GLOBAL JOURNAL
OF MEDICAL RESEARCH - F: DISEASES

Volume 26 | Issue 1 | 2026 | Article ID: GJMR-256048 | Language: English

CATALOGING

MESH • D003924, D007333, D050171 | NLM • WK 810 | ICD • E11

Conceptual and Biological Inconsistencies in the Insulin Resistance Paradigm of Type 2 Diabetes

Article Record

Dr. John M Poothullil MD, FRCP*
*Corresponding Author

RECEIVED	ACCEPTED	PUBLISHED	PEER REVIEW
2026-03-12	2026-03-21	2026-04-04	Double Blind

Abstract

Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) is commonly attributed to insulin resistance, defined as impaired responsiveness of skeletal muscle, adipose tissue, and liver to insulin. Although the concept is deeply embedded in modern metabolic medicine, it remains largely inferential and descriptive. This paper critically examines the conceptual, physiological, and epidemiological limitations of the insulin resistance paradigm. It argues that the model lacks a demonstrated unifying mechanism capable of coordinating selective impairment across multiple tissues, does not adequately explain preservation of many insulin-mediated functions, and leaves unresolved several clinical paradoxes, including rapid reversibility of hyperglycemia, metabolically healthy obesity, and diabetes in lean individuals. The paper further argues that the speed with which T2DM prevalence has risen is difficult to reconcile with explanations grounded in intrinsic cellular defects or evolutionary adaptation. An alternative interpretation based on chronic substrate overload and altered metabolic flux is presented as a more coherent framework for understanding the observed phenotype. This reinterpretation has implications for both research priorities and therapeutic strategy, suggesting that reduction of metabolic load and restoration of substrate balance may be central to effective management. Reassessment of insulin resistance as a primary causal construct may therefore be necessary for progress in the prevention and treatment of type 2 diabetes.

Type 2 diabetes | Insulin resistance | Hyperglycemia | Substrate overload | Metabolic flux | Nutrient excess | Ectopic fat

AI USE STATEMENT
No generative AI was used for analysis or results.

FUNDING
No external funding was declared for this work.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST
I have published several consumer books about Type 2 diabetes based on my hypothesis that dietary change can prevent or...

DATA AVAILABILITY
Not applicable for this article.

ETHICS
No ethics committee approval was required for this article type.

CONSENT
Not applicable for this article.

TRIAL REG.
Not applicable.

Crossref DOI: 10.34257/GJMRF256048

How to Cite: Poothullil MD, FRCP (2026). Conceptual and Biological Inconsistencies in the Insulin Resistance Paradigm of Type 2 Diabetes. Global Journal of Medical Research, 26(1), 14-18. DOI: 10.34257/GJMRF256048

AR Experience Web Page | DOI

Print ISSN 0975-5888

Online ISSN 2249-4618

Under the strict compliance and defined process of

METADATA CONTINUATION

AUTHOR CONTACT QR LEDGER

Dr. John M Poothullil MD, FRCP*

ARCHIVAL RECORD

GJMR · Vol 26 · Issue 1 · 2026

Article ID GJMR-256048 · DOI 10.34257/GJMRF256048

Print ISSN 0975-5888 · Online ISSN 2249-4618

Global Journal of Medical Research - Section F
GJMR Volume 26 Issue 1

Conceptual and Biological Inconsistencies in the Insulin Resistance Paradigm of Type 2 Diabetes

Dr. John M Poothullil MD, FRCP*

Abstract

Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) is commonly attributed to insulin resistance, defined as impaired responsiveness of skeletal muscle, adipose tissue, and liver to insulin. Although the concept is deeply embedded in modern metabolic medicine, it remains largely inferential and descriptive. This paper critically examines the conceptual, physiological, and epidemiological limitations of the insulin resistance paradigm. It argues that the model lacks a demonstrated unifying mechanism capable of coordinating selective impairment across multiple tissues, does not adequately explain preservation of many insulin-mediated functions, and leaves unresolved several clinical paradoxes, including rapid reversibility of hyperglycemia, metabolically healthy obesity, and diabetes in lean individuals. The paper further argues that the speed with which T2DM prevalence has risen is difficult to reconcile with explanations grounded in intrinsic cellular defects or evolutionary adaptation. An alternative interpretation based on chronic substrate overload and altered metabolic flux is presented as a more coherent framework for understanding the observed phenotype. This reinterpretation has implications for both research priorities and therapeutic strategy, suggesting that reduction of metabolic load and restoration of substrate balance may be central to effective management. Reassessment of insulin resistance as a primary causal construct may therefore be necessary for progress in the prevention and treatment of type 2 diabetes.

