Journal of Diabetes and Endocrinology

Volume 4 Number 3 August 2013

ISSN 2141-2685



Academic Journals

ABOUT JDE

The **Journal of Diabetes and Endocrinology (JDE)** is published monthly (one volume per year) by Academic Journals.

Journal of Diabetes and Endocrinology (JDE) is an open access journal that provides rapid publication (monthly) of articles in all areas of the subject such as steroid hormones, clinical chemistry and biochemistry, neuroendocrinology, hypoglycemia in diabetes etc.
The Journal welcomes the submission of manuscripts that meet the general criteria of significance and scientific excellence. Papers will be published shortly after acceptance. All articles published in JDE are peer-reviewed.

Submission of Manuscript

Submit manuscripts as e-mail attachment to the Editorial Office at: jde@academicjournals.org. A manuscript number will be mailed to the corresponding author shortly after submission.

The Journal of Diabetes and Endocrinology will only accept manuscripts submitted as e-mail attachments.

Please read the **Instructions for Authors** before submitting your manuscript. The manuscript files should be given the last name of the first author.

Editorial Board

Instructions for Author

Electronic submission of manuscripts is strongly encouraged, provided that the text, tables, and figures are included in a single Microsoft Word file (preferably in Arial font).

The **cover letter** should include the corresponding author's full address and telephone/fax numbers and should be in an e-mail message sent to the Editor, with the file, whose name should begin with the first author's surname, as an attachment.

Article Types
Three types of manuscripts may be submitted:

Regular articles: These should describe new and carefully confirmed findings, and experimental procedures should be given in sufficient detail for others to verify the work. The length of a full paper should be the minimum required to describe and interpret the work clearly.
Short Communications: A Short Communication is suitable for recording the results of complete small investigations or giving details of new models or hypotheses, innovative methods, techniques or apparatus. The style of main sections need not conform to that of full-length papers. Short communications are 2 to 4 printed pages (about 6 to 12 manuscript pages) in length.

Reviews: Submissions of reviews and perspectives covering topics of current interest are welcome and encouraged. Reviews should be concise and no longer than 4-6 printed pages (about 12 to 18 manuscript pages). Reviews are also peer-reviewed.

Review Process

All manuscripts are reviewed by an editor and members of the Editorial Board or qualified outside reviewers. Authors cannot nominate reviewers. Only reviewers randomly selected from our database with specialization in the subject area will be contacted to evaluate the manuscripts. The process will be blind review.
Decisions will be made as rapidly as possible, and the journal strives to return reviewers' comments to authors as fast as possible. The editorial board will re-review manuscripts that are accepted pending revision. It is the goal of the JDE to publish manuscripts within weeks after submission.

Regular articles

All portions of the manuscript must be typed double-spaced and all pages numbered starting from the title page.

The Title should be a brief phrase describing the contents of the paper. The Title Page should include the authors' full names and affiliations, the name of the corresponding author along with phone, fax and E-mail information. Present addresses of authors should appear as a footnote.

The Abstract should be informative and completely self-explanatory, briefly present the topic, state the scope of the experiments, indicate significant data, and point out major findings and conclusions. The Abstract should be 100 to 200 words in length.. Complete sentences, active verbs, and the third person should be used, and the abstract should be written in the past tense. Standard nomenclature should be used and abbreviations should be avoided. No literature should be cited.
Following the abstract, about 3 to 10 key words that will provide indexing references should be listed.

A list of non-standard **Abbreviations** should be added. In general, non-standard abbreviations should be used only when the full term is very long and used often. Each abbreviation should be spelled out and introduced in parentheses the first time it is used in the text. Only recommended SI units should be used. Authors should use the solidus presentation (mg/ml). Standard abbreviations (such as ATP and DNA) need not be defined.

The Introduction should provide a clear statement of the problem, the relevant literature on the subject, and the proposed approach or solution. It should be understandable to colleagues from a broad range of scientific disciplines.

Materials and methods should be complete enough to allow experiments to be reproduced. However, only truly new procedures should be described in detail; previously published procedures should be cited, and important modifications of published procedures should be mentioned briefly. Capitalize trade names and include the manufacturer's name and address. Subheadings should be used. Methods in general use need not be described in detail.

Results should be presented with clarity and precision. The results should be written in the past tense when describing findings in the authors' experiments. Previously published findings should be written in the present tense. Results should be explained, but largely without referring to the literature. Discussion, speculation and detailed interpretation of data should not be included in the Results but should be put into the Discussion section.

The Discussion should interpret the findings in view of the results obtained in this and in past studies on this topic. State the conclusions in a few sentences at the end of the paper. The Results and Discussion sections can include subheadings, and when appropriate, both sections can be combined.

The Acknowledgments of people, grants, funds, etc should be brief.

Tables should be kept to a minimum and be designed to be as simple as possible. Tables are to be typed double-spaced throughout, including headings and footnotes. Each table should be on a separate page, numbered consecutively in Arabic numerals and supplied with a heading and a legend. Tables should be self-explanatory without reference to the text. The details of the methods used in the experiments should preferably be described in the legend instead of in the text. The same data should not be presented in both table and graph form or repeated in the text.

Figure legends should be typed in numerical order on a separate sheet. Graphics should be prepared using applications capable of generating high resolution GIF, TIFF, JPEG or Powerpoint before pasting in the Microsoft Word manuscript file. Tables should be prepared in Microsoft Word. Use Arabic numerals to designate figures and upper case letters for their parts (Figure 1). Begin each legend with a title and include sufficient description so that the figure is understandable without reading the text of the manuscript. Information given in legends should not be repeated in the text.

References: In the text, a reference identified by means of an author‘s name should be followed by the date of the reference in parentheses. When there are more than two authors, only the first author‘s name should be mentioned, followed by ’et al‘. In the event that an author cited has had two or more works published during the same year, the reference, both in the text and in the reference list, should be identified by a lower case letter like ’a‘ and ’b‘ after the date to distinguish the works.

Examples:

Abayomi (2000), Agindotan et al. (2003), (Kelebeni, 1983), (Usman and Smith, 1992), (Chege, 1998; 1987a,b; Tijani, 1993,1995), (Kumasi et al., 2001)

References should be listed at the end of the paper in alphabetical order. Articles in preparation or articles submitted for publication, unpublished observations, personal communications, etc. should not be included in the reference list but should only be mentioned in the article text (e.g., A. Kingori, University of Nairobi, Kenya, personal communication). Journal names are abbreviated according to Chemical Abstracts. Authors are fully responsible for the accuracy of the references.

Examples:

Chikere CB, Omoni VT and Chikere BO (2008). Distribution of potential nosocomial pathogens in a hospital environment. Afr. J. Biotechnol. 7: 3535-3539.

Moran GJ, Amii RN, Abrahamian FM, Talan DA (2005). Methicillinresistant Staphylococcus aureus in community-acquired skin infections. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 11: 928-930.

Pitout JDD, Church DL, Gregson DB, Chow BL, McCracken M, Mulvey M, Laupland KB (2007). Molecular epidemiology of CTXM-producing Escherichia coli in the Calgary Health Region: emergence of CTX-M-15-producing isolates. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 51: 1281-1286.

Pelczar JR, Harley JP, Klein DA (1993). Microbiology: Concepts and Applications. McGraw-Hill Inc., New York, pp. 591-603.

Short Communications

Short Communications are limited to a maximum of two figures and one table. They should present a complete study that is more limited in scope than is found in full-length papers. The items of manuscript preparation listed above apply to Short Communications with the following differences: (1) Abstracts are limited to 100 words; (2) instead of a separate Materials and Methods section, experimental procedures may be incorporated into Figure Legends and Table footnotes; (3) Results and Discussion should be combined into a single section.

Proofs and Reprints: Electronic proofs will be sent (e-mail attachment) to the corresponding author as a PDF file. Page proofs are considered to be the final version of the manuscript. With the exception of typographical or minor clerical errors, no changes will be made in the manuscript at the proof stage.

Fees and Charges: Authors are required to pay a $550 handling fee. Publication of an article in the Journal of Diabetes and Endocrinology is not contingent upon the author's ability to pay the charges. Neither is acceptance to pay the handling fee a guarantee that the paper will be accepted for publication. Authors may still request (in advance) that the editorial office waive some of the handling fee under special circumstances.

Submission of a manuscript implies: that the work described has not been published before (except in the form of an abstract or as part of a published lecture, or thesis) that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere; that if and when the manuscript is accepted for publication, the authors agree to automatic transfer of the copyright to the publisher.

