

Clinical Decision Tool Reviews

Updated Review of HOMA-IR (Homeostatic Model Assessment for Insulin Resistance)

Jayachidambaram Ambalavanan, M.D.^{1,2} ¹ Endocrinology and Diabetes, Maine Health, Scarborough, Maine,² Department of Medicine, Tufts University School of Medicine

Keywords: HOMA, IR, insulin resistance, metabolic syndrome, diabetes, HOMA-IR, obesity

Evidence to Action: Official Journal of MDCalc

Vol. 042025, Issue 01, 2025

Article Information

Keywords: HOMA, IR, insulin resistance, metabolic syndrome, diabetes, HOMA-IR, obesity

<https://doi.org/10.65357/001c.154184>

Submitted: September 24, 2025 EDT

Accepted: December 08, 2025 EDT

Published: December 20, 2025 EDT

WHEN TO USE

Use the HOMA-IR to estimate the prevalence of insulin resistance in individuals who are at high risk of developing metabolic syndrome and diabetes when direct measurement (i.e., euglycemic clamp) methods are not feasible. High risk individuals include patients with obesity, increased waist circumference, dyslipidemia, and impaired glucose tolerance. It is best used in research settings for large-scale epidemiological studies.^{1,2} Clinically, it may be used as an adjunct in patients who need objective numbers to demonstrate the degree of insulin resistance to incentivize lifestyle modifications along with pharmacological treatment and prevent complications of metabolic syndrome.

PEARLS / PITFALLS

This is a simple, non-invasive estimate using fasting glucose and insulin measurements after an eight hour overnight fast. Values are assay-dependent (reference intervals need to be individualized) and also vary by ethnicity, β -cell function, and body mass index.³ Results typically show reasonable correlation between HOMA-IR and 'clamp' measurement, the gold standard.⁴ However, as a fasting test, it predominantly estimates hepatic resistance and does not consider peripheral resistance and early dysglycemia, which are better estimated with dynamic tests such as oral glucose tolerance tests and eug-

Abstract

HOMA-IR is used to estimate prevalence of insulin resistance in individuals who are at risk of developing metabolic syndrome and diabetes. This review summarizes pearls, pitfalls and practical application of the calculator.

lycemic clamp.⁵ As a result, it is not recommended for diagnosis or treatment decisions where clinical judgement is prioritized.

HOMA-IR is unreliable in:

- Patients with an established diagnosis of diabetes or patients on exogenous insulin⁶
- Lean individuals or individuals with normal BMI⁷
- Elderly (Age > 60 years)⁸
- Acute illness or stress states⁹

WHY USE

Direct methods (euglycemic clamp) for measuring insulin resistance are resource intensive, invasive, and time consuming, and this score can be a useful non-invasive metric to give patients an indirect measure of their risk of metabolic syndrome.

NEXT STEPS

Advice

- There is no universally accepted single cut-off, **and values between 2.0-3.0** are commonly used in U.S. clinical and research settings, with a **cutoff of ≥ 2.5** used in NHANES (National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey) to indicate insulin resistance.¹⁰
- Consider the population and context of use:

- A study of U.S. adults without diabetes (NHANES III) found a HOMA-IR median of 2.2, mean of 2.8, and standard deviation of 2.4.¹¹
- A study of U.S. adolescents found a HOMA-IR mean of 2.3 in normal weight and 4.9 in obese individuals (of which >50% had insulin resistance).¹²
- Internationally, cut-offs for metabolic syndrome and dysglycemia are lower in Asian populations, between 1.4-2.5.¹³⁻¹⁵

Management

There are no validated management algorithms or guidelines using the HOMA-IR score.

However, lifestyle modifications are the foundation of reversing early onset insulin resistance.^{16,17} High Intensity Interval Training (HIIT) or concurrent resistance training combined with a Mediterranean, or plant-based diet yields the greatest improvement in HOMA-IR, with practical implementation involving 2–3 sessions per week and a diet rich in fiber, whole grains, fruits, vegetables, and unsaturated fats.^{18,19} If lifestyle modifications are insufficient, pharmacological therapy focusing on weight loss and cardiovascular comorbidities should be employed. Weight loss of 5–10% can substantially improve insulin sensitivity.²⁰ For this reason, Glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) agonists or dual (GLP-1 and Glucose-dependent Insulinotropic Polypeptide) agonists, like tirzepatide, can be prescribed.^{21,22} Metformin can also play a role but it is not as effective as the GLP-1 or dual agonists.²³

