Title

Impact of telehealth nutrition therapy on costs and utilization in type 2 diabetes & obesity

Subtitle

A retrospective claims-based analysis

Authors:

Priya V. Shanmugam, PhD[a]
Rebecca N. Adams, PhD[a]
Shaminie J. Athinarayanan, PhD[a]
Adam J. Wolfberg, MD, MPH[a]
Jeromie Ballreich, PhD[b]

Affiliations
a: Research Department, Virta Health, Denver, CO
b: Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD

Word Count (excluding Title, Abstract, Figures and Tables): 2992/3000

Funding: No funding supported this work.

Competing interests:
PVS, RNA, SJA, and AJW are employees of Virta Health and hold stock or stock options in the company. JB received consulting fees from Virta Health for his contribution to the work.

Address for correspondence:
Priya Shanmugam
Priya.shanmugam@virtahealth.com
Virta Health
655 Montgomery St
San Francisco, CA 94110
630-697-9481

Data Sharing Statement: The data underlying this article was provided by the third party, Komodo Health, under license and cannot be shared publicly. The source data for this study were licensed by Virta Health from Komodo Health and hence may not be shared publicly.

Key points

Question

Is participation in a telehealth-delivered individualized nutrition therapy program associated with changes in total healthcare costs and utilization among adults with type 2 diabetes or obesity?

Findings

In this retrospective cohort study of 9,156 matched adults, participation in the program was associated with significantly lower total cost of care at 12 months (−$215 per member per month) and 24 months (−$184 per member per month), primarily due to reductions in inpatient and pharmacy spending.

Meaning

A telehealth-delivered nutrition therapy program may significantly reduce healthcare spending for adults with type 2 diabetes or obesity.

Structured Abstract

Importance
Type 2 diabetes and obesity drive substantial morbidity and spending. Rigorous evidence on the impacts of intensive digitally delivered lifestyle interventions on healthcare cost and utilization are critical to assessing their value.

Objective
Determine the impact of a telehealth-delivered individualized nutrition therapy program on per-member-per-month (PMPM) total cost of care and utilization over 12 and 24 months, overall and within T2D and obesity cohorts.

Design
Retrospective propensity score matched difference-in-differences analysis of one- and two-year cost and utilization outcomes over the study period of January 2017–March 2025.

Setting
US adults participating in a telehealth T2D and obesity management program.

Participants
Participated in program for ≥6 months, had ≥12 months pre-index and ≥6 months post-index claims coverage (allowing ≤30-day gaps), matched 1:1 to external controls drawn from a 2.4-million-patient pool. Final matched sample: 4,578 participants and 4,578 controls (per arm: 3,210 with type 2 diabetes and 1,368 with obesity).

Exposures
Telehealth-delivered, continuous care integrating individualized carbohydrate-reduced nutrition support, clinician-guided medication management, health coaching, and remote biometric monitoring.

Main Outcomes and Measures
Outcomes included PMPM allowed inpatient, outpatient, and prescription medication costs; inpatient, emergency department, primary care, cardiology, and endocrinology visits; and laboratory services. For type 2 diabetes, PMPM spending and monthly usage rates for each indicated medication.

Results
Among 9,156 matched adults, program participation was associated with a $215 PMPM reduction in the total cost of care at 12 months (−$184 over 24 months) (both P<.001), driven by inpatient (−$129 and −$104 PMPM) and pharmacy (−$80 and −$79 PMPM) reductions; outpatient costs did not differ significantly. In the T2D cohort, significant cost savings were driven by deprescription of SGLT2 inhibitors (62.2% reduction in medication usage PMPM), sulfonylureas (50.3%), insulin (26.5%), and GLP-1s (13.7%).

Conclusions and Relevance
In this large, real-world analysis, a nutrition-first digital care model was associated with sustained reductions in total spending and acute utilization over 12–24 months, with near-term

prescription spending reductions in the cohort with T2D and broader, gradual savings in the cohort with obesity. Together with prior clinical evidence, these findings suggest alignment of clinical durability and cost reductions of a telehealth-delivered lifestyle intervention.

Introduction

Diabetes and obesity represent major interrelated public health challenges in the United States, impacting over 40 million[9] and 100 million[8] Americans respectively. Diabetes and obesity directly lead to substantial morbidity and mortality and increase the risk of myriad associated conditions including cancer, kidney disease, and cardiovascular disease.[17,41] These syndemic conditions further create a staggering economic burden, with combined direct healthcare costs exceeding $500 billion annually.[33,46]

Despite significant advances in pharmacologic treatment options for both diabetes and obesity, including GLP-1 receptor agonists, real-world effectiveness is constrained by uneven access, complexity and polypharmacy, adverse effects, and coverage and affordability barriers that limit initiation and persistence.[2,5,19–21,25,27,31,36,40] Moreover, even under guideline-concordant therapy, substantial residual cardiometabolic risk remains.[18] Against a backdrop of rising pharmacy spend and payers' sharpened focus on net budget impact, there is an urgent need to identify effective alternatives with tangible cost impacts. Intensive lifestyle intervention programs are effective[26] but their reach in real-world clinical settings is limited by infrastructure not designed for sustained behavior change, including limited access to registered dieticians and infrequent touchpoints.[1,13–15]

Digital health platforms now serve millions of patients and providers, representing a paradigm shift in chronic condition management.[10] Wrap-around digital health models address care gaps by delivering continuous, between-visit support that integrates clinician-guided medication management, remote monitoring, behavioral coaching, and timely specialist input. One such

wraparound model is Virta Health's Individualized Nutrition Therapy (INT) program, which is a telehealth-delivered, continuous remote care model integrating individualized carbohydrate-reduced nutrition support, clinician-guided medication management, and remote monitoring. In a prospective, controlled trial of this intervention, adults with T2D experienced a 1.3% reduction in HbA1c and 12% weight loss at 1 year, while 94% of insulin users reduced or discontinued insulin and sulfonylureas were completely eliminated.[23] Two-year outcomes showed a durable reduction in HbA1c (0.9%) and weight (10%) with medication deintensification, translating into higher remission compared with usual care.[3]

Evidence on the downstream total cost and utilization impact of digital care models – and thus, their comprehensive value proposition – is limited. This study evaluates the INT's impacts on total cost of care (TCOC) and healthcare utilization using a retrospective claims-based analysis of nearly 5,000 patients over one and two years, leveraging a propensity score matched differences-in-differences (DID) study design to deliver rigorous evidence of the program's causal impacts.