Keywords: *Type 2 diabetes, Insulin resistance, Hyperglycemia, Substrate overload, Metabolic flux, Nutrient excess, Ectopic fat, Pathophysiology*

*** Corresponding Author**
Dr. John M Poothullil MD, FRCP

DOI
10.34257/GJMRF256048

1. Introduction

Type 2 diabetes mellitus has become one of the most consequential chronic diseases of modern medicine. Its prevalence has risen sharply within a historically brief period, both in the United States and globally. Earlier national estimates placed diabetes at a comparatively low prevalence in the mid-twentieth century, whereas current estimates show a many-fold increase, now affecting a large share of adults. The scale and speed of this rise demand a careful re-examination of the dominant causal framework used to explain hyperglycemia in T2DM [1, 2].

The prevailing model holds that T2DM develops because skeletal muscle, adipose tissue, and liver become resistant to insulin. In this account, muscle fails to take up glucose efficiently, adipose tissue does not adequately suppress lipolysis, and the liver continues to release glucose despite circulating insulin. Hyperinsulinemia is then interpreted as a compensatory response to diminished insulin action. This framework has shaped research priorities, clinical language, drug development, and public understanding of diabetes for decades [3].

Yet the apparent explanatory success of the insulin resistance model has masked a series of unresolved problems. The term itself often functions more as an interpretation of measured glucose dynamics than as a directly demonstrated lesion in cell biology. Measures such as HOMA-IR and clamp studies quantify relationships among glucose uptake, glucose production, and insulin concentration, but they do not directly identify a primary molecular defect that causes those relationships. In effect, the field observes altered glucose handling and names the observation insulin resistance, then uses that label to explain the same observation. The result is a concept with substantial descriptive utility but uncertain causal precision [4, 5].

This paper does not deny that reduced glucose disposal can be observed in T2DM. Rather, it questions whether such observations justify the conclusion that a primary defect in insulin signaling is the central biological driver of the disease. Drawing from prior analyses of conceptual gaps, physiological paradoxes, epidemiological trends, and a set of technical questions regarding substrate competition, this article argues that the insulin resistance paradigm is internally inconsistent in important respects and may not provide the most coherent account of hyperglycemia.

2. Historical Development of the Insulin Resistance Concept

The intellectual history of insulin resistance helps explain why the idea achieved such centrality despite its unresolved ambiguities. Once insulin had been identified as essential for glucose regulation, and once insulin therapy transformed the outlook for patients with Type 1 diabetes, it was natural for clinicians to interpret hyperglycemia broadly through an insulin-centered lens. When adults with diabetes were found to have normal or elevated insulin levels, reduced responsiveness of target tissues appeared to offer a convenient explanation. The concept of insulin resistance thus emerged not from direct observation of a specific molecular failure, but from the need to reconcile hyperglycemia with the presence of insulin [6].

As the twentieth century progressed, this interpretation hardened into doctrine. Classification systems distinguished juvenile from adult-onset diabetes, and the latter became increasingly framed as a disorder of impaired insulin action rather than absolute insulin deficiency. The glucose clamp technique later gave investigators a rigorous way to compare insulin levels with glucose disposal, and lower-than-expected disposal rates were interpreted as evidence that tissues had become resistant. This was an important methodological advance, but it still did not establish why glucose uptake was reduced. It quantified the phenomenon; it did not settle the cause [5].

Over time, the language of insulin resistance acquired a status beyond that warranted by the evidence supporting it. What began as an interpretive construct increasingly came to be treated as a primary lesion that could unify the metabolic abnormalities of T2DM. Yet the historical path by which the concept arose suggests caution. It was inferred from outcomes, generalized across tissues, and then institutionalized in textbooks and treatment paradigms before a unifying biological mechanism had been demonstrated. This history does not invalidate the concept, but it does mean that its causal authority should remain open to scrutiny [5, 6].

