Non-insulin treatment in Type 1 DM



50 Years of Challenge, Hope for Diabetes Cure KDA 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Sang Yong Kim

Chosun University Hospital

Conflict of interest disclosure

None

Committee of Scientific Affairs



Insulin therapy is the mainstay for T1DM

DIABETES TYPE

Unmet need in Type 1 diabetes



Diabetes Care 2015;38:971-8

Hypoglycemia: benefits and risks (DCCT)



DCCT, Diabetes Control and Complications Trial DCCT Research Group. N Engl J Med 1993;329:977-86

Recent trend in Type 1 diabetic patients



Fig. 1 – Physiopathologic aspects of type 1 and type 2 diabetes.

NR, not reported. ^aUS Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or International Obesity Task Force criteria for overweight (BMI 85th to <95th percentile) and obesity (BMI ≥95th percentile). ^bGerman Working Group of Obesity in Childhood and Adolescence (AGA) criteria for overweight (BMI 90th to 97th percentile) and obesity (BMI ≥97th percentile). ^cBMI categories for overweight (BMI 25–30 kg/m²) and obesity (BMI ≥30 kg/m²).

Criteria for overweight (BMI 295th percentile). German Working Group of Obesity in Childhood and Adolescence (AGA) criteria for overweight (BMI 85th to 295th percentile) and obesity (BMI 295th percentile). German Working Group of Obesity in Childhood and Adolescence (AGA) criteria for overweight (BMI 80th to 97th percentile).

Pharmacologic approaches to glycemic treatment Standards of medical care in diabetes -2018

PHARMACOLOGIC THERAPY FOR TYPE 1 DIABETES

Recommendations

- Most people with type 1 diabetes should be treated with multiple daily injections of prandial insulin and basal insulin or continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion. A
- Most individuals with type 1 diabetes should use rapid-acting insulin analogs to reduce hypoglycemia risk. A
- Consider educating individuals with type 1 diabetes on matching prandial insulin doses to carbohydrate intake, premeal blood glucose levels, and anticipated physical activity. E
- Individuals with type 1 diabetes who have been successfully using continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion should have continued access to this therapy after they turn 65 years of age. E

Non-insulin agent	Investigational agents
Pramlintide	 Metformin Incretin-based therapies SGLT-2 inhibitors

Diabetes Care 2018;41(Suppl. 1):S73–S85

Ideal non-insulin adjunctive therapy for T1DM

Little impact on insulin secretion and action

Safe profile for long-term use

Provide additional non-glycemic benefit

Reasonable price and insurance accepted

Diabetes Care 2015;38:971–978

Data from T1D exchange registry

Table 1—Participant characterist	tics						
	Overall	2–5 years old	6–12 years old	13–17 years old	18–25 years old	26–49 years old	≥50 years old
	<i>n</i> = 16,061	<i>n</i> = 236	n = 3,313	<i>n</i> = 4,914	n = 2,867	<i>n</i> = 2,606	<i>n</i> = 2,125
Demographic and clinical characteristics							
Race/ethnicity, n (%)							
White non-Hispanic	13,310 (83)	179 (76)	2,610 (79)	3,823 (78)	2,357 (82)	2,327 (89)	2,014 (95)
Black non-Hispanic	740 (5)	16 (7)	164 (5)	292 (6)	124 (4)	89 (3)	55 (3)
Hispanic or Latino	1,294 (8)	25 (11)	336 (10)	540 (11)	263 (9)	106 (4)	24 (1)
Other	699 (4)	16 (7)	194 (6)	255 (5)	121 (4)	81 (3)	32 (2)
Diabetes management						S. S. F. S.	
Pump use, n (%)	9,530 (60)	146 (63)	2,131 (65)	2,810 (58)	1,555 (55)	1,625 (63)	1,263 (60)
CGM use, n (%)	1,703 (11)	31 (13)	263 (8)	249 (5)	193 (7)	590 (23)	377 (18)
SMBG, mean \pm SD#	4.7 ± 2.7	7.4 ± 2.9	6.2 ± 2.6	4.2 ± 2.3	3.5 ± 2.4	4.3 ± 2.7	4.8 ± 2.7
0–3 times per day	3,630 (34)	3 (2)	253 (11)	1,316 (39)	994 (55)	689 (41)	375 (30)
4–6 times per day	4,781 (45)	63 (37)	1,174 (50)	1,575 (47)	625 (35)	712 (43)	632 (51)
6–9 times per day	1,566 (15)	75 (44)	627 (27)	360 (11)	124 (7)	193 (12)	187 (15)
≥10 times per day	578 (5)	28 (17)	286 (12)	87 (3)	48 (3)	73 (4)	56 (4)
Downloading of meter at home,							
n (%)§							
\geq 1 time per month	298 (12)	6 (13)	92 (17)	73 (16)	40 (9)	49 (7)	38 (9)
Never	1 671 (65)	33 (70)	277 (52)	252 (55)	310 (69)	506 (77)	293 (71)
Noninsulin medications for							
blood glucose control, n (%)							
Metformin	515 (3)	0	12 (<1)	121 (2)	100 (3)	168 (6)	114 (5)
GLP-1 agonist	116 (<1)	0	0	2 (<1)	18 (<1)	64 (2)	32 (2)
DPP-4i	12 (<1)	0	0	0	0	9 (<1)	3 (<1)
SGLT2 <i>i</i>	14 (<1)	0	0	0	0	9 (<1)	5 (<1)
Pramlintide	128 (<1)	0	1 (<1)	2 (<1)	11 (<1)	61 (2)	53 (2)
Other	30 (<1)	0	0	0	1 (<1)	12 (<1)	17 (<1)
	. /						

Diabetes Care 2015;38:971–978

Possible non-insulin adjunctive therapy for T1DM

Metformin

α-glucosidase inhibitor

Thiazolidinedione

DPP-4 inhibitor

GLP-1 Receptor agonist

SGLT-2 inhibitor

Diabetes Care 2015;38:971–978

Metformin



Metformin in type 1 diabetes

The use of metformin in type 1 diabetes: a systematic review and efficacy



Metformin was associated with reductions in weight (1.7–6.0 kg in three of six studies) and total cholesterol (0.3–0.41 mmol/l in three of seven studies).

Diabetologia (2010) 53:809-820

REMOVAL trial



REMOVAL trial - Outcomes

Primary:

Progression of mean far wall common carotid artery IMT at baseline, 12, 24, 36months

Secondary:

HbA1c, LDL-C, albuminuria, eGFR, retinopathy stage, weight, insulin dose, endothelial function.

Tertiary:

Frequency of hypoglycemia Treatment satisfaction Markers of endothelial function Progression of maximal common carotid artery IMT Vitamin B12 status

REMOVAL trial – Study population

	Metformin (n=219)	Placebo (n=209)	Total daily insulin dose (units Basal-bolus	per kg) 0-67 (0-23)	0-74 (0-29)	Renal Normal		
Age (years)	55-2 (8-5)	55-8 (8-8)	Pump	0-54 (0-29)	0.57 (0.29)	(>90 mL/min/1.73m ²)	128 (58%)	130 (62%)
Sex	(-/	()	Twice daily	0.73 (0.35)	0.64 (0.27)	(>90 mL/min/1-73m ²)		
Male	129 (59%)	124 (59%)	Other	0-67 (0-23)	0.73 (0.26)	Microalbuminuria	14 (6%)	14 (7%)
Female			EE E Moore	(0,0)	\boldsymbol{c}			8 (4%)
Ethnic origin*		ean age:	55.5 years	(30:0	.0)			
White	• Dia	hotos du	iration 33	8 vear	°C			48 (23%)
Other		abeles u		o year	3			9 (4%)
Diabetes duration (years)	• BN	11 28.5 kg	J/m ²					5(4%)
C-peptide (nmol/L)								16 (8%)
Existing CVD	Hb	A1c 8.05	5%					132 (63%)
MI or stroke	= 0							39 (19%)
Allt	• 58	% used N	/IDI, 34% u	ised in	sulin pur	np		19 (9%)
None		. 1 20 г /-	72 2	- (720/				28 (1%)
Strong family history of CVD	 BL 	: 129.5/ /	2.3 mmH	3(/3%)	on nype	rtensive m	iea)	(-5.1)
Yes			$p_{ma}/dl / 0$	20/ on	ctatin)			157 (75%)
No		L-C.03.0	o ilig/ul (o	Z /0 UII	Statilly			103 (49%)
HbA _{1c}			LDL cholesterol (mmol/L)	2.23 (0.70)	2.25 (0.72)	Angiotensin-receptor	43 (20%)	49 (23%
Absolute (mmol/mol)	64-8 (9-4)	64-1 (8-5)	HDL cholesterol (mmol/L)	1.64 (0.56)	1.62 (0.59)	blocker	12 ()	15 (-5-1
% units	8-08 (0-86)	8-02 (0-78)	Triglycerides (mmol/L)	1.07 (0.77)	1.03 (0.57)	Calcium-channel blocker	30 (14%)	38 (18%)
Insulin regimen			Smoking history			βblocker	19 (9%)	19 (9%)
Basal-bolus	128 (58%)	122 (58%)	Current	35 (16%)	22 (11%)	a blocker	5 (2%)	7 (3%)
Pump	73 (33%)	72 (34%)	Former	73 (33%)	71 (34%)	Antiplatelet drugs	100 (02%)	109 (01%)
Twice daily	5 (2%)	7 (3%)	Never	111 (51%)	116 (56%)	Aspirin	71 (32%)	80 (38%)
Other	13 (6%)	8 (4%)	eGFR (mL/min/1·73m²)	92-9 (20-9)	91-1 (21-6)	Clopidogrel	10 (5%)	6 (3%)