EVIDENCE

The HOMA-IR calculator was developed in 1985 via a comparative study using a computer-solved model. The study was a mathematical modeling analysis based on published physiological data, rather than a clinical trial with direct patient enrollment. The estimated insulin resistance obtained by the calculator correlated well with estimates obtained by using the euglycemic clamp ($R_s = 0.88$, $p < 0.0001$), the fasting insulin concentration ($R_s = 0.81$, $p < 0.0001$), and the hyperglycemic clamp, ($R_s = 0.69$, $p < 0.01$) (R_s : Spearman's rank correlation coefficient).²⁴ The study introduced a novel, non-invasive surrogate for insulin resistance with strong correlations with gold standard measures. However, it was based on a simplified feedback loop, which may not have captured dynamic physiology. Also, the coefficients of variation were high at 31% for insulin resistance and 32% for β -cell function which in turn indicate poor reproducibility and lack of sufficient accuracy for therapeutic decision.

The calculator was validated in a study published in 2000 by Bonora et al.⁴ This was a cross-sectional valida-

tion study in 53 patients with diabetes and 62 patients without diabetes to evaluate whether the HOMA-IR is a reliable surrogate measure of in vivo insulin sensitivity in humans. Patients on insulin, recent acute illness, clinical evidence of cardiovascular, kidney, or liver disease were excluded. It showed strong correlation between HOMA-IR and clamp-derived glucose disposal with overall $r = -0.82$, $p < 0.0001$, and no substantial differences were noted in correlation between patients with and without diabetes. The study concluded that HOMA-IR can be reliably used in large-scale or epidemiological studies. Kat-suki et al., using a univariate regression analysis, further validated the calculator by demonstrating a significant correlation between log-transformed HOMA-IR and log-transformed clamp IR before ($r = -0.613$, $p < 0.0001$) and after ($r = -0.734$, $p < 0.0001$) treatment in 55 Japanese patients with type 2 diabetes.²⁵ Both Ikeda et al. and Sarafidis et al. came to similar conclusions in patients with diabetes and hypertension.^{26,27}

A recent meta-analysis conducted by Otten et al. showed that the log-transformed HOMA-IR had a pooled correlation coefficient of -0.60 (95% CI: -0.66 to -0.53) across 22 studies.²⁸ Although the correlation was significant, it was still below other fasting indices of insulin resistance like revised QUICKI ($r = 0.68$) and OGTT-based indices like Matsuda and Stumvoll MCR ($r = 0.70$).²⁸

However, it is important to know that no major clinical guidelines from prominent organizations like the American Diabetes Association or the European Association for the Study of Diabetes endorse HOMA-IR for routine clinical use. An impact analysis done by Wallace et al. demonstrated that HOMA-IR is validated against gold standard methods and useful for large-scale studies, but its reliability depends on input data and interpretation. The authors also caution against using HOMA-IR to assess β -cell function in isolation or in clinical scenarios where dynamic testing is more appropriate.⁶

Of note, a modified version of the calculator called HOMA2-IR was published in 1998. It considers hepatic as well as peripheral glucose resistance, increase in insulin secretion at higher glucose, and the impact of proinsulin. However, this is not a simple equation and requires computer software to run calculations. Currently, a license is required from [Oxford University Innovations](#) to run this software, limiting daily use in clinical settings.

FORMULA

Score = (Fasting insulin, uIU/mL) * (Fasting glucose, mg/dL) / 405

FACTS & FIGURES

A HOMA-IR score ≥ 2.5 is generally considered indicative of insulin resistance, but the optimal cutoff may vary by clinical context and population.

