A mathematical model reveals sex-specific changes in glucose and insulin tolerance during rat puberty and maturation

**Aim** To evaluate the effects of maturation and sex on glucose metabolism during glucose tolerance (GTT) and insulin tolerance tests (ITT) in young and adult male and female rats by using two different approaches – the conventional, which uses area under the curve and glucose curve, and mathematical modeling that identifies parameters necessary for determining the function that models glucose metabolism.

**Methods** Male and female rats at 3.5 and 12 months of age underwent standard GTT and ITT after overnight fasting. The parameters were identified by using Mathematica-module NonlinearModelFit for experimentally obtained data.

**Results** When data were statistically analyzed, both sexes and age groups had similar glucose and insulin tolerance. In the mathematical model of GTT, parameters describing the rate of glucose concentration increase $G'(0)$ and decrease $G_I$ multiplied with maturation, with a concomitant decrease in the time point ($t_{max}$, $t_{I}$) of reaching maximum and minimum glucose concentration ($G_{max}$, $G_0$). The mathematical model of ITT for males was independent of age, unlike of that for females, which had increased $G'(0)$ and $G_I$, and more quickly recovered from hypoglycemia after maturation.

**Conclusion** The mathematical model revealed female susceptibility to large glucose excursions, which are better reflected by ITT in young animals and by GTT in adults.
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Glucose tolerance test (GTT) and insulin tolerance test (ITT) are common experimental and clinical biochemical tests based on (plasma/serum/whole blood) glucose monitoring during two up to four hours from the base point (1,2). GTT assesses the body’s ability to maintain normoglycemia after glucose load. The obtained glucose profile is the result of the action of multiple hormones that have similar (insulin/leptin), opposite (insulin/glucagon), or mutually modulating (insulin/incretins) effects (3,4). ITT assesses the stress response to insulin bolus. A steep drop in insulin-induced hypoglycemia excites the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis, finally leading to the secretion of two hormones – adrenaline and cortisol (corticosterone in rodents) – which oppose insulin action and re-establish normoglycemia (5,6). Glucose homeostasis depends on insulin release from β-cells of Langerhans islets of the pancreas and the sensitivity of the target tissues to insulin (ie, glucose storage and expenditure by the target tissues). The relationship between these two factors determines the total physiological tolerance of an individual to glucose and the individual’s ability to maintain glucose homeostasis. GTT reflects glucose sensitivity and can be performed by various methods – quantifying the insulin release from β-cells as a response to plasma glucose concentration, determining the target tissues’ sensitivity to insulin, and determining glucose tolerance, which is informative of both – insulin release from β-cells and target tissues sensitivity to insulin (1,7,8). On the other hand, ITT reflects insulin sensitivity, primarily in the liver and skeletal muscles (3,9). In clinical setting, fasting blood glucose (FPG) and 2-h plasma glucose (2-h PG) during 75 g oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT) are used to diagnose prediabetes (FPG 5.6-6.9 mmol/L, 2-h PG 7.8-11.0 mmol/L) and diabetes (FPG≥7 mmol/L, 2-h PG≥11.1 mmol/L) (10). However, FPG and final point of OGTT often miss patients with impaired glucose tolerance (IGT) and impaired fasting glucose (IFG), two intermediate states leading toward adult-onset diabetes or type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM). Since there are more than eight identified molecular mechanisms contributing to postprandial hyperglycemia and more than 143 common genetic variants associated with T2DM, IGT and IFG only crudely represent the heterogeneous glycemic response and its impairment (11,12). More prediabetic subphenotypes are expected to be classified by a closer analysis of glucose peaks (connected with cardiovascular risk) and overall glycemic variability. ITT is less frequently performed for clinical purposes because there is a risk of adverse effects (sweating, palpitations, epilepsy, cardiac ischemic event, etc) and the outcome cannot be interpreted unless hypoglycemia below 2.2 mmol/L is achieved (13). Nevertheless, the test is considered the gold standard for diagnosing hypopituitarism and Cushing’s syndrome (14). ITT is more often performed on experimental animals to test their ability to maintain metabolic balance under stressful conditions (15,16). Together, GTT and ITT reflect a number of molecular mechanisms responsible for normoglycemia – the prerequisite for the function of all organs, especially the brain.

While maturation is the sharpening of biological response, aging is a decay characteristic for biological entities, described as gradual degeneration rather than sudden collapse (17). Progressive degeneration of molecular mechanisms maintaining normoglycemia is reflected in glucose profile and easily accessible by GTT and ITT (18). The identification of the currently missing mathematical parameters describing the dynamics of glycemic profile in both tests can indicate subtle changes, point out impaired molecular mechanisms, and lead toward personalized therapy.

