THE ROLE OF
GLP-1 RECEPTOR
AGONISTS AND
GAMMALINOLENIC ACID
IN WEIGHT
MANAGEMENT



ELLEN STEHOUWER, D.O.

360 WEIGHT MANAGEMENT
PALI MOMI, O'AHU

# **OBJECTIVES:**

- 1. To recognize obesity as a chronic disease
- 2. Mechanisms of action of GLP-1/GIP receptor agonists
- 3. Safety and efficacy of GLP-1/GIP receptor agonists
- 4. Other promising indications for use of GLP-1/GIP receptor agonists
- 5. Role (?) of gamma-linolenic acid in weight management

## **DISCLOSURES:**

• Neither I, nor my spouse, have any financial relationships to disclose.



### OBESITY IS A CHRONIC DISEASE

"OBESITY IS DEFINED AS A CHRONIC,
PROGRESSIVE, RELAPSING, AND TREATABLE MULTIFACTORIAL, NEUROBEHAVIORAL DISEASE, WHEREIN
AN INCREASE IN BODY FAT PROMOTES ADIPOSE
TISSUE DYSFUNCTION AND ABNORMAL FAT MASS
PHYSICAL FORCES, RESULTING IN ADVERSE
METABOLIC, BIOMECHANICAL, AND PSYCHOSOCIAL
HEALTH CONSEQUENCES."

OBESITY MEDICINE ASSOCIATION (2023 OBESITY ALGORITHM)



# GLP-1 RECEPTOR AGONISTS:

MECHANISMS OF ACTION(1)



# MECHANISMS OF ACTION IN THE LIVER AND PANCREAS

### <u>Liver</u>

- Decreases glucose production
- Decreases liver fat content
- Decreases plasma liver enzyme level
- Decreases hepatic steatosis

### <u>Pancreas</u>

- Increases insulin synthesis and secretion
- Decreases blood glucose
- Increases Islet beta cell protection and proliferation



## MECHANISMS OF ACTION IN THE GI TRACK

- Slows gastric emptying
- Slows gastrointestinal peristalsis



# MECHANISMS OF ACTION IN THE BRAIN AND HEART

## **Brain**

- Increases signal level of satiety
- Increases synaptic transmission
- Increases nerve protection
- Decreases neuroinflammation
- Increases memory and motor function

### <u>Heart</u>

- Increases CV protection and antiinflammatory action
- Decreases endothelial dysfunction and myocardial ischemia injury
- Decreases blood lipid levels
- Increases atrial natriuretic peptide

# MECHANISMS OF ACTION OF GLUCOSE-DEPENDENT INSULINOTROPIC PEPTIDE (GIP)(2)

- Stimulation of satiety in the hypothalamus
- Produced in the small intestine, increasing general insulin sensitivity
- Improves glycemic control
- GIP does **not** appear to effect gastric emptying



# SAFETY OF GLP-1 RECEPTOR AGONISTS



# ABSOLUTE CONTRAINDICATIONS TO THE USE OF GLP-1 RECEPTOR AGONISTS

- Personal history of pancreatitis
- Personal/family history of medullary thyroid cancer (all thyroid cancers?)

The exposure to a GLP-1RA from 1 to 3 years was associated with a statistically significant increase in the risk of all thyroid carcinomas by 58% (hazard ratio or HR: 1.58; 95% interval confidence or 95% IC: 1.27–1.95), and medullary thyroid cancer by 78% (HR: 1.78; 95% IC: 1.04–3.05). (3)

• Personal/family history of multiple endocrine neoplasia (MEN)syndrome type 2



# POTENTIAL SIDE EFFECTS/ADVERSE REACTIONS

### Most common are GI symptoms

loss of appetite

nausea/vomiting

constipation/diarrhea

bloating

### Less common:

acute gallbladder disease

hypersensitivity reaction

hypoglycemia

diabetic retinopathy complications

acute kidney injury

gastroparesis

pancreatitis



# EFFICACY OF GLP-1 RECEPTOR AGONISTS AND GLP-1/GIP (4)



# PIONEER TRIALS

SEMAGLUTIDE DAILY ORAL FOR DIABETES



## PIONEER TRIALS

Pioneer 1: Semaglutide vs placebo in people with diabetes and A1c 7.0-9.5

<u>Pioneer 2</u>: People with diabetes and taking metformin. Semaglutide vs empagliflozin

