See updated Diabetes Landmark Trials & Links chart at: http://www.rxfiles.ca/rxfiles/uploads/documents/CHT-Diabetes-Landmark-Trials-Links.pdf



KENDOS 3305 pts random Forgerson ¹ et al. orlistat 120 or placebo Both groups of reduced die to ↑ physica DREAM 5269 pts random	mg TID ^{\$155/30d} n = 1650 h = 1655. on calorie t & encouraged I activity (mean age ~ 4 BMI≥ 30 kg/m ² Pts could not h active cardiov 21% of pts had	Length) yrs of age 43 yrs) ave DM or ascular dx.	Results 1° endpoint: Diabetes incidence: 6.2% with orlistat & 9.0% with placebo RRR = 37%. NNT/4 yrs = 36 Subgroup analysis was performed; orlistat's diabetes preventative effects were seen in pts with IGT, not in pts with normal glucose tolerance (NGT) {18.8%vs 28.8% in IGT; 2.6% vs 2.7% in NGT} 1° endpoint: Weight reduction was 5.8 kg with orlistat &	Comments • GI adverse effects: 91% of orlistat pts vs. 65% of placebo pts. ^{in 1st year} •Completed the trial: 52% of orlistat pts vs. 34% of placebo pts. • results given based on single +'ve test; <i>repeal +'ve test</i> results are quite differen
orgerson ¹ et al. or placebo Both groups o reduced die to ↑ physica	mg TID ^{\$155/30d} n = 1650 n = 1655. on calorie t & encouraged I activity (mean age ~ 4 BMI≥ 30 kg/m ² Pts could not h active cardiov 21% of pts had	43 yrs) ave DM or ascular dx.	6.2% with orlistat & 9.0% with placebo RRR = 37%. NNT/4 yrs = 36 Subgroup analysis was performed; orlistat's diabetes preventative effects were seen in pts with IGT, <u>not</u> in pts with normal glucose tolerance (NGT) {18.8%vs 28.8% in IGT; 2.6% vs 2.7% in NGT}	 pts vs. 65% of placebo pts. ^{in 1st year} Completed the trial: 52% of orlistat pts vs. 34% of placebo pts. results given based on single +'ve test; repeat +'ve test results are quite different.
	Iomized to Pts were > 30 y		3 kg with placebo at 4 yrs.	Effective in overweight IGT patients if able to tolerate
Gertsein ² et al or placebo Healthy diet & ei Cardiovascular Outcome Composite MI Stroke CV Death CHIP New Angina Revascularized es Loo HR (85% of	<pre>te 8 mg OD n = 2635 \$102/30d n = 2634. (median age = ~ 60% females Pts had IGT ar isolated IFG[‡]. Mean FBG = 5 No pts with DM CV dx. ~ 44% with hyp {original eligibil expanded dur</pre>	= 55 yrs) 3 yrs id/or IFG or (2.5-4.7 yr) .8 mmol/L or known ortension bertension lity criteria ing trial}	1° endpoint: incident diabetes or death: 11.6% with rosiglitazone 26.0 % with placebo NNT = 7 (p<0.0001)	 The trial was stopped 5 months early due to large difference in the 1° endpoint when rosiglitazone & placebo were compared. <u>CV Concerns</u> ↑ risk of HF; ?↑MI & ?↑CV events Recent rosiglitazone CV meta-analysis suggests harm Nissen NEM May0 (↑MI: OR 1.43 ° 1.03-198; ↑CV death: OR 1.64 ° 10.98-27 PROactive ⁷ trial with pioglitazone ACTOS studied CV event rates in DM pts with evidence of CV dx. N for 1° endpoint; some reductions i 2° CV events, but ↑ HF with pioglitazone ^{10.8%} vs. pl ^{7.5%}; NNH=34/3yr.
Bosch ³ et al (start 5 mg then ↑ to 10 ↑ 15 mg OE or placebo	omized to mg ODPts were > 30 $(mean age = 1)$ OD x 2 months D mg OD, then 0 at 1yr, $n = 2623$ IGT and/or IFG isolated IFG [‡] . No pts with DM CV dx. ~ 44% with hyp	54.7 yrs) 3 yrs 3 or 1 or known	 1° endpoint: incident diabetes or death 18.1% with ramipril & 19.5% with placebo. (p=0.15) NS Regression to normoglycemia^{FBG} <6.1mmol/L, 2hBG <7.8mmol/L 42.5% pts with ramipril 38.2% pts with placebo. HR = 1.16 (1.07-1.27) p=0.001 NNT/3 yrs = 23 No <u>significant</u> difference in rate of CV events.^{2.6} vs 2.4% HR = 1.08 (0.76-1.52) 	 The trial was stopped early as explained above. Cough: 9.7% of pts d/c ramipril & 1.8% of pts d/c placebo. Not effective and lack of CV benefit.
or placebo 26 Pts were encou & met with a c	D0 mg TID ^{\$42/30d} (mean age = $\frac{1}{2}$ IGT (2hBG \geq 7 mmol/L, with a 5.6-7.7 mmol/ Mean FBG = 6	54 yrs) 3.3 yrs .8 & <11.1 a FBG of L). .2 mmol/L	1° endpoint: incidence of diabetes ^{based on single +'ve test} : 32.4% pts with acarbose 41.5% pts with placebo. HR = 0.75 (0.63-0.9) NNT/3.3 yrs = 11 Regression to NGT ^{2hBG} <7.8 mmol/L: 35% in the acarbose group 31% in the placebo group. (p<0.001)	 GI related adverse: 83% of acarbos pts vs 60% with placebo pts D/c treatment early: 31% of acarbos pts & 19% of placebo pts Effective but high drop-out rate
Knowler ⁵ et al. mg Lifestyle ↓ + or	(mean = 51 yr metformin 850 BID ^{\$14/30d n=1073} , FBG of 5.3-6.9	2 {mean = 34} mmol/L, & -11 mmol/L. cipiants were	 1° endpoint:incident diabetes: 4.8 cases/100 person yrs for intensive lifestyle 7.8 cases/100 person yrs for metformin, 11 cases/100 person yrs for placebo, • NNT/2.8 yrs = 7 for lifestyle • NNT/2.8 yrs = 14 for metformin. Average weight loss: 5.6 kg with intensive lifestyle, 	 The trial was stopped one year early on the basis that the author's efficacy measure had been met. Troglitazone[∂] was initially included i the study, but was withdrawn from t trial due to potential liver toxicity caused by the drug⁸. When studied troglitazone significantly ↓ diabetes
Results: Cumulative incidence of diabet Metformin Meta-analysis: 6 trials, 311	(IDPP): 531 pts; Lifestyle vs metformin es/2.5yrs: Lifestyle 39.3% №T=6; MF 40.5% № 9 pts without diabetes, but with abdom day ↓ onset of diabetes over ≤3 yrs; N	INT=7, Control 55% (NNTs vs Contro inal obesity, IGT, family hx	2.1 kg with metformin metformin 0.1 kg with placebo (p<0.001)	 for a short time (0.9 yrs). Intensive lifestyle intervention was more cost-effective vs. metformin ¹⁰ RxFiles Diabetes Select Char