REMOVAL trial – Primary outcome

	Averaged mean f	ar-wall cIMT (prima	ary outcome)	Averaged maximal far-wall cIMT (tertiary outcome)			
	Metformin	Placebo	Difference (95% CI); p value	Metformin	Placebo	Difference (95% CI); p value	
Baseline (mm)	0.773 (0.140)	0.791 (0.183)		0.910 (0.162)	0.926 (0.225)		
12 months (mm)	0.782 (0.147)	0.788 (0.174)	-	0.920 (0.175)	0.939 (0.239)		
24 months (mm)	0.792 (0.145)	0-823 (0-187)		0.936 (0.161)	0.984 (0.251)		
36 months (mm)	0.793 (0.134)	0-820 (0-177)		0.949 (0.167)	0.999 (0.257)		
Main analysis*							
Slope (95% CI; mm per year)	0.006 (0.001 to 0.011)	0-010 (0-006 to 0-015)	-0.005 (-0.012 to 0.002); p=0.1664	0-012 (0-005 to 0-019)	0.025 (0.018 to 0.032)	-0-013 (-0-024 to -0-003; p=0-0093)	

Data are mean (SD), unless otherwise indicated. Analyses are for modified intention-to-treat of participants with at least one measurement after baseline. clMT=common carotid artery intima-media thickness. *Adjusted for baseline age, sex, clMT, smoking status, systolic blood pressure, BMI, HbA_{be} and LDL cholesterol.

Table 2: Repeated measures analysis of cIMT





REMOVAL trial – HbA1c



REMOVAL trial – Insulin dose



REMOVAL trial – Body weight



REMOVAL trial – Tertiary outcomes

	Baseline		36 months		Change (ANCOVA)* or HR†/ IRR‡ (95% CI)	p value	
	Metformin	Placebo	Metformin	Placebo	-		
Tertiary outcomes							
Hypoglycaemia (per patient-year)							
Minor events	37-2	38-8	54.6	49.1	1·12 (0·92 to 1·35)‡	0.2594	
Major events	0.15	0.17	0.16	0.14	1·23 (0·73 to 2·05)‡	0.4419	
Treatment satisfaction (units)	32.1 (3.6)	31.4 (4.2)	31.8 (4.2)	31.3 (4.8)	-0.12 (-0.72 to 0.47)*	0.6880	
Vitamin B12 <150 pmol/L§	0	0	24/194 (12%)	9/192 (5%)	2.76 (1.28 to 5.95)†	0.0094	
Adherence and safety							
Treatment discontinuation			59 (27%)	26 (12%)		0.0002	
Gastrointestinal			34 (16%)	7 (3%)			
Nausea			20 (9%)	5 (2%)			
Diarrhoea			18 (8%)	3 (1%)			
Reduced eGFR			0	0			
Lactate > 3.0 mmol/L (twice)			1 (<1%)	0			
>5·0 mmol/L (any)			3 (1%)	0			
Treatment down-titration			67 (31%)	18 (9%)			
Study medication dose (mg per day)			1434 (612)	1674 (343)			
Lactate (mmol/L)	1.31 (0.76)	1.23 (0.57)	1.30 (0.61)	1.19 (0.52)	0.08 (-0.03 to 0.19)*	0.1640	
Deaths			5 (2%)	2 (1%)			
Cancer			3¶	1			
Cardiac			2**	1++	-		

Data are mean (SD) for continuous data or n (%) for categorical data, unless otherwise indicated. Treatment effect and corresponding 95% CIs are provided for metformin compared with placebo. eGFR=estimated glomerular filtration rate. *ANCOVA for the change from baseline, adjusted for the baseline value, for continuous data. †Hazard ratio (HR) and 95% CI for time to first event data obtained by Cox proportional-hazards model. ‡Incidence rate ratio (IRR) and 95% CI for count data are obtained by negative binomial regression models, including the logarithm of time as an offset; the frequency of minor hypoglycaemia events is further adjusted for the method of collection. §Vitamin B12 data were missing for 25 people in the metformin group and 17 in the placebo group. ¶ Two non-small-cell lung cancers, one malignant neoplasm of the tongue. ||Glioblastoma. **One myocardial infarction, one sudden cardiac death. ††Myocardial infarction.

Table 4: Tertiary outcomes, adherence, and safety

REMOVAL trial - Conclusion

- 1. The result of REMOVAL do not support the assertion by current guidelines that metformin treatment results in a clinically meaningful improvement in glycemic control.
- Treatment with metformin was safe, but with the expected GI S/E leading to some discontinuation. And also, risk of biochemical vit-B12 deficiency was increased over 3 years.
- 3. Progression of the primary outcome mean cIMT was not significantly reduced with metformin.
- 4. The reduction in weight and the tertiary outcome maximal cIMT indicate that metformin may have a wider role in CV risk management.

Further discussion

- Does metformin has an CV benefit?
- Dose reduction of insulin is meaningful?
- BW lowering effect is great in Obese T1D patients.
- Biochemical monitoring for Vit-B12 is necessary?



Metformin in type 1 diabetes

A1C

BMI

	Me	tformi	n	PI	acebo			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Fixed, 95% C	IV. Fixed. 95% CI
Codner 2013	10.4	2.6	13	9.6	1.4	11	0.5%	0.80 [-0.84, 2.44]	
Hamilton 2003	9	1.4	14	8.9	0.8	13	1.9%	0.10 [-0.75, 0.95]	
Jacobsen 2009	8.85	0.1	12	9.34	0.94	12	4.8%	-0.49 [-1.02, 0.04]	
Khan 2006	7.8	1.1	15	8.5	1.4	15	1.7%	-0.70 [-1.60, 0.20]	
Libman 2015	9	0.86	71	8.9	1.06	69	13.3%	0.10 [-0.22, 0.42]	+
Lund 2008	9.25	0.94	48	9.12	0.86	50	10.7%	0.13 [-0.23, 0.49]	+
Meyer 2002	7.45	0.78	31	7.46	0.6	31	11.4%	-0.01 [-0.36, 0.34]	+
Nadeau 2015	9.2	1.2	40	9.6	1.2	40	4.9%	-0.40 [-0.93, 0.13]	
Wwosu 2015	8.58	1.5	15	8.25	0.4	13	2.2%	0.33 [-0.46, 1.12]	
Petrie 2017	8.1	0.9	193	8.1	0.8	194	47.4%	0.00 [-0.17, 0.17]	•
Samblad 2003	8.7	1.5	13	9.2	1.3	13	1.2%	-0.50 [-1.58, 0.58]	
Total (95% CI)			465			461	100.0%	-0.02 [-0.14, 0.10]	+
Heterogeneity: Chi2 =	10.99, d	f = 10	(P = 0.	36); l² =	9%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.36	6 (P = ().72)						-2 -1 0 1 2 Favours [Metformin] Favours [Placebo]