3. Definitional and Conceptual Problems

A central weakness of the insulin resistance paradigm lies in its imprecision. In common usage, insulin resistance can refer to reduced whole-body glucose disposal, impaired insulin-stimulated glucose transport, failure of insulin to suppress hepatic glucose production, or a broad syndrome inferred from surrogate indices. These are related but not identical phenomena. Because the term spans multiple levels of description, it can create an illusion of explanatory unity where none has been established [3, 4].

The problem is especially evident in causal reasoning. If elevated glucose and elevated insulin coexist, the relationship is commonly interpreted as evidence that tissues are not responding appropriately to insulin. However, this conclusion is not the only possible interpretation. Hyperglycemia resulting from reduced glucose utilization can arise from changes in substrate availability, intracellular fuel prioritization, storage capacity, hepatic overflow physiology, or adaptive endocrine responses. By treating all such possibilities as instances of insulin resistance, the paradigm risks collapsing distinct mechanisms into a single label [7].

The concept also suffers from circularity. Hyperglycemia leads to tests showing reduced glucose disposal relative to insulin; this pattern is labeled insulin resistance; insulin resistance is then invoked as the cause of hyperglycemia. Unless the underlying lesion is independently demonstrated, the explanation remains tautological. A descriptive index is effectively substituted for a mechanism. This is not a minor semantic concern. In medicine, labels shape therapeutic priorities, and if the causal model is misidentified, treatment strategies may be directed toward downstream manifestations rather than the primary physiological disturbance [4, 5].

From a conceptual standpoint, hyperglycemia may be viewed in a manner analogous to hypercholesterolemia, in that both are defined by elevated circulating biomarkers that may arise from multiple underlying causes. In the case of hypercholesterolemia, elevated lipid levels may reflect dietary factors, genetic conditions, or other metabolic disturbances, rather than a single unifying mechanism. Similarly, hyperglycemia may represent the net effect of diverse physiological processes, including altered substrate availability, storage limitations, and hormonal regulation. Such an approach has clear clinical utility but also underscores the importance of distinguishing descriptive constructs from primary biological mechanisms.

4. Major Biological Inconsistencies in the Paradigm

In addition to definitional and conceptual problems, several specific biological inconsistencies further challenge the internal coherence of the insulin resistance paradigm.

4.1. No unifying coordinating mechanism across tissues

The standard account requires that skeletal muscle, adipose tissue, and liver all develop some form of diminished insulin responsiveness. Yet these tissues are biologically distinct. They differ in transporter systems, intracellular signaling architecture, fuel priorities, and physiological roles. Despite decades of research, no established signal has been shown to orchestrate a coordinated, selective reduction in insulin responsiveness across all three tissues in a way that explains the core phenotype of T2DM [8].

This absence matters because the paradigm is not merely stating that abnormalities are present in several tissues; it is asserting a common causal process. If billions of cells across different organs are all said to become resistant, the burden is to identify a mechanism capable of inducing and reversing that state. Without such a mechanism, insulin resistance remains a descriptor attached to outcomes rather than a demonstrated biological program [8].

4.2. Selective preservation of other insulin functions

A further inconsistency is the selective nature of the supposed defect. In T2DM, glucose handling is said to be impaired, yet many other insulin-mediated actions remain operative. Protein synthesis continues. Lipogenic and other anabolic processes are not uniformly absent. Basic physiological functions such as maintenance of muscle tone and thermoregulation are preserved. If the primary defect were a generalized failure of insulin signaling, a broader collapse of insulin-mediated actions might be expected. Instead, the picture is one of selective disturbance, concentrated around glucose handling [9].

This selective preservation raises a critical question: why should insulin signaling fail specifically in ways that elevate blood glucose while remaining sufficiently functional for numerous other tasks? The paradigm offers descriptions of pathway complexity, but that is not the same as a unifying explanation. The more selective the impairment, the stronger the need to consider whether cells are reprioritizing fuel use under altered metabolic conditions rather than suffering a primary signaling defect [9].

