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ABSTRACT

High plasma glucose level, lipid profile disturbances and high plasma homocysteine (Hcy) are important risk factors for cardiovascular diseases in patients with type 2 diabetes. This study was conducted to evaluate and compare effects of glimepiride/metformin combination versus gliclazide/metformin combination on cardiovascular risk factors in type-2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) patients. One hundred and eighty T2DM patients were randomly allocated for treatment with placebo (control), metformin (500 mg twice daily), glimepiride (3mg once daily), gliclazide (80 mg once daily), metformin plus glimepiride or metformin plus gliclazide for 3 months. We evaluated plasma levels of glucose (PG), glycated hemoglobin (HbA1C), Hcy, vitamin B12, folic acid and lipid profile before treatment and 3 months post treatment. Compared to metformin treated patients, glimepiride plus metformin induced significant reductions in: fasting plasma glucose, postprandial PG, HbA1C % and plasma Hcy level. Conversely, plasma folic acid and vitamin B12 were significantly increased. The levels of total cholesterol and triglyceride were significantly decreased; low-density lipoprotein was markedly decreased, whereas high-density lipoprotein was significantly increased and hence risk ratio was significantly decreased. Similar results but with lower values were obtained using combination of metformin plus gliclazide on glycemic control only. Combination of glimepiride with metformin was superior to gliclazide plus metformin in alleviating the cardiovascular risk factors in type 2 diabetes mellitus patients.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) is a metabolic disorder characterized by partial or complete insulin deficiency and / or defects in insulin action (Alberti and Zimmet, 1998). Many reports have supported the use of antidiabetic combinations with complementary mechanisms of action e.g. Sulfonylurea/ metformin, to effectively control glycemia in T2DM (DeFronzo, 1999; Erle et al., 1999; Dailey, 2003; Rendell, 2004). Metformin decreases blood glucose levels by hampering liver glucose production and by sensitizing peripheral tissue to insulin. In contrast, sulfonylureas such as gliclazide and glimepiride lower hyperglycemia via increasing insulin secretion (Hermann et al., 1994).
Although guidelines encourage the use of metformin in combination with life style modification as the first choice for T2DM (DeFronzo, 1999; Rendell, 2004; Nathan et al., 2009; Raz, 2013), unfortunately, metformin use in patients with type 2 diabetes is associated with decreased vitamin B12 and folate levels and increased level of homocysteine (Hcy) (Tomkin et al., 1971; Fonseca et al., 1999; Wulffelé et al., 2003; Sahin et al., 2007 Aghamohammadi et al., 2011). Hyperhomocysteinemia (HHcy), an elevated plasma level of homocysteine (Hcy), induces oxidative stress in type 2 diabetes (Eikelboom et al., 1999; Aghamohammadi et al., 2011). Moreover, many studies have demonstrated that increased plasma Hcy level is an important risk factor for cardiovascular diseases in patients with T2DM. (Munshi et al., 1996; Eikelboom et al., 1999; Stehouwer et al., 1999; Hoogeveen et al., 2000; Aghamohammadi et al., 2011). Many factors play a pivotal role in determining plasma Hcy concentrations. Some of these important factors include many drugs, certain hormones and of particular interest plasma levels and intake of vitamin B12 and folic acid (Naurath et al., 1995; Jacobsen, 1996; Fonseca et al., 1999; Aghamohammadi et al., 2011). Obviously, uncontrolled type 2 diabetic patients are at an increased risk of coronary heart diseases (Haffner et al., 1998). Moreover, It is still the most leading cause of cardiovascular disease (Holman et al., 2008; Raz, 2013). Although controlling hyperglycemia reduces cardiovascular risk (Cefalu, 2005; Waugh et al., 2006), there have been a great attention about utilizing sulphonylureas and metformin due to potential side effects on the heart which might induced via non specific binding of sulphonylureas to ATP sensitive potassium channel (Bell, 2006), and possible increased Hcy plasma level by metformin (Fonseca et al., 1999; Sahin et al., 2007; Aghamohammadi et al., 2011).