The hypothesis of this study is that the interpretation of GTT and ITT test by classical calculation and statistics at the level of area under the curve (AUC) cannot detect metabolic differences between young and adult or male and female rats, whereas newly identified parameters describing the mathematical equation that had been fitted to experimental data pinpoint and quantify the differences between studied groups. The first aim of this study was to analyze the acquired data from GTT and ITT using mathematical modeling in order to reveal the details of glucose dynamics. The second aim of the study was to evaluate the influence of maturation and sex on glucose metabolism.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study, conducted from May to December 2016, used Sprague Dawley-CR rats (Charles River, Sulzfeld, Germany). In total, 40 animals were used: 10 young males and females, 3.5 months old, and 10 adult males and females, 12 months old (Figure 1). The experiment on young animals was performed at the Faculty of Medicine, J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek, Croatia and the experiment on adult animals was performed at the University of Szeged, Hungary. Both parts of the study were executed with the same equipment and chemicals. The study was approved by the Croatian Ministry of Agriculture (2158-61-07-14-118) and National Scientific Ethics Committee on Animal Experimentation of Hungary (IFV/3796-7/2015). The rats were kept in self-ventilating cages with housing temperature between 21°C and 24°C, five air
changes per minute, and constant humidity of 40%-60% (THF3364, Ehret, Freiburg, Germany). There were maximum three young animals per cage and at least two adult rats per cage. Standardized food for experimental rats (4RF21, Mucedola, Milan, Italy) and tap water were available ad libitum except 12-14 hours before GTT and 3 hours before insulin ITT. Day cycle was set to 7.00 AM-7.00 PM.

**Glucose and insulin tolerance tests**

Peritoneal GTT was performed in all animals after 12-14 hours of fasting by injecting 2 g of glucose/kg of body mass in the peritoneum. Glucose (Merck, Branchburg, NJ, USA) was dissolved in distilled water as a 25% working solution. Animals were heated with infrared lamp (R95E, Philips, Amsterdam, the Netherlands) for easier blood sampling from the lateral tail vein. Glucose was measured at 8 time points for GTT and ITT.

GTT was carried out as follows:

1. Rats fasted for 12-14 hours.
2. Basal glucose concentration was measured by tail puncture.
3. Glucose was injected intraperitoneally.
4. Fifteen minutes after glucose injection the second measurement of glucose concentration was performed.
5. The measurement of glucose concentration was continued after 30, 45, 60, 90, 120, and 240 minutes from glucose application.
6. At the end of the test, the animals were given food.

Peritoneal ITT was performed after 3 hours of fasting by injecting 0.75 U/kg of insulin Humalog (Lilly, Indianapolis, IN, USA) in the peritoneum. Animals were heated with infrared light for easier blood sampling from the tail vein. Glucose was measured at 8 time points: 0, 15, 30, 45, 60, 90, 120, and 180 minutes.

ITT was carried out as follows:

1. Rats fasted for 3 hours.
2. Basal glucose concentration was measured by tail puncture.
3. Insulin was injected intraperitoneally.
4. Fifteen minutes after glucose injection the second measurement of glucose concentration was performed.
5. The measurement of glucose concentration was continued after 30, 45, 60, 90, 120, and 180 minutes from insulin application.
6. At the end of the test, the animals were given food.

In both tests, the glucose concentration from a drop of blood (approximately 50 μL of blood per animal) was measured by the OneTouch Ultra Mini glucometer (Life Scan, Milpitas, CA, USA) as follows:

1. The animal was put in an appropriate plastic cylinder holder, and the tail was heated with an infrared lamp.
2. The tail was wiped with ethanol.

3. An appropriate needle was injected under the skin and into the lateral tail vein to obtain a drop of blood for measurement; aspiration was not performed due to possible vein collapse.

4. A drop of blood was applied to the glucose strip, inserted into the glucometer, and glucose concentration was read as mmol/L.

**Statistical analysis**

AUCs were calculated and compared by using Statistica 12 software (Tibco, Palo Alto, CA, SAD). Normality of distribution was tested by Shapiro-Wilk test. Mann-Whitney test with Bonferroni correction was applied to determine the significance of differences between AUCs of different animal groups. The level of significance was set to <0.05.

**Development of mathematical model for glucose and insulin tolerance tests**

The mathematical model was developed based on the following logic: let us consider the concentration of glucose $G$ in blood and the net normal hormonal concentration $H$ as a cumulative effect of all relevant hormones (for example, insulin and leptin decrease $G$, while cortisol and growth hormone increase $G$). A basic model can be written according to (19,20):

$$
\frac{\partial g}{\partial t} = F1(G,H) + J(t)
$$

$$
\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = F2(G,H)
$$

The function $J$ is the external rate at which the blood glucose concentration is increased due to adsorption rate. We assume that the quantities $G$ and $H$ attain optimal values $G_0$ and $H_0$ at the point when the patient arrives to hospital on an empty stomach. By using the substitution $g = G - G_0$ and $h = H - H_0$ and Taylor’s theorem, we obtain a system of linear differential equations for the functions $g$ and $h$:

$$
\frac{\partial g}{\partial t} = -m_1 g - m_2 h + J(t)
$$

$$
\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = -m_3 h - m_4 g
$$

where $m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4$ are positive constants. It can be shown that the functions $g$ and $h$ satisfy linear differential equation of the second order with constant coefficients:

$$
y'' + 2ay' + aw^2 y = K, \quad a, w^2 > 0,
$$

where $K = w^2 G_0$ for the function $g$ and $K = w^2 H_0$ for the function $h$. If experimental data $(t_i, y_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$ are known, where $t_i$ is the time point of measuring glucose $G$ concentration, we can estimate the parameters in the above stated model by solving the corresponding parameter identification problem (21-24). For solving this problem we used Mathematica-module NonlinearModelFit [] (25).