www RyFiles ca

	www.Kxrnes.ca				
Study	Intervention	Patient Population	Trial Length	Results	Comments
Finish Diabetes Prevention Study (FDPS) Tuomilehto ⁶ et al.	522 pts randomized to an intensive lifestyle intervention group ¹ n = 265, or control group ¹ n = 257. (see footnote)	Pts were aged 40 – 65 yrs (mean = 55 yrs) BMI ≥ 25 kg/m ² (mean=31.1) IGT = 2hBG >7.8 but <11.0 mmol/L, & a FBG < 7.8 mmol/L	Median = 4 yrs	1° endpoint: incident diabetes: 11% with intensive lifestyle intervention 23% for control RRR= 58% HR = 0.4 (0.3-0.7) NNT/4 yrs = 8 Change in Body weight: -4.2 kg (-4.8 to -3.6) with the intervention -0.8 kg (-1.3 to -0.3) with the control	Post-hoc 3 yr follow-up analysis: 9(total of 7 yr follow-up)1° endpoint of incident diabetes:4.3 cases/100 person yrs with intervention (75 cases, 28.3%)7.4 cases/100 person yrs with control (110 cases, 42.8%)RRR = 43% HR = 0.57 (0.43-0.76) NNT/7 yrs = 7Body weight remained significantly different in both groups ^{84.3 kg vs 85.6 kg.}

[†]IGT = 2h PG <10 mmol/L. FBG <6.7 mmol/L

[‡] IGT = 2h PG >7.8 mmol/L & <11.1 mmol/L, FBG <7 mmol/L. IFG = 2h BG <11.1 mmol/L, FBG >6.1 mmol/L & <7 mmol/L. Isolated IFG = 2h BG <7.8 mmol/L, FBG >6.1 mmol/L & <7 mmol/L DPP: Standard lifestyle intervention: included written information & individual sessions on healthy lifestyle. The goal of the Intensive Lifestyle Modification was to reduce weight by 7% through a healthy diet and physical exercise (> 150 minutes/week), and 16 individualized lessons, covering diet, exercise and behavior modification.