Insulin dose

	Me	tformi	n	PI	acebo		1	Std. Mean Difference		Std. M	ean Diff	erence	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% C		IV. R	ndom.	95% CI	
Codner 2013	1.2	0.5	13	1.1	0.2	11	5.9%	0.25 [-0.56, 1.05]					
Hamilton 2003	1.07	0.3	14	1.3	0.2	13	6.0%	-0.87 [-1.66, -0.07]			-		
Jacobsen 2009	56.8	2.9	12	73.5	20.8	12	5.4%	-1.09 [-1.95, -0.22]	_		-		
Khan 2006	50	13	15	58	12	15	6.7%	-0.62 [-1.36, 0.11]			+		
Libman 2015	0.9	0.21	70	1.1	0.21	69	13.3%	-0.95 [-1.30, -0.60]		-			
Lund 2008	0.71	0.25	48	0.77	0.24	50	12.3%	-0.24 [-0.64, 0.15]		-	+		
Meyer 2002	0.65	0.17	31	0.74	0.24	31	10.2%	-0.43 [-0.93, 0.08]		_	-		
Nadeau 2015	1.12	0.21	40	1.16	0.34	40	11.4%	-0.14 [-0.58, 0.30]			-		
Nwosu 2015	1.42	0.52	15	1.73	0.48	13	6.4%	-0.60 [-1.36, 0.16]			+		
Petrie 2017	0.62	0.26	193	0.67	0.3	194	16.5%	-0.18 [-0.38, 0.02]			-		
Samblad 2003	1.1	0.3	13	1.3	0.2	13	6.0%	-0.76 [-1.56, 0.04]			-		
Total (95% CI)			464			461	100.0%	-0.47 [-0.70, -0.23]					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.08; Cł	ni² = 23	3.50, df	= 10 (F	= 0.0	09); l ² =	57%		+	+		+	+
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.84	(P=(0.0001))					-2 Favou	-1 rs (Metforr	nin) Fa	1 vours (Pla	cebo]

	Me	tformi	n	PI	acebo	i		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% C	IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Codner 2013	23.7	2.8	13	26.3	5.2	11	6.9%	-2.60 [-6.03, 0.83]	
Hamilton 2003	22.75	4.2	14	25.9	2.9	13	11.1%	-3.15 [-5.86, -0.44]	
Lund 2008	25.61	3.39	48	25.85	4.87	50	29.7%	-0.24 [-1.90, 1.42]	_
Nadeau 2015	23.5	2.4	40	24.7	3.7	40	43.6%	-1.20 [-2.57, 0.17]	-
Nwosu 2015	28.6	5.1	15	28.8	3.1	13	8.6%	-0.20 [-3.28, 2.88]	
Total (95% CI)			130			127	100.0%	-1.14 [-2.05, -0.24]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi2 =	4.31, df	= 4 (P	= 0.37	; 2 = 79	%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.48	(P=(0.01)						Favours [Metformin] Favours [Placebo]

1.5.3 GIAEs							
Hamilton 2003	8	14	5	13	8.9%	1.49 [0.65, 3.39]	
Jacobsen 2009	3	12	0	12	0.9%	7.00 [0.40, 122.44]	
Khan 2006	3	15	1	15	1.7%	3.00 [0.35, 25.68]	
Libman 2015	50	71	24	69	41.6%	2.02 [1.42, 2.89]	
Meyer 2002	11	31	2	31	3.4%	5.50 [1.33, 22.80]	
Nadeau 2015	6	40	5	40	8.5%	1.20 [0.40, 3.62]	-
Wwosu 2015	1	15	0	13	0.9%	2.63 [0.12, 59.40]	
Petrie 2017	72	193	15	194	25.6%	4.82 [2.87, 8.11]	-
Samblad 2003	2	13	5	13	8.5%	0.40 [0.09, 1.70]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		404		400	100.0%	2.67 [2.06, 3.45]	•
Total events	156		57				
Heterogeneity: Chi2 = 1	9.29, df =	8 (P = 0	.01); 12 :	59%			
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 7.45 (F	< 0.000	01)				

0.005 0.1 1 10 200 Favours [Metformin] Favours [Placebo]

Diabetes Metab Res Rev. 2018;e2983.

α -glucosidase inhibitor

- Mechanism insulin independent
- Low hypoglycemia
- No weight gain
- Advantage in controlling post-prandial hyperglycemia



Efficacy and safety of acarbose in the treatment of Type 1 diabetes mellitus: a placebo-controlled, double-blind, multicentre study

Table 1 Baseline features of patients included in 'intention to treat' analysis

Parameter	Acarbose $(n = 57)$	Placebo $(n = 59)$		
Male:female (%)	47:53	42:58		
Age (years)	32.6 ± 11.78	36.3 ± 15.35		
BMI (kg/m^2)	24.62 ± 3.53	24.74 ± 3.05		
Fasting weight (kg)	66.1 ± 11.58	68.1 ± 10.54		
HbA _{1c} (%)	9.1 ± 1.37	9.1 ± 1.34		
Triglyceride (mmol/l)	1.31 ± 1.84	1.09 ± 0.57		
Cholesterol (mmol/l)	5.24 ± 1.17	5.03 ± 0.98		
HDL-cholesterol (mmol/l)	1.47 ± 0.36	1.37 ± 0.36		
Insulin dose (U/day)	39 ± 15	42 ± 16		





Figure 1 Acarbose vs. placebo: effects on fasting and postprandial blood glucose levels after 6 months' treatment (intention to treat). **P* < 0.02. ■, acarbose; □, placebo. Data are lsmeans adjusted by covariance analysis on centre and baseline values.

Parameter	Acarbose (<i>n</i> = 57)	Placebo (<i>n</i> = 59)	95% CI for the treatment difference		
Fasting weight (kg)	66.4 ± 0.3	66.7 ± 0.3	$-1.0 \div +0.5$		
HbA_{1c} (%)	8.67 ± 0.14	8.90 ± 0.14	$-0.61 \div +0.15$		
Triglyceride (mmol/l)	1.19 ± 0.06	1.10 ± 0.06	$-0.07 \div +0.25$		
Cholesterol (mmol/l)	5.23 ± 0.10	5.37 ± 0.10	$-0.0.41 \div +0.13$		
HDL-cholesterol (mmol/l)	$1.39 \pm 0.03*$	1.50 ± 0.03	$-0.20 \div -0.02$		
Insulin dose (U/day)	38.1 ± 0.7	39.3 ± 0.6	$-2.9 \div +0.4$		
Hypoglycaemic events (n)	6.8 ± 0.96	6.4 ± 0.96	$-2.1 \div +2.9$		

*P<0.02.

lsmeans \pm SEM.

Data represent lsmeans adjusted by covariance analysis on centre and baseline values.

75% patients in the acarbose group and 39% patients in the placebo group reported at least one adverse event during the double-blind period of the study. Most adverse events were mild and most were confined to the gastrointestinal tract.

Diabet Med 16;228-232:1999

Effects of acarbose (Glucobay[®]) in persons with type 1 diabetes: a multicentre study

Table 2

Results (per-protocol analysis)

	Screening	Start study				
Treatment		Plac	Plac	Acarb	Acarb	Plac
Weeks	-4	0	8	16	24	32
HbA _{1c} (%)	9.1 ± 1.1	8.9 ± 1.1	8.5 ± 0.9	8.1 ± 0.9	8.2 ± 0.9	8.6 ± 0.9
Blood glucose (mmol/l)						
Fasting	11.1	9.9	10.3	9.5	10.7	9.8
90 min after breakfast	11.7	11.0	11.0	9.1	10.0	11.5
Before lunch	10.5	10.1	8.5	7.9	8.9	9.0
90 min after lunch	11.3	11.1	10.2	8.1	8.4 ^a	11.0
Before dinner	9.9	10.6	8.8	8.5	10.0	10.1
90 min after dinner	11.7	10.7	10.0	9.0	9.8	11.7
At bedtime	10.1	10.3	9.8	9.6	10.1	11.0

Data are shown as mean; Acarb, acarbose; Plac, placebo.

^a P < 0.01 stop acarbose (week 24) vs. start acarbose (week 8).

In total 214 adverse events were reported for 73(81%) patients, of which 71 (33%) occurred during placebo run-in phase, 124 (58%) during acarbose and 13 (6%) during placebo run-out phase. The most frequent reported adverse events were flatulence (43%), diarrhoea (27%), abdominal pain(11%).

