Diabetes Therapies Part 2:

Pioglitazone AND DDP-4

Inhibitors - Cardiovascular,

Renal, and Liver Effects

May 18, 2022

Savitha Subramanian MD Associate Professor, Division of Metabolism, Endocrinology, and Nutrition University of Washington UW Cardiometabolic ECHO



Iniversity of Washington ardiometabolic

Objectives

- Understand the mechanism of action, efficacy, and side-effects of pioglitazone on cardiovascular, renal, and liver
- Understand the mechanism of action, efficacy, and side-effects of DPP-4 inhibitors on cardiovascular, renal, and liver

Case

- 54 year old male with 5 years of type 2 diabetes, no complications
- On metformin 1000mg twice daily
- Has gained 12 lbs working from home over the past 2 years
- Self-pay
- A1C 8.6-9% over recent 12 months $(8.6 \rightarrow 8.9 \rightarrow 9.2\%)$

What is the next step?

Glycemic control declines over time with traditional monotherapy

Most patients on traditional therapies will require another agent to maintain long-term glycemic control



4

Turner RC, et al. JAMA 1999;281:2005

Progressive deterioration in glycemic control over time



UKPDS Group. Lancet. 1998;352:837 -853. Holman RR. Diabetes Res Clin Pract 1998;40(suppl):S21 -S25.

Add-on oral therapies to metformin

- Sulfonylureas
 - Increase insulin secretion
- DPP-4 inhibitors
 - Inhibit the breakdown of GI hormones that stimulate insulin release (GLP-1 and GIP)
- GLP-1 receptor agonists
 - Stimulate the release of insulin in the pancreas
- Meglitinides
- Alpha glucosidase inhibitors
- Bromocriptine
- Colesevelam

- Biguanides
 - Reduce hepatic gluconeogenesis
 - Decrease insulin resistance

Thiazolidinediones

 Modulate expression of insulin-sensitive genes in adipocytes and skeletal muscle

SGLT2 inhibitors

 Inhibit reabsorption of glucose in kidney

Algorithm for Type 2 Diabetes Treatment – 2022



Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Management: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes - 2022. Diabetes Care 45: S125-143

THE JOURNAL OF CLINICAL AND APPLIED RESEARCH AND EDUCATION VOLUME 45 I SUPPLIMENT 1 Diabetes Care WWW.DIABETES.ORG/DIABETES.CARE

AMERICAN DIABETES ASSOCIATION STANDARDS OF MEDICAL CARE IN DIABETES-2022



PHARMACOLOGIC TREATMENT OF HYPERGLYCEMIA IN ADULTS WITH TYPE 2 DIABETES

FIRST-LINE THERAPY depends on comorbidities, patient-centered treatment factors, including cost and access considerations, and management needs and generally includes metformin and comprehensive lifestyle modification^



CONSIDER INDEPENDENT OF BASELINE A1C OR INDIVIDUALIZED A1C TARGET



TO AVOID THERAPEUTIC INERTIA REASSESS AND MODIFY TREATMENT REGULARLY (3-6 MONTHS





Minimize hypoglycemia Minimize weight gain/ Promote weight loss 3. Cost and access considerations

CONSIDER COST AND ACCESS

available at the lowest acquisition cost

Incorporate additional agents based on comorbidities, patient-centered treatment factors, and management needs

Pioglitazone

Pioglitazone – mechanism of action

- PPAR gamma agonist
- 1 insulin sensitivity by acting on fat, liver and skeletal muscle to increase glucose utilization and suppress liver glucose production
- Efficacy Al C reduction 1-1.5%



Key: FFA = free fatty acids

Adapted with permission from Bailey CJ, Feher MD, Therapies for Diabetes, Sherborne Gibbs, Birmingham UK, 2004

Source: Br J Diabetes Vasc Dis © 2006 Sherbourne Gibbs, Ltd

Cardiovascular effects of pioglitazone

- PROactive
- N=5238 with prior CV event
- Pioglitazone vs placebo for 34.5 months





PROactive Bad news



Pioglitazone: IRIS

- N= 3876 individuals without diabetes but with insulin resistance
- Recent h/o TIA or stroke
- Pioglitazone vs placebo for 4.8y
- Pioglitazone \downarrow fatal/NF stroke or MI by 24%
- \downarrow ACS by 29%
- Mechanism unclear
- Improved insulin sensitivity, blood pressure, plasma glucose, triglycerides, HDL-C, and CRP
- No \uparrow in heart failure