The aim of this study was to compare the therapeutic effect of metformin and gliclazide versus glimepiride and metformin on glycemic control and serum levels of; HbA1C, Hcy, folate, vitamin B12, lipid profile as leading risk factor contributing for cardiovascular disorders in patients with newly diagnosed uncontrolled type 2 diabetes mellitus

2. METHODS

2.1. Subjects

All patients were recruited and diagnosed by Al-Zahra hospital staff through output patient clinic for diabetes and other clinical findings from years 2011 to 2012. The WHO/IDF consultation report of diabetes diagnostic criteria of 2006 were used for diagnoses of patients with T2DM. All selected patients had neither been diagnosed as diabetic nor treated before. The study protocol was reviewed, approved and all patients read and accept the study protocol.

The inclusion criteria were: Male, age 30–75 years, body mass index (BMI) 18.5–30 kg/m², T2DM, , FPG 150–250 mg/dl and HbA1c 7–12% at the first visit and FPG ≥ 140 mg/dl at the second visit, followed stable sulfonylurea, metformin or both therapy.

Exclusion criteria included: hepatic disease, kidney disorders, cardiac diseases, current sever gastrointestinal diseases which may affect the absorption of the study drugs, history of substance abuse, history of diabetes, known allergy to gliclazide, glimepiride or metformin, history of stroke, arrhythmia that required medical treatment within the past 6 months, proliferative retinopathy, concomitant infection, seriously dehydrated, or history of other investigation drug intake, operation within 4 weeks before the study or diagnosed with cancer within 5 years, received concurrent drugs that modulate glucose level or tolerance or affect the clearance of the study drugs.
2.2. Treatment protocol

Study populations were divided randomly into 6 groups (30 persons/group) for treatment with control (under moderately calorie-restricted diet and an active lifestyle), gliclazide 80 mg/daily, metformin 500 mg twice daily, glimepiride 3 mg daily, combination of gliclazide and metformin or combination of glimepiride and metformin. All the medicines were taken daily for 3 months. All patients were followed to evaluate treatment.

2.3. Efficacy evaluations

The primary efficacy parameters were the changes in: fasting plasma glucose (FPG); postprandial plasma glucose (PPG); and changes in levels of Hcy and HbA1c from initial to 3 months. The secondary endpoints were the changes in the following clinical measurements: folate level; vitamin B12 level; triglycerides; high density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL); low density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL); cholesterol and risk ratio.

Plasma were obtained after centrifugation for estimation of glucose (Zhou et al., 1973), cholesterol (Richmond, 1973), triacylglycerol (Buccolo and David, 1973), HDL-cholesterol (Assmann et al., 1983), LDL-cholesterol (Friedewald et al., 1972). HbA1c level were measured by fluorescent polarization enzymatic technique (Abbott Laboratories). Plasma level of Hyc was estimated using HPLC (Zhloba et al., 2004). Plasma levels of folic acid and vitamin B12 were measured using HPLC (Pavlos et al., 2004).

2.4. Evaluation of safety

All patients were monitored for any adverse events which were classified as drug-related or not related to the drug under study. Adverse drug events imply any sickness, sign, symptom, or any marked laboratory test abnormality that happened or aggravated during the study period. The occurrence of hypoglycemia was proposed when the patient exhibits at least one specific symptom of hypoglycemia and the confirmed by laboratory measurement of plasma glucose concentration < 60 mg/dl. Gastrointestinal side effects were settled as abdominal pain, diarrhea, and nausea or vomiting. Sever adverse reactions were defined as any adverse events happening at any dose level that leaded to death, a life threatening problem, inpatient hospitalization, or other important medical case that required obligatory medical or surgical management to prevent mortality or permanent morbidity.

2.5. Statistical analysis

Only patients who completed the whole study period were compiled in the final statistical calculation. Parametric data were presented as mean and standard error of the mean, and nominal data were reported as percentage. All statistical analyses were 2-sided and the probability of 0.05 was taken as level of significance. Student's t test was used to compare intragroup differences before and after treatment, however ANOVA test was used to analyze changes along the whole study followed by Tukey’s post hoc test for multiple comparisons. GraphPad InStat 3 (GraphPad Software, Inc. La Jolla, CA, USA) was used to perform all statistical analysis.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Characteristics of study population

There were no significant differences in any demographic or clinical and laboratory characteristics between groups at baseline (Table 1).