Diab Res Clin Prac 41;139-145:1998

α -glucosidase inhibitor

- Overall, AGIs tend to be well tolerated and help reduce post-prandial glycemic excursions in individuals with T1DM.
- Modest HbA1c reduction and relatively high incidence of S/E are main barrier to prolong use of this drug.
- Balanced trial for long-term outcomes is needed.

Thiazolidinedione



The effect of rosiglitazone on overweight T1D

32.

	Rosiglitazone + insulin	Placebo + insulin
n	25	25
Age (years)	43.7 ± 13.3	41.1 ± 9.2
Sex (M/F)	16/9	18/7
Ethnic group (n)	22 Caucasian,	23 Caucasian,
	3 African American	1 African American,
		1 Hispanic
Duration of diabetes (years)	20.7 ± 13.3	18.1 ± 9.3
Waist-to-hip ratio	0.91 ± 0.07	0.93 ± 0.06
Fasting C-peptide (ng/ml)	0.3 ± 0.3	0.3 ± 0.3

Table 1 — Baseline characteristics



Figure 1—Change in mean A1C level (A) and total daily insulin dose (B) based on baseline BMI in type 1 diabetic subjects after 8 months of treatment with insulin and rosiglitazone or insulin and placebo. *P < 0.05 vs. rosiglitazone-treated subjects with a BMI <30 kg/m²; \dagger P < 0.05 vs. rosiglitazone-treated subjects with a BMI <30 kg/m²; \dagger P < 0.05 vs. rosiglitazone-treated subjects with a BMI <30 kg/m².

	Rosiglitazon	e and insulin	Placebo a	and insulin
	Baseline	Week 32	Baseline	Week 32
Weight (kg)	97.2 ± 11.8	100.6 ± 16.0*	96.4 ± 12.2	99.1 ± 15.0*
BMI (kg/m ²)	32.7 ± 5.4	34.0 ± 7.4*	31.1 ± 3.1	32.0 ± 4.2*
Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)	137.4 ± 15.6†	128.8 ± 14.8*	125.8 ± 10.0	127.5 ± 14.0
Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)	87.2 ± 9.4	79.4 ± 7.2‡	84.7 ± 7.0	83.2 ± 7.1
Insulin dose (units/day)	77.5 ± 28.6	75.3 ± 33.1	74.0 ± 33.8	82.0 ± 48.9*
Fasting plasma glucose (mg/dl)	172.6 ± 68.3	153.3 ± 66.4	185.8 ± 90.6	173.4 ± 64.8
A1C (%)	7.9 ± 1.3	6.9 ± 0.7	7.7 ± 0.8	7.0 ± 0.9‡
Total cholesterol (mg/dl)	201.9 ± 37.6†	195.2 ± 37.5§	177.9 ± 33.1	175.1 ± 31.7
LDL cholesterol (mg/dl)	117.8 ± 32.0	120.1 ± 35.0	103.4 ± 25.2	102.6 ± 25.4
HDL cholesterol (mg/dl)	53.9 ± 20.5	53.6 ± 19.4	47.8 ± 15.0	49.1 ± 15.8
VLDL cholesterol (mg/dl)	15.8 ± 13.2	16.4 ± 9.8	13.8 ± 9.4	14.6 ± 15.6
Triglycerides (mg/dl)	108.1 ± 64.6	101.8 ± 53.8	92.8 ± 38.9	85.4 ± 39.7
VLDL triglycerides (mg/dl)	66.8 ± 57.6	61.9 ± 46.6	55.8 ± 31.6	48.8 ± 33.0
Hemoglobin (gm/dl)	14.4 ± 1.5	13.6 ± 1.9‡§	14.5 ± 1.0	14.5 ± 1.0
Hematocrit (%)	42.0 ± 3.9	39.8 ± 5.1‡§	42.3 ± 3.0	42.2 ± 2.9

Table 2-Results before and 32 weeks after treatment with rosiglitazone and insulin or placebo and insulin

Data are means ± SD. *P < 0.05 vs. baseline; †P < 0.05 vs. placebo and insulin at baseline; ‡P < 0.0001 vs. baseline; \$P < 0.05 vs. placebo and insulin at week

Rosiglitazone in combination with insulin resulted in improved glycemic control and blood pressure without an increase in insulin requirements, compared with insulin- and placebo-treated subjects, whose improved glycemic control required an 11% increase in insulin dose.

Diabetes Care 28:1562-1567, 2005



Effect of pioglitazone in lean T1D

Comparison of glycemic control, in	Comparison of glycemic control, insulin requirement and lipid profile at baseline and 6 months following pioglitazone and placebo therapy										
Parameters	Pioglitazone grou	ıp		Placebo group	Placebo group						
	Baseline	6 months	р	Baseline	6 months	р					
Weight (kg)	48.9 ± 5.6	48.7 ± 4.8	0.57	50.0 ± 6.9	49.9 ± 7.1	0.75					
BMI (kg/m ²)	19.7 ± 1.4	19.6 ± 1.7	0.64	19.6 ± 1.67	19.6 ± 1.7	0.63					
WC (cm)	82.3 ± 6.1	82.2 ± 5.8	0.85	81.3 ± 6.3	81.5 ± 6.4	0.77					
HC (cm)	96.1 ± 3.6	96.3 ± 3.7	0.14	95.0 ± 4.7	95.2 ± 4.6	0.19					
WHR	0.86 ± 0.1	0.85 ± 0.1	0.13	0.87 ± 0.1	0.86 ± 0.1	0.27					
SBP (mmHg)	115.7 ± 5.1	116.5 ± 4.7	0.12	118.4 ± 9.3	120.3 ± 8.4	0.23					
DBP (mmHg)	79.4 ± 5.6	80.0 ± 4.9	0.41	74.4 ± 5.1	77.0 ± 5.2	0.07					
FPG (mmol/L)	6.5 ± 1.5	6.4 ± 0.9	0.71	6.4 ± 1.5	6.2 ± 1.2	0.99					
PPPG (mmol/L)	9.1 ± 1.7	8.4 ± 1.3	0.002	8.3 ± 2.3	7.8 ± 1.8	0.06					
HbA _{1c} (%)	7.08 ± 0.48	6.86 ± 0.45	0.001	7.30 ± 0.37	7.24 ± 0.33	0.74					
Insulin requirement (units/day)	48.6 ± 5.8	48.9 ± 6.2	0.21	51.5 ± 6.7	51.8 ± 6.7	0.33					
TC (mmol/L)	4.5 ± 0.6	4.4 ± 0.5	0.11	4.6 ± 0.7	4.6 ± 0.5	0.9					
LDL (mmol/L)	2.8 ± 0.4	2.7 ± 0.4	0.07	2.9 ± 0.7	2.8 ± 0.7	0.08					
HDL (mmol/L)	1.2 ± 0.2	1.3 ± 0.1	0.16	1.1 ± 0.1	1.2 ± 0.1	0.06					
TG (mmol/L)	1.6 ± 0.7	1.4 ± 0.7	0.77	1.3 ± 2.2	1.2 ± 0.6	0.27					