No. at Risk Pioglitazone Placebo





Pioglitazone – meta-analysis

Prediabetes, insulin resistance Type 2 diabetes

	Pioglita	zone	Compar	ator		Risk Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	L
1.1.1 MACE							
ACT NOW 2011	2	303	1	299	0.4%	1.97 [0.18, 21, 65]	
IRIS 2016	175	1939	228	1937	99.6%	0.77 [0.64, 0.92]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		2242		2236	100.0%	0.77 [0.64, 0.93]	
Total events	177		229				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0	0.60, df = 1	1 (P = 0.	44); I ² = 0	%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.73 (F	P = 0.00	6)				
1.1.2 Myocardial infa	retion						
ACT NOW 2014	iction o	202		000	1.00/	1 07 10 10 01 051	
ACT NOW 2011	50	1020	70	299	1.3%	1.97 [0.18, 21, 65]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	52	2242	/8	2236	98.7%	067 [0.47, 0.94]	
Total quanta	EA	2242	70	2230	100.0 %	000 [0.49, 0.90]	
Hotorogonoitu: Chi2 - /	0.77 44 - 1	(D - 0	201-12-0	0/			
Test for everall effects	0.77, 01 = 1	P = 0.02	38); = 0	70			
rest for overall effect.	Z = 2.70 (f	P = 0.03)				
1.1.3 Stroke							
ACT NOW 2011	0	303	0	299		Not estimable	
IRIS 2016	127	1939	154	1937	95.4%	0.82 [0.66, 1.03]	
J SPIRIT 2015	4	63	7	57	4.6%	0.52 [0.16, 1.67]	1
Subtotal (95% CI)		2305		2293	100.0%	0.81 [0.65, 1.01]	
Total events	131		161				
Heterogeneity: Chi2 = 0	0.58, df = 1	1 (P = 0.	45); l ² = 0	96			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.86 (F	P = 0.06)				
	<u></u>						
							<u>-</u>
							1'
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Cl	$hi^2 = 0.6$	8 df = 2 (F	P = 0.71) l ² = 0%		

	Pioglita	zone	Compar	ator		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
2.1.1 MACE							
CHICAGO 2006	0	230	2	228	0.8%	0.20 [0.01, 4.11]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Kaku 2009	7	293	7	294	2.1%	1.00 [0.36, 2.82]	
PERISCOPE 2008	5	270	6	273	1.8%	0.84 [0.26, 2.73]	
PROactive 2005	257	2605	313	2633	93.1%	0.83 [0.71, 0.97]	
PROFIT J 2014	8	234	8	247	2.3%	1.06 [0.40, 2.77]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		3632		3675	100.0%	0.83 [0.72, 0.97]	•
Total events	277		336				
Heterogeneity. Chi2 =	1.22, df = 4	4 (P = 0.	.87); l ² = 0	%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.36 (I	P = 0.02)				
2.1.2 Myocardial inar	ction						
CHICAGO 2006	0	230	1	228	1.2%	0.33 [0.01, 8.07]	1
Lee 2013	2	60	7	61	0.8%	2.03 [0.19, 21.84]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
PERISCOPE 2008	2	270	4	273	3.2%	0.51 [0.09, 2.74]	·
PROactive 2006	90	2605	116	2633	91.8%	0.78 [0.60, 1.03]	
PROFIT J 2014	6	234	4	247	3.1%	1.32 [0.36, 4.85]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		3399		3442	100.0%	0.80 [0.62, 1.03]	•
Total events	99		126				
Heterogeneity. Chi2 =	1.76, df = 4	4 (P = 0.	.78); l ² = 0	%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.73 (I	P = 0.08)				
2.1.3 Stroke							
CHICAGO 2006	0	230	1	228	1.2%	0.33 [0.01, 8.07]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
J SPIRIT 2015	4	63	7	57	6.1%	0.52 [0.16, 1.67]	
PERISCOPE 2008	0	270	1	273	1.2%	0.34 [0.01, 8.24]	·
PROactive 2005	96	2605	107	2633	88.2%	0.81 [0.61, 1.07]	
PROFIT J 2014	3	234	4	247	3.2%	1.79 [0.18, 3.50]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		3402		3438	100.0%	0.78 [0.60, 1.02]	-
Total events	93		126				
Heterogeneity. Chi2 =	1.09, df = 4	4 (P = 0.	90); l ² = 0	%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.83 (I	P = 0.07)				
							0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Cl	$hi^2 = 0.2$	2, df = 2 (P = 0.90), l² = 0%	č.	Favours pioglitazone Favours comparator