Methods

Data sources and study design

Thes study combined administrative data from the INT program with longitudinal claims data from the Komodo Healthcare Map for both Virta patients and an external control group. Clinic data includes program participation dates, aggregated baseline and follow-up HbA1c and weight data. The Komodo Healthcare Map is a nationally representative database of closed and open medical and prescription claims, all-cause mortality, and demographic data for over 300 million unique patients across commercial, Medicare and Medicaid plans.[28]

Data was extracted between January 2016 and September 2025. Privacy-preserving tokenization was used to identify Virta participants and link program participation data to the claims data. An additional sample of 2.4 million patients that had either a T2D or obesity diagnosis code and matched the overall age and sex distribution of the Virta participant sample was extracted to create the matched control group.

As this study did not involve the collection, use, or transmittal of individually identifiable data, Institutional Review Board review or approval and patient consent were not required. All records were deidentified and compliant with United States patient confidentiality requirements, including the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996. This study followed the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines for observational cohort studies.[16]

Virta Program

Patients are eligible to join the INT if their employer or health plan offer the program and if they meet clinical eligibility and safety requirements specific to T2D and obesity. Patients receive limited advertising from their employer or health plan about the program's availability and may participate for free. Participation costs are paid by the employer or health plan on an engaged member-month basis.

Patients in the INT program receive telehealth-delivered continuous remote care integrating individualized very low-carbohydrate nutrition support (targeting generally <30g/day), clinician-guided medication management, health coaching, peer support, and regular biometric feedback

via a mobile app. 73% of patients achieved biomarker levels indicating adherence to the dietary recommendations. Program participation measures for patients with T2D and obesity are detailed in Appendix 1.

Program participants were eligible for inclusion in the study if they registered and stayed enrolled in the program for at least six months between January 2017 and March 2025. Patients may disenroll if they lose employer coverage, leave voluntarily, or be disenrolled if safety risks arise. The INT's 180-day retention rate is approximately 90% for patients with T2D[38] and 80% for patients with obesity[39], suggesting this eligibility criterion does not exclude a significant proportion of program participants. In adherence with an intent-to-treat analysis, we do not further condition on adherence or engagement. Patients with type 1 diabetes, heart failure, stage 4+ chronic kidney disease or end-stage renal disease, pregnancy, or acute psychosis at baseline are ineligible for the program and were thus excluded from the control sample. Patients with less than one year of closed claims coverage at baseline or six months of follow-up, allowing for gaps of up to 30 days, those aged <18 years at registration, or those with cancer during the baseline year were further excluded. Figure 1 summarizes the study sample construction.

Measures

Outcomes

We identified ten outcomes relevant to the management of T2D and obesity. All cost and utilization outcomes were measured on a per member, per month (PMPM) basis. Cost outcomes included costs of inpatient care, outpatient care, prescription medication costs, and total costs, defined as the sum of the previous three cost components. Utilization outcomes included the

number of inpatient visits, emergency department (ED) visits, evaluation and management visits with primary care providers (PCPs), endocrinologists, and cardiologists, and laboratory tests.

We investigated nine additional outcomes for the T2D cohort only. Cost outcomes included estimated T2D- and non-T2D associated prescription medication costs separately. Utilization outcomes included monthly use of metformin, thiazolidinediones, GLP-1s, SGLT2is, sulfonylureas, DPP4s and insulin. Use was defined by the months between each prescription fill date and supply end date, allowing for up to 60-day gaps between prescriptions in accordance with prior evidence on the specificity of gap allowances in claims-based measures of medication adherence.[32]

Covariates

The index date was the first day of the registration month for INT and a randomly assigned pseudo-registration month for the matched control group. Baseline covariates included age at index date, sex, race, comorbidities (T2D, obesity, high cholesterol, hypertension, chronic kidney disease, liver disease, and smoking), and baseline medication use (all T2D-indicated medications and selected medications for non-T2D indications). Comorbidities and prescription medication use during the baseline year were identified by the presence of at least one claim with a corresponding ICD-10 code (Appendix 2) or generic medication name (Appendix 3).

Statistical analysis

Matched control group construction

The 2.4 million control sample was used to construct control groups that closely matched the INT participants' demographic and clinical characteristics. For the cohorts with T2D and obesity

separately, matched control groups were constructed using 1:1 nearest neighbor matching on a propensity score estimated based on sex, race, five-year age groups, payer type, US region, baseline comorbidities, use of lipid and blood pressure lowering medications, categorical variables for the quartile of baseline year outpatient and prescription medication spending quartile, a binary indicator for one or more inpatient visits during the baseline year, and total cost measures for inpatient, outpatient, and prescription drug spending.

For the cohort with T2D, the propensity score included exact matching on baseline use of each T2D-indicated medication. For the cohort with obesity, the propensity score included exact matching on baseline usage of GLP-1s or other anti-obesity medications. Appendix 4 describes the composition of the INT and matched control samples for the cohorts with T2D and obesity before and after matching. Matching was conducted using the MatchIt package in R.[24]

DID framework

We estimated the impact of program participation on the outcomes of interest using the following specification

$$y_{it} = \beta T_i + \beta_2 * Post_{it} + \beta_3 (T*Post)_{it} + t + i + \varepsilon_{it}$$

where y_{it} is one of ten outcomes measured for person *i* in month *t*, T_i indicates program participation, $Post_{it}$ indicates months after the index date, *t* capture calendar-month fixed effects and *i* capture individual fixed effects. β_3 captures the impact of the INT.

We estimated the model for each outcome for the combined sample, and the cohort with T2D and cohort with obesity separately. For the cohort with T2D, we also estimated the model for the nine secondary outcomes specified above.

The DID model's key assumption is that, in the absence of the program's existence, outcomes would have evolved similarly over time in the treated and untreated groups. If the parallel trends assumption is satisfied, differences in outcomes in the post-intervention period beyond pre-existing during the baseline period can be attributed to the treatment's causal impact.

We assessed the validity of the parallel trends assumption for each outcome in two ways. First, we used one year of pre-intervention data to estimate an adjusted model, replacing the post-treatment indicator with a continuous variable indicating the number of months prior to the index date. β_3 then estimates the significance of the difference in the linear trend of the outcome between the treatment and control groups during the pre-intervention year. Second, we estimated a modified specification, replacing the post-treatment indicator with indicators for each of the four quarters before and after the index date to estimate the quarterly DID relative to the quarter prior to the index date.

Results

Baseline sample characteristics

4,815 INT and 306,343 control patients met the study eligibility criteria. After matching, the resulting study sample contained 4,578 INT and 4,578 control patients.