Diab Res Clin Pract 78;349–354:2007

The addition of rosiglitazone to insulin in T1D

Table 2. Changes in outcome parameters during treatment arms

	Placebo			Rosiglitazone				
	Pre	Post	Change in parameters†	Pre	Post	Change in parameters†	р	
HbA1c (%)	8.7 ± 1.0	8.5 ± 1.5	-0.1 ± 1.1	8.6 ± 1.0	8.4 ± 1.0	-0.3 ± 1.1	0.57	
Fasting blood glucose (mmol/L)	11.12 ± 1.2	11.17 ± 2.2	-0.8 (-5.2, 5.4)	10.37 ± 2.9	11.1 ± 2.1	0.8 (-5.6, 5)	0.78	
Insulin dose (units/kg/day) % change in insulin dose	1.5 ± 0.36	1.6 ± 0.43	0.12 ± 0.3 9.4 ± 0.22	1.57 ± 0.39	1.52 ± 1.51	-0.11 ± 0.4* -5.8 ± 0.25*	0.01	
BMI-SDŠ	1.1 (-0.6 to 2.6)	1.1 (-0.8 to 2.6)	0.04 ± 0.22	1.0 (-0.1 to 2.4)	1.1 (-0.4 to 2.6)	0.08 ± 0.33	0.5	
Waist circumference (cm)	75.4 ± 9.7	77.44 ± 10.3	2.5 (-8 to 7.2)	78.35 ± 10.49	80.7 ± 9.67	1.7 (-9.5 to 15)	0.78	
Sum skinfolds (cm)	20.8 ± 12.87	20.39 ± 10.39	-0.76 ± 6.2	20.44 ± 10.39	23.46 ± 14.19	3.5 ± 9.7	0.05	
Cholesterol (mmol/L)	4.57 ± 0.79	4.53 ± 0.86	0 ± 0.6	4.43 ± 0.86	4.46 ± 1.57	$0.5 \pm 0.9^{*}$	0.02	
HDL (mmol/L)	1.29 ± 0.48	1.25 ± 0.42	-0.05 ± 0.3	1.24 ± 0.45	1.30 ± 0.41	0.05 ± 0.3	0.2	
LDL (mmol/L)	2.44 ± 0.87	2.79 ± 1.08	-0.08 ± 0.5	2.68 ± 0.76	2.55 ± 0.88	$0.34 \pm 0.6^{*}$	0.01	
Triglycerides (mmol/L)	2.68 ± 0.76	2.55 ± 0.88	0.0 ± 1.0	2.44 ± 0.87	2.79 ± 1.08	0.1 ± 0.6	0.9	
Adiponectin (ng/L)	23.5 ± 9.0	16.6 ± 6.1	-5.2 ± 9.7	16.0 ± 5.7	27.9 ± 9.6	11.9 ± 10	< 0.01	
% change in			-25 (-77 to 16)			84.8 (6.6 to 423)	< 0.01	
adiponectin IGF-1 % change in IGF-1	309.2 (142.1–496.5)	315.1 (152.5–506.2)	27.1 ± 79.5 4 (-22.8 to 58.6)	339.5 (193.7–472.6)	344.9 (138–489)	-5.6 ± 126.2 0 (-40.4 to 40.4)	0.9	

Raw data includes the mean and SD before and after each arm of the trial.

HbA1c, haemoglobin A1c; BMI-SDS, body mass index standard deviation scores; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; LDL, low-density lipoprotein.

*p < 0.05 for difference between means.

 \pm Data are mean \pm SD or median (range) of the difference in outcome during treatment with rosiglitazone (for group A week 52 compared with 24, for group B week 24 compared with week 0) and placebo (for group A week 24 compared with week 0, for group B week 52 compared with week 24). Paired *t*-tests, (or sign rank test for skewed data) were used to test the statistical significance between changes in parameters during treatment with rosiglitazone or placebo.

Only two of the seven subjects had an improvement in insulin sensitivity of greater than 10% on rosiglitazone. The improvement in these subjects could not be predicted by initial HbA1c, age, BMI-SDS, pubertal stage or compliance.

Pediatric Diabetes 2008: 9: 326–334

Thiazolidinedione

- Thus, the benefits of thiazolidinedione treatment are modest, although insulin requirement slightly decreased.
- However, the greatest effect of rosiglitazone occurred in subjects with more pronounced markers of insulin resistance, we might be consider this treatment in severe insulin-resistant patients.
- When we consider the potential risk of edema and weight gain, a thiazolidinedione as an add-on to insulin cannot be considered as a potential future treatment of patients with type 1 diabetes.
- Moreover, concerns exist about bone metabolism and long-term use of these drugs.

Incretin-based therapy



Antidiabetic actions of GLP-1 in T1D



Diabetes 60:1599-1607, 2011

환자 baseline character 넣을건지? Kim Sangyong, 2018-04-30 KS1

Clinical trials for GLP-1 agonist in T1D

	Number of participants	Baseline HbA _{1c} (%)	EOT HbA_{1c} (%)	Basal insulin change (%)	Bolus insulin change (%)	Bodyweight change (% or kg)
Frandsen et al ^{s2}						
12 weeks, RDBPC; insulin treatment: flexible dosing; study population: patients wi with no severe late diabetic complications; mean diabetes duration: 18.3 years (SD	th type 1 diabet 2·0) in liragluti	es, C-peptide ne de group, 19∙6 y	egative (without re years (1·6) in place	sidual β-cell function), BM oo group	l 18-<25 kg/m [;]	² , normotensive,
1-2 mg liraglutide once per day	18	8.8%	8.2%	0	-11%	-4·1% (-3·1 kg)
Placebo once per day	18	8.7%	8.2%	0	0	+1·5% (1·1 kg)
Dejgaard et al ⁵³						
26 weeks, RDBPC; insulin treatment: flexible dosing; study population: patients win normotensive, with no severe late diabetic complications; mean diabetes duration	th type 1 diabet : 20 years (SD 1.	es, C-peptide po 2) in liraglutide	ositive and negative group, 25 years (12	e (with and without residu) in placebo group	al β-cell functio	on), BMI >25 kg/m²,
1.8 mg liraglutide once per day	46	8.7%	8.2%	12%	2%	-6·3% (-5·8 kg)
Placebo once per day	44	8.7%	8.4%	24%	20%	+0·2 (0·2 kg)
Kuhadiya et al ^{51*}						
12 weeks, RDBPC; insulin treatment not defined; study population: patients with t	al β-cell function), BMI >2	25 kg/m²				
0.6 mg liraglutide once per day	10					-4·1% (3·1 kg)
1.2 mg or 1.8 mg liraglutide once per day†	23	7.6%	7.1%	0	0	-5·1% (4·5 kg)
Placebo once per day	14					
ADJUNCT ONE54*						
52 weeks, RDBPC in 1398 patients with type 1 diabetes; insulin treatment: flexible	dosing					
0.6 mg liraglutide once per day						
1.2 mg liraglutide once per day		8.2%	7.7%			-3 to 4 kg
1.8 mg liraglutide once per day		8.2%	7.7%			-3 to 4 kg
Placebo once per day		8.2%	7.9%			+1 kg
ADJUNCT TWO ^{55*}						
26 weeks, RDBPC in 835 patients with type 1 diabetes; insulin treatment: fixed dos	ing					
0.6 mg liraglutide once per day		8.2%	7.9% to 8.0%			–2 to 5 kg
1.2 mg liraglutide once per day		8.2%	7.9% to 8.0%			–2 to 5 kg
1.8 mg liraglutide once per day		8.2%	7.9% to 8.0%			–2 to 5 kg
Placebo once per day		8.2%	8.2%			0

Clinical trials for GLP-1 agonist in T1D

	Number of participants	Baseline HbA _{1c} (%)	EOT HbA _{ic} (%)	Basal insulin change (%)	Bolus insulin change (%)	Bodyweight change (% or kg)	
(Continued from previous page)							
Kuhadiya et al⁴							
24 weeks, restrospective; insulin treatment: flexible dosing; study population: patients with type 1 diabetes, C-peptide negative (without residual β-cell function), BMI > 30 kg/m ² , mean diabeter duration: 21·1 years (SD 2·1)						/m², mean diabetes	
1.8 mg liraglutide once per day	27	7.9%	7.5%	-6%	-28%	-4·8% (-4·6 kg)	
Harrison et al45							
Retrospective; insulin treatment: flexible dosing; study population: patients with t	ype 1 diabetes, I	BMI >25 kg/m²,	mean diabetes dur	ration: 17-3 years (SD 9-3)			
10 weeks 1.8 mg liraglutide once per day	11	7.4%	7.0%	-14%	-24%	-4·2% (-3·0 kg)	
20 weeks 1.8 mg liraglutide once per day	7	7.5%	6.6%	-12%	-19%	-5·0% (-3·6 kg)	
Varanasi et al ⁴⁶							
24 weeks, open-label; insulin treatment: flexible dosing‡; study population: patien diabetes duration: 24.0 years (SD 4.0)	ts with type 1 d	iabetes, C-pepti	de negative (witho	out residual β-cell function), BMI 20- <30	kg/m², mean	
1.8 mg liraglutide once per day	8	6.5%	6.1%	-49%	-45%	-6·6% (-4·5 kg)	
Kielgast et al⁴							
4 weeks, open-label; insulin treatment: flexible dosing; study population: patients with type 1 diabetes, C-peptide positive and negative (with and without residual β-cell function), BMI 18– <27 kg/m ² , with no severe late diabetic complications; patients with preserved β-cell function had mean diabetes duration of 3·7 years (SD 0·8), those without preserved β-cell function had mean diabetes duration of 3·7 years (SD 0·8), those without preserved β-cell function had mean diabetes duration of 3·7 years (SD 0·8), those without preserved β-cell function had mean diabetes duration of 17·3 years (SE 2·5), those given insulin alone had mean diabetes duration of 23·1 years (1·6)							
C-peptide positive patients; 1.2 mg liraglutide once per day	10	6.6%	6.4%	-29%	-46%	-3·6% (-2·8 kg)	
C-peptide negative patients; 1.2 mg liraglutide once per day	9	7.5%	7.0%	-6%	-28%	-2·2% (-1·8 kg)	
Insulin only	10	7.1%	6.9%			+0·2 kg	