In this way we obtained a good approximation of parameters $a, w^2$ and $G_0$ in the differential equation and optimal initial condition $y = y(0)$ and $v = v'(0)$ in the corresponding Cauchy’s problem. In the case of glucose concentration, by knowing the parameters $a, w^2$ and $G_0$, in the differential equation and optimal initial condition $y(0)$ and $G'(0)$, we can write the required function $G$ as the solution to the corresponding Cauchy’s problem, whereas the crucial role belongs to the corresponding characteristic equation:

$$
r^2 + 2ar + w^2 = 0, \quad r \in \mathbb{C}.
$$

If $a^2 > w_0^2$, then the roots $r_1, r_2$ of the characteristic equation are negative and mutually different real numbers, and the solution of the Cauchy’s problem for the differential equation is obtained in the form $G(t) = G_0 + C_1 e^{r_1 t} + C_2 e^{r_2 t}$, $C_1, C_2, r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. If $a^2 < w_0^2$, the roots $r_1, r_2$ of the characteristic equation are conjugate complex numbers:

$$
r_1 = -a - iw, r_2 = -a + iw, w = \sqrt{w^2 - a^2} > 0,
$$

and the solution of the Cauchy’s problem for the differential equation is obtained in the form:

$$
G(t) = G_0 + e^{-at}(C_1 \cos(wt) + C_2 \sin(wt)), C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{R},
$$

or in the form:

$$
G(t; \alpha, \omega, \delta) = G_0 + Ae^{-at} \cos(\omega t - \delta), \alpha, \omega, \delta \in \mathbb{R}.
$$

The workflow of determining the function $G$ is depicted in Figure 2. The characteristics of this function are initial glucose concentration $G(0)$, initial rate of glucose absorption $G'(0)$, maximum glucose concentration $G_{max}$ which is achieved at the moment $t_{max}$, maximum speed of glucose concentration decrease $G''$, (a negative number because it represents the decrease of concentration), the moment $t_i$ (inflexion) in which the maximum speed of glucose concentration decrease is obtained, stabilized glucose concentration $G_0 = \lim G(t)$, AUC, and estimated variance ($Es$-
The same applies both to changes in blood glucose concentration under the influence of glucose load (GTT) or insulin bolus (ITT).

To evaluate the overall difference between real data and the values predicted by the mathematical model we calculated residual sum of squares and $R^2$ (determination coefficient).

RESULTS

Classical analysis: young and adult rats of both sexes are similarly exposed to hyperglycemia during GTT or hypoglycemia during ITT test.

GTT data were analyzed by classical comparison of AUCs (Figure 3A and B). In males, AUC decreased after maturation (Figure 3A). Unlike young males, adult males reached maximum glucose concentration very fast and returned to normal glucose concentration range after 45 minutes (Figure 3B). In females, AUC increased after maturation (Figure 3C). However, in young females the glucose curve was biphasic (Figure 3D) – it reached the first glucose concentration peak after 15 minutes and the second peak after 60 minutes of the test. In adult females the glucose curve was not biphasic, and it reached maximum glucose concentration after 15 minutes. Because the differences between young and adult animals of both sexes were not significant, we concluded that glucose tolerance during maturation remained similar.

AUCs for ITT were the same in young and adult males (Figure 4A). Young males reached the minimum glucose concentration later (after 45 minutes) than adult males, who reached the minimum glucose concentration after 30 minutes of the test (Figure 4B). Both male animal groups returned to glucose concentration slightly above 5 mmol/L after 180 minutes of the test, which is a sign of normoglycemia (defined as glucose concentration between 4.2 and 5.5 mmol/L). Adult females had higher AUC than young females (Figure 4C). Young females became hypoglycemic after 60 minutes and maintained

---

**FIGURE 2.** Workflow diagram for determining the function modeling blood glucose.
such low glucose concentration until 120 minutes of the test (Figure 4D) and did not become normoglycemic even after 180 minutes of the test. Conversely, adult females reached hypoglycemic glucose concentration after 60 minutes and returned to normoglycemia between 90 and 120 minutes of the test. The statistical analysis of AUCs for both GTT and ITT revealed no significant differences inside same sex groups or between the two age groups. Because observed differences between young and adult animals of both sexes were not significant, we concluded that insulin sensitivity during maturation also remained similar.

Mathematical model: glucose dynamics is age and sex specific

When mathematical modeling was applied to the same GTT data, the rate of glucose increase, $G'(0)$, was almost four times lower in young males than in adult males (Figure 5A and C). $G_{\text{max}}$ was 13% higher in adult males than in young males, while the rate of glucose decrease, $G'$, was six times lower in young than in adult males. The maximum rate of glucose decrease to normoglycemia, $t_\text{I}$, was reached sooner in adult (after 23.1 minutes) than in young males (after 82.0 minutes). Stabilized glucose concentration, $G_0$, in males increased upon maturation.