Table 1 shows the average baseline characteristics of the INT and control groups, for the populations with T2D and obesity separately. The population with T2D averaged 55 years old at index date, 52% male, and 49% white. The population with obesity was 50 years old, 28% male and 56% white. In both cohorts, baseline medications and comorbidities were comparable between the INT and control groups. Appendix 4 describes the INT and control groups for the T2D and obesity cohorts before and after matching.

Impacts

Table 2 reports DID estimates overall and by cohort. The baseline parallel trends test in Table 2 and event-study DID estimates in Figure 2 indicate no significant pre-trend differences between the INT and control groups for any utilization or cost outcome, supporting the parallel trends assumption. The intervention was associated with significantly lower healthcare utilization and costs, overall and within each cohort.

Overall sample

Utilization

In Year 1, participants had 0.0034 fewer inpatient ($p<0.001$) and 0.018 fewer PCP visits PMPM ($p < 0.01$). Effects persisted over two years, with 0.0035 fewer inpatient and 0.020 fewer PCP visits (both $p < 0.001$), corresponding to 42 fewer hospitalizations per 1,000 members annually and 7.6% fewer PCP visits relative to baseline. Impacts on other outcomes, including ED and specialty care, were not statistically significant.

Cost

In Year 1, the intervention reduced total healthcare costs by $215 PMPM, driven by reductions of $129 in inpatient costs and $80 in prescription medication costs ($p < 0.001$), with no significant change in outpatient costs. Over two years, total costs were $184 PMPM lower, corresponding to a 18% reduction relative to baseline.

Cohort with obesity

Utilization

In the cohort with obesity, in Year 1, significant reductions were observed across inpatient, PCP, and laboratory services, with impacts persisting across two years. Over two years, participants had 0.0044 fewer inpatient visits PMPM ($p<0.01$), equivalent to 50 fewer visits per 1,000 members annually. Participants had reductions of 0.032 PCP visits ($p<0.01$) and 0.045 laboratory tests PMPM ($p<0.05$), corresponding to 11.7% fewer PCP visits and 11.5% fewer laboratory tests relative to baseline.

Cost

Total PMPM costs decreased by $274 in Year 1 and $233 across two years (both $p<0.05$), corresponding to a 24% reduction in total costs relative to baseline. An inpatient cost reduction of $171 PMPM was statistically significant at year two ($p<0.05$), while outpatient and prescription drug cost reductions, though substantial ($63 and $25 PMPM in year 1; $32 and $29 in year 2), were not significant.

Cohort with T2D

Utilization

In Year 1, participants had 0.0029 fewer inpatient ($p<0.01$) and 0.015 fewer PCP visits PMPM ($p < 0.05$). Effects persisted over two years, with 0.0032 fewer inpatient ($p<0.05$) and 0.018 fewer PCP visits ($p < 0.01$). These impacts corresponded to 38 fewer hospitalizations per 1,000 members annually and 7% fewer PCP visits relative to baseline. Impacts on other outcomes, including ED and specialty care, were not statistically significant.

Cost

In Year 1, total costs decreased by $205 PMPM, driven by reductions of $111 in inpatient costs and $101 in prescription medication costs ($p<0.001$). Over two years, total costs were $198 PMPM lower**,** corresponding to a 19% reduction relative to baseline**.** Reductions in prescription medication costs were driven by a $108 PMPM reduction in T2D-indicated medication costs.

Deprescription

The INT led to significant deprescription of T2D medications within one year and persisting across two years. Across two years, the number of member-months covered by prescriptions was reduced relative to the baseline year by 50.3% for sulfonylureas, 62.2% for SGLT2s, 26.5% for insulin and 13.7% for GLP1s. Cost reductions were $48 PMPM for SGLT2is, $33 for GLP-1s, $16 for insulin, $7 for metformin, and $5 for DPP4s, reflecting both dose reduction and deprescription impacts. The $108 PMPM reduction in T2D-indicated medication spending over two years corresponded to a 38% reduction relative to baseline.

Discussion

In this large, claims-based study of adults with T2D and obesity, participation in a clinically effective telehealth nutrition program was associated with lower cost of care and utilization over 1 and 2 years. The total cost of care was $215 lower PMPM at 12 months and $184 lower over 24 months, with reductions driven by inpatient costs (-$130 PMPM at one year and -$104 over two years) and pharmacy costs (−$80 PMPM at one and two years), with no significant change in outpatient costs. Because long-term effectiveness across digital programs is heterogeneous and rigorous claims-based economic evaluations are scarce, these findings suggest that intensive, wrap-around digital nutrition care can pair clinical effectiveness with significant savings. For payers and employers, a sustained reduction in the total cost of care supports coverage and outcomes-based contracting, particularly for adults with T2D or obesity.

Utilization impacts of the INT differed by clinical cohort in ways consistent with the care model. Among participants with T2D, the rapid deprescription of diabetes medication translated into early cost reductions within the first quarter, consistent with rapid improvements in glycemic control and medication deintensification observed in prior clinical studies.[23] While there is evidence supporting the effectiveness of digitally delivered lifestyle interventions for glycemic control for individuals with T2D in general[29] and within higher-acuity subpopulations[11] claims-based economic evaluations of diabetes self-management often report modest or short-term savings, with limited evidence of persistence beyond one year[12,42,45] In this context, the 12- and 24-month TCOC reductions concentrated in pharmacy and inpatient domains suggest a wrap-around model that pairs individualized nutrition therapy with clinician-guided deintensification may achieve larger and more durable cost offsets.

For participants with obesity, impacts of the INT accrue more gradually and across a broader set of cost domains. This pattern is consistent with evidence that benefits of intentional weight loss manifest over longer horizons[30,37] and that digital support can help maintain weight loss achieved through pharmacotherapy.[34] Across prevention and weight management programs, economic findings remain limited and mixed with most evaluations reporting modest or no short-term cost reductions despite clinically meaningful weight loss.[4,6,7,44]

From an economic standpoint, the intervention compares favorably to pharmacologic alternatives. The average annual cost of GLP-1 receptor agonists for obesity or T2D ranges between $12,000 and $16,000 per patient per year[35]; consequently, estimates suggest significantly lower cost-effectiveness compared to lifestyle interventions.[22] The average cost of INT participation over the study period was $150 PMPM for T2D and $120 PMPM for obesity, suggesting annualized net savings of $480 per member with T2D and $1430 per member with obesity over two years. Collectively, these results support a digitally delivered nutrition-first approach to treating metabolic disease.