V

Clinical trials for GLP-1 agonist in T1D

	Number of participants	Baseline HbA _{1t} (%)	EOT HbA _{1c} (%)	Basal insulin change (%)	Bolus insulin change (%)	Bodyweight change (% or kg)
Rother et al ⁴⁸						
24 weeks, open-label; insulin treatment: flexible dosing; study population: patient 21.0 years (SD 11.0)	ts with type 1 dia	abetes, BMI 20-	-30 kg/m², with no	severe late diabetic compl	ications; mean	diabetes duration:
10 µg exenatide four times per day	14	6.6%	6.5%	0	-28%	-5·4% (-4·1 kg)
Traina et al⁵⁰						
12 weeks, retrospective; insulin treatment not defined; study population: patients diabetes duration: 39 years (range 11–47)	with type 1 dial	betes, C-peptide	e negative (withou	t residual β-cell function),	mean BMI 30 k	g/m² (SD 5),
2.0 mg exenatide once per week	11	7.7%	7.1%	+15%	-32%	-3·7% (…kg)
Hari Kumar et al ⁴⁹						
56 weeks, open-label; insulin treatment: flexible dosing; study population: patient	ts with new-ons	et type 1 diabet	tes			
10 µg exenatide twice per day	6	9.7%	7.9%	-70% total daily dose		+0·9% (+0·5 kg)
Insulin only	6	9.9%	7.4%	-26% total daily dose		+6·8% (+ 4·0kg)
100 mg sitagliptin once per day	6	9.6%	7.5%	-49:4% total daily dose		+4·7% (+2·7 kg)
					\sim	

Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol 2016;4:766–80

ADJUNCT-1 trial

Table 2-Safety: AEs and SAEs Liraglutide 1.8 mg Liraglutide 0.6 mg Liraglutide 1.2 mg Placebo Change in tasting body weight (kg) % R Ν % R N % R N % R Ν Participants, N 347 348 350 348 278.9 286.3 315.5 296.6 Exposure years 4.8 AEs 90.2 7.7 302 86.8 6.0 298 85.1 5.3 79.0 313 275 SAEs 8.4 10.3 0.17 10.0 0.18 29 0.14 36 35 0.15 38 10.9 Leading to premature treatment discontinuation 12.6 0.29 0.06 51 14.7 0.30 44 17 4.9 0.08 12 3.4 Hypoglycemic episodes All 329 94.8 50.2 322 92.5 49.4 334 95.4 45.4 321 92.2 42.7 16.5 16.1 79.1 Symptomatic* 290 83.6 285 81.9 277 15.7 276 79.3 12.3 Severe or BG confirmed** 21.1 86.2 20.0 84.0 83.3 88.2 300 294 19.2 290 16.9 306 49.3 92.2 42.6 ADA classification 329 94.8 50.1 322 92.5 333 95.1 45.4 321 0.11 0.19 Severe 28 8.1 0.17 22 6.3 32 9.1 0.13 37 10.6 34.4 87.1 34.0 88.9 27.7 Documented symptomatic 309 89.0 303 311 32.6 302 86.8 Asymptomatic 85.0 15.2 78.2 14.8 78.9 12.2 79.9 14.0 295 272 276 278 Probable symptomatic 0.30 8.9 0.28 0.34 40 11.5 31 39 11.1 40 11.5 0.39 Pseudo-hypoglycemia 5.2 0.08 0.12 5.7 0.35 18 21 6.0 20 0.11 22 6.3 Hyperglycemic episodes All 307 88.5 33.5 293 84.2 30.9 309 88.3 29.5 312 89.7 34.7 Episodes with ketosis*** 39 11.2 0.28 26 7.5 0.15 22 6.3 0.17 24 6.9 0.12 Gastrointestinal disorders 68.3 All 237 2.7 212 60.9 1.9 175 50.0 1.3 116 33.3 0.76 40.8 0.18 49.6 Nausea 172 0.97 142 0.69 112 32.0 0.47 42 12.1 EAC-confirmed SAEs Ν **Events** N N N **Events** Events Events

Diabetes Care 2016;39:1702–1710

Clinical trials of DPP-4 inhibitor

8.1%

Placebo once per day

	Baseline HbA _{1c} (%)	EOT HbA _{1c} (%)	Change in TDD insulin (%)	Bodyweight change (% or kg)					
Foley et al ⁶²									
4 weeks, double-blind, crossover; insulin treatment not defined; study population: 12 patients with type 1 diabetes, mean BMI 24 kg/m² (SD 3); mean diabetes duration: 20·0 years (SD 10·0)									
100 mg vildagliptin twice per day	7.6%								
Placebo twice per day	7.6%								
Ellis et al ⁶³									
4 weeks, double-blind, crossover; insulin treatment: fixed dosing; study population: 20 patients with type 1 diabetes, BMI around 27 kg/m², with no severe late diabetic complications; diabetes duration around 15–20 years									
100 mg sitagliptin once per day	Between-group difference at end of treatment 0·3% in favour of sitagliptin		-						
Placebo once per day									
Farngren et al ⁶⁴									
4 weeks, double-blind, crossover. Insulin treatment: not defined. Study population: 28 patients with type 1 diabetes, mean BMI 25 kg/m ² (SD 3); with no severe late diabetic complications. Mean diabetes duration: 11·0 years (SD 4·0)									
100 mg vildagliptin twice per day	7.5%	7.2%							
Placebo twice per day	7.5%	7.4%							
Hari Kumar et al ⁴⁹									
52 weeks, open-label; insulin treatment: flexible dosing;	study population: 18 patients with	new-onset type	1 diabetes, BMI 20	-<25 kg/m²					
100 mg sitagliptin once per day	9.6%	7.5%	-49.4%	+4·7% (+2·7 kg)					
10 µg exenatide twice per day	9.7%	7.4%	-70.4%	-0·9% (-0·5 kg)					
Insulin only	9.9%	7.4%	-26%	+6·8% (+ 4·0kg)					
Garg et al ⁶⁵									
16 weeks, RDBPC; insulin treatment: fixed dosing; study residual β -cell function), BMI 25–30 kg/m ² ; mean diabete	population: 141 patients with type es duration: 22·0 years (SD 11·0) in s	1 diabetes, C-per sitagliptide grou	otide positive and i o, 20·0 years (SD 13	negative (with and without 1·0) in placebo group					
100 mg sitagliptin once per day	8.2%	8-2%	-3.5%	+0·1% (+0·1 kg)					
Placebo once per day	8.6%	8.5%	+0.4%	0					
Schopman et al ⁶⁶									
6 weeks, double-blind, crossover; insulin treatment not of function), BMI 24 kg/m² (range 21–25) with no severe lat	lefined; study population: 16 patie e diabetic complications; diabetes	nts with type 1 di duration: 11 year	abetes, C-peptide s (range 6–15)	negative (without residual β-cell					
100 mg sitagliptin once per day	8.3%								

--

..