- FDPS: Intensive Lifestyle Intervention: detailed and individualized counseling, sessions with a nutritionist, & free use of a individualized circuit for exercise. The goals of the intervention were to reduce weight by >5%, fat <30% of all energy, fibre > 15g/1000 kcal, & moderate exercise for > 30 minutes/day. Control: general verbal and written information on a healthy diet & exercise.
- ^a Troglitazone was studied by Knowler⁸ et al. At 0.9 years, there were 3 diabetes cases/100 patient years with troglitazone, 5.1 cases/100 person years for intensive lifestyle intervention, 6.7 cases/100 person years for metformin, and 12/100 person years for placebo. A significant reduction in incident diabetes was seen when troglitazone was compared to metformin (p=0.02), and placebo (p<0.001), but not when compared with intensive lifestyle intervention (p=0.18).

ARR=Absolute Risk Reduction DREAM=Diabetes REduction Assessment with ramipril & rosiglitazone Medication CV=Cardiovascular DM=Diabetes Mellitus Dx=Disease FBG=Fasting Blood Glucose HR=Hazard Ratio IFG=Impaired Fasting Glucose IGT=Impaired Glucose Tolerance NGT=Normal Glucose Tolerance NNH=Number Needed to Harm NNT=Number Needed to Treat NS=Non-Significant Pt=Patient PROactive=PROspective pioplitAzone Clinical Trial in macroVascular Events STOP-NIDDM=Study TO Prevent Non-Insulin Dependent Diabetes Mellitus RRR=Relative Risk Reduction T2DM= type 2 diabetes melitis XENDOS=XENical in the Prevention of Diabetes in Obese Subjects 2hBG=Blood glucose measure 2 hours after a 75g oral glucose load

The Bottom Line: Counsel & encourage weight loss, physical activity, monitor for the development of diabetes every 1-2yrs & treat CVD risk factors eg. tobacco use, hypertension & dyslipidemia ADA 2007 • Lifestyle Intervention^{5,6}: Is the most effective intervention for preventing diabetes when patients are motivated to be compliant. Individualized counseling/education is very important. Exercise: from 150 minutes/week, to 30 minutes/day of moderate intensity activity. Diet: healthy, low calorie, low fat diet <30% kcal fat, <10% kcal saturated fat and >15g fibre/1000 kcal consumed. A small weight loss of only 5kg from these trials has shown enormous benefits.

- Metformin⁵: is effective in preventing diabetes ^{250mg 850 mg BID} when compared to placebo. {Benefits including ↓mortality, have been found in obese patients with diabetes UKPDS-34¹²}. ∞
- **Orlistat**¹ and **Acarbose**⁴: some evidence in their efficacy in preventing diabetes in IGT, but the tolerability (eg. 1 GI side effects) of these medications limit their use ω
- Rosiglitazone²: is effective in preventing diabetes ^{8mg OD} compared to placebo. However, concern over weight gain, edema, CV events & the risk of ↑ heart failure ^{0.5% rosi, vs. 0.1% NNH=250.} Ramipril³: despite promising preliminary evidence^{13,14,15}, ramipril was not effective in preventing diabetes ^{15mg OD DREAM} when compared to placebo ∞
- ∞

References:

Torgerson JS, Boldrin MN, et al, XENical in the Prevention of Diabetes in Obese Subjects (XENDOS) Study, Diabetes Care, 2004; 27; 155-161,

- ² DREAM (Diabetes REduction Assessment with ramipril and rosiglitazone Medication) Trial Investigators, Gerstein HC, Yusuf S, Bosch J, et al. Effect of rosiglitazone on the frequency of diabetes in patients with impaired glucose tolerance or impaired fasting glucose: a randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2006 Sep 23;368(9541):1096-105. Erratum in: Lancet 2006;18;368:1770.
- ³DREAM Trial Investigators; Bosch J, Yusuf S, Gerstein HC, et al.Effect of ramipril on the incidence of diabetes. N Engl J Med. 2006 Oct 12;355(15):1551-62. Epub 2006 Sep 15.
- ⁴ Chiasson JL, Josse RG, et al. Acarbose for prevention of type 2 diabetes mellifus: the STOP-NIDDM randomized trial. The Lancet. 2002; 359: 2072-2077. ⁵ Knowler WC, Barret-Connor E, et al. Reduction in the incidence of type 2 diabetes with lifestyle intervention or metformin. (DPP trial) N End J Med. 2002; 346: 393-403.