This claims-based, nonrandomized evaluation has several limitations that guide priorities for future research. First, residual confounding and selection are possible despite propensity-score matching; we mitigated these risks by leveraging a differences-in-differences study design with confirmed parallel preintervention trends across all study outcomes. Pragmatic trials can further strengthen these results. Second, generalizability may be limited because the sample primarily reflects commercially insured adults. Our results are consistent with significant cost

reductions observed in a pilot of the INT among Veterans[43]; further replication within Medicare and Medicaid populations and other integrated delivery systems is warranted. In the obesity cohort, reliance on claims-based diagnosis codes excluded INT participants with solely BMI-defined obesity as detailed in Appendix 5. Analyses involving linked claims and EHR data can inform the generalizability of these finding within the claims-based population to the broader cohort.

Finally, while we identify the program's causal impacts on utilization and cost, future analyses could explore factors that drive variation in these impacts, including engagement, adherence, duration, and baseline medication usage, especially as newer glucose- and weight-lowering therapies are developed. These analyses may inform how digitally delivered lifestyle interventions can be combined with pharmacotherapy to cost-effectively maximize population health.

Conclusion

In this claims-based, real-world evaluation leveraging causal inference methods, participation in a telehealth delivered nutrition therapy program was associated with sustained reductions in healthcare utilization and total medical costs over two years among adults with T2D and obesity. Reductions were primarily driven by decreases in inpatient and pharmacy spending in the T2D cohort, and broader reductions in inpatient and outpatient spending in the obesity cohort. Together, the results suggest that telehealth-based nutrition therapy may be an effective method to improve outcomes and reduce healthcare use and spending in populations at high risk for metabolic disease.

Figure 1. Flowchart of study sample construction



Note: Continuous coverage was defined as the difference in days between the first and last day of closed-source claims availability, allowing for gaps of up to 30 days. History was defined as the presence of a relevant ICD-10-CM code during the year prior to the index date.

Abbreviations: CKD: chronic kidney disease; ESRD: end-stage renal disease

Table 1. Study sample characteristics for matched cohorts with obesity and T2D

Covariate	**Obesity**				**T2D**			
Mean (SD) or n (%)	**INT (N = 1,368)**	**Control (N = 1,368)**	**SMD**	**p**	**INT (N = 3,210)**	**Control (N = 3,210)**	**SMD**	**p**
Demographics								
Age at index date (years)	50 (9.5)	50 (9.7)	0.00	0.93	55 (8.5)	55 (8.5)	-0.01	0.73
Race			0.00	1.0			0.00	1.0
White	769 (56.2%)	769 (56.2%)			1,577 (49.1%)	1,577 (49.1%)		
Black or African American	166 (12.1%)	166 (12.1%)			334 (10.4%)	334 (10.4%)		
Hispanic or Latino	106 (7.7%)	106 (7.7%)			260 (8.1%)	260 (8.1%)		
Asian or Pacific Islander	22 (1.6%)	22 (1.6%)			122 (3.8%)	122 (3.8%)		
Other	24 (1.8%)	24 (1.8%)			60 (1.9%)	60 (1.9%)		
Missing	281 (20.5%)	281 (20.5%)			857 (26.7%)	857 (26.7%)		
Sex			0.00	1.0			0.00	1.0
Female	986 (72.1%)	986 (72.1%)			1,533 (47.8%)	1,533 (47.8%)		
Male	376 (27.5%)	376 (27.5%)			1,669 (52.0%)	1,669 (52.0%)		
Missing	6 (0.4%)	6 (0.4%)			8 (0.2%)	8 (0.2%)		
US Region			0.04	0.89			0.15	<.001
Midwest	527 (38.5%)	517 (37.8%)			1,118 (34.8%)	1,022 (31.8%)		
Northeast	114 (8.3%)	116 (8.5%)			385 (12.0%)	547 (17.0%)		
South	634 (46.3%)	651 (47.6%)			1,269 (39.5%)	1,176 (36.6%)		
West	91 (6.7%)	81 (5.9%)			437 (13.6%)	465 (14.5%)		
Missing	2 (0.1%)	3 (0.2%)			1 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)		
Payer Type			0.04	0.86			0.22	<.001
Commercial	1,326 (96.9%)	1,322 (96.6%)			2,939 (91.6%)	2,748 (85.6%)		
Medicaid	25 (1.8%)	28 (2.0%)			78 (2.4%)	203 (6.3%)		
Medicare	15 (1.1%)	14 (1.0%)			192 (6.0%)	253 (7.9%)		
Missing	2 (0.1%)	4 (0.3%)			1 (0.0%)	6 (0.2%)		
Baseline comorbidities								
T2D	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0.00		2,715 (84.6%)	2,715 (84.6%)	0.00	1.0

Obesity	1,368 (100.0%)	1,368 (100.0%)	0.00		1,482 (46.2%)	1,482 (46.2%)	0.00	1.0
Hypertension	593 (43.3%)	565 (41.3%)	0.04	0.28	1,999 (62.3%)	2,133 (66.4%)	-0.09	<.001
High Cholesterol	525 (38.4%)	525 (38.4%)	0.00	1.0	2,089 (65.1%)	2,218 (69.1%)	-0.09	<.001
MASLD	79 (5.8%)	71 (5.2%)	0.03	0.5	253 (7.9%)	250 (7.8%)	0.00	0.89
CKD, Stage 1-3	27 (2.0%)	21 (1.5%)	0.03	0.38	114 (3.6%)	134 (4.2%)	-0.03	0.2
History of Smoking	12 (0.9%)	14 (1.0%)	-0.02	0.69	36 (1.1%)	66 (2.1%)	-0.07	0.003
Baseline prescription medications								
T2D-indicated medications								
DPP4	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0.04	1.0	233 (7.3%)	233 (7.3%)	0.00	1.0
GLP-1	176 (12.9%)	176 (12.9%)	0.00	1.0	971 (30.2%)	971 (30.2%)	0.00	1.0
Insulin	3 (0.2%)	5 (0.4%)	-0.03	0.73	449 (14.0%)	449 (14.0%)	0.00	1.0
Metformin	109 (8.0%)	55 (4.0%)	0.17	<.001	2,273 (70.8%)	2,273 (70.8%)	0.00	1.0
SGLT2i	2 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	0.02	1.0	614 (19.1%)	614 (19.1%)	0.00	1.0
Sulfonylureas	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0.00	1.0	544 (16.9%)	544 (16.9%)	0.00	1.0
TZDs	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.1%)	-0.05	0.5	102 (3.2%)	102 (3.2%)	0.00	1.0
Other medications								
Anticoagulants	26 (1.9%)	32 (2.3%)	-0.03	0.43	74 (2.3%)	119 (3.7%)	-0.08	0.001
Beta blocker	152 (11.1%)	136 (9.9%)	0.04	0.32	572 (17.8%)	654 (20.4%)	-0.07	0.009
Calcium blocker	171 (12.5%)	159 (11.6%)	0.03	0.48	551 (17.2%)	569 (17.7%)	-0.01	0.55
Diuretic	272 (19.9%)	269 (19.7%)	0.01	0.89	912 (28.4%)	959 (29.9%)	-0.03	0.2
MRA	44 (3.2%)	35 (2.6%)	0.04	0.3	92 (2.9%)	90 (2.8%)	0.00	0.88
RAAS Inhibitor	387 (28.3%)	379 (27.7%)	0.01	0.73	1,884 (58.7%)	1,964 (61.2%)	-0.05	0.042
Statin	279 (20.4%)	280 (20.5%)	0.00	0.96	1,982 (61.7%)	2,082 (64.9%)	-0.06	0.010
Baseline healthcare cost categories								
Inpatient			0.00	0.9			0.03	0.24
≥1 hospital visit	31 (2.3%)	30 (2.2%)			126 (3.9%)	145 (4.5%)		
0 hospital visits	1,337 (97.7%)	1,338 (97.8%)			3,084 (96.1%)	3,065 (95.5%)		
Outpatient			0.03	0.91			0.06	0.18
1st (lowest)	108 (7.9%)	115 (8.4%)			379 (11.8%)	424 (13.2%)		