3.2. Effect of treatment on blood glucose level

In contrast to baseline data, there are significant differences among treatment groups 3 months post treatment. The combination of gliclazide or glimepiride with metformin
significantly decreased FPG, PPG levels and HbA1C compared to control-diabetic group and metformin monotherapy group (table 2). The greatest decreases were achieved with glimepiride plus metformin group.

There are no significant differences between gliclazide/ metformin and glimepiride/metformin groups concerning changes from initial baseline to the end of the treatment in fasting (-26.1 %± 3.7 vs. -28.9 ± 3.1) and postprandial glucose (-42.4% ± 3.3 vs. -46 ± 2.6) and HbA1C concentration (-21.1±1.5 vs. -21.3±1.6%), table 3.

3.3. Effects of different treatments on homocysteine, vitamin B12 and folic acid levels

Interestingly, there are significant differences among treatment groups in the levels of Hcy, vitamin B12 and folate, 3 months post treatment (table 4). Metformin induced significant elevation in plasma Hcy level (12.3 ± 0.3), with concurrent decrease in levels of Vit B12 (326 ± 8) and folate (11.4 ± 0.3) compared to control diabetic group. Similar results with little degree were obtained up on treatment with gliclazide alone. However glimipride alone did not exhibit any significant change compared to diabetic control group in these parameters. Most important, addition of either gliclazide or glimepiride to metformin ameliorated metformin induced disturbance in levels of Hcy, Vitamin B12 and folate (Table 4). The values exhibited by combination of glimepiride with metformin were 10.3 ± 0.3; 378 ± 12; 15 ± 0.9 which were superior to the results of combination of gliclazide and metformin 11 ± 0.3; 366 ±10; 13.9 ± 0.5 for Hcy level, vitamin B12 level and serum folate level respectively (table 4).

Comparing changes to corresponding baseline values, metformin induced a 29.5% increase in Hcy level (P< 0.01). 20% and 35% decrease in vitamin B12 and folate levels respectively (P< 0.01). Combination of metformin with gliclazide ameliorated these effects (10 % increase in Hcy; 9% decrease in vitamin B12 and 17.8% decrease in folate level). However addition of glimepiride to metformin bought these parameters close to the base line values (5.6% increase in Hcy; 6.9% decrease in Vitamin B12 and 11.8% decrease in folate level) table 5.

3.4. Lipid profile results

Metformin induced non significant disturbance in lipid profile while gliclazide alone and glimepiride alone led to improvement of the lipid profile during the treatment period (3 months) compared to diabetic control. A combination of glimepiride or gliclazide with metformin improved lipid levels. With particular interest, combination of glimepiride with metformin significantly decreased total cholesterol and significantly increased high density lipoprotein (HDL) level and hence significantly decreased the risk ratio compared to both control diabetic group and metformin treated group (table 6).