By week 26 - those on semaglutide 14 mg

By week 52 – those on semaglutide 14

A1c reduction of 0.6-1.1

A1c reduction of 1.3 vs 0.9

Average weight loss 5 kg

Weight loss of 4.7 kg vs 3.8 kg



<u>Pioneer 3</u>: Persons with diabetes on metformin +/- sulfonylurea. Semaglutide 14 mg vs sitagliptin.

<u>Pioneer 4</u>: Persons with diabetes on metformin +/- SGLPT2 inhibitor. Semaglutide vs liraglutide.

A1c reduction of 0.3-0.5 with semaglutide Weight loss of 1.6-2.5 kg more with semaglutide

Alc reduction of 1.2 with semaglutide vs 1.1 with liraglutide

Weight loss of 1.6-2.5 kg more with semaglutide



<u>Pioneer 8</u> – Persons with diabetes on basal insulin +/- metformin. Semaglutide 3, 7 and 14 mg vs placebo

A1c reduction in semaglutide 0.6, 0.9, 1.3 respectively compared to 0.1 in placebo group Weight loss in semaglutide -1.4, -2.4, -3.7kg respectively and 0.4 kg in placebo group



# OASIS TRIAL: SEMAGLUTIDE DAILY ORAL 50 MG FOR WEIGHT LOSS

Persons with overweight or obesity with 1 or more comorbidity. Semaglutide vs placebo plus lifestyle intervention. At the end of 68 weeks:

Weight loss in those taking semaglutide 17.4% from start of study vs 1.8% in the placebo group

Participants achieving 5% or more total body weight loss in the semaglutide group was 89.2% vs 24.5% in the placebo group



# STEP TRIALS

SEMAGLUTIDE WEEKLY INJECTION FOR WEIGHT MANAGEMENT.



• Step 1: Persons without diabetes given semaglutide 2.4 mg vs placebo. Each group was also given lifestyle intervention.

Weight loss in those taking semaglutide was 14.9% vs 2.4% in placebo group.

In the semaglutide group 86.4% of participants lost 5% or more of their total starting body weight.

Step 2: Persons with diabetes and obesity or overweight.

Semaglutide 1 vs 2.4 mg vs placebo.

At 68 weeks, weight loss seen was 6.99% vs 9.64% vs 3.4% respectively.



Step 3: Persons with diabetes and O/W or obesity. Semaglutide 2.4 mg or placebo and intensive lifestyle intervention.

Weight loss in those taking semaglutide and adhering strictly to lifestyle intervention achieved 16% weight loss from starting weight vs 5.7% in placebo group.

Those achieving 5% or more in total body weight lost was 86% vs 47.6%

Step 4: Persons with O/W or obesity with related comorbidities but without diabetes. All participants received semaglutide 2.4 mg for 20 weeks. Then randomized into semaglutide 2.4 mg vs placebo for 28 weeks.

Those in placebo group regained 6.9% of the weight lost initially. Total body weight lost was 5% at study end.

Those in semaglutide group lost an additional 7.9% of total body weight, with 17.4% total lost at study end.

Step 5: Evaluated durability of weight loss over 2 years in persons with O/W or obesity without diabetes.

Participants lost weight until week 60 and maintained their weight loss until the end of the study at week 104.

There was a placebo-corrected weight loss of 12.6%.

Step 6: Participants were Asians with O/W or obesity with related comorbidities, including diabetes. Groups were divided into those taking semaglutide 2.4 vs 1.7 mg vs placebo.