2nd	290 (21.2%)	298 (21.8%)			870 (27.1%)	854 (26.6%)		
3rd	438 (32.0%)	425 (31.1%)			939 (29.3%)	969 (30.2%)		
4th (highest)	532 (38.9%)	530 (38.7%)			1,022 (31.8%)	963 (30.0%)		
Prescription Medications			0.09	0.14			0.08	0.018
1st (lowest)	188 (13.7%)	187 (13.7%)			219 (6.8%)	200 (6.2%)		
2nd	422 (30.8%)	392 (28.7%)			535 (16.7%)	477 (14.9%)		
3rd	439 (32.1%)	418 (30.6%)			791 (24.6%)	744 (23.2%)		
4th (highest)	319 (23.3%)	371 (27.1%)			1,665 (51.9%)	1,789 (55.7%)		
Baseline healthcare costs, $ per member per year								
Total cost	13,019 (24,738)	10,991 (19,227)	0.09	0.63	13,824 (24,254)	13,771 (23,925)	0.00	0.27
Inpatient costs	1,010 (8,993)	711 (5,937)	0.04	0.89	1,403 (8,858)	1,395 (8,617)	0.00	0.26
Outpatient costs	9,521 (19,310)	8,178 (15,593)	0.08	0.36	7,273 (16,971)	6,674 (17,130)	0.04	0.13
Prescription medication costs	2,488 (10,150)	2,102 (8,009)	0.04	0.23	5,148 (10,151)	5,703 (10,595)	-0.05	0.003

Note: For continuous variables, *p*-values were derived using the Student's *t*-test when the normality assumption was met and the Wilcoxon rank-sum test otherwise. For categorical variables, *p*-values were obtained using the chi-square test or Fisher's exact test when cell counts were small. SMDs were computed as the absolute difference in means (or proportions for categorical variables) between groups divided by the pooled standard deviation. Quartiles for baseline outpatient and prescription medication costs were defined as the percentile of total costs across the baseline year: 1st through 25th percentile (quartile 1), 26th through 49th (quartile 2), 50th through 74th (quartile 3), or 75th through 99th (quartile 4).

Abbreviations: SMD, standardized mean difference; INT, individualized nutrition therapy; CKD, chronic kidney disease; MASLD, metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease; DPP4, dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitor; GLP-1, glucagon-like peptide 1 agonist; SGLT2i, sodium–glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitor; TZD, thiazoledinedione; MRA, mineralocorticoid receptor agonist; RAAS, renin–angiotensin–aldosterone system inhibitor (e.g., ACEi/ARB/ARNI).

Fig 2. Event-study DID estimates for key outcomes

Cohort with T2D Cohort with obesity

A. Inpatient visits



B. RX costs



C. PCP visits



Abbreviations: DID, differences-in-differences; T2D, type 2 diabetes; PCP, primary care physician.

Note: The figure plots coefficients for the interaction terms between each quarterly indicator for the four quarters before and after the index date and INT participation, with the quarter prior to the index date as the reference category. Quarter 0 is the first quarter that treated patients participated in the INT. Blue estimates indicate treated quarters; red estimates indicate pre-treatment quarters. Estimates are derived from a regression model of individual monthly outcomes adjusted for individual and calendar-month fixed-effects. Standard errors are clustered at the member level.

Table 2. DID estimates of cost and utilization impacts

Combined study sample

Outcome	**DID Model**				**Baseline values**			
	One Year (n=105,425 member-months)		**Two years (n=135,799 member-months)**		**Mean**		**Difference in baseline trends**	
	Treatment effect	**95% CI**	**Treatment effect**	**95% CI**	**Control**	**INT**	**Est.**	**95% CI**
Cost, $ PMPM								
Total Cost	-214.93***	(-318.83, -111.03)	-183.94***	(-276.14, -91.74)	938.58	1018.37	2.69	(-13.21, 18.59)
Inpatient	-129.17***	(-195.23, -63.11)	-104.35***	(-161.2, -47.5)	99.03	106.01	-0.6	(-9.14, 7.93)
Outpatient	-5.61	(-72.71, 61.49)	-0.24	(-60.36, 59.88)	439.25	534.78	4.08	(-8.14, 16.3)
Prescription medications	-80.15***	(-104.07, -56.23)	-79.35***	(-103.61, -55.08)	400.31	377.58	-0.79	(-4.54, 2.96)
Utilization, visits PMPM								
Inpatient	-0.0034***	(-0.005, -0.002)	-0.0035***	(-0.005, -0.002)	0.005	0.004	0.0000	(-0.0002, 0.0003)
ED	0.0008	(-0.002, 0.004)	-0.0003	(-0.003, 0.003)	0.028	0.021	-0.0003	(-0.001, 0.0004)
PCP	-0.018**	(-0.028, -0.008)	-0.020***	(-0.029, -0.010)	0.216	0.255	0.0016	(-0.0004, 0.0036)
Cardiologist	0.0008	(-0.001, 0.003)	0.0011	(-0.001, 0.003)	0.009	0.006	0.0001	(-0.0002, 0.0005)
Endocrinologist	-0.0003	(-0.002, 0.001)	-0.0003	(-0.002, 0.001)	0.008	0.006	0.0001	(-0.0002, 0.0003)
Laboratory services	-0.009	(-0.027, 0.009)	-0.012	(-0.030, 0.006)	0.413	0.402	0.0009	(-0.0026, 0.0045)
Cohort with T2D								
Cost, $ PMPM								
Total Cost	-205.08**	(-321.77, -88.39)	-197.91***	(-303.04, -92.78)	1013.97	1038.77	1.3	(-17.08, 19.68)
Inpatient	-110.59**	(-183.43, -37.75)	-89.78**	(-152.13, -27.43)	116.1	117.45	1.54	(-9.33, 12.41)
Outpatient	6.55	(-66.33, 79.43)	-8.18	(-75.57, 59.21)	402.51	472.64	-0.29	(-13.42, 12.84)
All Prescription Medications	-101.03***	(-131.23, -70.83)	-99.95***	(-129.78, -70.12)	495.36	448.68	0.06	(-4.58, 4.69)
T2D-related	-113.22***	(-129.73, -96.71)	-108.03***	(-124.39, -91.67)	295.5	286.75	-1.63	(-4.17, 0.9)
non-T2D-related	12.19	(-12.18, 36.56)	8.09	(-15.94, 32.12)	199.86	161.92	1.69	(-2.12, 5.5)
Utilization,								