Journal of Diabetes and Endocrinology

Table of Content: Volume 4 Number 3 August 2013

ARTICLES

Research Articles

academicJournals

Vol. 4(3), pp. 27-36, August 2013
DOI 10.5897/JDE09.014
ISSN 2141-2685 ©2013 Academic Journals
http://www.academicjournals.org/JDE

Journal of Diabetes and Endocrinology

Full Length Research Paper

An overview on management of diabetic dyslipidemia

Ramen C. Basak[1], Manas Chatterjee[1] and P. S. A. Sarma[2]*

[1]Department of Internal Medicine, KKGH, Hafr Al Batin, KSA.
[2]Medical and Health Services, JLN Hospital and Research Center, Bhilai, India.

Accepted 31 December, 2009

Type 2 diabetes mellitus (DM) has recently been described as "coronary risk equivalent". Lipoprotein metabolism disorder in type 2 DM is known as diabetic dyslipidemia. Dyslipidemia contributes to a substantial percentage in cardiovascular mortality and morbidity in diabetic patients. National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) and American Diabetic Association (ADA) have provided recent guidelines for early diagnostic and therapeutic approaches to contain this health hazard. Diabetic patients tend to have higher serum levels of triglycerides (TGs), lower high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C), and similar serum values for low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) when compared with non-diabetic patients. However, diabetic patients tend to have a higher concentration of smaller and denser LDL particles, which are associated with higher coronary heart disease (CHD) risk. Current recommendations are for a LDL-C goal of less than 100 mg/dl (an option of less than 70 mg/dl in very high-risk patients), a HDL-C goal greater than 40 mg/dl for men and greater than 50 mg/dl for women, and a triglyceride goal less than 150 mg/dl. Non-pharmacologic interventions (diet and exercise) are first-line therapies and are adjuvant to the pharmacologic therapy when necessary. Reduction in serum LDL levels will reduce the circulating levels of smaller and denser LDL particles. Thus lowering LDL-C level is the first priority in treating diabetic dyslipidemia. Statins are the first drug of choice, followed by resins, ezetimibe, fenofibrate, niacin and others. If a single agent is inadequate to achieve lipid goals, combinations of the preceding drugs may be used.

Key words: Diabetic dyslipidemia, diabetes mellitus, coronary heart disease.

INTRODUCTION

Dyslipidemia is a disorder of lipoprotein metabolism, including lipoprotein overproduction or deficiency. Dyslipidemia may be manifested by elevation of the total cholesterol, the low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) and the triglyceride (TG) concentrations, and a decrease in the high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C) concentration in the blood. The association of dyslipidemia with type 2 diabetes mellitus (DM) as co-morbidity for cardiovascular events leading eventually to a high rate of mortality has been a growing concern for the medical fraternity. Lipoprotein (a) [Lp(a)], the smaller and denser fraction of LDL-C, because of its profound atherogenecity, is an emerging risk factor for coronary heart disease (CHD) (American Diabetes Association, 2004). This Lp(a) has a propensity for atherogenesis appearing to be approximately twice as high in type 2 DM as compared to non-diabetics (Vakkilainen et al., 2003). There has been 2 to 4 fold increased risk of CHD, cerebrovascular stroke, peripheral vascular disease events in type 2 DM and the mortality from cardiovascular complications remains as high as 75% in these patients. It has been debated whether patients with diabetes who have not had myocardial infarction (MIs) should be treated aggressively for cardiovascular risk factors as patients who have had MIs. In support of aggressive care are findings that diabetic patients without previous MIs

*Corresponding author. E-mail: basakrc@yahoo.com. Tel: 0096637228179 or 00966551106087.

have as high a risk of death from CHD as non-diabetic patients who have had a previous MI. Adult Treatment Panel (ATP) III now defines diabetes as a CHD risk equivalent (Krentz, 2000; Haffner et al., 1998), evident from Figure 1. The relative risk for major CHD events is reduced by approximately 1% with every 1% reduction in LDL-C levels as depicted in the following graph (Grundy et al., 2004a) (Figure 2). This relationship is consistent with a large body of epidemiological data and with the data available from clinical trials of LDL-C lowering therapy. These data suggest that for every 30 mg/dl change in LDL-C, the relative risk for CHD is changed in proportion by about 30%. The Collaborative Atorvastatin Diabetes Study (CARDS) suggests that the subjects with type 2 DM could benefit from statin therapy to reduce cardiovascular disease (CVD) risk, even when they do not have high cholesterol (Colhoun et al., 2004). Hence, prompt identification and aggressive management of dyslipidemia in type 2 DM, aimed at achieving the recommended set goal by National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) in type 2 DM, have become a cornerstone of diabetic care. This article provides a review of the current literature supporting the recommendations for the management of dyslipidaemia among patients with type 2 diabetes, including new strategies involving newer agents and drug combinations that achieve good glycaemic and lipidaemic control that could potentially reduce the morbidity and mortality associated with type 2 diabetes.

Features of diabetic dyslipidemia

The most common pattern of dyslipidemia in type 2 DM is elevated TGs and decreased HDL-C levels. However, the concentration of LDL-C in type 2 diabetic patients is usually not significantly different from non-diabetic individuals. But, “modified” LDL-C in type 2 DM can promote atherogenesis. For example, non-enzymatic glycation may cause LDL-C to be rapidly internalized by macrophages, thus accelerating the process of atherosclerosis. Elevated glucose levels may also favor the production of oxidized LDL-C, the first step in the process of atherosclerosis (Curtiss and Witztum, 1985). These patients typically have a preponderance of smaller and denser LDL particles Lp(a) which possibly increases atherogenecity, even though the absolute concentration of LDL-C is not significantly raised (Krauss, 2004). Type 1 DM by itself is seldom associated with any lipid abnormalities, until the nephropathy sets in, leading to elevated levels of total cholesterol, LDL-C, TGs, Lp(a) and reduced HDL-C level (Kreisberg, 1998).

PATHOGENESIS OF DIABETIC DYSLIPIDEMIA

The pathogenesis of diabetic dyslipidemia is a complex phenomenon. Normally insulin inhibits lipolysis in adipose tissue by suppressing hormone sensitive lipase present in the cytosol of adipocytes, particularly visceral adipocytes. The insulin deficiency in diabetes reduces suppression of hormone sensitive lipase activity thereby increasing intracellular hydrolysis of TGs in the adipose tissue, consequently releasing free fatty acids (FFA) in the portal circulation. These FFA stimulate the assembly and secretion of very-low-density lipoprotein (VLDL; the major triglyceride ide-carrying lipoprotein particle) from the liver, resulting in excess circulating TG concen-tration (Ginsberg, 1996). The increase VLDL also results from reduced action of insulin on hepatocytes causing reduced suppression of VLDL production. The LDL-C does not appear to be secreted as such from either the liver or intestine; rather it seems to be formed from VLDL and possibly chylomicrons (Lewis et al., 1993). The formation of LDL from VLDL may contribute to the clinical phenomenon referred to as the "beta shift" (Mayes, 1977). An increase of LDL as hypertrigyceridemia resolves and because of its longer half-life, the LDL accumulates in plasma. TG-enriched LDL-C may undergo lipolysis resulting in increase in small and dense LDL-C particles Lp(a). The LDL-C particle size is reduced by increased hepatic lipase (present in the hepatic endothelium) activity. The low HDL-C in these patients results from reduced production, increased clearance or VLDL stimulating the exchange of cholesterol ester from HDL particles through cholesteryl ester transfer protein (CETP) (Figure 3).

BENEFITS OF TREATMENT OF DIABETIC DYSLIPIDEMIA: CLINICAL TRIAL EVIDENCE

In the widely acclaimed popular Scandinavian Simvastatin Survival Study (4S) trial, simvastatin significantly reduced CHD incidence and total mortality in diabetic subjects with high LDL cholesterol or with previous clinical CHD (The Scandinavian Simvastatin Survival Study Group, 1994; Pedersen et al., 2000). In the Cholesterol and Recurrent Events (CARE) study, pravastatin reduced CHD incidence significantly in diabetic subjects with average LDL levels and with previous clinical CHD (Goldberg et al., 1998). In the Helsinki Heart Study, gemfibrozil was associated with a reduction in CHD in diabetic subjects without prior CHD (Frick et al., 1993). The recently completed Heart Protection Study (HPS) has been the largest study to date, enrolling and randomizing 5,963 patients over the age of 40 years with diabetes and total serum cholesterol more than 135 mg/dl (Collins et al., 2003). In this trial, patients with diabetes assigned to simvastatin had a 22% reduction in the event rate for major cardiovascular disease (Collins et al., 2003). In the Veterans Affairs High-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol Intervention Trial (VA-HIT), gemfibrozil was associated with a 24% decrease in cardiovascular events in diabetic subjects with prior cardiovascular disease, low HDL (<40 mg/dl) and modestly elevated triglycerides (Robins et al., 2001). Two recent trials (Anglo-Scandinavian Cardiac Outcomes Trial-Lipid Lowering Arm [ASCOT-LLA] with atrovastatin 10 mg and Antihypertensive and Lipid-



Circulation. 2004;109:855-860

Figure 1. Diabetics without prior MI face similar risks as non-diabetics with prior MI



Figure 2. Log-linear relationship between LDL-C levels and relative risk for CHD.