4.3. Selective vulnerability of insulin versus other hormones

Insulin does not operate in isolation. Glucagon, catecholamines, cortisol, growth hormone, incretins, adipokines, and other signals all influence nutrient handling. Yet the dominant model posits a pathological resistance focused primarily on insulin. Other hormones in the same organism, acting on the same tissues and within the same inflammatory or nutrient milieu, are not typically described as becoming broadly ineffective in parallel. Glucagon continues to stimulate hepatic glucose production. Catecholamines retain lipolytic and cardiovascular effects. Cortisol and growth hormones continue to exert major physiological actions [10].

Table 1. Key Inconsistencies and Contradictions in the Insulin Resistance Paradigm

Inconsistency	Description	Implication
No unifying mechanism	No identified biological signal explains coordinated insulin resistance across muscle, liver, and adipose tissue	Suggests insulin resistance may be descriptive rather than causal
Selective insulin impairment	Glucose metabolism appears impaired while other insulin-mediated functions remain largely intact	Inconsistent with a global signaling defect
Hormonal selectivity	Other hormonal systems (e.g., glucagon, cortisol) remain functional under the same conditions	Challenges the concept of generalized endocrine resistance
Transporter differences	GLUT4 (muscle) and GLUT2 (liver) operate through distinct mechanisms	Complicates the notion of a uniform resistance mechanism
Rapid reversibility	Hyperglycemia improves quickly with caloric restriction	Suggests a dynamic metabolic process rather than fixed cellular defect
Obesity without diabetes	Many individuals with obesity remain metabolically normal	Indicates obesity alone is insufficient to cause T2D
Lean diabetes	Type 2 diabetes occurs in non-obese individuals	Points to factors beyond adiposity
Adipose storage variability	Differences in fat storage capacity influence metabolic outcomes	Supports the concept of a personal fat threshold
Measurement limitations	Insulin resistance is inferred from indirect indices (e.g., HOMA-IR)	Limits causal interpretation

If glucotoxicity, inflammation, or lipotoxicity were sufficient to generate a generalized state of hormonal resistance, a broader endocrine dysfunction might be expected. The selective targeting of insulin is therefore conceptually odd. Why would insulin alone be uniquely vulnerable while neighboring hormonal systems remain substantially intact? This asymmetry weakens the idea that T2DM is fundamentally a hormone resistance disorder and instead suggests that the apparent defect may reflect context-specific limitations on glucose utilization.

4.4. Transporter and tissue inconsistencies

The concept of insulin resistance is often spoken of as though it were uniform across tissues, yet the relevant transport biology differs markedly. Skeletal muscle glucose uptake is linked strongly to GLUT4, whereas hepatic glucose transport is mediated primarily by GLUT2, which is bidirectional and not directly governed by insulin in the same manner. Cardiac muscle also uses GLUT4 yet is not usually discussed in the same simple way as "insulin resistant" skeletal muscle. These discrepancies complicate the idea of a single receptor-level defect producing the same functional syndrome everywhere [11].

In the liver, for example, continued glucose release in the presence of insulin is often called hepatic insulin resistance. But because glucose transport there is structurally different, the mechanism cannot simply be the same as in muscle. Likewise, adipose tissue behavior reflects both storage capacity and ongoing lipolytic signaling, which again differs from muscle physiology. To gather these diverse phenomena under a single heading may be rhetorically convenient, but it risks mechanistic confusion [11].

These inconsistencies, summarized in Table 1, collectively challenge the internal coherence of the insulin resistance paradigm.

5. Clinical and Epidemiological Contradictions

Several clinical and epidemiological observations further challenge the explanatory adequacy of the insulin resistance paradigm.

5.1. Rapid reversibility of hyperglycemia

One of the most difficult observations for the insulin resistance model is the speed with which hyperglycemia can improve. Hypocaloric or very-low-calorie interventions can normalize fasting glucose and reduce hepatic glucose output within days to weeks, often before major changes in peripheral insulin sensitivity are evident. Such rapid improvement is easier to understand if the core disturbance is one of substrate overload, hepatic fat burden, or altered metabolic flux, all of which can change quickly when nutrient intake falls. It is harder to explain if the disease is driven primarily by a stable intrinsic defect in insulin signaling [12, 13].

This does not prove that signaling plays no role, but it suggests that at least some central drivers of hyperglycemia are dynamic, reversible, and closely linked to nutrient conditions. The clinical time course therefore argues against treating insulin resistance as the primary lesion [12, 13].