The same findings were observed in just 3 out of 10 females that fit in the mathematical model: $G'(0)$ was six times, while $G'$, was ten times lower in young compared with adult females (Figure 5B and C). Surprisingly, adult females had almost twice as high $G_{\text{max}}$ than young females. In adults, $t_\text{I}$ was reached sooner (after 19.6 minutes) than in young females (after 44.3 minutes). $G_0$ in females was also increased upon maturation.

Between sexes, $G'(0)$ was 1.5 times higher in young females than in young males and 2.5 times higher in adult females than in adult males. $G_{\text{max}}$ was 2.4 times higher in young males than in young females and 1.5 times higher in adult males than in adult females. The maximum rate of glucose decrease to normoglycemia, $t_\text{I}$, was almost double in young males (after 82 minutes) than in young females (after 44.3 minutes) and 1.2 times higher in adult males (after 82 minutes) than in adult females (after 44.3 minutes).

FIGURE 3. Glucose tolerance test (GTT) in young and adult male and female Sprague Dawley rats. (A) Areas under the glucose curve (AUCs) of young and adult males. (B) Glucose curve of young and adult males. (C) AUCs of young and adult females. (D) Glucose curve of young and adult females. Glucose curves and AUCs were constructed using trapezoidal rule based on experimental data. Mann-Whitney test with Bonferroni correction was applied for determination of significant differences between AUCs of different animal groups, $p$ value was set to <0.05. No significant differences were determined.
ter 23.1 minutes) than in adult females (after 19.6 minutes). Generally, the rate of glucose increase was lower in males than in females, contrary to the rate of glucose decrease. Stabilized glucose concentration, $G_0$, was seven times higher in young males than in young females, while the same trend was not observed in adult animals. AUCs predicted by modeling were very similar in both young and adult males and females. The described peculiarities of GTT mathematical modeling were missed by classical AUC and glucose curve. Residual sum of squares in the case of GTT was lowest in males (Figure 5), while $R^2$ was over 90% for all the groups (data not shown).

In the case of ITT modeling, the function of young males was very similar to that of adult males (Figure 6A and C). In males, differences were observed only in $t_I$, which was 16.5% lower in adult than in young males, while the rest of the parameters were almost the same. $G'(0)$ was seven times higher in adult females than in young females (Figure 6B and C). The rate of increase to normoglycemia, $G'_I$, was 1.7 times higher in adult females, therefore $t_I$ was reached sooner in adult (after 91.5 minutes) than in young females (after 135.7 minutes). Stabilized glucose concentration, $G_0$, decreased 1.7 times in young females.

Between sexes, $G'(0)$ was almost five times higher in young males compared with young females, while in adult animals no dramatical differences were observed. Young females developed life-threatening hypoglycemia ($G_{min}$), while both age groups of males stayed above the level of hypoglycemia. $G'_I$ was 1.4 times higher in young females compared with young males and 1.7 higher in adult females compared with adult males. The $t_I$ was reached faster in young males (after 122.6 minutes) than in young females (after 135.7 minutes), while the opposite was observed for adult females (after 91.5 minutes) and males (after 102.4 minutes). $G_0$ was decreased in young females compared with young males, while adult males and females had a similar value of $G_0$. AUCs predicted by modeling were very similar in all animal groups except in young females, which had the lowest AUC value. As in GTT modeling, the described peculiarities of mathematical modeling were not observed when ITT results were subjected to classical analysis. Residual sum of squares in the case of ITT was lower in males (Figure 5).

**Figure 4.** Insulin tolerance test (ITT) in young and adult male and female Sprague Dawley rats. (A) Areas under the glucose curve (AUCs) of young and adult males. (B) Glucose curve of young and adult males. (C) AUCs of young and adult females. (D) Glucose curve of young and adult females. Glucose curves and AUCs were constructed using trapezoidal rule based on experimental data. Mann-Whitney test with Bonferroni correction was applied for determination of significant differences between AUCs of different animal groups, $p$ value was set to <0.05. No significant differences were determined.
FIGURE 5. Mathematical model of glucose tolerance test (GTT) in young and adult male (A) and female (B) Sprague Dawley rats. (C) The properties identified by the mathematical model: $AUC = $ area under the curve, $EstVar = $ estimated variance, $G(0) = $ fasting glucose, $G'(0) = $ initial rate of glucose concentration increase, $G_0 = $ stabilized glucose concentration, $G'' = $ maximum rate of glucose concentration decrease, $G_{max} = $ maximum concentration of glucose, $T_G(h) = $ basic period of function $G$, $t_I = $ time point in which $G''$ was reached, $t_{max} = $ time point in which $G_{max}$ was reached. Residual sum of squares (RSS) was calculated to evaluate the quality of mathematical modeling, and data are shown in the table. The most discriminatory mathematical parameters between animal groups are shaded in gray.