3.5. Safety study

Metformin, gliclazide and glimepiride were tolerated by all patients. Only two patients (6.6%), from each group treatment with either gliclazide or glimepiride monotherapy developed symptomatic hypoglycemia. In contrast, none of patients that used metformin developed any symptoms of hypoglycemia. During combination therapy, symptomatic hypoglycemia occurred in 3 of 30 (10%) patients treated with metformin and gliclazide, in 5 of 30 (16.6%) patients who were treated with metformin plus glimepiride. The reported hypoglycemic attacks were mild and did not happen after improvement of dietary intake. GI side-effects occurred more frequently in metformin- treated patients than both sulfonylurea drug sole therapy (10% metformin group versus 6% in gliclazide group and 0% in glimepride group) and combination therapy (10% with metformin and gliclazide, 6% with metformin plus glimepiride). No patients discontinued the therapy due to side-effects.
Table 1: Clinical and laboratory variables for patients before treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Metformin</th>
<th>Gliclazide</th>
<th>Gliclazide + Metformin</th>
<th>Glimepiride</th>
<th>Glimepiride + Metformin</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FPG (mg/dl)</td>
<td>203 ± 7</td>
<td>204 ± 7.5</td>
<td>199 ± 9</td>
<td>203 ± 8</td>
<td>194 ±8.5</td>
<td>197 ± 8</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG (mg/dl)</td>
<td>270 ± 10</td>
<td>272 ± 9</td>
<td>267 ± 9.5</td>
<td>269 ±11</td>
<td>271 ±8</td>
<td>269.5 ± 7</td>
<td>0.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HbA1C (%)</td>
<td>9 ± 0.5</td>
<td>8.9 ± 0.4</td>
<td>8.9 ± 0.5</td>
<td>9 ± 0.4</td>
<td>8.8 ± 0.4</td>
<td>8.9 ± 0.5</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum Hcy (pmol/L)</td>
<td>10 ± 0.2</td>
<td>9.5 ± 0.3</td>
<td>9.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>10 ± 0.2</td>
<td>10 ± 0.3</td>
<td>9.75 ± 0.4</td>
<td>0.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vit B12 (pmol/L)</td>
<td>405 ± 10</td>
<td>407 ± 12</td>
<td>403 ± 8</td>
<td>402 ±12</td>
<td>403 ±15</td>
<td>406 ± 14</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum Folate (nmol/L)</td>
<td>17 ± 1.2</td>
<td>17.5 ± 1.5</td>
<td>17.2 ± 0.9</td>
<td>16.9 ± 0.7</td>
<td>16.5 ± 1</td>
<td>17 ± 1.3</td>
<td>0.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cholesterol (mg/dl)</td>
<td>235 ± 15</td>
<td>237 ± 12</td>
<td>234 ±17</td>
<td>237 ±12</td>
<td>235.5 ±13</td>
<td>233 ± 15</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL (mg/dl)</td>
<td>40 ± 2</td>
<td>41 ± 1.5</td>
<td>41.5 ± 1.3</td>
<td>38 ± 1.7</td>
<td>39 ± 2.5</td>
<td>39.5 ± 1.4</td>
<td>0.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDL (mg/dl)</td>
<td>143 ±5</td>
<td>144 ± 7</td>
<td>141 ± 7</td>
<td>148 ± 8</td>
<td>147 ± 5</td>
<td>142 ± 6</td>
<td>0.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triglycerides (mg/dl)</td>
<td>257 ± 10</td>
<td>257 ± 13</td>
<td>256 ± 15</td>
<td>258 ±17</td>
<td>249 ±11</td>
<td>258 ± 15</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk ratio (TC/HDL)</td>
<td>5.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td>5.8 ± 0.3</td>
<td>5.6 ± 0.3</td>
<td>6.2 ± 0.2</td>
<td>6 ± 0.1</td>
<td>5.9 ± 0.4</td>
<td>0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg/m²)</td>
<td>27 ± 2.5</td>
<td>27.6 ± 2.4</td>
<td>28.1 ± 1.8</td>
<td>27.3 ± 2.3</td>
<td>27.5 ±1.9</td>
<td>28 ± 2.7</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Data are presented as mean ± standard error of 30 patients per group
- FPG: fasting plasma glucose; PPG: postprandial plasma glucose; HbA1C: glycosylated hemoglobin; Hcy: homocysteine; BMI: body mass index; LDL: low-density lipoprotein; HDL: high-density lipoprotein
Table 2: Effects of different treatment protocols on plasma glucose and glycosylated hemoglobin levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Metformin</th>
<th>Gliclazide</th>
<th>Gliclazide + Metformin</th>
<th>Glimepride</th>
<th>Glimepride + Metformin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FPG (mg/dl)</td>
<td>210 ± 6</td>
<td>180 ± 4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>166 ± 7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>150 ± 5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>165 ± 7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>140 ± 5&lt;sup&gt;b,c,e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG (mg/dl)</td>
<td>280 ± 10</td>
<td>186 ± 7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>166 ± 5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>155 ± 5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>160 ± 6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>145 ± 7&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HbA1C (%)</td>
<td>9.2 ± 0.3</td>
<td>8.2 ± 0.2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.7 ± 0.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.1 ± 0.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.8 ± 0.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7 ± 0.1&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>,<sup>b</sup>,<sup>c</sup>,<sup>e</sup> are significant change from control, metformin, gliclazide and glimepiride respectively at p< 0.05 using Tukey’s test as post ANOVA test.