Lowering Treatment to Prevent Heart Attack Trial [ALLHAT] with pravastatin 10 mg) indicated that further reduction of the LDL-C threshold resulted in additional benefits for patients in the moderately high-risk category (Sever et al., 2003). A meta-analysis of four large trials revealed that the high-dose statin therapy significantly improves cardiovascular outcomes as compared to the standard low-dose one (The Scandinavian Simvastatin Survival Study Group, 1994). The ASCOT-LLA and Collaborative Atorvastatin Diabetes Study (CARDS) suggests people with type 2 diabetes could benefit from statin therapy to reduce CVD risk, even when they do not have high cholesterol (Pedersen et al., 2000; Goldberg et al., 1998) (Table 1).

SCREENING PROTOCOL

A definitive screening for dyslipidemia is significantly important for its early detection and management to curb

Table 1. Clinical trial evidence (Titel should be completed).

Study	Drug (mg/day)	CHD event Reduction (%)
4S	Simvastatin 20-40	55
CARE	Pravastatin 40	25
HPS	Simvastatin 40	22
VA-HIT	Gemfibrozil 600	24
ASCOT-LLA	Atrovastatin 10	23
ALLHAT	Pravastatin 10	11
CARDS	Atrovastatin 10	36

the associated high morbidity and mortality in adults. Every adult aged 20 years or above should have a fasting lipoprotein profile every 5 years. It is preferable to perform annual lipid profile in all diabetics and if the values remain normal, assessment may be repeated every 2 years. In children with diabetes, consideration should be given to measure lipoproteins after age 2 years, as suggested by the NCEP (Haffner, 1998). Risk factors contributing to the early onset of CHD in children and adolescents include elevated LDL-C levels; family history of CHD, cardiovascular disease (CVD), or peripheral vascular disease before age 55 years, smoking, hypertension, HDL-C levels less than 35 mg/dl, obesity, physical inactivity, and diabetes (Frick et al., 1993). The potential harms and benefits of routinely screening for lipid disorders in children, adolescents, or adults as old as 20 years are not clear, according to the US Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) statement published in the July 9, 2007; issue of pediatrics (American Diabetes Association, 2004).

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT TARGETS

The recommendations for treatment of elevated LDL-C generally follow the guidelines of both NCEP and a recent American Diabetes Association (ADA) consensus development conference. The Adult Treatment Panel III (ATP III) of the NCEP issued an evidence-based set of guidelines on cholesterol management in 2001. Since the publication of ATP III, 5 major clinical trials of statin therapy with clinical end points have been published. The ADA has set desirable LDL-C, HDL-C, and triglyceride levels as <100 mg/dl, >40 mg/dl in men, >50 mg/dl in women, and <150 mg/dl, respectively. The primary treatment strategy, as in the NCEP guidelines, is LDL-C lowering to <100 mg/dl. The recommended LDL-C level to start pharmacological therapy is >100 mg/dl in individuals with established CHD and >130 mg/dl in those without CHD. However, the 2005 recommendations now also state that "statin therapy to achieve an LDL-C reduction of ~30% regardless of baseline LDL-C levels may be appropriate." (Prisant, 2004; Grundy et al., 2004b).

Therapeutic lifestyle changes (TLC) remain an essential modality in clinical management. This has 3 main areas of focus: diet, exercise, and weight reduction. Dietary recommendations consist of reduction of saturated fats (<7% of total calories), a low intake of cholesterol (<200 mg/day) otherwise known as NCEP step 2 diet. ADA suggests either a dietary increase in carbohydrate or monounsaturated fat to compensate the reduction in saturated fat. A moderate physical activity is encouraged because it can improve cardiovascular fitness and coronary blood flow, reduce VLDL, increase HDL-C, lower blood pressure, reduce insulin resistance and decrease LDL-C. The ADA recommends aerobic exercise at 50 to 70% maximum O2 uptake for 20 to 45 min, atleast 3 days per week (American Diabetes Association, 2001).

The ADA has assigned the priorities for lowering lipids and lipoproteins as per the following pattern (Robins et al., 2001). The first priority is the lowering of LDL-C; second priority is the lowering of triglyceride levels and third priority is raising levels of HDL-C. The lowering of LDL-C by statins is considered as the first priority because the clinical trials (4S and CARE) showed the effectiveness of statins in reducing CHD in diabetic subjects more convincing than for the Helsinki study with gemfibrozil and also, the safety record of the statins with regards to total mortality is better than that of the fibric acids.

According to the ATP III algorithm, persons are categorized into 3 risk categories (Tables 2 and 3): (1) established CHD and CHD risk equivalents, (2) multiple (2+) risk factors, and (3) zero to one (0 - 1) risk factor. CHD risk equivalents include non-coronary forms of clinical atherosclerotic disease, diabetes, and multiple (2+) CHD risk factors with 10-year risk for CHD >20%. All persons with CHD or CHD risk equivalents can be called high risk. The goal for LDL-lowering therapy in high-risk patients is an LDL-C level <100 mg/dl. According to ATP III, for a baseline or on-treatment LDL-C <100 mg/dl. For all high-risk patients with LDL-C levels ≥100 mg/dl, LDL-lowering dietary therapy should be initiated. When baseline LDL-C is ≥130 mg/dl, an LDL-lowering drug should be started simultaneously with dietary therapy. However, LDL-lowering drugs were not mandated if the baseline LDL-C level is in the range of 100 to 129 mg/dl.

The current ATP III of the NCEP recommendations is (NCEP, 2002):

(1) In high-risk persons, the recommended LDL-C goal is <100 mg/dl, but when risk is very high, an LDL-C goal of <70 mg/dl is a therapeutic option, on the basis of available clinical trial evidence.
(2) ATP III introduced a new secondary target of therapy, namely, non-HDL-C (VLDL, LDL) in patients with elevated triglycerides (>200 mg/dl). The non-HDL-C goal is 30 mg/dl higher than the LDL-C goal.
(3) Although the potential benefit of HDL-C raising therapy

Table 2. LDL goals recommended by the ADA in diabetic patients.

Patient profile	Medical nutrition	Drug	
	Initiation level (mg/dl)	Initiation level (mg/dl)	LDL-C level (mg/dl)
Pre-existing CVD	>100	>100	<100
Absence of CVD	>100	>130	<100

Diabetes Care. 26:S83-S86, 2003.

Table 3. LDL Cholesterol Goals and Cutpoints for Therapeutic Lifestyle Changes (TLC) and Drug Therapy in Different Risk Categories (ATP III).

Risk category	LDL goal (mg/dl)	Initiate TLC (mg/dl)	Initiate drug therapy (mg/dl)
CHD or CHD risk equivalents (10-year risk >20%)	<100	≥100	≥130 (100 - 129:drug optional)
2+Risk factors (10-year risk ≤20%)	<130	≥130	10-year risk 10 - 20%: ≥130; 10-year risk <10%: ≥160
0-1 Risk factor	<160	≥160	≥190 (160 - 189: LDL-lowering drug optional)

Circulation. 2004; 110:227-239.

Table 4. Doses of Currently Available Statins Required to Attain an Approximate 30% to 40% Reduction of LDL-C Levels (Standard Doses)*.

Drug	Dose (mg/day)	LDL Reduction (%)
Atorvastatin	10‡	39
Lovastatin	40‡	31
Pravastatin	40‡	34
Simvastatin	20 - 40‡	35 - 41
Fluvastatin	40 - 80	25 - 35
Rosuvastatin	5 - 10‡	39 - 45

*Estimated LDL reductions were obtained from US Food and Drug Administration package inserts for each drug.
‡All of these are available at doses up to 80 mg. For every doubling of the dose above standard dose, an approximate 6% decrease in LDL-C level can be obtained. †For rosuvastatin, doses available up to 40 mg; the efficacy for 5 mg is estimated by subtracting 6% from the Food and Drug Administration-reported efficacy at 10 mg. Circulation. 2004; 110:227-239.

has evoked considerable interest, current documentation of risk reduction through controlled clinical trials is not sufficient to warrant setting a specific goal value for raising HDL-C. Recent lipid-lowering drug trials provide no new evidence in this regard.

Lipid-lowering therapy in the management of diabetes: Current recommendations

After initial trial of diet therapy, drugs become the next important means to achieve the set and said goals (Tables 4 and 5).

HMG CoA reductase inhibitors (Statins)

These reduce LDL-C by 18 to 55% and TG by 7 to 30% and raise HDL-C by 5 to 15%, and hence are considered to be very effective. They are known to produce usually gastric intolerance apart from myopathy and elevated hepatic transaminases. Hence, they are contraindicated in liver affections while drug interactions must be taken care of during their usage. Their definitive benefits have been documented in reducing major coronary events, CHD mortality, cerebral stroke, procedures like PTCA/CABG and thereby decreasing overall mortality (American Diabetes Association, 2008; Vijan and Hayward, 2004).