	Pioglita	zone	Compar	ator		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
2.1.1 MACE							
CHICAGO 2006	0	230	2	228	0.8%	0.20 [0.01, 4.11]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Kaku 2009	7	293	7	294	2.1%	1.00 [0.36, 2.82]	
PERISCOPE 2008	5	270	6	273	1.8%	0.84 [0.26, 2.73]	
PROactive 2005	257	2605	313	2633	93.1%	0.83 [0.71, 0.97]	
PROFIT J 2014	8	234	8	247	2.3%	1.06 [0.40, 2.77]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		3632		3675	100.0%	0.83 [0.72, 0.97]	•
Total events	277		336				
Heterogeneity. Chi2 =	1.22, df = 4	4 (P = 0.	.87); l ² = 0	%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.36 (F	P = 0.02)				
2.1.2 Myocardial inar	rction						
CHICAGO 2006	0	230	1	228	1.2%	0.33 [0.01, 8.07]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Lee 2013	2	60	7	61	0.8%	2.03 [0.19, 21.84]	
PERISCOPE 2008	2	270	4	273	3.2%	0.51 [0.09, 2.74]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
PROactive 2006	90	2605	116	2633	91.8%	0.78 [0.60, 1.03]	
PROFIT J 2014	6	234	4	247	3.1%	1.32 [0.36, 4.85]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		3399		3442	100.0%	0.80 [0.62, 1.03]	◆
Total events	99		126				
Heterogeneity. Chi2 =	1.76, df = 4	(P = 0.	78); l ² = 0	%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.73 (F	P = 0.08)				
2.1.3 Stroke							
CHICAGO 2006	0	230	1	228	1.2%	0.33 [0.01, 8.07]	0
J SPIRIT 2015	4	63	7	57	6.1%	0.52 [0.16, 1.67]	
PERISCOPE 2008	0	270	1	273	1.2%	0.34 [0.01, 8.24]	
PROactive 2005	96	2605	107	2633	88.2%	0.81 [0.61, 1.07]	
PROFIT J 2014	3	234	4	247	3.2%	1.79 [0.18, 3.50]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		3402		3438	100.0%	0.78 [0.60, 1.02]	-
Total events	93		126				
Heterogeneity. Chi2 =	1.09, df = 4	(P = 0.)	90); l ² = 0	%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.83 (F	P = 0.07)				
							0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Ch	ni² = 0.2	2, df = 2 (P = 0.90), l² = 0%	č.	Favours pioglitazone Favours comparator

	Pioglita	zone	Compar	ator		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
2.1.1 MACE							
CHICAGO 2006	0	230	2	228	0.8%	0.20 [0.01, 4.11]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Kaku 2009	7	293	7	294	2.1%	1.00 [0.36, 2.82]	
PERISCOPE 2008	5	270	6	273	1.8%	0.84 [0.26, 2.73]	
PROactive 2005	257	2605	313	2633	93.1%	0.83 [0.71, 0.97]	
PROFIT J 2014	8	234	8	247	2.3%	1.06 [0.40, 2.77]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		3632		3675	100.0%	0.83 [0.72, 0.97]	•
Total events	277		336				
Heterogeneity. Chi2 =	1.22, df = 4	4 (P = 0.	.87); l ² = 0	%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.36 (F	P = 0.02)				
2.1.2 Myocardial inar	rction						
CHICAGO 2006	0	230	1	228	1.2%	0.33 [0.01, 8.07]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Lee 2013	2	60	7	61	0.8%	2.03 [0.19, 21.84]	
PERISCOPE 2008	2	270	4	273	3.2%	0.51 [0.09, 2.74]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
PROactive 2006	90	2605	116	2633	91.8%	0.78 [0.60, 1.03]	
PROFIT J 2014	6	234	4	247	3.1%	1.32 [0.36, 4.85]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		3399		3442	100.0%	0.80 [0.62, 1.03]	◆
Total events	99		126				
Heterogeneity. Chi2 =	1.76, df = 4	(P = 0.	78); l ² = 0	%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.73 (F	P = 0.08)				
2.1.3 Stroke							
CHICAGO 2006	0	230	1	228	1.2%	0.33 [0.01, 8.07]	0
J SPIRIT 2015	4	63	7	57	6.1%	0.52 [0.16, 1.67]	
PERISCOPE 2008	0	270	1	273	1.2%	0.34 [0.01, 8.24]	
PROactive 2005	96	2605	107	2633	88.2%	0.81 [0.61, 1.07]	
PROFIT J 2014	3	234	4	247	3.2%	1.79 [0.18, 3.50]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		3402		3438	100.0%	0.78 [0.60, 1.02]	-
Total events	93		126				
Heterogeneity. Chi2 =	1.09, df = 4	(P = 0.)	90); l ² = 0	%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.83 (F	P = 0.07)				
							0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Ch	ni² = 0.2	2, df = 2 (P = 0.90), l² = 0%	č.	Favours pioglitazone Favours comparator



\downarrow MACE RR 0.72

Pioglitazone: kidney effects

- Decrease in urinary albumin and protein excretion in T2D
- No studies in low eGFR!