|                | RSS | $T_I(h)$ | $G(0)$ | $G'(0)$ | $G_{max}$ | $t_{max}(h)$ | $G'$ | $t_I(h)$ | $G_{max}$ | $AUC$ | $EstVar$ |
|----------------|-----|---------|--------|---------|-----------|--------------|-----|---------|-----------|-------|----------|
| Young males    | 3.02| 5.5     | 44.5   | 16.9    | 0.7       | -5.5         | 1.2 | 5.0     | 43.5      | 6.2   |
| Adult males    | 1.19| 2       | 4.8    | 17.1    | 0.2       | -30.5        | 0.4 | 7.2     | 34.0      | 1.8   |
| Young females  | 6.12| -       | 6.0    | 66.1    | 0.4       | -2.3         | 0.7 | 0.7     | 41.1      | 12.4  |
| Adult females  | 7.58| 4.6     | 423.6  | 25.0    | 0.2       | -20.2        | 0.3 | 7.1     | 44.1      | 16.5  |

FIGURE 6. Mathematical model of insulin tolerance test (ITT) in young and adult male (A) and female (B) Sprague Dawley rats. (C) Properties identified by the mathematical model: $AUC = $ area under the curve, $EstVar = $ estimated variance, $G(0) = $ fasting glucose, $G'(0) = $ initial rate of glucose concentration decrease, $G_0 = $ stabilized glucose concentration, $G'' = $ maximum rate of glucose concentration increase, $G_{min} = $ minimum concentration of glucose, $T_G(h) = $ basic period of function $G$, $t_I = $ time point in which $G''$ was reached, $t_{min} = $ time point in which $G_{min}$ was reached. Residual sum of squares (RSS) was calculated to evaluate the quality of mathematical modeling, and data are shown in the table. The most discriminatory mathematical parameters between animal groups are shaded in gray.

|                | RSS | $T'_I(h)$ | $G(0)$ | $G'(0)$ | $G_{min}$ | $t_{min}(h)$ | $G'$ | $t_I(h)$ | $G_{min}$ | $AUC$ | $EstVar$ |
|----------------|-----|-----------|--------|---------|-----------|--------------|-----|---------|-----------|-------|----------|
| Young males    | 0.22| 5.2       | 6.3    | -6.1    | 3.1       | 1.1          | 1.6 | 2       | 5.2       | 18.0  | 0.8      |
| Adult males    | 0.43| 5.7       | 5.3    | -6.0    | 3.0       | 0.9          | 1.5 | 1.7     | 5.2       | 17.7  | 1.2      |
| Young females  | 1.53| 3.3       | 7.0    | -1.3    | 1.4       | 1.6          | 2.3 | 2.3     | 3.1       | 13.4  | 1.7      |
| Adult females  | 2.35| 3.2       | 6.2    | -7.6    | 2.6       | 0.8          | 4.0 | 1.5     | 5.3       | 19.6  | 1.3      |
was lowest in males (Figure 6), while $R^2$ ranged from 86%-99% for all animal groups (data not shown).

**DISCUSSION**

Using mathematical modeling, we generated new parameters that described GTT and ITT results in greater detail than the AUC approach. The following mathematical parameters were more discriminatory: $G^0(0)$ – the initial rate of glucose concentration increase (for GTT) or decrease (for ITT), $G_{\text{max}}$ – maximum glucose concentration for GTT, $G_{\text{min}}$ – minimum glucose concentration for ITT, $t$ – the time point when $G^0(0)$ was reached, $t_{\text{min}}$ – the time point when $G_{\text{min}}$ was reached, and $t_{\text{max}}$ – the time point when $G_{\text{max}}$ was reached in ITT. Residual sum of squares and $R^2$ revealed whether modeled curve fitted real data – residual sum of squares was not ideal and overall it was lower in males than females. $R^2$ revealed perfect fit (86%-99%), but this finding should be interpreted with caution since our data did not satisfy all theoretical properties for its usage due to small sample size and nonlinearity of the model.

When the AUCs were compared between classical data (Figure 3 and 4) and modeled data (Figure 5 and 6), the differences in glucose and insulin tolerance between the groups were not obvious, meaning that in both cases AUC is not the ideal parameter describing the glucose dynamics.

GTT modeling revealed that adult females reached $t_{\text{min}}$ faster and had higher maximum glucose concentration ($G_{\text{max}}$) as well as slower return to normoglycemia, which implies a possible metabolic disbalance upon such glucose fluctuation. The modeled AUC for GTT was lowest in adult males, revealing their good tolerance to glucose. ITT modeling revealed more prominent differences in young females – $G^0(0)$ and $G_{\text{min}}$ were lowest and hypoglycemia lasted longer than in other groups. The predicted AUC for ITT was evidently lower in young females, which indicates their susceptibility to hypoglycemia and slower gluconeogenesis response. Both young and adult male and female animals had overall good tolerance to glucose and insulin, however their glucose dynamics was different during GTT and ITT, which became more obvious only after modeling.

Animal models investigating type-2 diabetes and insulin resistance use a wide range of species, mostly rodents, and subject them to genetic, chemical, or nutritional interventions (26-29). It was shown that 16 and 20-month-old C57BL/6J male mice had significantly lower AUC for GTT than 4-month-old mice. The same study revealed that adult males’ AUC was slightly reduced in response to insulin compared with that of young males (30). These findings agree with our data; however, the previous study did not quantify glucose dynamics.