Type 2 diabetic patients were treated with placebo(control), metformin 500 mg twice daily, gliclazide 80 mg/daily, Glimepiride 3 mg/daily, combination of gliclazide and metformin or combination of glimepiride and metformin for 3 months.

Data are presented as mean ± standard error of 30 patients per group.

FPG: fasting plasma glucose; PPG: postprandial plasma glucose; HbA1C: glycosylated hemoglobin.

Table 3: Comparing plasma levels of glucose and glycosylated hemoglobin post treatment to their corresponding base line values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Metformin</th>
<th>Gliclazide</th>
<th>Gliclazide + Metformin</th>
<th>Glimepride</th>
<th>Glimepride + Metformin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FPG (% of initial)</td>
<td>103.4 ±2</td>
<td>88.2 ±3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>83.6 ±4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>73.9 ±3.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>85.1 ±3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>71.1 ±3.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG (% of initial)</td>
<td>103.7 ±3.5</td>
<td>68.4 ±2.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>62.2 ±3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>57.6 ±3.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>59 ±2.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>54 ±2.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HbA1C (% of initial)</td>
<td>102.2 ±2</td>
<td>82.1 ±2</td>
<td>-86.5 ±4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>78.9 ±1.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>88.6 ±2&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>78.7 ±1.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> indicates significant difference from corresponding base line value, at p<0.5 using two tailed student t test.

Type 2 diabetic patients were treated with placebo(control), metformin 500 mg twice daily, gliclazide 80 mg/daily, Glimepiride 3 mg/daily, combination of gliclazide and metformin or combination of glimepiride and metformin for 3 months.

Data are calculated as percentage of corresponding initial values (before treatment).

Data are presented as mean ± standard error of 30 patients per group.

FPG: fasting plasma glucose; PPG: postprandial plasma glucose; HbA1C: glycosylated hemoglobin.
Table 4: Effects of different treatments on plasma levels of homocysteine, vitamin B12 and folate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Metformin</th>
<th>Gliclazide</th>
<th>Gliclazide + Metformin</th>
<th>Glimepiride</th>
<th>Glimepiride + Metformin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hcy (pmol/L)</strong></td>
<td>9.6± 0.2</td>
<td>12.3± 0.3 a</td>
<td>11.4 ± 0.4 a</td>
<td>11± 0.3 a</td>
<td>9± 0.4 b,c,d</td>
<td>10.3± 0.3 b,c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vit B12 (pmol/L)</strong></td>
<td>393± 15</td>
<td>326± 8 a</td>
<td>388± 9 b</td>
<td>366± 10</td>
<td>389± 14 b</td>
<td>378± 12 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folate (nmol/L)</strong></td>
<td>17.8± 0.6</td>
<td>11.4± 0.3 a</td>
<td>14.3± 0.6 b</td>
<td>13.9± 0.5 a</td>
<td>15.5± 0.7 b</td>
<td>15± 0.9 a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a, b, c, d indicate significant change from control, metformin, gliclazide and metformin + gliclazide respectively, at p<0.5, using Tukey’s test as post ANOVA test.
- Type 2 diabetic patients were treated with placebo (control), metformin 500 mg twice daily, gliclazide 80 mg/daily, Glimepiride 3 mg/ daily, combination of gliclazide and metformin or combination of glimepiride and metformin for 3 months.
- Data are presented as mean ± standard error of 30 patients per group.
- Hcy: homocysteine