Pioglitazone: Effect on the liver

- Improves liver histology in biopsy-proven NASH in patients with or without T2D – decreases steatosis/ hepatic fat
- Improves hepatic fibrosis at any stage of NASH (use up to 24 months)
- Discontinuation of pioglitazone is accompanied by an abrupt \uparrow in ALT levels



Sanyal A et al. PIVENS trial. NEJM 2010; Musso G et al. JAMA Int Med 2017

Safety concerns of pioglitazone

Weight gain

- 1-4 kg of adipose tissue mass over 1 yr (2-5% body wt)
- Dose related
- Greater wt gain → greater reductions in A1 C → improvements in insulin sensitivity
- ↑ in body weight –due to stimulation of PPARγ receptors in the hypothalamus to augment appetite
- No negative effects of weight gain
- Can be minimized by limiting dose to 30mg

Fluid retention/ heart failure

- Edema 5-10%
- Dose related; increased with use of sulfonylureas and insulin
 - -Causes → renal sodium retention. Peripheral vasodilation
- ↑ serious heart failure events on pioglitazone in PROactive
- Can improve diastolic dysfunction
- Should not be used in patients with symptomatic HF; if edema present on exam



Other

- Bone fractures
- Bladder cancer

Safety outcomes from pioglitazone meta -analysis

	Experim	ontal	Cont			Disk Datio	Disk Date	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	3.1.5 Bladder cancer
3.1.1 Heart failure								IRIS 2016 12
ACT NOW 2011	1	303	1	299	0.4%	0.99 [0.06, 15.70]	•	→ PROactive 2005 14
CHICAGO 2006	1	230	0	228	0.2%	2.97 [0.12, 72.62]		Subtotal (95% CI)
IRIS 2016	74	1939	71	1937	25.9%	1.04 [0.76, 1.43]	_ _ _	Total events 26
PERISCOPE 2008	4	270	5	273	1.8%	0.81 [0.22, 2.98]		Heterogeneity: Chi ² =0.46, df=1 (P=0
PROaclive 2005 Subtotal (95% CI)	281	2605 5347	198	2633 5370	71.8% 100.0%	1.43 [1.21, 1.71] 1.32 [1.14, 1.54]		Test for overall effect: Z= 1.89 (P = 0.0
Total evenis	361		275	275		•		3.1.6 Edema
Heterogeneity: Chi2= 3	.83. df = 4 (P	e=0.43); I	2= 0%					ACT NOW 2011 39
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 3.64 (P =	= 0.0003)						CHICAGO 2006 30
								IRIS 2016 691
3.1.2 Fracture								Kaku 2009 48
ACT NOW 2011	8	3.3	7	299	8.0%	1.13 [0.41, 3.07]		PERISCOPE 2008 48
IRIS 2016	99	1939	62	1937	70.9%	1.60 [1.17, 2.18]		PROactive 2005 689
Kaku 2009	18	293	18	294	20.5%	1.00 [0.53, 1.89]		PROFIT J 2014 12
PERISCOPE 2008	8	270	0	273	0.6%	17.19 [1.00, 296.32]		→ Subtotal (95% CI)
Subtotal (95% CI)		2805		2803	100.0%	1.52 [1.17, 1.99]	-	Total events 1557
Total evenIs	133		87	87				Heterogeneity: Chi ² =21.65, df=6 (P=
Heterogeneity: Chi2=4	.89, df = 3 (P	P= 0.18);	$l^2 = 39\%$					Test for overall effect: Z = 13.62 (P < 0
Test for overall effect: 2	Z=3.13 (P=	0.002)						3.1.7 Weight gain
3.1.3 All-cause morta	lity							ACT NOW 2011 205
ACT NOW 2011	3	303	1	299	0.3%	2.96 [0.31, 28.30]		→ CHICAGO 2006 15
CHICAGO 2006	1	230	0	228	0.2%	2.97 [0.12, 72.62]		→ IRIS 2016 1013
IRIS 2016	136	1939	146	1937	49.6%	0.93 [0.74, 1.17]		PROaclive 2005 95
Lee 2013	0	60	1	61	0.5%	0.34 [0.01, 8.16]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	- Subtotal (95% CI)
PERISCOPE 2008	3	270	2	273	0.7%	1.52 [0.26, 9.01]		Total events 1328
PROactive 2005	129	2605	142	2633	48.0%	0.92 [0.73, 1.16]		Heterogeneity: Chi ² =8.38, df=3 (P=
PROFIT J 2014	1	234	2	247	0.7%	0.53 [0.05, 5.78]		Test for overall effect: Z = 13.76 (P < 0
Subtotal (95% CI)	070	5641	204	50/8	100.0%	0.93 [0.80, 1.09]	T	3.1.8 Hypoglycemia
Total events	213		294					CHICAGO 2006 45
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =2	.42, 01 = 6 (P)	2=0.88); I	² =0%					IBIS 2016 1
Test for overall effect: A	2= 0.85 (P=	0.40)						Kaku 2009 46
3.1.4 Any cancer								PERISCOPE 2008 41
ACT NOW 2011	3	303	8	299	3.0%	0.37 [0.10, 1.38]	·	PROactive 2005 709
IRIS 2016	133	1939	150	1937	56.5%	0.89 [0.71, 1.11]		Subtotal (95% CI)
PROactive 2005	103	2605	103	2633	38.6%	1.01 [0.77, 1.32]		Total events 842
PROFIT J 2014 Subtotal (95% CI)	3	234 5081	5	247 5116	1.8% 100.0%	0.63 [0.15, 2.62] 0.91 [0.77, 1.08]	•	Pleterogeneity: Chi ² =59.57, df = 4 (P = Test for overall effect: Z = 4.70 (P < 0.1
Total events	242		266					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =2 Test for overall effect: 2	.68, df = 3 (P Z= 1.05 (P =	e = 0.44); 0.30)	l ² =0%					