visits PMPM								
Inpatient Visits	-0.0029**	(-0.0049, -0.0008)	-0.0032**	(-0.0051, -0.0012)	0.006	0.004	0.00003	(-0.0003, 0.0004)
ED	0.0017	(-0.002, 0.0054)	0.0004	(-0.003, 0.0038)	0.027	0.019	-0.0004	(-0.0013, 0.0005)
PCP	-0.0152*	(-0.027, -0.0034)	-0.0184**	(-0.03, -0.0068)	0.209	0.248	0.0011	(-0.0012, 0.0035)
Cardiologist	0.0007	(-0.0015, 0.003)	0.0012	(-0.0009, 0.0032)	0.010	0.006	0.0001	(-0.0003, 0.0005)
Endocrinologist	-0.0008	(-0.0025, 0.001)	-0.0009	(-0.0027, 0.001)	0.009	0.007	0.0001	(-0.0003, 0.0004)
Laboratory Services	-0.0027	(-0.0239, 0.0186)	-0.0078	(-0.0293, 0.0137)	0.413	0.407	0.0007	(-0.0035, 0.005)
Cohort with obesity								
Cost, $ PMPM								
Total Cost	-273.50*	(-531.76, -15.24)	-232.64*	(-447.32, -17.96)	761.72	969.82	-3.47	(-36.73, 29.79)
Inpatient	-185.05	(-375.97, 5.87)	-171.11*	(-323.18, -19.04)	58.78	78.79	-7.43	(-21.44, 6.57)
Outpatient	-63.21	(-211.12, 84.7)	-32.21	(-161.67, 97.25)	526.00	682.63	6.96	(-22.24, 36.15)
All Prescription Medications	-25.24	(-64.99, 14.51)	-29.32	(-74.61, 15.97)	176.93	208.39	-2.99	(-9.13, 3.14)
Utilization, visits PMPM								
Inpatient Visits	-0.0044**	(-0.0075, -0.0014)	-0.0048**	(-0.0077, -0.0019)	0.003	0.003	0.0001	(-0.0006, 0.0007)
ED	-0.0033	(-0.0094, 0.0027)	-0.0038	(-0.0094, 0.0018)	0.028	0.025	-0.0004	(-0.0017, 0.0009)
PCP	-0.0321**	(-0.0526, -0.0116)	-0.0296**	(-0.049, -0.0102)	0.233	0.273	0.0040	(-0.0004, 0.0079)
Cardiologist	0.0007	(-0.0021, 0.0035)	0.0004	(-0.0022, 0.003)	0.007	0.006	0.00001	(-0.0006, 0.0007)
Endocrinologist	0.0009	(-0.0011, 0.0028)	0.0011	(-0.0009, 0.003)	0.005	0.004	0.0002	(-0.0004, 0.0007)
Laboratory Services	-0.045*	(-0.0825, -0.007)	-0.040*	(-0.0738, -0.0055)	0.411	0.389	0.0005	(-0.0068, 0.0078)

Note: *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$. The table reports coefficients, standard errors, and p-values for the interaction terms between the post-intervention indicator and the indicator for INT participation. Estimates are derived from a regression model of individual monthly outcomes adjusted for individual and calendar-month fixed-effects. Standard errors are clustered at the member level. Total cost is defined as the sum of inpatient, outpatient, and prescription medication costs.

Abbreviations: DID, differences in differences; PMPM, per member per month; T2D, type 2 diabetes; ED, emergency department; PCP, primary care physician

Table 3. Reductions in spending by specific T2D-indicated medication

	Baseline mean		DID Model, one year (n=74,597 member-months)			DID Model, two years (n=98,825 member-months)		
T2D Medication	**Control**	**INT**	**Treatment effect**	**95% CI**	**As % of baseline**	**Treatment effect**	**95% CI**	**As % of baseline**
Cost, $ PMPM								
Metformin	18.32	15.31	-7.72***	(-10.37, -5.07)	-50.4%	-6.83***	(-9.55, -4.12)	-44.6%
DPP4s	18.13	19.12	-4.69**	(-7.35, -2.04)	-24.5%	-4.95**	(-7.83, -2.08)	-25.9%
GLP-1s	144.40	139.84	-33.87***	(-46.57, -21.16)	-24.2%	-32.54***	(-44.77, -20.31)	-23.3%
TZDs	0.19	0.16	-0.03	(-0.11, 0.06)	-15.6%	-0.02	(-0.09, 0.05)	-13.1%
Sulfonylureas	0.63	0.64	-0.31***	(-0.39, -0.22)	-48.5%	-0.34***	(-0.42, -0.25)	-52.9%
SGLT2i	65.94	66.78	-49.29***	(-55.65, -42.94)	-73.8%	-47.85***	(-54.4, -41.31)	-71.7%
Insulin	47.89	44.89	-17.31***	(-22.27, -12.34)	-38.5%	-15.5***	(-20.87, -10.12)	-34.5%
% of on-medication member-months								
Metformin	54.8%	54.8%	2.7%**	(1.17%, 4.24%)	4.9%	0.96%	(-0.62%, 2.54%)	1.7%
DPP4s	5.1%	5.2%	-0.85%**	(-1.45%, -0.24%)	-16.2%	-1.1%**	(-1.79%, -0.41%)	-21.1%
GLP-1s	20.7%	20.9%	-2.78%***	(-4.12%, -1.43%)	-13.3%	-2.86%***	(-4.29%, -1.43%)	-13.7%
TZDs	2.4%	2.5%	-0.53%*	(-0.95%, -0.11%)	-21.1%	-0.83%**	(-1.31%, -0.36%)	-33.2%
Sulfonylureas	12.6%	12.8%	-5.41%***	(-6.39%, -4.44%)	-42.3%	-6.43%***	(-7.51%, -5.36%)	-50.3%
SGLT2i	13.9%	14.2%	-8.47%***	(-9.56%, -7.37%)	-59.8%	-8.8%***	(-10%, -7.61%)	-62.2%
Insulin	10.8%	10.9%	-2.58%***	(-3.38%, -1.77%)	-23.7%	-2.88%***	(-3.72%, -2.03%)	-26.5%

Note: The table reports coefficients, standard errors, and p-values for the interaction terms between the post-intervention indicator and the indicator for INT participation. Estimates are derived from a regression model of individual monthly outcomes adjusted for individual and calendar-month fixed-effects. Standard errors are clustered at the member level.