5.2. Obesity without diabetes and diabetes without obesity

Obesity undoubtedly correlates with diabetes risk, yet correlation is not sufficiency. A substantial fraction of individuals with obesity remain normoglycemic, while a meaningful subset of patients with T2DM are not obese by conventional BMI criteria. Prior material highlighted both metabolically healthy obesity and the increasing prevalence of diabetes in lean individuals, including populations with lower BMI thresholds and different body composition profiles [14, 15].

These findings challenge any simple model in which excess body mass directly causes insulin resistance, which in turn causes T2DM. They are more compatible with variation in fat storage capacity, ectopic fat handling, and substrate overflow. Under such a view, obesity is a risk marker but not the decisive causal variable. What matters is whether incoming nutrient load exceeds the individual's capacity to store, oxidize, or buffer it without disturbing glucose homeostasis [14, 15].

5.3. Diabetes with no intake of excess food, termed malnutrition-associated diabetes

Malnutrition in the womb and early childhood may limit the development of adipose tissue, reducing the number of fat cells available for lipid storage in adulthood. When energy intake later increases, this reduced storage capacity may be exceeded more rapidly, leading to earlier diversion of lipid substrates into the circulation and ectopic tissues. This concept, often described as limited adipose expandability or a "personal fat threshold," provides a potential explanation for the development of type 2 diabetes in individuals who are not overtly obese [16]. Once this storage capacity is approached or exceeded, increased fatty acid availability may promote substrate competition in muscle and liver, contributing to reduced glucose utilization despite preserved insulin signaling.

5.4. Evolutionary implausibility of the epidemic

The modern diabetes epidemic has unfolded over decades, not millennia. That temporal fact alone creates difficulty for explanations centered on the emergence of intrinsic cellular defects or a widespread biological tendency for humans to become insulin resistant. Prior text correctly emphasized that the dramatic rise in T2DM cannot plausibly reflect recent genetic evolution. Environmental and behavioral changes have occurred far too quickly relative to the pace of genome-wide adaptation [2, 17].

This point is more than rhetorical. If the disease has surged because of rapid changes in food environment, food processing, caloric density, and sustained nutrient excess, then the primary explanatory burden should fall on metabolic conditions created by that environment. A framework that begins with nutrient overload is therefore more historically and epidemiologically plausible than one that begins with spontaneous widespread hormone resistance [17].

6. Alternative Interpretation: Substrate Overload and Altered Metabolic Flux

A more coherent interpretation is that many features of T2DM arise from chronic substrate overload rather than a primary defect in insulin signaling. This framework does not deny that reduced glucose uptake can be measured. It argues instead that the reduction may reflect fuel competition, storage saturation, and overflow physiology. When fatty acids and their metabolites are abundant, tissues may preferentially oxidize fat, thereby suppressing glucose uptake and oxidation without requiring a defect in insulin receptors or downstream signaling pathways. A more detailed formulation of this substrate-based interpretation has been presented elsewhere [18].

Within this view, hepatic glucose overproduction under hyperinsulinemic conditions can be understood as a consequence of substrate handling and storage constraints rather than failed insulin signaling alone. The liver may increase glucose export when glycogen storage is saturated, lipogenic burden is high, and gluconeogenic substrates remain abundant. Because GLUT2 mediates bidirectional glucose equilibration, continued hepatic glucose release need not imply that insulin signaling has collapsed; it may instead reflect overflow metabolism [11, 19].

Fasting hyperglycemia can likewise be interpreted as a flux problem. Persistent fatty acid availability promotes gluconeogenesis and reduces glucose oxidation. Hyperinsulinemia becomes understandable as a physiological response to nutrient excess, attempting to drive storage and maintain glycemic control in an overloaded system. In this framework, what is commonly called compensatory hyperinsulinemia is not proof of a primary signaling defect but evidence that the organism is dealing with persistent substrate surplus [18, 20].

The same reinterpretation extends to beta-cell behavior. Relative reductions in insulin secretion may represent adaptive limitation rather than primary exhaustion, especially if prolonged hyperinsulinemia itself is metabolically costly. It also clarifies why therapies labeled insulin sensitizing may work even if they do not literally repair a molecular signaling lesion. If treatment reduces hepatic glucose output, lowers caloric intake, decreases ectopic lipid burden, or alters substrate availability, clinical benefit can follow without requiring restoration of a hypothetical primary defect in insulin action [20].