REFERENCES

1. Lee CH, Shih AZL, Woo YC, et al. Optimal Cut-Offs of Homeostasis Model Assessment of Insulin Resistance (HOMA-IR) to Identify Dysglycemia and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A 15-Year Prospective Study in Chinese. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(9). doi:[10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0163424](https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0163424)
2. Haffner SM, Miettinen H, Stern MP. The homeostasis model in the San Antonio Heart Study. *Diabetes Care*. 1997;20(7):1087-1092. doi:[10.2337/DIACARE.20.7.1087](https://doi.org/10.2337/DIACARE.20.7.1087)
3. Matli B, Schulz A, Koeck T, et al. Distribution of HOMA-IR in a population-based cohort and proposal for reference intervals. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2021;59(11):1844-1851. doi:[10.1515/CCLM-2021-0643](https://doi.org/10.1515/CCLM-2021-0643)
4. Bonora E, Targher G, Alberiche M, et al. Homeostasis model assessment closely mirrors the glucose clamp technique in the assessment of insulin sensitivity: studies in subjects with various degrees of glucose tolerance and insulin sensitivity. *Diabetes Care*. 2000;23(1):57-63. doi:[10.2337/DIACARE.23.1.57](https://doi.org/10.2337/DIACARE.23.1.57)
5. Muniyappa R, Lee S, Chen H, Quon MJ. Current approaches for assessing insulin sensitivity and resistance in vivo: advantages, limitations, and appropriate usage. *Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab*. 2008;294(1). doi:[10.1152/AJPENDO.00645.2007](https://doi.org/10.1152/AJPENDO.00645.2007)
6. Wallace TM, Levy JC, Matthews DR. Use and abuse of HOMA modeling. *Diabetes Care*. 2004;27(6):1487-1495. doi:[10.2337/DIACARE.27.6.1487](https://doi.org/10.2337/DIACARE.27.6.1487)
7. Diamanti-Kandarakis E, Kouli C, Alexandraki K, Spina G. Failure of mathematical indices to accurately assess insulin resistance in lean, overweight, or obese women with polycystic ovary syndrome. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2004;89(3):1273-1276. doi:[10.1210/JC.2003-031205](https://doi.org/10.1210/JC.2003-031205)
8. Chang AM, Smith MJ, Bloem CJ, Galecki AT, Halter JB, Supiano MA. Limitation of the homeostasis model assessment to predict insulin resistance and beta-cell dysfunction in older people. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2006;91(2):629-634. doi:[10.1210/JC.2005-1803](https://doi.org/10.1210/JC.2005-1803)
9. Holzinger U, Kitzberger R, Fuhrmann V, Funk GC, Madl C, Ratheiser K. Correlation of calculated indices of insulin resistance (QUICKI and HOMA) with the euglycaemic hyperinsulinaemic clamp technique for evaluating insulin resistance in critically ill patients. *Eur J Anaesthesiol*. 2007;24(11):966-970. doi:[10.1017/S0265021507001111](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0265021507001111)
10. Parcha V, Heindl B, Kalra R, et al. Insulin Resistance and Cardiometabolic Risk Profile Among Nondiabetic American Young Adults: Insights From NHANES. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2022;107(1):E25-E37. doi:[10.1210/CLINEM/DGAB645](https://doi.org/10.1210/CLINEM/DGAB645)
11. Bravata DM, Wells CK, Concato J, Kernan WN, Brass LM, Gulanski BI. Two measures of insulin sensitivity provided similar information in a U.S. population. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2004;57(11):1214-1217. doi:[10.1016/j.jclinepi.2004.05.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2004.05.001)
12. Lee JM, Okumura MJ, Davis MM, Herman WH, Gurney JG. Prevalence and determinants of insulin resistance among U.S. adolescents: a population-based study. *Diabetes Care*. 2006;29(11):2427-2432. doi:[10.2337/DC06-0709](https://doi.org/10.2337/DC06-0709)
13. Lin SY, Li WC, Yang TA, et al. Optimal Threshold of Homeostasis Model Assessment of Insulin Resistance to Identify Metabolic Syndrome in a Chinese Population Aged 45 Years or Younger. *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne)*. 2022;12. doi:[10.3389/FENDO.2021.746747](https://doi.org/10.3389/FENDO.2021.746747)
14. Lee CH, Shih AZL, Woo YC, et al. Optimal Cut-Offs of Homeostasis Model Assessment of Insulin Resistance (HOMA-IR) to Identify Dysglycemia and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A 15-Year Prospective Study in Chinese. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(9). doi:[10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0163424](https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0163424)
15. Yun KJ, Han K, Kim MK, et al. Insulin Resistance Distribution and Cut-Off Value in Koreans from the 2008-2010 Korean National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(4). doi:[10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0154593](https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0154593)
16. Aedh AI, Alshahrani MS, Huneif MA, Pryme IF, Oruch R. A Glimpse into Milestones of Insulin Resistance and an Updated Review of Its Management. *Nutrients*. 2023;15(4). doi:[10.3390/NU15040921](https://doi.org/10.3390/NU15040921)
17. Vogeser M, König D, Frey I, Predel HG, Parhofer KG, Berg A. Fasting serum insulin and the homeostasis model of insulin resistance (HOMA-IR) in the monitoring of lifestyle interventions in obese persons. *Clin Biochem*. 2007;40(13-14):964-968. doi:[10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2007.05.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2007.05.009)
18. Banaszak M, Górna I, Przysławski J. Non-Pharmacological Treatments for Insulin Resistance: Effective Intervention of Plant-Based Diets-A Critical Review. *Nutrients*. 2022;14(7). doi:[10.3390/NU14071400](https://doi.org/10.3390/NU14071400)
19. Battista F, Ermolao A, van Baak MA, et al. Effect of exercise on cardiometabolic health of adults with overweight or obesity: Focus on blood pressure, insulin resistance, and intrahepatic fat-A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obes Rev*. 2021;22 Suppl 4(Suppl 4). doi:[10.1111/OBR.13269](https://doi.org/10.1111/OBR.13269)
20. García-Hermoso A, López-Gil JF, Izquierdo M, Ramírez-Vélez R, Ezzatvar Y. Exercise and Insulin Resistance Markers in Children and Adolescents With Excess Weight: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-Analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2023;177(12):1276-1284. doi:[10.1001/JAMAPEDIATRICS.2023.4038](https://doi.org/10.1001/JAMAPEDIATRICS.2023.4038)