Also, age should be taken into account when studying glucose metabolism, since glucose metabolism is influenced by the fine tuning of many hormones at prepubertal and pubertal age. Young rats used in this study match 9-10 year-old humans, while adult rats match 25-30 year-old humans (31).

A study in boys and girls without diabetes showed that physiologic insulin resistance started in prepuberty or puberty (32). Physiologically normal individuals of this age more slowly reach $G_{\text{max}}$ and more slowly return to normoglycemia. Two possible mechanisms underlie such glucose dynamics. During an early stage in sexual maturation, termed adrenarche, adrenal gland hormones are intensively synthesized, especially dehydroepiandrosterone sulfate (DHEA-S) (33). DHEA-S levels are inversely related to insulin sensitivity. The same clinical study also showed that preadrenarchal children were more insulin sensitive than children who already reached adrenarche. Adrenarche occurs earlier in girls than in boys, a factor that may be responsible for the sex-specific insulin sensitivity (34), also observed in our study. Another factor influencing insulin resistance during puberty is an increased secretion of growth hormone (GH), which opposes insulin (35). GH release is stimulated by hypoglycemia and suppressed by oral glucose administration, which presents the standard test for inhibitory control of GH release (36). Young female Sprague Dawley rats had higher GH than males (37), which could explain hypoglycemia in young females observed in our study during ITT. During maturation females undergo different metabolic changes than males due to different reproductive function, so it is reasonable to study the sexes separately. Our results clearly imply that glucose and insulin tolerance changes dramatically with extensive growth, particularly in females. Sexual dimorphism in energy expenditure is an evolutionary adaptation that preserves the reproductive function in females during fasting, while males mobilize energy stores during physical activity (38). Young females do not switch to gluconeogenesis as quickly as males, probably due to differences in gluconeogenesis regulation and lipolysis activation. Male metabolism favors gluconeogenesis and the use of glycogen stores, while female metabolism relies on fats during increased physical activity (39). In females free fatty acids are stored in subcutaneous adipose tissue, while in males free fatty
Acids are oxidized rather than stored (40, 41), a finding that is supported by the lower basal fat oxidation in women than in men (42). Insulin is known to suppress lipolysis, i.e., the release of free fatty acids after a meal (43). After lipolysis of adipose tissue, women have higher delivery of free fatty acids to the liver, which puts them at a greater risk for hepatic insulin resistance (44, 45).

Glucose metabolism has a different dynamics during adolescence than in adulthood. Upon glucose peritoneal challenge, glucose is absorbed to the blood via peritoneal mesothelial cells. In our study, young females had delayed glucose increase. Similar differences in glucose dynamics between the sexes have been observed when it came to the expression and function of molecular water channels, aquaporins. When 8-10-week-old C57BL/6 mice were exposed to glucose dialysate, males and females had a matching peritoneal delivery rate of low weight molecules, but females had lower aquaporin 1 mRNA in peritoneal mesothelial cells (46). Another in vitro study found that the expression of aquaporin 1 in human peritoneal mesothelial cells was significantly increased by glucose exposure (47).

The observed and existing data indicate that adolescents have different glucose metabolism than adults. Young animals are more prone to hypoglycemia, which was observed in females in ITT. Different glucose metabolism in young males and females is caused by different lipid metabolism and different expression of peritoneal water channels and increased GH. Even though the classical glucose curves and AUCs imply reduced glucose and insulin tolerance, this state is caused by normal maturation and does not represent a pathology. Therefore, young animals are not a good model for translational diabetes studies. Also, sex seems to be of great importance and we strongly believe the sexes should be analyzed separately.

Our study was limited by the fact that the same animals were not longitudinally studied at several time points of aging. Furthermore, the use of euglycemic-hyperinsulinemic glucose clamp test could have provided a better assessment of insulin sensitivity (48). The used mathematical model was not able to predict the biphasic GTT in several young female rats.

However, the developed mathematical model has two important advantages: the possibility to identify the parameters that relevantly describe the blood glucose dynamics and the ability to quantify subtle changes not visible in classical statistical analysis of AUC and glucose curve. This is why we recommend its use in future studies. We also believe the new model is applicable in the diagnostics of prediabetes.

Acknowledgment. The authors thank the reviewers for the constructive comments and motivation to improve this manuscript, as well as Nenad Suvak, PhD, from the Department of Mathematics, J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek for the help with data analysis.

Funding. The study was funded by Regional Cooperation for Health, Science and Technology (RECOOP HST) Association formed by Cedars-Sinai Medical Center (CSMC), Los Angeles, CA, USA, RECOOP Grant #001; Croatian Science Foundation through research grants IP-2014-09-2324 and IP-2016-06-6545, European Union through the European Regional Development Fund, Operational Programme Competitiveness, and Cohesion, grant agreement No. KK.01.1.1.01.0007, CoRE – Neuro.