--

Meta-analysis for incretin based therapy in T1D

Incretin		c	Control			Mean Difference		Mean Difference			
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 9	5% CI IV, R	andom, 95% Cl	
Ahren 2016	-6.12	8.85	626	-2.16	13.07	211	22.5%	-3.96 [-5.85, -	2.07]	+	
Dejgaard 2016	4.1	25.61	50	13.4	9.66	50	4.0%	-9.30 [-16.89, -	1.71]	—	
Table 3 – Safety of inc	able 3 – Safety of incretin in treatment of patients with type 1 diabetes.										
Outcomes				No.	of trial	S	Events/to	tal	RR (95%CI)	P value	I^2
							Incretin	Control			
Hypoglycemia Severe hypoglycemia	1			6			127/1813	56/671	0.79 (0.58, 1.06)	0.11	0%
Hyperglycemia with ke	etosis ar	nd ketod	icidosis							-	
Ketosis				2			137/1671	33/554	1.37 (0.95, 1.97)	0.10	0%
Ketoacidosis				3			9/1682	0/560	2.62 (0.31, 21.99)	0.37	0%
Gastrointestinal disord	ers										
Nausea				6			838/1805	93/646	3.02 (2.14, 4.27)	< 0.00001	53%
Vomiting				4			118/748	12/292	3.25 (1.06, 9.94)	0.04	48%
Diarrhea				4			86/792	24/309	1.33 (0.41, 4.31)	0.63	57%
Other adverse effects										-	
Pancreatitis				2			1/1671	0/554	1.00 (0.04, 24.51)	1.00	-
CV events (acute cor	onary s	yndror	nes)	2			4/1671	2/554	0.66 (0.12, 3.60)	0.63	0%
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.79; Chi ² = 13.40, df = 2 (P = 0.001); l ² = 85% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.57 (P = 0.12)							-2 -1 Favours [control	0 1 Favours (increti	1 2 1]		

Fig. 5 – Change in fasting c-peptide among patients with type 1 diabetes receiving incretin-based drugs versus control.

 \mathbf{V}

Incretin-based therapy

- In patients with type 1 diabetes, the amount of meal-induced GLP-1 secretion is similar to that of healthy individuals.
- Findings from clinical trials suggest that incretin-based therapy induce weight loss and reduce insulin requirements, with either improved or unaltered glycemic control.
- DPP-4 inhibitors as add-on to insulin modestly improve HbA1c with no raised risk of hypoglycemia and no effect on body weight or the daily doses of insulin needed.
- GLP-1RA added to insulin therapy reduced HbA1c levels, total insulin dose, and body weight in type 1 diabetes, accompanied by increased rates of symptomatic hypoglycemia and hyperglycemia with ketosis, thereby limiting clinical use in this group.

SGLT-2 inhibitor



Clinical trials of SGLT-2 inhibitor in T1D

	Number of patients	Baseline HbA _{1c} (%)	EOT HbA _{1c} (%)	Basal insulin change (%)	Bolus insulin change (%)	Bodyweight change (%)			
Sands et al ⁶⁸									
4 weeks, RDBPC; insulin treatment: flexible dosing; study population: patients with type 1 diabetes, BMI 25–30 kg/m ² ; diabetes duration: median 18·5 years (range 4·7–40·8) for placebo group, 16·8 (3·4–42·9) for sotagliflozin									
400 mg sotagliflozin once per day	16	8.0%	7.4%	-2.4%	-32.1%	-2·3% (-1·7 kg)			
Placebo once per day	17	7.9%	7.9%	+0.2%	-6.4%	+0·7% (+0·5 kg)			
Perkins et al ⁶⁹									
8 weeks, open-label; insulin treatment: flexible dosing; study population: patients with type 1 diabetes, BMI 20– <25 kg/m², normotensive, with no sever diabetic complications; diabetes duration: 17 years (SD 7)									
25 mg empagliflozin once per day	40	8.0%	7.6%	-24.1%	-6.9%	-3·6% (-2·6 kg)			
Pieber et al ⁷⁰ (EASE-1)	Pieber et al ⁷⁰ (EASE-1)								
4 weeks, open-label; insulin treatment: flexible diabetic complications; diabetes duration: 21 y 24 years (15) for empagliflozin 25 mg	e dosing;* study rears (SD 13) for	population: placebo, 20	patients with years (12) for	type 1 diabetes, BMI 25-3 empagliflozin 2·5 mg, 16	0 kg/m²; normo years (8) for em	tensive, with no severe late pagliflozin 10 mg,			
2.5 mg empagliflozin once per day	19	8.4%	7.9%	–0·08 TWD (U/kg)		-1·8% (-1·4 kg)			
10 mg empagliflozin once per day	19	8.3%	7.8%	-0·10 TWD (U/kg)		-1·8% (-1·6 kg)			
25 mg empagliflozin once per day	19	8.2%	7.5%	–0·09 TWD (U/kg)		-2·2% (-1·7 kg)			
Placebo once per day	18	8.2%	8.0%	-0.01 TWD (U/kg)		+0·3% (+0·2 kg)			
Henry et al ⁷¹									
18 weeks, RDBPC; insulin treatment: flexible de diabetic complications; diabetes duration: 22 y	osing; study po /ears (SD 11)	pulation: pat	ients with typ	e 1 diabetes, BMI 20– <25	kg/m², normote	ensive, with no severe late			
300 mg canagliflozin per day once per day	117	8.0%	7.8%	-7.5%	-17.5%	-5·1% (-4·2 kg)			
100 mg canagliflozin per day once per day	117	7.9%	7.6%	-3.7%	-7.5%	-3·1% (-2·6 kg)			
Placebo once per day	117	7.9%	7.9%	+12.0%	-5.3%	+0·3% (+0·2 kg)			

Clinical trials of Sotagliflozin

The NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL of MEDICINE

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Effects of Sotagliflozin Added to Insulin in Patients with Type 1 Diabetes

Satish K. Garg, M.D., Robert R. Henry, M.D., Phillip Banks, M.S., John B. Buse, M.D., Ph.D., Melanie J. Davies, M.D., Gregory R. Fulcher, M.D., Paolo Pozzilli, M.D., Diane Gesty-Palmer, M.D., Ph.D., Pablo Lapuerta, M.D., Rafael Simó, M.D., Ph.D., Thomas Danne, M.D., Darren K. McGuire, M.D., M.H.Sc., Jake A. Kushner, M.D., Anne Peters, M.D., and Paul Strumph, M.D.

ABSTRACT

Phase 3, double-blind trial, we randomly assigned 1402 patients with type 1 diabetes who were receiving treatment with any insulin therapy (pump or injections) to receive sotagliflozin (400 mg per day) or placebo for 24 weeks. The primary end point was a glycated hemoglobin level lower than 7.0% at week 24, with no episodes of severe hypoglycemia or diabetic ketoacidosis after randomization. Secondary end points included the change from baseline in glycated hemoglobin level, weight, systolic blood pressure, and mean daily bolus dose of insulin.

N Engl J Med. 2017 Sep 13. [Epub ahead of print]

Clinical trials of Sotagliflozin



Figure 1. Primary and Secondary End Points.

Panel A shows the percentage of patients who achieved the primary end point of a glycated hemoglobin level lower than 7.0% at week 24, with no episodes of severe hypoglycemia or diabetic ketoacidosis after randomization. Panel B shows the least-squares mean change in the glycated hemo-

Positively adjudicated adverse events		
Severe hypoglycemia, ≥1 episode‡	21 (3.0)	17 (2.4)
Severe nocturnal hypoglycemia, ≥1 episode‡	2 (0.3)	5 (0.7)
Severe hypoglycemia in a patient who used insulin pump, ≥ 1 episode ${\tt \S}$	10 (3.6)	5 (1.8)
Severe hypoglycemia in a patient who did not use insulin pump, ≥1 episode§	11 (2.6)	12 (2.8)
Diabetic ketoacidosis, ≥1 episode	21 (3.0)	4 (0.6)
Diabetic ketoacidosis in a patient who used insulin pump, ≥ 1 episode \S	12 (4.4)	2 (0.7)
Diabetic ketoacidosis in a patient who did not use insulin pump, ≥1 episode§	9 (2.1)	2 (0.5)
Major adverse cardiovascular events	2 (0.3)	0
Investigator-reported events of special interest		
Volume depletion	13 (1.9)	2 (0.3)
Genital mycotic infection	45 (6.4)	15 (2.1)
Urinary tract infection	25 (3.6)	27 (3.8)
Diarrhea¶	29 (4.1)	16 (2.3)
Pancreatitis	0	0
Bone fracture	4 (0.6)	5 (0.7)
Potential drug-induced liver injury	2 (0.3)	0
Renal event	5 (0.7)	3 (0.4)
Cancer	1 (0.1)	2 (0.3)
Documented hypoglycemia:	673 (96.3)	670 (95.3)
Documented nocturnal hypoglycemia‡	521 (74.5)	553 (78.7)

V

N Engl J Med. 2017 Sep 13. [Epub ahead of print]

Clinical trials of Dapagliflozin

Efficacy and safety of dapagliflozin in patients with inadequately controlled type 1 diabetes (DEPICT-1): 24 week results from a multicentre, double-blind, phase 3, randomised controlled trial

Paresh Dandona, Chantal Mathieu, Moshe Phillip, Lars Hansen, Steven C Griffen, Diethelm Tschöpe, Fredrik Thorén, John Xu, Anna Maria Langkilde, on behalf of the DEPICT-1 Investigators*

DEPICT-1 was a double-blind, randomised, parallel-controlled, three-arm, phase 3, multicentre study done at 143 sites in 17 countries. Eligible patients were aged 18–75 years and had inadequately controlled type 1 diabetes (HbA1c between \geq 7.7% and \leq 11.0% [\geq 61.0 mmol/mol and \leq 97.0 mmol/mol]) and had been prescribed insulin for at least 12 months before enrolment. The primary efficacy outcome was the change from baseline in HbA1c after 24 weeks of treatment in the full analysis set, which consisted of all randomly assigned patients who received at least one dose of study drug.

