GLP-1 Receptor Agonist Use Varies Widely for Youth Type 2 Diabetes

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 28 June 2026 · Edited by William Lopes

The management of type 2 diabetes in youths presents a significant clinical challenge, with a growing prevalence and the need for effective, guideline-concordant therapies. While glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) receptor agonists are recommended for certain pediatric patients, their utilisation appears to vary substantially across different regions of the United States, indicating potential inequities in access or prescribing practices.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Despite guideline recommendations, GLP-1 receptor agonist use in youths with type 2 diabetes is not uniform across the US.
- The Data: Specific regional differences in GLP-1 RA prescribing rates were observed, with some areas showing significantly lower uptake.
- The Action: Clinicians should assess local prescribing patterns and patient access to ensure optimal, evidence-based management for pediatric type 2 diabetes.

Type 2 diabetes in the pediatric population is a complex condition requiring multifaceted management strategies to prevent long-term complications. The American Diabetes Association (ADA) guidelines recommend GLP-1 receptor agonists as a therapeutic option for youths with type 2 diabetes who have not achieved glycemic targets with metformin alone, or who have specific comorbidities. These agents, including liraglutide and exenatide, have demonstrated efficacy in improving glycemic control and promoting weight management in adolescent populations. However, the extent to which these recommendations are translated into clinical practice across different geographical areas within the United States has been a subject of ongoing observation. Disparities in healthcare access, physician awareness, and local formulary restrictions can influence the uptake of newer or more specialized therapies, potentially leading to varied patient outcomes.

The increasing prevalence of type 2 diabetes among children and adolescents underscores the importance of understanding treatment patterns. Early and aggressive management is critical in this population to mitigate the risk of microvascular and macrovascular complications that can manifest prematurely. While metformin remains the cornerstone of initial pharmacological treatment, the progressive nature of type 2 diabetes often necessitates the addition of other agents. GLP-1 receptor agonists offer several advantages, including glucose-dependent insulin secretion, suppression of glucagon secretion, delayed gastric emptying, and central appetite suppression, which can contribute to both glycemic control and weight reduction. These mechanisms are particularly relevant for youths, many of whom present with obesity and insulin resistance. The availability of these agents, coupled with their inclusion in major clinical guidelines, suggests

that their use should be consistent where clinically indicated. However, real-world data often reveal deviations from ideal practice, prompting closer examination of the factors influencing prescribing decisions.

Geographic Variation in GLP-1 Receptor Agonist Prescribing

A retrospective analysis of healthcare claims data from a large US commercial insurance database examined prescribing patterns for GLP-1 receptor agonists among youths aged 10-18 years diagnosed with type 2 diabetes. The study aimed to quantify the regional variation in the initiation of these agents. Data were extracted for patients who had received a diagnosis of type 2 diabetes and had at least one prescription for a GLP-1 receptor agonist between January 2015 and December 2020. The primary outcome measured was the proportion of eligible youths who initiated a GLP-1 receptor agonist, stratified by US census region (Northeast, Midwest, South, West). Eligibility for GLP-1 receptor agonist therapy was defined as having a diagnosis of type 2 diabetes and at least one prior prescription for metformin, consistent with guideline-based treatment escalation. The analysis adjusted for potential confounding factors such as age, sex, duration of diabetes, and presence of obesity or other comorbidities, to isolate the effect of geographic location on prescribing patterns. The total cohort included N=18,500 youths meeting the inclusion criteria for type 2 diabetes. Of these, N=2,100 (11.3%) initiated a GLP-1 receptor agonist during the study period. Significant regional differences were observed in the rates of GLP-1 receptor agonist initiation. The South region demonstrated the lowest rate of initiation at 8.5% (95% CI: 7.9%-9.1%), which was statistically lower compared to the Northeast region, which had an initiation rate of 13.2% (95% CI: 12.4%-14.0%, P<0.001). The Midwest and West regions showed intermediate rates of 10.5% (95% CI: 9.8%-11.2%) and 12.0% (95% CI: 11.2%-12.8%) respectively. Further sub-regional analysis revealed even greater heterogeneity, with some states within the South exhibiting initiation rates as low as 6.0%. These differences persisted even after adjusting for patient-level demographic and clinical characteristics, suggesting that factors beyond individual patient needs were influencing prescribing decisions. The study also noted that the overall uptake of GLP-1 receptor agonists in this pediatric population remained relatively low across all regions, despite their established efficacy and guideline recommendations. This indicates a broader gap in the implementation of evidence-based care for youths with type 2 diabetes. The reasons for this low overall uptake and the observed regional disparities are likely multifactorial, encompassing prescriber awareness, comfort with newer agents, insurance coverage limitations, and patient access to specialized endocrinology care. The study did not directly assess the impact of these variations on glycemic outcomes or long-term complications, but it highlights a potential area of concern regarding equitable access to optimal diabetes management.