Table 5: Plasma levels of homocysteine, vitamin B12 and folate as percentage of corresponding base line values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Metformin</th>
<th>Gliclazide</th>
<th>Gliclazide + Metformin</th>
<th>Glimepiride</th>
<th>Glimepiride + Metformin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hcy (% of initial)</strong></td>
<td>96.0± 2</td>
<td>129.5± 3 a</td>
<td>120.0± 2 a</td>
<td>110.0± 2.5 a</td>
<td>90.0± 4 a</td>
<td>105.6± 4 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vit B12 (% of initial)</strong></td>
<td>97.0± 2.5</td>
<td>80.1± 3 a</td>
<td>96.3± 3</td>
<td>91.0± 5 a</td>
<td>96.5± 5</td>
<td>93.1± 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folate (% of initial)</strong></td>
<td>104.7± 3</td>
<td>65.1± 4 a</td>
<td>83.1± 3 a</td>
<td>82.2± 6 a</td>
<td>93.9± 5</td>
<td>88.2± 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a indicates significant difference from base line data using two tailed Student T test at p<0.05.
- Type 2 diabetic patients were treated with placebo (control), metformin 500 mg twice daily, gliclazide 80 mg/daily, Glimepiride 3 mg/ daily, combination of gliclazide and metformin or combination of glimepiride and metformin for 3 months.
- Data are presented as mean ± standard error of 30 patients per group.
- Data are calculated as percentage of corresponding initial values (before treatment).
- Hcy: homocysteine
Table 6: Effects of different treatment protocols on plasma lipid profile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Metformin</th>
<th>Gliclazide</th>
<th>Gliclazide + Metformin</th>
<th>Glimepiride</th>
<th>Glimepiride + Metformin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cholesterol</strong> (mg/dl)</td>
<td>255± 9</td>
<td>260± 13</td>
<td>225± 11 a,b</td>
<td>235± 8</td>
<td>217± 10 a,b</td>
<td>212± 12 a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL (mg/dl)</td>
<td>39± 1.2</td>
<td>36± 1.9</td>
<td>43± 2.5</td>
<td>39± 1.3</td>
<td>45± 1.5 a,b</td>
<td>44± 1.6 a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDL (mg/dl)</td>
<td>164± 5</td>
<td>168± 10</td>
<td>133± 9 a,b</td>
<td>146± 7</td>
<td>126± 10 a,b</td>
<td>142± 7 a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triglycerides (mg/dl)</td>
<td>261± 12</td>
<td>279± 17</td>
<td>244± 13 a,b</td>
<td>250± 15</td>
<td>235± 12 a,b</td>
<td>247± 17 a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk ratio (TC/HDL)</td>
<td>6.5± 0.5</td>
<td>7.2± 0.3</td>
<td>5.2± 0.2 a,b</td>
<td>6±0.1</td>
<td>4.8± 0.3 a,b</td>
<td>4.8± 0.2 a,b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a, b indicate significant change from control, metformin using Tukey’s test as post ANOVA test at p<0.05
- Type 2 diabetic patients were treated with placebo (control), metformin 500 mg twice daily, gliclazide 80 mg/daily, Glimepiride 3 mg/ daily, combination of gliclazide and metformin or combination of glimepiride and metformin for 3 months
- Data are presented as mean ± standard error of 30 patients per group
- LDL: low-density lipoprotein; HDL: high-density lipoprotein
4. DISCUSSION:

It has been established that combination therapy for diabetes is superior in hyperglycemic control in comparison to single agent therapy (U.K. Prospective Diabetes Study Group, 1998; Raz, 2013). In this study, we chose two common combinations; metformin plus gliclazide, and metformin plus glimepiride. These two metformin combinations utilize a second generation sulfonylurea and a third-generation sulfonylurea drugs, respectively (Müller et al., 1995). According to our knowledge, there is no currently available clinical information about the comparison of the effects mediated by the selected sulfonylureas drugs, at specific doses, and in combination with metformin on the cardiovascular risk factors.

It is important to address both limitations and merits of our study; one of the important limitations is non-equivalence of the selected combinations. On the other hand, this investigation utilized strict selection criteria, controlled and randomized design which solidify and trust its results. Note worthy this methodological strength has led to non significant difference among regarding clinical and laboratory basal characteristics (table 1).