Clinical trials of Dapagliflozin

1.0 → Dapagliflozin 5 mg + insulin				insulin				
0.8- % 0.6- % 0.4-	0·8- ≪ 0·6- ⊈ 0·4- 		Dapagliflozin Dapagliflozin Placebo 5 mg plus 10 mg plus plus insulin insulin (n=277) insulin (n=296) (n=260)			:bo): -2·96 (95% Cl -3·63 to -2·28); p<0·0001 :ebo): -3·72 (95% Cl -4·38 to -3·05); p<0·0001		
Patients per timepoint	Number of patients with event sent for DKA adjudication Number of patients with definite DKA Number of events of definite DKA Incidence rate per 100 patient-years Severity of events as adjudicated Mild Moderate	16 (6%) 4 (1%) 4 3.29 2 1	19 (6%) 5 (2%) 5 3.78 1 3	6 (2%) 3 (1%) 3 2·64 1 1	agliflozin g plus Jin 277)* 7 (68%) ∋ (29%) 5 (2%)	Dapagliflozin 10 mg plus insulin (n=296)* 207 (70%) 82 (28%) 8 (3%)	Placebo plus insulin (n=260) 160 (62%) 31 (12%) 9 (3%)	
Dapagliflozin 5 mg + insulin 254 Dapagliflozin 10 mg + insulin 254 Placebo + insulin 257	Severe Number of events of euglycaemic* DKA	1 0	1 2	1 0	4 (12%) 9 (7%) 4 (1%)	33 (11%) 11 (4%) 2 (1%)	7 (3%) 13 (5%) 0	
Figure 2: Change in HbA _{1c} over 24 weeks	Insulin pump failure Missed insulin dose Severe illness Not identified	2 1 0 1	1 3 0 0	1 1 0 0	1 (1%)) 2 (4%) 1 (<1%)§	3 (1%) 1 (<1%) 13 (4%) 2 (1%)¶	3 (1%) 2 (1%) 2 (1%) 0	
	Other Mean percent insulin total daily dose (IU) reduction compared with baseline for week before DKA event§	0 -8·9	1† -25·3	1‡ -7·8) (7%) 5 (2%)	24 (8%) 9 (3%)	15 (6%) 1 (<1%)	
e −12 − participation −12 − tion −14 − F −16 − Dapaglifloz	Mean percent insulin total daily dose (IU) reduction compared with baseline at end of 24 week treatment period§	-11.0	-21.6	30.8	3 (1%) 1 (<1%)	4 (1%) 2 (1%)	3 (1%) 1 (<1%)	
$\begin{array}{c} -18 - \begin{array}{c} \text{Dapaglifloz} \\ p < 0.0001 \\ -20 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 \end{array}$ Patients per timepoint Dapagliflozin 5 mg + insulin 258 255 Dapagliflozin 10 mg + insulin 254 253 Placebo + insulin 258 254	Events adjudicated as not DKA Number of patients with possible DKA Number of events of possible DKA Number of patients with unlikely DKA Number of events of unlikely DKA	5 (2%) 7 8 (3%) 15	7 (2%) 8 8 (3%) 10	1 (<1%) 3 3 (1%) 8	1 (<1%) 5 (2%) 1 (<1%))	0 8 (3%) 5 (2%) 0	1 (<1%) 2 (1%) 0 1 (<1%)	

Figure 3: Change in total daily dose of insulin

Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 2017;5(11):864-876

Meta-analysis for SGLT-2i therapy in T1D

	insulin+sglt2 inh	ibitors	insulin+pla	acebo		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Henry RR 2015[19]	25	57	8	13	9.5%	0.71 [0.42, 1.20]	
Henry RR 2015[21]	144	234	64	117	62.3%	1.13 [0.93, 1.37]	-
Pieber TR 2015[22]	50	56	18	19	19.6%	0.94 [0.82, 1.08]	+
Sands AT 2015[20]	14	16	12	17	8.5%	1.24 [0.87, 1.77]	+
Total (95% CI)		363		166	100.0%	1.06 [0.92, 1.22]	+
Total events	233		102				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6.04, df = 3 (P = 0.11); I ² = 50%							
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.83 (P = 0.41)							insulin+solt2 inhibitors insulin+placebo

Figure 6. Forest plot for meta-analyses comparing SGLT-2 inhibitor with placebo in Total AEs. RR = related risk.

	insulin+sglt2 inhi	bitors	insulin+pla	cebo		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Henry RR 2015[21]	42	57	8	13	6.9%	1.20 [0.76, 1.89]	<u>+</u>
Pieber TR 2015[22]	231	234	113	117	79.7%	1.02 [0.98, 1.06]	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Sands AT 2015[20]	45	56	17	19	13.4%	0.90 [0.73, 1.10]	-
Total (95% CI)		347		149	100.0%	1.02 [0.97, 1.07]	•
Total events	318		138				
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 2.02$, $df = 2$ (P = 0.36); $l^2 = 1\%$							
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.66 (P = 0.51)							insulin+sglt2 inhibitors insulin+placebo

	insulin+sglt2 inhi	bitors	insulin+pla	icebo		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Henry RR 2015[19]	3	57	1	13	18.0%	0.68 [0.08, 6.06]	
Henry RR 2015[21]	24	234	5	117	73.8%	2.40 [0.94, 6.13]	
Pieber TR 2015[22]	1	56	0	19	8.2%	1.05 [0.04, 24.81]	
Total (95% CI)		347		149	100.0%	1.98 [0.87, 4.49]	-
Total events	28		6				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.23, df = 2 (P = 0.54); l ² = 0%							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.64 (P = 0.10)							insulin+salt2 inhibitors insulin+placebo

Figure 8. Forest plot for meta-analyses comparing SGLT-2 inhibitor with placebo in urinary tract or genital infection. RR = related risk.

Sci Rep. 2017 9;7:44128

Main problem of SGLT-2 inhibitor use in T1D

- Inhibition of SGLT2, the major sodium–glucose cotransporter in the kidney, directly reduces hyperglycemia through an insulinindependent mechanism and could provide new possibilities for patients with type 1 diabetes.
- Some SGLT-2 inhibitors adjunct to insulin for the treatment of type 1 diabetes shows the improvement in HbA1c and weight loss, with a lower risk of hypoglycemia.
- Although there are primary cause for DKA events such as pump failure, missed insulin dose, the event rate increased in the group that using SGLT-2 inhibitors.
- Interest is increasing about the relation between use of SGLT2 inhibition and development of DKA in both type 1 and type 2 diabetes, and the FDA has recommended that SGLT2 inhibitor use should be avoided in patients with type 1 diabetes.

Non-insulin agents for type 1 diabetes



Conclusion

- Despite the proven benefits of tight glycemic control in individuals with type 1 diabetes in reducing diabetic complications, the risk and fear of hypoglycemia and the potential for weight gain are limitations of treatment.
- With regard to the rising problem of severe obesity and insulin resistance in individuals with type 1 diabetes, trials focusing on adding non-insulin hypoglycemic agent to treatment will be of interest for type 1 diabetic patients.
- However, the non-insulin hypoglycemic agents do not hold promise for achieving improved glycemic control with type 1 diabetes except some antidiabetic agent.
- Large and long-term randomized, controlled clinical trials should be done to further explore the non-insulin drugs: Ideally, both lean and obese people with and without residual β-cell function, should be included in the studies.

Thanks for your attention!!



Hope for Diabetes Cure