Ethical Approval. All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf (available on request from the corresponding author) and declare: no support from any organization that might have an interest in the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organizations that might have an interest in the submitted work; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Competing Interests. All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf (available on request from the corresponding author) and declare: no support from any organization that might have an interest in the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organizations that might have an interest in the submitted work; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

References
1. Ernsberger P, Koletsky RJ. The Glucose Tolerance Test as a Laboratory Tool with Clinical Implications. InTech. 2012; 3-14.
2. Ayala JE, Samuel VT, Morton GJ, Obici S, Croniger CM, Shulman GI, et al. Standard operating procedures for describing and performing metabolic tests of glucose homeostasis in mice. Dis Model Mech. 2010;3:525-34. Medline:20713647 doi:10.1242/dmm.006239
3. Ghezzi AC, Cambri LT, Botezelli JD, Ribeiro C, Dalla RA, de Mello MAR. Metabolic syndrome markers in wistar rats of different ages. Diabetol Metab Syndr. 2012;4:16 Medline:22543167 doi:10.1186/1758-5996-4-16
4. Kim W, Egan JM. The role of incretins in glucose homeostasis and diabetes treatment. Pharmacol Rev. 2008;60:470-512. Medline:19074620 doi:10.1124/pr.108.000604
5. Chan O, Chan S, Inouye K, Shum K, Matthews SG, Vranic M. Diabetes impairs hypothalamo-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) responses to hypoglycemia, and insulin treatment normalizes HPA but not epinephrine responses. Diabetes. 2002;51:1681-9. Medline:12031953 doi:10.2337.diabetes.51.6.1681
6. Chan O, Inouye K, Akirav E, Park E, Riddell MC, Vranic M, et al. Insulin alone increases hypothalamo-pituitary-adrenal activity, and diabetes lowers peak stress responses. Endocrinology. 2005;146:1382-90. Medline:15564337 doi:10.1210/en.2004-0607
Balog et al: A mathematical model of GTT and ITT in young and adult Sprague Dawley rats

www.cmj.hr

17 Hall H, Perelman D, Breschi A, Limcaoco P, Kellogg R, McLaughlin T, et al. Glucotypes reveal new patterns of glucose dysregulation. PLoS Biol. 2018;16:e2005143. Medline:30040822 doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.2005143

18 Schuit FC, Huygens P, Heimberg H, Pipeleers DG. Glucose sensing in pancreatic β-cells: a model for the study of other glucose-regulated cells in gut, pancreas, and hypothalamus. Diabetes. 2001;50:1-11. Medline:11147773 doi:10.2337/diabetes.50.1.1

19 Raff H, Sharma ST, Nieman LK. Physiological basis for the etiology, diagnosis and treatment of adrenal disorders: Cushing's syndrome, adrenal insufficiency, and congenital adrenal hyperplasia. Compr Physiol. 2014;4:739-69. Medline:24715566 doi:10.1002/cphy.c130035

20 Nyarko K, Scitovski R. Solving the parameter identification problem of mathematical models using genetic algorithms. Appl Math Comput. 2004;153:651-8.

21 Wilcox G. Insulin and insulin resistance. Clin Biochem Rev. 2005;26:19-39. Medline:16278749

22 Mühlig H. Parameteridentifikation bei Differentialgleichungen mit Hilfe von B-Splines. 41. Germany: Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden; 1992. p. 3-6.

23 Scitovski R, Jukić D. A method for solving the parameter identification problem for ordinary differential equations of the second order. Appl Math Comput. 1996;74:273-91.

24 Xue A, Wu Y, Zhu Z, Zhang F, Kemper KE, Zheng Z, et al. Genome-wide association analyses identify 143 risk variants and putative regulatory mechanisms for type 2 diabetes. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2018;9:2941. doi:10.1210/jc.2018-10486.

25 Wolfram Research Inc. Mathematica Version 11.3 ed: Wolfram Research, Inc.; 2018.

26 Leiter EH, Lee C-H. Mouse models and the genetics of diabetes. Diabetes. 2005;54 suppl 2:S151. Medline:16306333 doi:10.2337/diabetes.54.suppl_2.S151

27 Nyarko K, Scitovski R. Solving the parameter identification problem of mathematical models using genetic algorithms. Appl Math Comput. 2004;153:651-8.

28 Barbosa-da-Silva S, Sarmento IB, Bargut TCL, Souza-Mello V, Aguilera MB, Mandarim-de-Lacerda CA. Animal models of nutritional induction of type 2 diabetes mellitus. Int J Morphol. 2014;32:279-93. doi:10.4067/S0717-95022014000100046

29 Bloch O, Broide E, Ben-Yehudah G, Cantrell D, Shirin H, Rapoport MJ. Nutrient induced type 2 and chemical induced type 1 experimental diabetes differently modulate gastric GLP-1 receptor expression. J Diabetes Res. 2015;2015:561353. Medline:25893200 doi:10.1155/2015/561353

30 Oh YS, Seo E-H, Lee Y-S, Cho SC, Jung HS, Park SC, et al. Increase of calcium sensing receptor expression is related to compensatory insulin secretion during aging in mice. PloS one. 2016;11:e0159689. Medline:27441644 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0159689