21. Wu S, Gao L, Cipriani A, et al. The effects of incretin-based therapies on β -cell function and insulin resistance in type 2 diabetes: A systematic review and network meta-analysis combining 360 trials. *Diabetes Obes Metab*. 2019;21(4):975-983. doi:[10.1111/DOM.13613](https://doi.org/10.1111/DOM.13613)
22. Frias JP, De Block C, Brown K, et al. Tirzepatide Improved Markers of Islet Cell Function and Insulin Sensitivity in People With T2D (SURPASS-2). *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2024;109(7):1745-1753. doi:[10.1210/CLINEM/DGAE038](https://doi.org/10.1210/CLINEM/DGAE038)
23. Bermúdez-Pirela VJ, Cano C, Medina MT, et al. Metformin plus low-dose glimeperide significantly improves Homeostasis Model Assessment for insulin resistance (HOMA(IR)) and beta-cell function (HOMA(beta-cell)) without hyperinsulinemia in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Am J Ther*. 2007;14(2):194-202. doi:[10.1097/01.PAP.0000249909.54047.0E](https://doi.org/10.1097/01.PAP.0000249909.54047.0E)
24. Matthews DR, Hosker JP, Rudenski AS, Naylor BA, Treacher DF, Turner RC. Homeostasis model assessment: insulin resistance and beta-cell function from fasting plasma glucose and insulin concentrations in man. *Diabetologia*. 1985;28(7):412-419. doi:[10.1007/BF00280883](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00280883)
25. Katsuki A, Sumida Y, Gabazza EC, et al. Homeostasis model assessment is a reliable indicator of insulin resistance during follow-up of patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2001;24(2):362-365. doi:[10.2337/DIACARE.24.2.362](https://doi.org/10.2337/DIACARE.24.2.362)
26. Ikeda Y, Suehiro T, Nakamura T, Kumon Y, Hashimoto K. Clinical significance of the insulin resistance index as assessed by homeostasis model assessment. *Endocr J*. 2001;48(1):81-86. doi:[10.1507/ENDOCRJ.48.81](https://doi.org/10.1507/ENDOCRJ.48.81)
27. Sarafidis PA, Lasaridis AN, Nilsson PM, et al. Validity and reproducibility of HOMA-IR, 1/HOMA-IR, QUICKI and McAuley's indices in patients with hypertension and type II diabetes. *J Hum Hypertens*. 2007;21(9):709-716. doi:[10.1038/SJ.JHH.1002201](https://doi.org/10.1038/SJ.JHH.1002201)
28. Otten J, Åhrén B, Olsson T. Surrogate measures of insulin sensitivity vs the hyperinsulinaemic-euglycaemic clamp: a meta-analysis. *Diabetologia*. 2014;57(9):1781-1788. doi:[10.1007/S00125-014-3285-X](https://doi.org/10.1007/S00125-014-3285-X)