- ⁷ Dormandy JA, et al. Secondary prevention of macrovascular events in patients with type 2 diabetes in the PROactive Study. (PROspective pioglitAzone Clinical Trial in macroVascular Events): a RCT. Lancet. 2005; 366: 1279-1289.
- ⁸ Knowler WC, Hamman RF, Edelstein SL, et al. Prevention of type 2 diabetes with troglitazone in the diabetes prevention program. Diabetes. 2005; 54: 1150-1156.
- ⁹ Lindstrom J, Ilanne-Parikka P, et al. Sustained reduction in the incidence of type 2 diabetes by lifestyle intervention: follow-up of the Finnish Diabetes Prevention Study. The Lancet. 2006; 368:1673-1679. ¹⁰ Herman WH. Brandle M. Zhand P et al. Within-Trial Cost-Effectiveness of Lifestyle Intervention or Metformin for the Primary Prevention of Type 2 Diabetes Care. 2003; 26: 2518-2523.
- ¹¹ Gillies CL, et al. Pharmacological and lifestyle interventions to prevent or delay type 2 diabetes in people with impaired glucose tolerance: systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ. 2007 Feb 10;334(7588):299. Epub 2007 Jan 19.
- 12 UKPDS-34. Effect of intensive blood-glucose control with metformin on complications in overweight patients with type 2 diabetes. Lancet. 1998 Sep 12;352(9131):854-65. Erratum in: Lancet 1998 Nov 7;352(9139):1558.

¹³ McCall KL, et al. Effect of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors and angiotensin II type 1 receptor blockers on the rate of new-onset diabetes mellitus: a review and pooled analysis. Pharmacotherapy. 2006 Sep.26(9):1297-306.

¹⁴Andraws R, Brown DL. Effect of inhibition of the renin-angiotensin system on development of type 2 diabetes mellitus (meta-analysis of randomized trials). Am J Cardiol. 2007 Apr 1;99(7):1006-12. Epub 2007 Feb 16. ¹⁵ Elliott WJ, Meyer PM. Incident diabetes in clinical trials of antihypertensive drugs: a network meta-analysis. Lancet. 2007 Jan 20;369(9557):201-7. Erratum in: Lancet. 2007 May 5;369(9572):1518.

⁶ American Diabetes Association (ADA). Standards of medical care in diabetes. IV. Prevention/delay of type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Care 2007 Jan;30(Suppl 1):S7-8. http://care.diabetesjournals.org/cgi/content/full/30/suppl 1/S4#SEC14

Upcoming Trials in Diabetes/CV Risk Prevention:

• NAVIGATOR (Nateglinide and Valsartan in Impaired Glucose Tolerance Outcomes Research); • TRANSCEND (Telmisartan Randomized Assessment Study in aCE iNtolerant subjects with cardiovascular Disease): • ONTARGET (Ongoing Telmisartan Alone and in combination with Ramipril Global Endpoint Trial): • ACCORD: Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes (standard therapy vs. intensive therapy of type 2 diabetes).; **RAPSODI** (rimonabant in diabetes prevention) **RxFiles Diabetes Select Charts**

For FMF07 - Page 2

See updated HTN, Lipid & Diabetes Glucose Trials charts at: ftp://www.rxfiles.ca/rxfiles/uploads/documents/members/cht-HTN-trial-summary.pdf; http://www.rxfiles.ca/rxfiles/uploads/documents/members/CHT-lipid%20agents-major%20trials.pdf http://www.rxfiles.ca/rxfiles/uploads/documents/CHT-Diabetes-Landmark-Trials-Links.pdf

⁶ Tuomilehto J, Lindstrom J, Eriksson JG, et al. Prevention of Type 2 diabetes mellitus by changes in lifestyle among subjects with impaired glucose tolerance. (FDPS trial) N Eng J Med. 2001; 344: 1343-1350.

Other references:

Buchanan TA, et al. Preservation of pancreatic beta-cell function & prevention of type 2 diabetes by pharmacological treatment of insulin resistance in high-risk hispanic women. (TRIPOD) Diabetes. 2002Sep;51(9):2796-803. Li G, Zhang P, Wang J, et al. The long-term effect of lifestyle interventions to prevent diabetes in the China Da Qing Diabetes Prevention Study: a 20-year follow-up study. Lancet. 2008 May 24;371(9626):1783-9. Group-based lifestyle

interventions over 6 years can prevent or delay diabetes for up to 14 years after the active intervention. However, whether his locads to reduced CVD and CVD and the remains unclear.

Ramachandran A, Snehalatha C, Mary S, Mukesh B, Bhaskar AD, Vijay V; Indian Diabetes Prevention Programme (IDPP). The Indian Diabetes Prevention Programme shows that lifestyle modification and metformin 250mg bid prevent type 2 diabetes in Asian Indian subjects with impaired glucose tolerance (IDPP-1). Diabetologia. 2006 Feb;49(2):289-97. Epub 2006 Jan 4. n=531 over 2.5yrs

Salpeter SR, Buckley NS, Kahn JA, Salpeter EE. Meta-analysis: metformin treatment in persons at risk for diabetes mellitus. Am J Med. 2008 Feb;121(2):149-157.e2. Using metformin to treat patients at risk for diabetes decreases their likelihood of developing diabetes over a 3-year period. Longer studies are needed to determine whether the likelihood of diabetes is truly decreased or simply delayed. We have no research to tell us whether, in the long run, patients live longer or live better if they are treated at this stage of (pre)diabetes. (LOE = 1a)