Bile acid sequestrants

Their major action is directed to reducing LDL-C by 15 to 30%, raising HDL-C by 3 to 5% while sometimes increasing TG. They can cause gastrointestinal disturbances and also interfere with absorption of many drugs. They must be avoided in the presence of dysbetalipoproteinemia or raised TG especially when the value exceeds 400 ml/dl (Wong, 2001).

Nicotinic acid

It lowers the LDL-C by 5 to 25%, TG by 20 to 50% and raises HDL-C by 15 to 35%. In fact, it is one of the strongest tools to raise favourable HDL-C. But it causes flushing, hyperglycemia, hyperuricemia in addition to upper gastrointestinal distress and hepatotoxicity. It is contraindicated in peptic ulcer, severe gout and liver disease (Tavintharan and Kashyap, 2001).

Table 5. Non-statin drugs for management of lipid disorders in diabetes.

Drug	Doses
Fibrates	
Gemfibrozil	600 mg daily
Fenofibrate	200 mg daily
Clofibrate	200 mg daily
Bile acid sequestrants	
Colestipol	l5 - 20 g daily
Cholestyramine	4 - 16 g daily
Nicotinic acid	
Niacin	1.5 - 3 g daily
Cholesterol absorption inhibitor	
Ezitimibe	10 mg daily

Fibric acids

These decrease LDL-C by 5 to 20% when the value of TG is normal, but with high value of TG, contrarily LDL-C may be increased because of improved VLDL metabolism. TG levels are lowered by 20 to 50% while HDL-C may be raised to 10 to 20%. They can cause dyspepsia, gall stone and myopathy. Severe renal and hepatic impairment are contraindication for prescribing these acids (Bloomfield et al., 1999; Tsimihodimos et al., 2005).

Ezetimibe

Ezetimibe, a selective cholesterol absorption inhibitor, blocks the synthesis of a key protein in the intestinal villi, thus preventing the absorption of dietary cholesterol. By itself, the drug has been shown to reduce modestly the serum levels of LDL-C, but it works synergistically when combined with a statin. The action of ezetimibe 10 mg plus a 10 mg dose of a statin is equivalent to that of a statin alone at higher doses, such as 80 mg of simvastatin or 40 mg of atorvastatin. It is used (10 mg daily) to reduce the amount of total cholesterol, LDL cholesterol and also, there are no differences in liver or muscle-related side effects while combined with statin therapy (Bays, 2002).

Rosuvastatin

Compared to other HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors, rosuvastatin possesses the highest bonding interactions with HMG-CoA reductase, resulting in the most potent inhibition of cholesterol synthesis. The half-life of rosuvastatin is approximately 20 h, which is longer than the other HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors. An advantage with rosuvastatin is that it is not significantly metabolized by the liver. Rosuvastatin is primarily eliminated through biliary excretion (90%) and found unchanged in the feces, with the remainder of elimination occurring in the urine. The FDA-approved dosage range of rosuvastatin is 5 to 40 mg daily; however, the 40 mg dose should only be used in patients who do not reach their LDL-C goal with the 20 mg dosage. The recent JUPITER trial indicated a reduction in incidence of total stroke by 48% in apparently healthy individuals with elevated highly sensitive c-reactive protein (hsCRP) and low to normal LDL-C (American Diabetes Association, 2008). Although more potent, it can cause potentially serious kidney toxicity that is not seen with the other statins. It is the only statin that caused rhabdomyolysis, a life-threatening adverse drug reaction, in pre-approval clinical trials (Ridker et al., 2008; Vaughan and Gotto, 2004; Davidson, 2002).

Omega-3 fatty acids

Fish oil preparations containing omega-3 fatty acids have been proven useful in reducing triglyceride levels in patients with diabetes although they are only indicated for patients with severe hypertriglyceridaemia and/or chylomicronaemia and for patients whose triglycerides remain elevated despite alternative therapies (Kris-Etherton et al., 2002).

CETP (cholesteryl ester transfer protein) inhibitors

An emerging therapeutic avenue for the management of dyslipidemia is inhibition of CETP, given that elevated CETP levels appear to be associated with progressive atherosclerosis in patients with type 2 diabetes. Two CETP inhibitors, JTT-705 and torcetrapib, are currently in the early stages of development and the results of both monotherapy and combination therapy are conflicting (Brousseau et al., 2006).

Rimonabant

A cannabinoid receptor blocker significantly reduces weight and waist circumference and improves dyslipidemias in overweight and obese patients with or without diabetes. It decreases TG and increases HDL levels (Hollander, 2007).

Other antidiabetic agents

Insulin therapy itself, through its direct effect on the adipocytes and the liver, can lower TG concentrations, significantly but have minimal impact on HDL levels (Ginsberg, 2000). Exenatide, a glucagon like peptide one

Table 6. Following would be a practical approach to the pharmacologic treatment of lipid disorders in diabetes.

Lipid disorder	1st Choice	Alternate or add on	Other consideration
High LDL-C	Statin	Ezetimibe	Niacin
Low HDL-C	Fibrate	Niacin	Statin, thiazolidinediones
High TGs	Fibrate	High-dose statin	Niacin, pioglitazone and/or insulin
Combined hyperlipidemia	High-dose statin	Statin+fibrate	Statin + niacin

Endocrinol Metab Clin N Am. 2005; 34:36.

(GLP-1) analogue increases HDL-C and decreases LDL-C, probably an indirect effect secondary to its weight reduction (Klonoff et al., 2008). Metformin, recent meta-analysis of 41 randomized, controlled clinical trials assessing the effects of metformin on the lipid profile in patients with type 2 diabetes concluded that metformin has no intrinsic effect on triglycerides and HDL-C and any reductions in LDL-C, although statistically significant, are relatively small (Wulffele et al., 2004).

Pioglitazone as monotherapy in patients with type 2 diabetes provides significant improvements in glycemic control, while also causing significant decreases in plasma triglycerides and increases in HDL-C when compared with placebo (Winkler et al., 2002).

Roseglitazone, the benefits of rosiglitazone monotherapy on diabetic dyslipidemia are less apparent and the only clear advantage appears to be an increase in HDL-C levels of 14 to 18%. Triglycerides appear to be unaffected by rosiglitazone and LDL-C increased by 9.5% among patients treated with 2 mg twice daily to 18.3% among patients treated with 8 mg once daily (Brunzell et al., 2001).

COMBINATION THERAPY AND FACTS

Often monotherapy is not sufficient to completely normalize the lipid profile. Currently, there are no randomized controlled trials demonstrating that combination therapy reduces cardiovascular disease to a greater extent than monotherapy. Use of combination therapy should be considered in several situations. First, combination therapy is useful in those patients who are unable to reach their target with just one drug. As mentioned previously, doubling the dosage of statins will only decrease LDL levels by an additional 5 to 10% and may not be enough to reach the goal. However, by using combination therapy, the addition of another lipid-regulating agent with a different mechanism of action may lower LDL levels by another 20 to 25%. Second, patients with diabetes often have abnormalities in more than one type of lipid particle and have high LDL levels as well as low HDL levels and high triglyceride levels. Most lipid-lowering drugs partially correct lipid abnormalities or achieve target values. For example, statins are powerful agents to lower LDL levels. However, if a patient also has a high triglyceride level or low HDL level, adding a second agent such as a fibrate or niacin should be considered. Third, occasionally, maximum dosage escalation cannot be achieved because of adverse effects. Since the occurrence of adverse effects often correlates with the dosage, small dosages of lipid-regulating agents from two different classes can be used together to reach goal (Table 6).

When using combination therapy one must be aware that the addition of either fibrate or niacin to statin therapy increases the risk of myositis. The increased risk of myositis is greatest when gemfibrozil is used in combination with statins. Statins plus bile acid resins or ezetimibe can achieve greater than 50% reduction in LDL-C, with little or no increase in adverse effects. Fibrates, niacin, and omega-3 fatty acids, when added to statins, can reduce triglycerides, increase HDL-C, and reduce non-HDL-C to a greater extent than statin monotherapy. Conclusions regarding ezetimibe/statins combinations should not be made until the three large clinical outcome trials will be completed within the next 2 to 3 years (Tenenbaum et al., 2008). Majority of LDL-C lowering effect occurs at the lowest statin dose and side effects are dose dependent. Hence, to start with, the lowest possible dose is recommended (Jones et al., 1998). The combination of statins with nicotinic acid is extremely effective in modifying diabetic dyslipidemia (with the largest increases in HDL-C levels), but this significantly worsen hyperglycemia. Thus, this combination should be used with extreme caution like using low doses of nicotinic acid (<=2 g of nicotinic acid per day) with frequent monitoring of blood glucose levels. It should also be noted that the higher doses of statins may be moderately effective at reducing triglyceride levels (although not necessarily at raising HDL levels) and thus may reduce the need for combination therapy. The elevation of liver enzymes more than 3 times the upper limit of normal is found in less than 1.5% cases while significant myopathy in less than 0.3%, with statins (Heart Protection study Collaborative Group, 2002). Recently, it is demonstrated that gemfibrozil and fenofibrate differ in their effects on statin pharmacokinetics. A recently conducted national survey reported the prevalence of rhabdomyolysis to be approximately 10 times more with statin plus fenofibrate and about a 100 times more likely with statin plus gemfibrozil treatment compared to statin alone (Jones, 2005). Thus fenofibrate is preferred to gemfibrozil for use in combination therapy with statins. Fenofibrate is more likely to increase serum creatinine levels than gemfibrozil and should be avoided in patients with renal disease; in whom, the combination of statin and niacin probably is safer than a statin-fibrate

regimen.