Abbreviations: PMPM, per member per month; T2D, type 2 diabetes; DPP4, dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitor; GLP-1, glucagon-like peptide 1 agonist; TZD, thiazolidinedione; SGLT2i, sodium–glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitor.

References

1. AHA. *Strategies to Address Socioeconomic and Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Chronic Diseases by Incorporating Food and Nutrition Programs into the Primary Healthcare Setting*.; 2022. Accessed October 22, 2025. https://www.heart.org/en/-/media/Files/About-Us/Policy-Research/Policy-Positions/Access-to-Healthy-Food/Medical-Nutrition-Therapy-Policy-Statement-2022.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com

2. Arnold SV, Gosch K, Kosiborod M, et al. Contemporary use of cardiovascular risk reduction strategies in type 2 diabetes. Insights from the diabetes collaborative registry. *Am Hear J*. 2023;263:104-111. doi:10.1016/j.ahj.2023.05.002

3. Athinarayanan SJ, Adams RN, Hallberg SJ, et al. Long-Term Effects of a Novel Continuous Remote Care Intervention Including Nutritional Ketosis for the Management of Type 2 Diabetes: A 2-Year Non-randomized Clinical Trial. *Front Endocrinol*. 2019;10:348. doi:10.3389/fendo.2019.00348

4. Barthold D, Chiguluri V, Gumpina R, et al. Health Care Utilization and Medical Cost Outcomes from a Digital Diabetes Prevention Program in a Medicare Advantage Population. *Popul Heal Manag*. 2020;23(6):414-421. doi:10.1089/pop.2019.0184

5. Barthold D, Li J, Basu A. Patient Out-of-Pocket Costs for Type 2 Diabetes Medications When Aging Into Medicare. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2024;7(7):e2420724. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.20724

6. Bilger M, Finkelstein EA, Kruger E, Tate DF, Linnan LA. The Effect of Weight Loss on Health, Productivity, and Medical Expenditures Among Overweight Employees. *Méd Care*. 2013;51(6):471-477. doi:10.1097/mlr.0b013e318286e437

7. Brown V, Tran H, Downing KL, Hesketh KD, Moodie M. A systematic review of economic evaluations of web based or telephone delivered interventions for preventing overweight and obesity and/or improving obesity related behaviors. *Obes Rev*. 2021;22(7):e13227. doi:10.1111/obr.13227

8. CDC. *Adult Obesity Facts*.; 2025. Accessed September 21, 2025. https://www.cdc.gov/obesity/adult-obesity-facts/index.html

9. CDC. *National Diabetes Statistics Report*.; 2024. Accessed September 21, 2025. https://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/php/data-research/?CDC_AAref_Val=https://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/data/statistics-report/index.html

10. CDC. *National Health Statistics Report*.; 2024. Accessed October 22, 2025. https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr205.pdf

11. Crowley MJ, Tarkington PE, Bosworth HB, et al. Effect of a Comprehensive Telehealth Intervention vs Telemonitoring and Care Coordination in Patients With Persistently Poor Type 2 Diabetes Control. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2022;182(9):943-952. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2022.2947

12. Dalal MR, Robinson SB, Sullivan SD. Real-World Evaluation of the Effects of Counseling and Education in Diabetes Management. *Diabetes Spectr□: A Publ Am Diabetes Assoc*. 2014;27(4):235-243. doi:10.2337/diaspect.27.4.235

13. Davis AM, Vogelzang JL, Affenito SG. The Shortage of Registered Dietitians or Nutritionists with a Terminal Degree: A Call to Action for the Profession. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2023;123(4):569-575. doi:10.1016/j.jand.2023.01.003

14. Deslippe AL, Soanes A, Bouchaud CC, et al. Barriers and facilitators to diet, physical activity and lifestyle behavior intervention adherence: a qualitative systematic review of the literature. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2023;20(1):14. doi:10.1186/s12966-023-01424-2

15. Echouffo-Tcheugui JB, Chakkalakal RJ, Ali MK. Is the Current Lifestyle Modification Approach to Diabetes Prevention in the U.S. a Success? *Diabetes Care*. 2025;48(6):863-870. doi:10.2337/dci24-0040

16. Elm E von, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiology*. 2008;61(4):344-349. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.008

17. Flegal KM, Graubard BI, Williamson DF, Gail MH. Cause-Specific Excess Deaths Associated With Underweight, Overweight, and Obesity. *JAMA*. 2007;298(17):2028-2037. doi:10.1001/jama.298.17.2028

18. Fruchart JC, Sacks FM, Hermans MP, et al. The Residual Risk Reduction Initiative: a call to action to reduce residual vascular risk in dyslipidaemic patients. *Diabetes Vasc Dis Res*. 2008;5(4):319-335. doi:10.3132/dvdr.2008.046

19. Gao Y, Peterson E, Pagidipati N. Barriers to prescribing glucose-lowering therapies with cardiometabolic benefits. *Am Hear J*. 2020;224:47-53. doi:10.1016/j.ahj.2020.03.017

20. Gleason PP, Urick BY, Marshall LZ, Friedlander N, Qiu Y, Leslie RS. Real-world persistence and adherence to glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists among obese commercially insured adults without diabetes. *J Manag Care Spéc Pharm*. 2024;30(8):860-867. doi:10.18553/jmcp.2024.23332

21. Guerci B, Chanan N, Kaur S, Jasso-Mosqueda JG, Lew E. Lack of Treatment Persistence and Treatment Nonadherence as Barriers to Glycaemic Control in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes. *Diabetes Ther*. 2019;10(2):437-449. doi:10.1007/s13300-019-0590-x