This alternative interpretation also makes sense of pharmacologic treatment. Exogenous insulin can lower blood glucose effectively, but in this framework it does so by overriding substrate-driven prioritization and forcing glucose into storage pathways. That helps control symptoms while potentially increasing weight and lipid storage. GLP-1 receptor agonists can also improve glycemia, not necessarily because they correct insulin resistance, but because they reduce appetite, caloric intake, and metabolic load. Their success is entirely compatible with a substrate-overload model [20, 21].

7. Implications for Research and Clinical Practice

If the primary disturbance in type 2 diabetes is one of chronic substrate overload rather than intrinsic failure of insulin signaling, then treatment objectives should require redefinition. Rather than focusing primarily on overcoming presumed tissue resistance to insulin, therapeutic strategies would be expected to emphasize reduction of metabolic load, restoration of appropriate substrate balance, and prevention of ectopic lipid accumulation. In this context, improvements in glycemic control may be interpreted as the result of relieving metabolic pressure on key tissues rather than correcting a primary cellular defect.

Beyond these clinical considerations, if insulin resistance is primarily descriptive rather than primary, several implications for research follow. These implications are presented as logical extensions of the metabolic flux hypothesis rather than definitive clinical protocols.Research should place greater emphasis on temporal ordering: which abnormalities appear first, under what nutritional conditions, and in which tissues. Measures of lipid flux, ectopic fat, hepatic burden, postprandial substrate handling, and individual storage capacity may prove more causally informative than global indices that collapse diverse processes into the single language of resistance [8, 18].

Clinically, this perspective places dietary intervention at the center of therapy, not as an adjunct to pharmacologic management but as a primary means of reducing substrate burden. Improvement in glycemia following caloric restriction or reduction in refined carbohydrate intake may therefore be understood as a direct consequence of reduced metabolic load rather than restoration of impaired insulin signaling. Pharmacologic therapies remain important when they are targeted to alter substrate availability or redistribute nutrient flux.

8. Conclusion

The insulin resistance paradigm has become the default explanation for T2DM, but its conceptual authority exceeds its demon-

strated mechanistic foundation. It lacks a unifying coordinating mechanism across tissues, struggles to explain selective preservation of insulin's other functions, cannot readily account for the absence of broad parallel hormone resistance, and sits uneasily with transporter biology, rapid reversibility of hyperglycemia, lean diabetes, metabolically healthy obesity, and the extraordinary speed of the modern diabetes epidemic.

These difficulties do not eliminate the usefulness of the term insulin resistance as a descriptive shorthand. They do, however, cast doubt on its status as the primary causal engine of T2DM. A framework based on chronic substrate overload, limited metabolic capacity, and altered fuel selection offers a more parsimonious and biologically coherent explanation of many observations now attributed to insulin resistance. Reassessing the dominant paradigm may therefore be necessary if progress in prevention and treatment is to match the scale of the disease [18, 19, 20].

The next step should be to test these competing interpretations directly. Rather than asking only whether glucose disposal is reduced relative to insulin concentration, future work should ask what proximal metabolic events precede that change, whether elevations in fatty acid flux and ectopic lipid burden occur first, and whether reduction of substrate overload improves glycemia before any measurable alteration in canonical insulin-sensitivity indices. A framework that can explain timing, reversibility, tissue heterogeneity, and population trends with fewer ad hoc assumptions deserves serious consideration. If the observed phenotype of T2DM can be better explained by chronic nutrient excess and substrate competition than by a primary defect in insulin action, then the biological fallacy may lie not in the data, but in the interpretation that has long been imposed upon them [18, 19, 20].

REFERENCES

[1] Parker ED, Lin J, Mahoney T, Ume N, Yang G, Gabbay RA, El-Sayed NA, Bannuru RR. Economic costs of diabetes in the U.S. in 2022. *Diabetes Care*. 2024;47(1):26-43. doi:10.2337/dci23-0085.

[2] International Diabetes Federation. *IDF Diabetes Atlas*. 11th ed. Brussels: International Diabetes Federation; 2024.