The safety profile of combination lipid lowering therapy is acceptable, if the global CHD risk of the patient is high, thus producing a favorable risk to benefit ratio. Careful surveillance of hepatic transaminases, avoidance of gemfibrozil in statin-fibrate combinations, and awareness of statin-concomitant drug interactions is the key to safe and efficacious use of combination lipid lowering drug therapy (Vasudevan and Jones, 2006).

Clinical approach in drug selection

The ADA provides recommendations and priorities for treatment of dyslipidemia specifically for patients with diabetes. Although patients with diabetes have characteristically low HDL levels and high triglyceride levels with "normal" LDL levels, the priority should still lie in lowering LDL levels since many large clinical trials in the general population repeatedly have shown that lowering LDL levels will decrease CHD events. Resins, ezetimibe, niacin, or combinations are used as alternatives. For those patients with low HDL and/or high triglyceride levels, fibrates are the first choice. However, the increased risk of myopathy with a statin-fibrate combination must be considered. The combination is to be avoided in patients with diabetic nephropathy. Niacin, fish oil, or combinations are used in addition or as alternatives if the goal is not achieved. Many patients with diabetes will have abnormalities in all lipid particles. They may have high LDL levels, and at the same time, have low HDL and high triglyceride levels. In this scenario, treating LDL is still the first priority. After the LDL goal is reached, treatment for low HDL and high triglyceride levels should be considered. One exception is for those with extremely high triglyceride levels (>500 mg/dl) who are at risk for pancreatitis. For patients with triglyceride levels greater than 500 mg/dl, triglycerides should be treated first (Knopp, 1999).

A significant number of patients with diabetes will require combination therapy. Most combinations are safe and effective, except as previously stated. Benefits of combination therapy should be carefully weighed against the risks. A complete review of the patient's drug regimen along with a medical history should be performed. To minimize the occurrence of myotoxicity in these patients, clinicians should ensure that there are no interactions with drugs that can decrease statin clearance (Figure 4).

Monitoring of therapy

Summary of National Lipid Association Statin Safety Recommendations (Kapur and Musunuru, 2008).

Muscle effects

Pretreatment measurement of creatine kinase (CK) levels is generally not necessary unless an individual is at high risk.

(1) Routine measurements of CK levels are unnecessary in asymptomatic patients.
(2) Counsel patients on the possibility of muscle discomfort while on statin therapy and the importance of reporting symptoms like muscle ache.
(3) In symptomatic patients, CK levels should be measured: (a) If CK levels <10 times the upper limit of normal (ULN) then statin therapy may be continued or doses reduced with close monitoring of symptoms; (b) If CK levels >10,000 IU/L or above 10 times the ULN, then admit for intravenous (IV) hydration therapy, monitoring of renal function, and treatment of rhabdomyolysis; (c) Irrespective of CK levels, if muscle symptoms are intolerable, statin therapy should be discontinued with possible reinstitution of a different agent or lower dose once patient becomes asymptomatic; (d) If symptoms recur, alternative therapies should be considered.

Hepatic effects

(1) Measure serum hepatic transaminase levels before initiating therapy, 12 weeks after starting therapy, after a dose adjustment, and periodically thereafter.
(2) Monitor for signs of potential hepatotoxicity such as jaundice, malaise, fatigue, and lethargy. If present, measure transaminase levels, fractionated bilirubin levels, and liver function tests.
(3) In asymptomatic patients, if serum hepatic transaminase levels are between 1 and 3 times the ULN, then consider continuing statin therapy with close follow up testing.
(4) If serum hepatic transaminase levels increase >3 times the ULN, then reduce the statin dose or discontinue treatment while ruling out other possible etiologies.
(5) If objective evidence of liver injury is documented, then discontinue the statin and refer the patient to a gastroenterologist.

Renal effects

(1) Routine measurements of serum creatinine and proetinuria are not necessary for patients on statins.
(2) Pre-treatment baseline creatinine levels may be helpful in identifying patients with underlying renal disease who may be at risk for higher muscle toxicity.
(3) If creatinine levels increase while on statin therapy, an adjustment in statin dosing may be required.
(4) If proteinuria is detected, consider adjusting the statin dose.
(5) Any perturbation of renal indices should warrant further investigation of other non-statin related causes.
(6) In patients with chronic kidney disease, statin therapy may be initiated with close attention to dose adjustments in moderate to severe renal disease.

Risk factors for muscle toxicity include: concomitant therapy with fibric acid derivatives, erythromycin, or azole antifungals, advanced age, small body habitus, worsening renal function, ongoing infection, trauma such as recent surgery, alcohol abuse, and untreated hypothyroidism.

CONCLUSION

All diabetic patients should be treated aggressively for the prevention of CVD, because diabetic patients without previous MI have as high a risk of MI as non-diabetic patients with previous MI. Current ADA and NCEP guidelines recommend aggressive treatment for dyslipidemia in diabetic patients, particularly in those with elevated LDL-C levels which remains the first priority, but abnormalities in HDL-C and TG levels also should be treated aggressively. Tight glycemic control achieved with diet, exercise, and some antidiabetic agents may substantially improve the lipid profile and reduce the risk of CVD in some patients. However, most patients will require the use of intensive lipid-lowering therapy to reduce their cardiovascular risk, most commonly with one of the statins or fibric acid derivatives. Finally, since combination therapy is safe for most patients if used judiciously, it should be considered for all those who are unable to meet their goals with monotherapy.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The third generation statin, rosuvastatin, has demonstrated reasonable clinical efficacy and safety in several clinical trials. Safety issues surrounding the use of high-potency statins remain of paramount concern. Future studies involving rosuvastatin/fenofibrate combination therapy and the recently announced combination of rosuvastatin with a next generation fenofibrate (ABT-335) will provide further insight into the efficacy of dual-targeted therapy on both LDL-C and HDL-C profiles.

REFERENCES

American Diabetes Association (2004). Dyslipidemia management in adults with diabetes. Diabetes Care 27(suppl. 1):68-71.

American Diabetes Association (2001). Diabetes mellitus and exercise (Position statement). Diabetes Care 24:51-55.

American Diabetes Association (2008). Standards of medical care in diabetes (Position Statement). Diabetes Care 31(Suppl. 1):12-54.

Bays H (2002). Ezetimibe. Expert Opin. Investig. Drugs 11(11):1587-1604.

Bloomfield RH, Robins SJ, Collins D (1999). Gemfibrozil for the secondary prevention of coronary heart disease in men with low levels of high-density lipoprotein cholesterol. The Veterans Affairs High-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol Intervention Trial Study Group. N. Engl. J. Med. 341:410-418.

Brousseau ME, Schaefer EJ, Wolfe ML (2006). Effects of an inhibitor of cholesteryl ester transfer protein on HDL cholesterol. N. Engl. J. Med. 350:1505-1515.

Brunzell J, Cohen BR, Kreider M (2001). Rosiglitazone favorably affects LDL-C and HDL-C heterogeneity in type 2 diabetes. Diabetes 50(Suppl. 2):A141.

Colhoun HM, Betteridge DJ, Durrington PN (2004). Primary prevention of cardiovascular disease with atorvastatin in type 2 diabetes in the Collaborative Atorvastatin Diabetes Study (CARDS): Multicentre randomized placebo-controlled trial. Lancet 364:685-696.

Collins R, Armitage J, Parish S, Sleigh P, Peto R (2003). Heart Protection Study Collaborative Group. MRC/BHF Heart Protection Study of cholesterol-lowering with simvastatin in 5963 people with diabetes: a randomised placebo-controlled trial. Lancet 361:2005-2016.

Curtiss LK, Witztum JL (1985). Plasma apolipoproteins AI, AII, B, CI, and E are glucosylated in hyperglycemic diabetic subjects. Diabetes 34:452-461.

Davidson MH (2002). Rosuvastastin: A highly efficacious statin for the treatment of dyslipidemia. Expert Opin. Investig. Drugs 11:125-141.