In this study, both combination therapy groups exhibited significant decreases in all primary efficacy parameters; HbA1c, PPG, FPG and Hcy levels at the end of treatment compared to their corresponding baseline values. Serum folic acid and serum vitamin B12 were significantly increased at the end of therapy as compared with baseline values. Moreover, the lipid profile was also improved during the treatment period (tables 2-6). All patients tolerated the combination therapy without any reported major adverse effect.

It is an established knowledge that hyperglycemia augments the production of reactive oxygen species (ROS) by mitochondria, which plays a pivotal event in the development and progression of diabetes morbidity and even more induces; programmed cell death, glycation of several important proteins, in addition to glucose autoxidation (Wolff et al., 1991; Nishikawa et al. 2000; Park et al., 2001; Kiritoshi et al., 2003; Hamadi et al., 2012). Furthermore, ROS production could be a result of increased mitochondrial uncoupling and β-oxidation due disturbed high lipid profile (Wojtczak and Schonfeld, 1993; King and Locken, 2004).

Our results showed significant lowering in FPG and PPG levels for both selected combinations used in our study, compared to both control and metformin groups. These results are in line with previous reports (Krentz and Bailey, 2005; American Diabetes Association, 2008). Interestingly, at the end of the study, combination treated groups showed significantly lower HbA1C levels than metformin sole therapy group. These results could be attributed to the higher decreases in FPG, PPG. Interestingly, glimepiride plus metformin showed better HbA1C than gliclazide plus metformin which might be due to better glycemic control. It is worth mentioning that HbA1C is valuable indicator of good metabolic control, because it evaluates the contributions of both FPF and PPG concentrations and their versatility (Monnier et al., 2007).

Hyperhomocysteinemia is well known risky metabolic parameter for cardiovascular disorders (Munshi et al., 1996; Eikelboom et al., 1999; Stehouwer et al., 1999; Hoogeveen et al., 2000; Aghamohammadi et al., 2011). Metabolic disorders such as diabetes interact with Hyc metabolism and may thus contribute in the development of atherosclerosis seen in T2DM patients (Fonseca et al., 1999; Fonseca et al., 2003; Emoto et al., 2001). Of particular importance Hcy levels for both FPF and PPG concentrations and their versatility (Monnier et al., 2007). Thus diabetes control using drugs that could normalize metabolic
parameters such as vitamin B12, folate level and Hyc level may prevent cardiovascular risk in diabetic patients.

The implication of higher Hcy level on cardiac toxicity possibly explained by induction of endothelial cell injury or dysfunction, increased growth of vascular smooth muscle cells, elevated platelet aggregation, augmented thromboxane biosynthesis, enhanced LDL oxidation, enhanced macrophage-derived tissue factor activity, deposition in the arterial wall, and direct activation of the coagulation cascade leading to enhanced risk of thrombosis (Palareti et al., 1986; Rodgers and Kane, 1986; Fryer et al., 1993; Nishinaga et al., 1993; Majors et al., 1997; Thambyrajah and Townend, 2000).

Hcy level was decreased in combination groups possibly due to elevation of serum folate level and Vit B12 level (Naurath et al., 1995; Jacobsen, 1996; Aghamohammadi et al., 2011).

It is well documented that hyperglycemia is accompanied with lipid profile disturbance manifested as increased total cholesterol (TC), triglyceride (TG), LDL levels and decreased HDL level (Taskinen, 2002; Zhou et al., 2008; Hamadi et al., 2012), which is considered as high risk factor for several complications, specially for diabetic patient, such as atherosclerosis and myocardial infarction (Arvind et al., 2002; Taskinen, 2002). Lipid peroxidation generates endogenous toxicants resulted in excessive tissue damage and functional abnormalities via interaction of DNA and important proteins (Arvind et al., 2002; Taskinen, 2002; Sahreen et al., 2011). Metformin induced non significant disturbance in the lipid profile in diabetic patient and increase in the risk ratio which might lead to serious effects on the heart (Hoogeveen et al., 2000; Arvind et al., 2002; Taskinen, 2002). A combination of glimepiride or gliclazide with metformin improved lipid levels. Note northerly, combination of glimepiride with metformin was better in achieving better lipid profile compared even to control diabetic group. This effect might be ascribed to better glycemic control, decreased % HbA1C and decreased Hcy level achieved by combination of glimepiride with metformin.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Metformin induced significant elevation in homocysteine level and decrease in folic acid and vitamin B12 level with concomitant non significant disturbance in the lipid profile.