[3] Galicia-Garcia U, Benito-Villalvilla C, Jebari S, Larrea-Sebal A, Siddiqi H, Uribe KB, et al. Pathophysiology of type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Int J Mol Sci*. 2020;21(17):6275. doi:10.3390/ijms21176275.

[4] Matthews DR, Hosker JP, Rudenski AS, Naylor BA, Treacher DF, Turner RC. Homeostasis model assessment: insulin resistance and beta-cell function from fasting plasma glucose and insulin concentrations in man. *Diabetologia*. 1985;28(7):412-419. doi:10.1007/BF00280883.

[5] DeFronzo RA, Tobin JD, Andres R. Glucose clamp technique: a method for quantifying insulin secretion and resistance. *Am J Physiol*. 1979;237(3):E214-E223. doi:10.1152/ajpendo.1979.237.3.E214.

[6] Reaven GM. Banting lecture 1988. Role of insulin resistance in human disease. *Diabetes*. 1988;37(12):1595-1607. doi:10.2337/diab.37.12.1595.

[7] Randle PJ, Garland PB, Hales CN, Newsholme EA. The glucose fatty-acid cycle. Its role in insulin sensitivity and the metabolic disturbances of diabetes mellitus. *Lancet*. 1963;281(7285):785-789. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(63)91500-9.

[8] Shulman GI. Ectopic fat in insulin resistance, dyslipidemia, and cardiometabolic disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;371(12):1131-1141. doi:10.1056/NEJMra1011035.

[9] Petersen MC, Shulman GI. Mechanisms of insulin action and insulin resistance. *Physiol Rev*. 2018;98(4):2133-2223. doi:10.1152/physrev.00063.2017.

[10] DeFronzo RA. From the triumvirate to the ominous octet: a new paradigm for the treatment of type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes*. 2009;58(4):773-795. doi:10.2337/db09-9028.

[11] Thorens B. GLUT2, glucose sensing and glucose homeostasis. *Diabetologia*. 2015;58(2):221-232. doi:10.1007/s00125-014-3451-1.

[12] Lim EL, Hollingsworth KG, Aribisala BS, Chen MJ, Mathers JC, Taylor R. Reversal of type 2 diabetes: normalisation of beta cell function in association with decreased pancreas and liver triacylglycerol. *Diabetologia*. 2011;54(10):2506-2514. doi:10.1007/s00125-011-2204-7.

[13] Taylor R. Type 2 diabetes: etiology and reversibility. *Diabetes Care*. 2013;36(4):1047-1055. doi:10.2337/dc12-1805.

[14] Eckel RH, Kahn R, Ferrannini E, Goldfine AB, Nathan DM, Schwartz MW, et al. Obesity and type 2 diabetes: what can be unified and what needs to be individualized? *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2011;96(6):1654-1663. doi:10.1210/jc.2010-2235.

[15] Kim JM, Kim HJ, et al. Rising prevalence of lean type 2 diabetes and comparison with overweight or obese type 2 diabetes. *BMC Public Health*. 2024;24.

[16] Taylor R. Pathogenesis of type 2 diabetes: tracing the reverse route from cure to cause. *Diabetologia*. 2008;51(10):1781-1789. doi:10.1007/s00125-008-1116-7.

[17] Polonsky KS. The past 200 years in diabetes. *N Engl J Med*. 2012;367(14):1332-1340. doi:10.1056/NEJMra1110560.

[18] Poothullil J. A substrate-competition hypothesis for type 2 diabetes driven by nutrient excess rather than a primary insulin-signaling defect. *Med Hypotheses*. 2026;209. doi:10.1016/j.mehy.2026.111XXX.

[19] Petersen KF, Dufour S, Befroy D, Lehrke M, et al. Reversal of nonalcoholic hepatic steatosis, hepatic insulin resistance, and hyperglycemia by moderate weight reduction in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes*. 2005;54(3):603-608. doi:10.2337/diabetes.54.3.603.

[20] Corkey BE. Banting lecture 2011: hyperinsulinemia: cause or consequence? *Diabetes*. 2012;61(1):4-13. doi:10.2337/db11-1483.

[21] Drucker DJ. Mechanisms of action and therapeutic application of glucagon-like peptide-1. *Cell Metab*. 2018;27(4):740-756. doi:10.1016/j.cmet.2018.03.001.