Frick MH, Heinonen OP, Huttunen JK, Koskinen P, Mänttäri M, Manninen V (1993). Efficacy of gemfibrozil in dyslipidemic subjects with suspected heart disease. An ancillary study in the Helsinki Heart Study frame population. Ann. Med. 25(1):41-45.

Ginsberg HN (1996). Diabetic dyslipidemia: basic mechanisms underlying the common hypertriglyceridemia and low HDL cholesterol levels. Diabetes 45(suppl 3):27-30.

Ginsberg HN (2000). Insulin resistance and cardiovascular disease. J. Clin. Invest. 106:453-458.

Goldberg RB, Mellies MJ, Sacks FM (1998). Cardiovascular events and their reduction with pravastatin in diabetic and glucose-intolerant myocardial infarction survivors with average cholesterol levels: Subgroup analysis in the cholesterol and recurrent events (CARE) trial. Circulation 98:2513-2519.

Grundy SM, Benjamin IJ, Bruke GL (2004a). Log-linear relationship between LDL-C levels and relative risk for CHD. Circulation 110:227-239.

Grundy SM, Cleeman JI, Merz CN (2004b). Implications of recent clinical trials for the National Cholesterol Education Program Adult Treatment Panel III guidelines. Circulation 110:227-239.

Haffner SM (1998). Management of dyslipidemia in adults with diabetes (Technical Review). Diabetes Care 21:160–178.

Haffner SM, Lehto S, Ronnemaa T (1998). Mortality from coronary heart disease in subjects with type 2 diabetes and in nondiabetic subjects with and without prior myocardial infarction. N. Engl. J. Med. 339: 229-234.

Heart Protection study Collaborative Group (2002). MCR/BHF Heart Protection study of Cholesterol Lowering with Simvastatin in 20,536 High–risk Individuals: A randomized placebo-controlled trial. Lancet 360:7-22.

Hollander P (2007). Endocannabinoid blockade for improving glycemic control and lipids in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. Am. J. Med. 120:18-28.

Jones P, Kafonek S, Laurora I, Hunninghake D (1998). Comparative dose efficacy study of atorvastatin versus simvastatin, pravastatin, lovastatin, and fluvastatin in patients with hypercholesterolemia (the CURVES study) Am. J. Cardiol. 82:128.

Jones PH (2005). Davidson MH Reporting rate of rhabdomyolysis with fenofibrate + statin versus gemfibrozil + any statin. Am. J. Cardiol. 95:120-122.

Kapur NK, Musunuru K (2008). Clinical efficacy and safety of statins in managing cardiovascular risk. Vasc. Health Risk Manag. 4:341–353.

Klonoff DC, Buse JB, Nielsen LL (2008). Exenatide effects on diabetes, obesity, cardiovascular risk factors and hepatic biomarkers in patients with type 2 diabetes treated for at least 3 years. Curr. Med. Res. Opin. 24:275-286.

Knopp RH (1999). Drug therapy: Drug treatment of lipid disorders. N. Engl. J. Med. 341:498-511.

Krauss RM (2004). Lipids and lipoproteins in patients with type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Care 27:1496-1504.

Kreisberg R (1998). Diabetic dyslipidemia. Am. J. Cardiol. 82:67-73.

Krentz AJ (2000). Churchill's Pocket Book of Diabetes. Churchill Livingstone pp. 250-257.

Kris-Etherton PM, Harris WS, Appel LJ (2002). Fish consumption, fish oil, omega-3 fatty acids, and cardiovascular disease: AHA scientific statement. Circulation 106:2747-2757.

Lewis GF, Uffelman KD, Szeto LW, Weller B, Steiner G (1993). Effects

of acute hyperinsulinemia on VLDL triglyceride and VLDL apo B production in normal weight and obese individuals. Diabetes 42:833-842.
Mayes PA (1977). Metabolism of Lipids. In: Harper HA, Rodwell VW (eds.), Review of Physical Chemistry. 16th ed. California: Langes Medical Publication. pp. 280-320.
National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III) (2002). Third Report of the National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III) final report. Circulation 106:3143-3421.
Pedersen TR, Wilhelmsen L, Faergeman O (2000). Follow-up study of patients randomized in the Scandinavian Simvastatin Survival Study (4S) of cholesterol lowering. Am. J. Cardiol. 86:257-262.
Prisant LM (2004). Clinical trials and lipid guidelines for type 2 diabetes. J. Clin. Pharmacol. 44:423-430.
Ridker PM, Danielson E, Fonseca FAH (2008). Rosuvastatin to prevent vascular events in men and women with elevated C-reactive protein. N. Engl. J. Med. 359(21):95-207.
Robins SJ, Collins D, Wittes JT (2001). For the Veterans Affairs High-Density Lipoprotein Intervention Trial Study Group. Relation of gemfibrozil treatment and lipid levels with major coronary events: VA-HIT: A randomized controlled trial. JAMA. 285:1585-1591.
Sever PS, Dahlof B, Poulter NR, Wedel H, Beevers G, Caulfield M, Collin R, Kjeldsen SE, Kristinsson A, Mclnnes GT, Mehlsen J, Nieminen M, O'Brien E, Ostergren J (2003). For the ASCOT investigators. Prevention of coronary and stroke events with atorvastatin in hypertensive patients who have average or lower-than-average cholesterol concentrations, in the AngloScandinavian Cardiac Outcomes Trial 1 Lipid Lowering Arm (ASCOT-LLA): A multicentre randomised controlled trial. Lancet 361:1149-1156.
Tavintharan S, Kashyap ML (2001). The benefits of niacin in atherosclerosis. Curr. Atheroscler. Rep. 3:74-82.
Tenenbaum A, Fisman EZ, Motro M, Adler Y (2008). Optimal management of combined dyslipidemia: what have we behind statins monotherapy? Adv Cardiol. 45:127-153.
The Scandinavian Simvastatin Survival Study Group (1994). Randomized trial of cholesterol lowering in 4444 patients with coronary heart disease: the Scandinavian Simvastatin Survival Study (4S). Lancet 344:1383-1389.
Tsimihodimos V, Miltiadous G, Daskalopoulou SS, Mikhailidis DP, Elisaf MS (2005) Fenofibrate: metabolic and pleiotropic effects. Curr. Vasc. Pharmacol. 3:87-98.
Vakkilainen J, Steiner G, Ansquer JC (2003). Relationships between low-density lipoprotein particle size, plasma lipoproteins, and progression of coronary artery disease. The Diabetes Atherosclerosis Intervention Study (DAIS). Circulation 107:1733-1737.
Vasudevan AR, Jones PH (2006). Effective use of combination lipid therapy. Curr. Atheroscler. Rep. 8:76-84.
Vaughan CJ, Gotto Jr AM (2004). Update on statins: 2003. Circulation 110:886-892.
Vijan S, Hayward RA (2004). For the American College of Physicians. Pharmacologic lipid-lowering therapy in type 2 diabetes mellitus: Background paper for the American College of Physicians. Ann. Intern. Med. 140:650-658.
Winkler K, Freedrich I, Baumstark MW, Wieland H, Marz W (2002). Pioglitazone reduces atherogenic dense low density lipoprotein (LDL) particles in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. Br. J. Diabetes Vasc. Dis. 2:143-148.
Wong NN (2001). "Colesevelam: A new bile acid sequestrant". Heart Dis. 3:63-70.
Wulffele MG, Kooy A, de Zeeuw D, Stehouwer CDA, Gansewoort RT (2004). The effect of metformin on blood pressure, plasma cholesterol and triglycerides in type 2 diabetes mellitus: a systematic review. J. Intern. Med. 256:1-14.

academicJournals

Vol. 4(3), pp. 37-44, August, 2013
DOI 10.5897/JDE2013.0065
ISSN 2141-2685 ©2013 Academic Journals
http://www.academicjournals.org/JDE

Journal of Diabetes and Endocrinology

Full Length Research Paper

Diabetes Objective Control and Education (DOCE) Project Study: Continued education and multiprofessional care in type 1 diabetes contribute to long-term glycemic control?

Mirnaluci Paulino Ribeiro Gama[1,2]*, Marcelo Bettega[3], Aniele Cristine Ott Clemente[3] and Lucianna Ribeiro Machado Thá[1]

[1]Endocrinology Service, DOCE Project Outpatient Clinic of the Hospital Universitário Evangélico de Curitiba, Curitiba, PR, Brazil.
[2]Endocrinology Service and Diabetes Unit of the Hospital Universitário Evangélico de Curitiba, Curitiba, PR, Brazil.
[3]Depatment of Internal Medicine, Hospital Universitário Evangélico de Curitiba, PR, Brazil.