Weight loss seen was 13.2% vs 9.6% vs 2.1% respectively.

A significant reduction in visceral fat was achieved in those taking semaglutide.

A reduction of 25% in A1c was noted in those taking semaglutide.

GRAND NANILOA HOTEL

### STEP TEENS

Included adolescents ages 12-17 with O/W or obesity and related comorbidities. This study looked at semaglutide 2.4 mg vs placebo.

Weight loss seen was 16.1% total body weight from start of study in the semaglutide group vs 0.6% in the placebo group.

Improved lipids, especially triglycerides was also noted.



# SURMOUNT TRIALS

TIRZEPATIDE, A GLP-1/GIP RECEPTOR AGONIST WEEKLY INJECTION FOR WEIGHT MANAGEMENT

Surmount 1: Participants with BMI of 27 or greater. Compared tirzepatide 5, 10, and 15 mg vs placebo.

Total body weight % lost at 72 weeks was

15%, 19.5%, 20.9 and 3.1% respectively

Percent of those who lost 5% or more of total body weight was 85%, 89%, 91% and 35% respectively

Surmount 2: Participants with BMI of 27 or greater and diabetes. Compared tirzepatide 10 and 15 mg vs placebo.

Total body weight % lost at 72 weeks was 12.8%, 14.7% and 3.2% respectively

Percent of those who lost 5% or greater of total body weight was 82.7%

Percent of those who lost 15% or more was 48%



# OTHER PROMISING OR KNOWN INDICATIONS FOR THE USE OF GLP-1 RECEPTOR AGONISTS

- Heart disease
- Hepatic steatosis
- Diabetic kidney disease (decreasing macroalbuminuria and slowing eGFR decline)
- Parkinson's disease





# GAMMA-LINOLENIC ACID

WHAT ROLE DOES IT PLAY IN WEIGHT MANAGEMENT?



- 1. In a meta-analysis of 18 studies in which conjugated linolenic acid was provided to humans in randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled trials and in which body composition was assessed, the use of CLA at 3.2 grams daily produced 0.09 kg/week (or 0.2 lbs) compared to placebo. This effect plateaued at 6 months and then began to decrease in effectiveness thereafter. (5)
- 2. In another study healthy participants with BMI > 28 were put on calorie restricted diets for 8 weeks. Those who lost >8% total body weight were randomized to a 1-year double blinded CLA (3.2 gm/day) vs placebo (olive oil), along with a modest hypocaloric diet. After 1 year, there was no significant difference in body weight or body fat regain between those taking CLA and those taking placebo. (6)
- 3. In one study done on rats, study results indicated a decrease in white adipose tissue and an upregulation of brown adipose. This has not been replicated in human studies. (7)



# POSSIBLE SIDE EFFECTS OF GAMMA-LINOLENIC ACID SUPPLEMENTATION

- Headache
- Abdominal pain
- Loose stool
- Worsening of lipid profile: decrease in HDL and increase in Lp(a)
- Elevation in CRP
- Elevation of liver enzymes



## IN CONCLUSION

### GLP-1 Receptor Agonists/GIP

- 1. There is strong evidence that the newest GLP-1 Receptor Agonists provide significant in the fight against obesity.
- 2. These medications are generally well tolerated but do come with potential health risks.
- 3. Although currently approved only for diabetes and weight management, there is evidence that these medications may be beneficial in multiple other disease states.

### Gamma-Linolenic Acid

- 1. There is very little evidence of a beneficial role in weight loss.
- 2. These supplements do have potential for worsening metabolic health.



### REFERENCES

- 1. Frontiers in Endocrinology, August 23, 2021. Volume 12-2021
- 2. Diabetes Symposium, June 27, 2021
- 3. Endocrine Connections, volume 12, 11/21/2023
- 4. Diabetes Medicine Matters.com
- 5. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, May 2007: 85(5), 1203-1211
- 6. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, March 2006: 86(3), 606-612
- 7. Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology. Part B, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, October 2000; 127(2), 213-222