31 Sengupta P. The laboratory rat: relating its age with human’s. Int J Prev Med. 2013;4:624-30. Medline:23930179

32 Bloch CA, Clemons P, Sperling MA. Puberty decreases insulin sensitivity. J Pediatr. 1987;110:481-7. Medline:2950219 doi:10.1016/S0022-3476(87)80522-X

33 Nakamura Y, Gang HX, Suzuki T, Sasano H, Rainey WE. Adrenal changes associated with adrenarche. Rev Endocr Metab Disord. 2009;10:19-26. Medline:18821019 doi:10.1007/s11154-008-9902-2

34 Hemker PW, Kok J. A project on parameter identification in reaction kinetics. Technical Report. 1993.

35 Müssig K, Staiger H, Machicao F, Stančáková A, Kuusisto J, Laakso M, et al. Classification and diagnosis of diabetes: standards of medical care—2020. Diabetes Care. 2020;43 Supplement 1:S1-41.

36 Schuit FC, Huypens P, Heimberg H, Pipeleers DG. Glucose sensing in pancreatic β-cells: a model for the study of other glucose-regulated cells in gut, pancreas, and hypothalamus. Diabetes. 2001;50:1-11. Medline:11147773 doi:10.2337/diabetes.50.1.1

37 Wilcox G. Insulin and insulin resistance. Clin Biochem Rev. 2005;26:19-39. Medline:16278749

38 Mühlig H. Parameteridentifikation bei Differentialgleichungen mit Hilfe von B-Splines. 41. Germany: Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden; 1992. p. 3-6.

39 Scitovski R, Jukić D. A method for solving the parameter identification problem for ordinary differential equations of the second order. Appl Math Comput. 1996;74:273-91.
35 Hage M, Kamenický P, Chanson P. Growth hormone response to oral glucose load: from normal to pathological conditions. Neuroendocrinology. 2019;108:244-55. Medline:30685760
36 Roth J, Glick SM, Yalow RS. Bersonsa. Hypoglycemia: a potent stimulus to secretion of growth hormone. Science. 1963;140:987-8. doi:10.1126/science.140.3570.987
37 Schalch DS, Reichlin S. Plasma growth hormone concentration in the rat determined by radioimmunoassay: influence of sex, pregnancy, lactation, anesthesia, hypophysectomy and extrasellar pituitary transplants. Endocrinology. 1966;79:275-80. Medline:5921766 doi:10.1210/endo-79-2-275
38 Tramunt B, Smati S, Grandgeorge N, Lenfant F, Arnal J-F, Montagner A, et al. Sex differences in metabolic regulation and diabetes susceptibility. Diabetologia. 2020;63:453-61. Medline:31754750 doi:10.1007/s00125-019-05040-3
39 Hedrington MS, Davis SN. Sexual Dimorphism in glucose and lipid metabolism during fasting, hypoglycemia, and exercise. Front Endocrinol. 2015;6:61. Medline:25964778 doi:10.3389/fendo.2015.00061
40 Nielsen S, Guo Z, Albu JB, Klein S, O’Brien PC, Jensen MD. Energy expenditure, sex, and endogenous fuel availability in humans. J Clin Invest. 2003;111:981-8. Medline:12671047 doi:10.1172/JCI16253
41 Uranga AP, Levine J, Jensen M. Isotope tracer measures of meal fatty acid metabolism: reproducibility and effects of the menstrual cycle. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab. 2005;288:E547-55. Medline:15507534 doi:10.1152/ajpendo.00340.2004
42 Blaak E. Gender differences in fat metabolism. Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care. 2001;4:499-502. Medline:11706283 doi:10.1097/00075197-200111000-00006
43 Jensen MD. Gender differences in regional fatty acid metabolism before and after meal ingestion. J Clin Invest. 1995;96:2297-303. Medline:793616 doi:10.1172/JCI118285
44 Miyazaki Y, Glass L, Triplitt C, Wajcberg E, Mandarino LJ, DeFronzo RA. Abdominal fat distribution and peripheral and hepatic insulin resistance in type 2 diabetes mellitus. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab. 2002;283:E1135-43. Medline:12424102 doi:10.1152/ajpendo.0327.2001
45 Nielsen S, Guo Z, Johnson CM, Hensrud DD, Jensen MD. Splanchnic lipolysis in human obesity. J Clin Invest. 2004;113:1582-8. Medline:15173884 doi:10.1172/JCI21047
46 Ni J, Cnops Y, Debaix H, Boisde I, Verbavatz JM, Devuyst O. Functional and molecular characterization of a peritoneal dialysis model in the C57BL/6J mouse. Kidney Int. 2005;67:2121-31. Medline:15840053 doi:10.1111/j.1523-1755.2005.00304.x
47 Lai KN, Li F, Lan Y, Tang S, Tsang AWL, Chan DTM, et al. Expression of aquaporin-1 in human peritoneal mesothelial cells and its upregulation by glucose In vitro. J Am Soc Nephrol. 2001;12:1036-45. Medline:11316863
48 Pacini G, Omar B, Ahren B. Methods and models for metabolic assessment in mice. J Diabetes Res. 2013;2013:986906. Medline:23762879 doi:10.1155/2013/986906