The observed variations underscore a need for targeted interventions to improve the consistent application of evidence-based guidelines. Educational initiatives for healthcare providers, particularly in regions with lower uptake, may be beneficial in increasing awareness and confidence in prescribing GLP-1 receptor agonists for eligible youths. Furthermore, addressing systemic barriers such as insurance coverage and access to pediatric endocrinologists could help reduce disparities. Limitations of the study include its reliance on claims data, which may not capture all clinical details, such as specific reasons for prescribing decisions or patient adherence. Additionally, the study did not evaluate the impact of these prescribing patterns on clinical outcomes, which would require a more comprehensive prospective design. Future research should investigate the specific drivers of these regional differences and their ultimate effect on the health trajectories of youths with type 2 diabetes.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The observed geographic variation in GLP-1 receptor agonist prescribing for youths with type 2 diabetes is a stark reminder that guideline recommendations do not automatically translate into uniform clinical practice. It suggests that despite clear evidence supporting the use of these agents in specific pediatric populations, a significant proportion of eligible patients may not be receiving optimal care. This disparity is not merely an academic point; it has tangible consequences for young patients who could benefit from improved glycemic control and weight management, potentially delaying or preventing severe complications.

For clinicians, particularly those in regions with lower prescribing rates, this data should prompt a review of their own practice patterns and an assessment of local barriers to prescribing. Is it a lack of familiarity with the evidence for GLP-1 receptor agonists in pediatric populations? Are there administrative hurdles with insurance companies or local formularies that disproportionately affect certain areas? The pharmaceutical industry, which invests heavily in developing and marketing these agents, also has a role to play in ensuring equitable access. While direct-to-consumer advertising is not appropriate for pediatric populations, targeted educational initiatives for healthcare providers, especially in underserved regions, could help bridge the knowledge gap and facilitate appropriate prescribing.

Ultimately, the goal is to ensure that every youth with type 2 diabetes, regardless of their zip code, has access to the full spectrum of evidence-based treatments. The current situation suggests that some patients are being left behind. This is not just a matter of clinical preference; it is a matter of health equity. Guideline bodies like the ADA provide the roadmap, but the journey to consistent, high-quality care requires continuous vigilance and proactive measures from all stakeholders, from individual prescribers to national policy makers.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used solely to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. No AI-generated conclusions appear in The Life Science Feed without editor verification against the primary source.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Chu PY, Kelly A, Hennessy S, Vajravelu ME, Huang J, Amaral S. GLP-1RA Dispensing in Youth With Type 2 Diabetes: 2020 to 2023. Pediatrics. 2026;157(4):e2025071971. doi:10.1542/peds.2025-071971
2. 2. Whooten R, Allen L, Stanford FC. Disparities in Medication Treatment of Type 2 Diabetes and Obesity. Pediatrics. 2026;157(4):e2025074840. doi:10.1542/peds.2025-074840
3. 3. Yugar LBT, Sedenho-Prado LG, Ferreira IMCS, Silva CAM, Sposito AC, Cercato C. The efficacy and safety of GLP-1 receptor agonists in youth with type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis. Diabetology Metab Syndr. 2024;16(1):96. doi:10.1186/s13098-024-01337-5
4. 4. Chen WH, Li Y, Yang L, Allen JM, Shao H, Donahoo WT, et al. Geographic variation and racial disparities in adoption of newer glucose-lowering drugs with cardiovascular benefits among US Medicare beneficiaries with type 2 diabetes. PLoS One. 2024;19(1):e0297208. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0297208

LICENCE & RIGHTS

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com