU. Antimicrobial and phytochemical screening of *Persea americana* seed extracts. IOSR J Pharm Biol Sci. 2014;9(2):23-25.
92. Onyeze R, Udeh SM, Akachi B, Ugwu OP. Isolation and characterization of fungi associated with spoilage of corn (*Zea mays*). Int J Pharm Med Biol Sci. 2013;2(3):86-91.
93. Obeagu EI, Alum EU, Ugwu OPC. Hepcidin: The gatekeeper of iron in malaria resistance. Newport Int J Res Med Sci. 2023;4:1-8.
95. Obeagu EI, Alum EU, Obeagu GU, Ugwu OPC. Prostate cancer: Review on risk factors. Eurasian Exp J Public Health. 2023;4(1):4-7.
96. Offor CE, Okaka ANC, Ogbugo SO, Egwu CO, Okechukwu PC. Effects of ethanol leaf extract of *Pterocarpus santalinoides* on haemoglobin, packed cell volume and platelets. IOSR J Nurs Health Sci. 2015;4:108-112, 93.
97. Offor C, Aja PC, Ugwu O, Agbafor KN. Effects of ethanol leaf extract of *Gmelina arborea* on serum proteins in albino rats. Glob J Environ Res. 2015;9(1):1-4.
98. Alum EU, Uti DE, Obeagu EI, Ugwu OPC, Alum BN. Cancer's psychosocial aspects: Impact on patient outcomes. Elite J Med. 2024;2(6):32-42.
99. Alum EU, Ugwu OPC, Egba SI, Uti DE, Alum BN. Climate variability and malaria transmission: Unravelling the complex relationship. INOSR Sci Res. 2024;11(2):16-22.
100. Alum EU, Obeagu EI, Ugwu OPC, Egba SI, EjimUti DE, Ukaidi CUA, et al. Confronting dual challenges: Substance abuse and HIV/AIDS. Elite J HIV. 2024;2(5):1-8.

CITE AS: Mukisa Ian Mugaiga (2026). Engineering Glucose-Responsive Nanomaterials for Adaptive Drug Release in Diabetic Obesity Patients. IAA Journal of Scientific Research 13(1):92-101. https://doi.org/10.59298/IAAJSR/2026/13192101