22. Gupta N, Babyak A, Chorbajian A, Tardio V, Ballreich J, Dasgupta K. A cost effectiveness analysis of behavioural, pharmacological, and surgical obesity treatments in Canada. *Diabetes, Obes Metab*. 2025;27(10):5748-5760. doi:10.1111/dom.16627

23. Hallberg SJ, McKenzie AL, Williams PT, et al. Effectiveness and Safety of a Novel Care Model for the Management of Type 2 Diabetes at 1 Year: An Open-Label, Non-Randomized, Controlled Study. *Diabetes Ther*. 2018;9(2):583-612. doi:10.1007/s13300-018-0373-9

24. Ho DE, Imai K, King G, Stuart E. *{MatchIt}: Nonparametric Preprocessing for Parametric Causal Inference}*,. https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/MatchIt/citation.html

25. Johansson KS, Jimenez-Solem E, Petersen TS, Christensen MB. Increasing Medication Use and Polypharmacy in Type 2 Diabetes: The Danish Experience From 2000 to 2020. *Diabetes Care*. 2024;47(12):2120-2127. doi:10.2337/dc24-0011

26. Kelly JT, Law L, Guzman KRD, et al. Cost-effectiveness of telehealth-delivered nutrition interventions: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Nutr Rev*. 2023;81(12):1599-1611. doi:10.1093/nutrit/nuad032

27. Kirkman MS, Rowan-Martin MT, Levin R, et al. Determinants of Adherence to Diabetes Medications: Findings From a Large Pharmacy Claims Database. *Diabetes Care*. 2015;38(4):604-609. doi:10.2337/dc14-2098

28. KomodoHealth. The Komodo Healthcare Map. October 1, 2021. https://www.komodohealth.com/solutions/healthcare-map/

29. Lee PA, Greenfield G, Pappas Y. The impact of telehealth remote patient monitoring on glycemic control in type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of systematic reviews of randomised controlled trials. *BMC Heal Serv Res*. 2018;18(1):495. doi:10.1186/s12913-018-3274-8

30. Li G, Zhang P, Wang J, et al. Cardiovascular mortality, all-cause mortality, and diabetes incidence after lifestyle intervention for people with impaired glucose tolerance in the Da Qing Diabetes Prevention Study: a 23-year follow-up study. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2014;2(6):474-480. doi:10.1016/s2213-8587(14)70057-9

31. Nau DP. Recommendations for improving adherence to type 2 diabetes mellitus therapy--focus on optimizing oral and non-insulin therapies. *Am J Manag care*. 2012;18(3 Suppl):S49-54.

32. Niznik JD, Shmuel S, Pate V, et al. Validating claims based definitions for deprescribing: Bridging the gap between clinical and administrative data. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf*. 2024;33(4):e5784. doi:10.1002/pds.5784

33. Parker ED, Lin J, Mahoney T, et al. Economic Costs of Diabetes in the U.S. in 2022. *Diabetes Care*. 2023;47(1):26-43. doi:10.2337/dci23-0085

34. Perri MG, Shankar MN, Daniels MJ, et al. Effect of Telehealth Extended Care for Maintenance of Weight Loss in Rural US Communities. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(6):e206764. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.6764

35. Peterson-KFF. *How Do Prices of Drugs for Weight Loss in the U.S. Compare to Peer Nations' Prices?*; 2023. Accessed October 25, 2025. https://www.healthsystemtracker.org/brief/prices-of-drugs-for-weight-loss-in-the-us-and-peer-nations/

36. Polonsky WH, Henry RR. Poor medication adherence in type 2 diabetes: recognizing the scope of the problem and its key contributors. *Patient Preference Adherence*. 2016;10(0):1299-1307. doi:10.2147/ppa.s106821

37. Poobalan A, Aucott L, Smith WCS, et al. Effects of weight loss in overweight/obese individuals and long□term lipid outcomes – a systematic review. *Obes Rev*. 2004;5(1):43-50. doi:10.1111/j.1467-789x.2004.00127.x

38. Roberts CG, Adams RN, Athinarayanan SJ, Volk BM, Zoller AR, McKenzie AL. One-Year Real-World Evidence of Effectiveness of Carbohydrate Restricted Nutrition Therapy in Adults with Type 2 Diabetes across Age and Gender. Presented at: June 14, 2024. Accessed November 5, 2025. https://diabetesjournals.org/diabetes/article/73/Supplement_1/871-P/156567/871-P-One-Year-Real-World-Evidence-of

39. Roberts CG, Athinarayanan SJ, Volk BM, Adams RN. One year real-world outcomes of remotely delivered carbohydrate restricted nutrition therapy. Presented at: October 17, 2024. Accessed November 5, 2025. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/oby.24195

40. Rodriguez PJ, Zhang V, Gratzl S, et al. Discontinuation and Reinitiation of Dual-Labeled GLP-1 Receptor Agonists Among US Adults With Overweight or Obesity. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2025;8(1):e2457349. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.57349

41. Stratton IM, Adler AI, Neil HAW, et al. Association of glycaemia with macrovascular and microvascular complications of type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 35): prospective observational study. *BMJ*. 2000;321(7258):405. doi:10.1136/bmj.321.7258.405

42. Strawbridge LM, Lloyd JT, Meadow A, Riley GF, Howell BL. One-Year Outcomes of Diabetes Self-Management Training Among Medicare Beneficiaries Newly Diagnosed With Diabetes. *Méd Care*. 2017;55(4):391-397. doi:10.1097/mlr.0000000000000653

43. Strombotne KL, Lum J, Pizer SD, Figueroa S, Frakt AB, Conlin PR. Clinical effectiveness and cost□impact after 2 years of a ketogenic diet and virtual coaching intervention for patients with diabetes. *Diabetes, Obes Metab*. 2024;26(3):1016-1022. doi:10.1111/dom.15401

44. Sweet CC, Jasik CB, Diebold A, DuPuis A, Jendretzke B. Cost Savings and Reduced Health Care Utilization Associated with Participation in a Digital Diabetes Prevention Program in an

Adult Workforce Population. *J Heal Econ Outcomes Res*. 2020;7(2):139-147. doi:10.36469/jheor.2020.14529

45. Turner RM, Ma Q, Lorig K, Greenberg J, DeVries AR. Evaluation of a Diabetes Self-Management Program: Claims Analysis on Comorbid Illnesses, Health Care Utilization, and Cost. *J Méd Internet Res*. 2018;20(6):e207. doi:10.2196/jmir.9225

46. Ward ZJ, Bleich SN, Long MW, Gortmaker SL. Association of body mass index with health care expenditures in the United States by age and sex. *PLoS ONE*. 2021;16(3):e0247307. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0247307