Liao H et al, BMJ open 2017



DPP4 inhibitors



The Incretin Effect



Oral Glucose (50 g/400 ml)

Isoglycemic IV Glucose Infusion

٦

The incretin effect is a term describing greater

Nauck M et al. Diabetologia (1986) 29:46-52

GLP-1 action





Deacon C 2020

Incretin based therapies – DPP4 inhibitors

- Incretin enhancers
- Suppress the enzyme dipeptyl peptidase (DPP)-4 that degrades endogenous GLP-1 → increase the concentration of intact, biologically active GLP-1 → augmented interaction with receptors



Lovshin JA and Drucker DJ (2009)

DPP4 inhibitors – glycemic effects

- Reduction in HbA1c $\sim 0.6-0.8\%$
- Well-tolerated
 - <u>No weight gain</u> when glycemic control improved
 - No hypoglycemia
- Expensive
- Dose adjustment for renal insufficiency for sitagliptin, saxagliptin and alogliptin; Not necessary for linagliptin
- Sitagliptin (Januvia); Saxagliptin (Onglyza);
 Linagliptin (Tradjenta); Alogliptin (Nesina)

	Increas
	seci
Glycate	d hemoglol
levels	s decrease



Lovshin JA and Drucker DJ (2009)

DPP-4 inhibitors – cardiovascular effects

- All DPP4 inhibitors are non-inferior to placebo in CVOTs
 - Safe to use in patients with CVD, BUT no demonstrable cardiovascular benefit

CVOT	Comparator	Cardiovascular safety (MACE), (HR; primary end point)	Risk of hospitalization for heart failure (HR)
EXAMINE ⁸⁶	Placebo	0.96	1.07 (P=0.66)
CARMELINA ⁸⁸	Placebo	1.02	0.90 (P = 0.26)
CAROLINA ⁸⁹	Glimepiride	0.98	1.21 (P = 0.18)
SAVOR-TIMI85	Placebo	1.00	1.27 (P<0.007)
TECOS ⁸⁷	Placebo	0.98	1.00 (P=0.98)
None planned ^a	NA	No data	No data
	CVOTEXAMINE ⁸⁶ CARMELINA ⁸⁸ CAROLINA ⁸⁹ SAVOR-TIMI ⁸⁵ TECOS ⁸⁷ None planned ^a	CVOTComparatorEXAMINE ⁸⁶ PlaceboCARMELINA ⁸⁸ PlaceboCAROLINA ⁸⁹ GlimepirideSAVOR-TIMI ⁸⁵ PlaceboTECOS ⁸⁷ PlaceboNone planned ^a NA	CVOTComparatorCardiovascular sheaventEXAMINE*6Placebo0.96CARMELINA*8Placebo1.02CAROLINA*9Glimepiride0.98SAVOR-TIMI*5Placebo1.00TECOS*7Placebo0.98None planned*NANo data