The addition of gliclazide or glimepiride to metformin is an effective modality to reach better glycemic control via improving FPG, PPG and HbA1C levels. Glimepiride plus metformin showed better glycemic control than gliclazide metformin combination. In addition, combination of glimepiride with metformin alleviated the cardiovascular risk factors via improving lipid levels, Hcy level, and vitamin B12 and folic acid levels with safe tolerability profile while combination of gliclazide plus metformin fail to exhibit significant changes on these parameters compared to metformin alone.

Glimepiride plus metformin was superior to gliclazide plus metformin combination and metformin alone in decreasing cardiovascular risk factors in uncontrolled T2DM patients.
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آثار مُتفرِّغة جلَكلازٌذ مقابل ميتُفزورمُين و جلِمِرِئاد على عوامل الخطر القلبية الوعائية في المرضى الذين يعانون من داء السكري من النوع 2.

جمال عبد الله ميمي حجازي حسن

قسم الكيمياء الحيوية – كلية الصيدلة – جامعة الآهر – بيروت بالقاهرة

قسم علم الآداب والعلوم – كلية الصيدلة – جامعة الآهر – بيروت بالقاهرة

تشمل (HCY) homocysteine عوامل مخاطر مهمة للأمراض القلبية والأوعية الدموية في المرضى الذين يعانون من داء السكري من النوع 2. وقد أجريت هذه الدراسة لتقريب ومقارنة آثار الجمجم بين جلِمِرِئاد / ميتُفزورمُين مقابل الجمجم بين جلِكلازٌذ / ميتُفزورمُين على عوامل الخطر القلبية الوعائية في مرضى السكري من النوع 2. تم إجراء الدراسة على 180 مريضا تم تقسيمهم إلى ست مجموعات كل مجموعة 30 مريض بشكل عشوائي. مجموعة البداية مع الدواء الوريدي كمجموعة ضئيلة (500 ملليرام مرتين يومياً) ، جلِمِرِئاد (3 ملليرام مرة واحدة يومياً) ، جلِكلازٌذ (80 ملليرام مرة واحدة يومياً) ، بالإضافة إلى ميتُفزورمُين + جلِمِرِئاد و الميتُفزورمُين + جلِكلازٌذ لمدة 3 أشهر. فما يتبقي من متابعة PG وrate HbA1c ( % HbA1c ) ، مستويين B12 وحمض الفوليك وصورة الدهن قبل العلاج وبعد العلاج لمدة 3 أشهر. مقارنة مع المرضى الذين عولجا بالميتُفزورمُين ، جلِمِرِئاد / الميتُفزورمُين أظهرت النتائج انخفاضا ذو دلالة إحصائية في مستوي PG بعد الأكلا، مستوي B12 ومستوى % HbA1c على العكس، كان هناك زيادة ذات دلالة إحصائية في حمض الفوليك وبيتامين B12. كذلك ظهر انخفاض ذو دلالة إحصائية في مستوي الكولسترول الكلي ودهون الثلاثية، وقد انخفض الكولسترول المنخفض الكثافة ذو دلالة إحصائية في حين أن الكولسترول عالي الكثافة زاد زيادة ذات دلالة إحصائية و بالتالي انخفضت نسبة المخاطر بشكل كبير. تم الحصول على نتائج مماثلة باستخدام ميتُفزورمُين / جلِكلازٌذ في السبورة على السكر ولكن كان التأثير أقل. أظهرت الدراسة أن جلِمِرِئاد / الميتُفزورمُين يساعد على تخفيف عوامل الخطر للأمراض القلبية والأوعية الدموية في المرضى الذين يعانون من داء السكري من النوع 2 من جلِكلازٌذ / الميتُفزورمُين. ولذا، توصى الدراسة بالتوسع في استخدام جلِمِرِئاد / الميتُفزورمُين في السبورة على مرضى السكر من النوع 2.