Accepted 2 May, 2013

The purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of continued education and multiprofessional care for type 1 diabetes mellitus patients as a strategy for long-term glycemic control evaluated by glycosylated hemoglobin (A1C) levels. This study is a retrospective, observational study of the Diabetes Objective Control and Education (DOCE) Project. A group of 74 patients accompanied by family member attended multiprofessional appointments and an epidemiologic profile of the group was created. The analyzed variables were age, body mass index (BMI), height, duration of disease, age at diagnosis, duration of follow-up, current and baseline A1C, and the relationship between the period of follow-up and the variation in A1C. Mean age at diagnosis was 10.4±7.3 years, and duration of disease was 5.6±6.3 years. Mean age was 16±9.3 years, while mean BMI was 20.3±5.3. Mean duration of follow-up was 27.5±15.6 months. Baseline and current A1C were 10.5±1.8 and 8.2±1.7, respectively. A significant reduction in A1C was observed with the follow-up by the DOCE Project (p=0.00436). Other significant correlations were found between duration of treatment and reduction of current A1C (p=0.00000001) and duration follow-up and A1C reduction (p=0.00000003). Continued education and multiprofessional care for type 1 diabetes mellitus patients is an effective method for long-term glycemic control.

Key words: Diabetes mellitus, glycosylated hemoglobin (A1C), education, glycemic control.

INTRODUCTION

Type 1 diabetes mellitus (DM1) accounts for 10% of all cases of diabetes worldwide (Halimi and Benhamou, 2004). Incidence rates varying between 7.6 and 12.6/100,000 were found in two studies conducted in Brazil (Campos et al., 1998; Ferreira et al., 1993).

In DM1, as demonstrated by several studies including the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT), adequate glycemic control along with glycosylated hemoglobin (A1C) levels <7% prevents chronic micro-angiopathic complications (The Diabetes Control and

*Corresponding author. E-mail: mirnaluci.gama@yahoo.com. Tel: +55 41 33363952.

Complications Trial Research Group, 1993). However, the low socioeconomic status of the population and the limited education of the patients view about disease and its complications are some of the factors that hamper glycemic control and increase the mortality rates deriving from those complications (Secrest et al., 2011). Therefore, a multidisciplinary approach is critically important in the follow-up of this chronic disease, for patient motivation, improved control and fewer hospitalizations, and the psychological aspects of the disease, thus improving patient quality of life (Laron et al., 1979).

Education about the disease is one of the key to a good control. The insulin-dependent patient with diabetes needs to be educated in order to adjust insulin dosage in the context of a healthy diet without prohibitions. The Diabetes Objective Control and Education (DOCE) Project study is based on the Dose Adjustment for Normal Eating (DAFNE) study, which educates patients with diabetes to live with their illness freely along with quality of life (DAFNE Study Group, 2005).

Previous experiences have shown that education regimens for type 1 diabetes patients are effective in reducing A1C values. However, continued education is indispensable for sustaining the reduced values (Koplatadze et al., 2003; Santiprabhob et al., 2008). Therefore, the aim of the present study was to assess whether type 1 diabetes patients participating in a continued, longer education project at a teaching hospital show better glycemic control and lower A1C levels.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The present study is a retrospective, observational study to assess the effectiveness of continued, guided education for patients with DM1 for long-term glycemic control. The database of the DOCE Project Study (Diabetes Objective Control and Education, Portuguese form of Diabetes Control and Educational Purpose) of the Hospital Universitário Evangélico de Curitiba was used. The DOCE study comprises two arms: a control group constituted by patients who refused to participate in the study and are seen in the outpatient clinic of the Endocrinology and Diabetes Service at the Hospital Universitário Evangélico de Curitiba and the strict control group with consultations with a multidisciplinary team every three months on an ambulatory basis. The end point of the study is education-discipline in managing the disease as demonstrated by reduction and stability in A1C values.

The medical visits focus on education and a review of all aspects of the disease with the patient, always in the presence of the family. The individual and his or her family are encouraged to clear all their doubts about the application of insulin, doses, handling and maintenance of the pens, doses and interactions with other indefinite-use medications. At each visit, patients blood glucose values are discussed along with hypoglycemic and/or hyperglycemic episodes and their determinants. These data are related to the current insulin treatment and eventual improvements or deteriorations in the weight-for-stature curves and in glycemic control, as well as complaints reported by the patients or relatives. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Hospital Universitário Evangélico de Curitiba.

A total of 74 patients constituted the sample of the DOCE Project in Curitiba. In order to create the epidemiologic profile of the patients, patients gender, age, family history, age at diagnosis, duration of disease, height, body mass index (BMI), duration of project follow-up, baseline and current A1C were also analyzed. The relation between the variation in A1C during the study period and the duration of follow-up was also assessed. The data were collected from the medical records of the DOCE Project at the Hospital Universitário Evangélico de Curitiba. The statistical analysis was performed with the aid of GraphPad Prism 5 software.

Simple frequency charts as well as Pearson linear correlation test and Student's *t* test for numerical variables and paired data were used in the analyses. For all comparisons, the level of significance was set at 5%.

RESULTS

Out of the 74 patients in the project, 45.9% have family history of diabetes. The mean age at diagnosis was 10.6±7.316 years. In total, 56.8% of the patients were diagnosed after an episode of diabetic ketoacidosis. Duration of disease ranged from 0 to 30 years, with an average of 5.65±6.352. Thirty-one patients (41.9%) were female and 43 (58.1%) were male whose age ranged from 5 to 51 years, with an average of 16.07±9.387 years. Marked concentration of patients in the second and third decades of life can be observed as shown in Figure 1.

With regard to anthropometric values, height ranged from 1.11 to 1.78 m (mean, 1.52 m; standard deviation (SD), 0.1936) and the BMI ranged from 12.9 to 45.5 (mean, 20.3; SD, 5.3575) were observed.

The follow-up period in the project ranged between 4 and 64 months (mean, 27.5±15.644 months). As shown in Figure 2, a large proportion of patients had more than one year follow-up, which means a minimum of 12 appointments.

Baseline and current HbA1C showed a mean decrease of 2.3131. Student's *t* test yielded a p-value of 0.00436, indicating a significant decline. The differences between values are given in Figure 3.

In order to assess the influence of treatment duration on the reduction of A1C, these two variables were analyzed. The comparison of the A1C values in the different lengths of time of the project reveals a correlation of 49.7%

Table 1. Correlation between HbA1c and duration of treatment.

Parameter		Baseline HbA1C	Current HbA1C	Variation in HbA1C	Duration of project (months)
Baseline HbA1C	Pearson correlation	100.00%	49.70%	56.70%	1.40%
	Level of significance	-	0.0000067	0.0000001	0.907
	Sample	74	74	74	74
Current HbA1C	Pearson correlation	49.70%	100.00%	-43.30%	-60.60%
	Level of significance	0.00001	-	0.00011	0.00000001
	Sample	74	74	74	74
Variation in HbA1C	Pearson correlation	56.70%	-43.30%	100.00%	59.00%
	Level of significance	0.00000014	0.00011459	-	0.00000003
	Sample	74	74	74	74
Duration of Project (months)	Pearson correlation	1.40%	-60.60%	59.00%	100.00%
	Level of significance	0.907	0.00000001	0.00000003	-
	Sample	74	74	74	74



Figure 1. DOCE Project patients divided by age (shown in years).



Figure 2. DOCE Project patient frequency (shown in months).

between baseline and current A1C (p=0.00001) concluded that patients participate in the project beginning treatment with higher A1C levels. On the other hand, a statistically significant (p=0.00000014) correlation of 56.7% between baseline A1C and the reduction in A1C found in the present study indicates that patients who initiate treatment with higher A1C values tend to show greater reduction.

Therefore, it is possible to infer that patients starting follow-up with higher baseline values exhibit a greater decrease; however, they still show elevated values when compared with the average. When relating A1C levels to length of follow-up, a significant correlation of -60.6% (p=0.00000001) is observed. A statistically significant (p=0.00000003) correlation of 59% between duration of project and A1C reduction was found as well. This confirms that the longer the duration of treatment, the greater the reduction in A1C levels.

DISCUSSION

The DCCT study had established the basis for glycaemic control in DM1, relying on a multiprofessional approach, The DCCT study had established the basis for glycemic control in DM1, relying on a multiprofessional approach, attitudes and patient-centered education (The Diabetes Control and Complications Trial Research Group, 1993; Brink et al., 2002; Leite et al., 2008).

Despite the recent and continuous advances in knowledge, majority of the patients with DM1 shows unsatisfactory glycemic control ((Silveira et al., 2001). Similarly, only 74% report adherence to dietary measures recommended for DM1 ((Diabetes UK, 2004).

Educational programs on DM1, aimed primarily at prevention and prevention plays a key role in the management of the disease. Given that only 20% of the children and adolescents manage to achieve A1C levels



Figure 3. DOCE Project patients A1C values after and before the Project (shown in %).

< 7.5%, while 48% of them have A1C > 9%.