DPP-4 inhibitors - Kidney effects

- CARMELINA linagliptin vs placebo
- Secondary composite kidney outcome
 - -74% CKD
 - -43% eGFR < 45
 - -15% eGFR<30
- Decreased progression of albuminuria

Rosenstock J et al CARMELINA, JAMA 2019

DPP-4 inhibitors - Liver/NAFLD benefits

- Early uncontrolled trials suggested decrease in plasma ALT levels (sitagliptin)
- In RCTs, DPP-4 inhibitors have been largely negative for treatment of NASH -No impact on transaminases or liver fat accumulation
- Recent small study n=75 from China addition of sitagliptin resulted in similar wt loss compared to liraglutide in pts with "uncontrolled" diabetes

- No pancreatitis or pancreatic cancer signal
- No immune effects
- Saxagliptin 1 in heart failure hospitalization (SAVOR-TIMI) -Not a class effect
- Vildagliptin \uparrow LV volume but no \uparrow in HF; \uparrow in liver transaminases
- Safe to use esp in older individuals, renal impairment, multiple comorbidities



Deacon C 2020

- 54-year-old male with 5 years of type 2 diabetes, no complications
- On metformin 1000mg twice daily
- Has gained 12 lbs working from home over the past 2 years
- Self-pay
- Al C 8.6-9% over recent 12 months $(8.6 \rightarrow 8.9 \rightarrow 9.2\%)$

What is the next step?



- 1. Pioglitazone is a cheap, effective drug with likely cardioprotective effects
- 2. Pioglitazone causes edema, and weight gain; should not be used in people with heart failure
- 3. Pioglitazone is beneficial in patients with NAFLD
- 4. DPP4 inhibitors are expensive with no significant CV, renal, or liver benefits
- 5. DPP4 inhibitors are safe to use in certain populations





Patient Recommendation Form

Presentation Date: May 18th, 2022 Presenter name: Aristotle Sun, MD

Presenter Facility: UW Valley Medical Clinic

Case Report Recap

- 63 year old Jamaican male with HTN, Sickle cell trait and T2DM
- Taking multiple oral agents for DM, HTN and CVD risk reduction
- Struggles with reducing high starch content of diet and getting physical activity controlled
- On 4 blood pressure medication and 3 oral agents for DM

Medication	Dose	Frequency
metformin	1000 mg	Twice daily
empagliflozin	25 mg	Daily
sitagliptin	100 mg	Daily
benazepril	40 mg	Daily
hydrochlorothiazide	12.5 mg	Daily
atenolol	25 mg	Daily
amlodipine	10 mg	Daily
simvastatin	20 mg	Daily
aspirin	81 mg	Daily
tamsulosin	0.8 mg	Nightly
sildenafil	100 mg	PRN
omeprazole	40 mg	Daily PRN

Case Recommendations:

- 1. Continue to work on portion size control and offer ideas for food substitutes, given his higher starch traditional intake
- 2. Due to this patient's sickle cell, continue the current course of overall glycemic control with fructosamine in addition to A1c. An additional option is CGM to confirm average glucose and may also teach about nutrition and activity
- 3. Encourage this patient to take extra steps during his workday as an uber driver. For example, walking to let passengers out of the car and walking for 5-10 minutes in between picking up new passengers if possible.

Cardiometabolic teleECHO™ Clinic



- 4. There are no changes to consider for this patient's current DM therapy. If appetite cravings continue to be a barrier, consider holding empagliflozin, sitagliptin, and replace with GLP-1 RA (if this medication is available to pt and GERD symptoms on PPI are not limiting).
- 5. With further nutrition/lifestyle changes, maybe consider holding off on sitagliptin. The goal of minimizing medications may be encouraging to the patient.
- 6. Consider moderate intensity statin with atorvastatin 20, rather than simvastatin.
- 7. Screen aldosterone/renin ratio since this patient is currently on four BP medications.
- 8. There is no indication for ASA therapy.

Nicole Ehrhardt, MD

<u>Nicole Ehrhardt</u>

Physician Signature Nicole Ehrhardt Represent case July 2022