In view of this challenging scenario, patient care should rely on their ability to interpret their own test results, identify biorhythm patterns in glycemic control and find ways to ensure adequate physical activity and diet. These measures increase the success rate of the treatment (The Diabetes Control and Complications Trial Research Group, 1993; Brink et al., 2002). The family is instrumental in the success of the treatment and should always be included (Leite et al., 2008).

The literature also refers to the individualization of specialized medical follow-up and interaction with the patient's family as factors of good compliance with non-pharmacological measures, such as the required diet. A total of 82% of the patients who follow a diet stated that their meal plan was introduced by a trusted specialist; this rate is statistically significant (Silveira et al., 2001).

Despite these well-established foundations, no effective standardized educational program for DM1 exists on a world level (Norris et al., 2001). The major studies in this field combined educational and behavior intervention, adapted to patient's sociocultural setting, coupled with support for intensive insulin treatment (Norris et al., 2001; Murphy et al., 2006). In that sense, the individualized approach proved superior in terms of glycemic control compared with the group treatment when the same methodology of clinic visits was used (Rickheim et al., 2002).

In this context, the DOCE Project emerges as an educational program aimed at changing the approach to DM1 patients, in a study based on the largest city in Southern Brazil.

Our DM1 patients are mostly children or adolescents. This age group demands intensive educational assistance so that independence and self-reliance are developed for greater efficacy of the therapeutic approach. The initial approach, immediately after diagnosis, is essential, since treatment tend to be established over the first years following diagnosis; resistance to changes increase over the course of the disease (Delamater et al., 2007).

Nascimento et al. (2011) in a nationwide study, reviewed available data in the literature concerning factors that influence the adequate management of type 1 DM from the children's perspective. They reported lack of knowledge and the fear of prejudice as negative factors for the appropriate management of DM1. The importance of multiprofessional,

individualized follow-up in this age group is emphasized, since the literature reports moderate depression and anxiety in school children diagnosed with DM1 (Delamater et al., 2007). Follow-up in the school should be closely monitored, in order to establish an environment of encouragement and trust (Diabetes UK, 2004).

Even for adolescents, the interaction between patient, family and school environment shows positive results, which are more favorable as the patient's independence is encouraged and they feel that the responsibility for the management of the disease can be shared (Wysocki et al., 2001).

Considering that we have adult patients, it is worth noting that managing these patients may not be simpler than managing younger individuals, as is often thought (Leite et al., 2008). Adults show resistance to learning techniques and even to the professional-patient interact-tion that is attempted over the course of the appointments.

The psychological aspect is further characterized by the high prevalence of depression as a comorbidity, with 25 to 70% (Fisher et al., 2007). In light of these facts regarding the behavior of patients with diabetes towards their illness, we have established a *motto* of diabetes for the diabetic-living with quality of life and guided freedom as in the DAFNE study of the United Kingdom.

Many authors highlight the difficulty in maintaining adequate levels of A1C, even in centers of reference (Jose et al., 2009). Other previous national and international studies also demonstrated the inadequacy of the treatment for young patients (Liberatore Junior et al., 2008; Paulino et al., 2006; Weyhreter et al., 2008). The literature conspicuously lacks results for long-term glycemic control in these patients in the absence of a supportive educational program. We believe that such scenario can be changed with the implementation of educational programs following proper methodology for handling glycemic control over the long term and promoting multidisciplinary support for patients and their families, as is the case with the DOCE Project, and in accordance with guidelines of the International Diabetes Center (IDC) (Strock et al., 2004).

Weight control in the face of a more liberal diet with education

The BMI of our patients ranged from 12.9 to 45.5 (mean, 20.3±5.3575). Overweight, diagnosed as BMI between 25 and 29.9 kg/m^2, was found in 32.43%, while obesity, defined as BMI > 30 kg/m^2, was present in 8.1% of the patients.

In a study with 170 DM1 patients including adults, adolescents and children, overweight was found in 21% and obesity in 2.9% of the patients (Moraes et al., 2006). According to Arcanjo et al. (2005) who evaluated 72 patients with DM1, mean age of 22.72±9.60 years, the BMI of these DM1 patients averaged 21.1±3.1 kg/m^2. Marques et al. (2011) noted BMI above normal in 14.1% of the patients in a study with 84 subjects with DM1, 90% of whom had inadequate glycemic control. Liberatore Junior et al. (2008) recorded a 16% prevalence rate of overweight in the DM1 patients.

The SEARCH study reported that 34% of the adolescents with DM1 presented with overweight or obesity, a similar rate as for the young patients that did not have diabetes (33%) (Liu et al., 2010). A Belgian study evaluating a cohort of adults with DM1 found prevalence of 41.9 and 32.1% of overweight in men and women, respectively, and 9 and 16.7% of obesity, respectively (Van Gaal et al., 2002).

Patient age, duration of disease, diagnosis and length of participation in the project

The patients in the present study had a mean age at diagnosis of 10 years. In a study by Silveira et al. (2001) with 126 DM1 subjects, the most frequent age at diagnosis ranged between 11 and 15 years, with 31% of the diagnoses established in that age range.

Diabetic ketoacidosis (DKA) as the first clinical manifestation of the disease was present in 56.8% of the cases. In the aforementioned cited study, this rate was 18%; however, it was mostly associated with worse socioeconomic status (Silveira et al., 2001).

Two studies about DM1 and DKA reported that 25.5% of the patients under 20 years of age were diagnosed with DM1 after an episode of DKA, and 19% of all hospitalizations for DKA were due to newly-diagnosed DM1 (Rewers et al., 2008; Elmehdawi et al., 2010). It remains unclear why some patients develop this condition while others do not.

A recent study showed some factors associated with an increased risk for developing DKA-among them, age below five years, lower BMI, diagnostic delay or error, late initiation of treatment, difficulty of access to health care (Usher-Smith et al., 2010). On the other hand, the presence of a first-degree relative with the disease and higher schooling of parents helps to reduce the incidence of DKA, probably as a result of greater awareness regarding DM1 (Usher-Smith et al., 2010).

Of the 74 patients participating in the DOCE project, 66 (89.18%) had at some time been hospitalized after an episode of DKA; the mean for hospitalizations/patient was 0.73. The number of times the patients were hospitalized as a result of that complication ranged from 0 (no hospitalization) to 3 hospitalizations in some cases. In the cohort of patients studied by Elmehdawi et al. (2010), an average of 1.23 DKA episodes was found; for which 9.876% of the patients had two or more episodes of DKA.

A1C

Mean baseline A1C was 10.539. A reduction of 2.3131 was noted, with a final mean of 8.226, which was significantly lower following the multidisciplinary interventions.

In a study on the efficacy of education for patients on insulin, these received educational support with one monthly session for six months, after which A1C levels were evaluated (Jenhani et al., 2005). A1C values at this moment were ≤ 8 in 61.2% of the cases, while only 33% of the patients had baseline A1C within that range (Jenhani et al., 2005).

In an experiment with camps for type 1 diabetes patients, were effective in providing education to patients with DM1 and reducing A1C levels. This approach, however, was effective only for the first three months after the camp (baseline A1C of 9.0±1.8%; A1C three months after camp of 8.2±1.7 with $p<0.001$; A1C six months after camp of 9.2±2.5 with $p<0.2$). This demonstrates the importance of continued education in order to maintain adequate glycemic control (Koplatadze et al., 2003; Santiprabhob et al., 2008).

The mean follow-up period for our patients was 27.5 months; four months was the minimum duration of the project, and 64 months the maximum. Lower A1C values were found for patients with a longer follow-up period. Table 1 expresses more accurately the findings of this study regarding the relation between A1C and duration of the project. This finding confirms that the process of continued education including educational and behavioral interventions, in conjunction with support for intensive insulin treatment, produce beneficial effects in the management of DM1.

IMPLICATIONS

The DOCE Project was shown to be a very useful tool to aid and foster glycemic control in DM1 patients with freedom and quality of life, as demonstrated through the reduction in A1C and stabilization at lower levels, although the target levels were not achieved.

REFERENCES

Arcanjo CL, Piccirillo LJ, Machado IV, Andrade CR Jr, Clemente EL, Gomes MB (2005). Lipid profile and anthropometrical evaluation in type 1 diabetes. Arq. Bras. Endocrinol. Metab. 49(6):951-958.

Brink SJ, Miller M, Moltz KC (2002). Education and multidisciplinary team care concepts for pediatric and adolescent diabetes mellitus. *J* Pediatr**.** Endocrinol**.** Metab. 15(8):1113-1130.

Campos JJB, Almeida HG, Iochida LC, Franco LJ (1998). Incidence of diabetes mellitus insulin dependent (Type 1) in the city of Londrina, Paraná - Brazil. Arq. Bras. Endocrinol. Metab. 42(1):36-44.

DAFNE Study Group (2005). Training in flexible intensive insulin management to enable dietary freedom in people with type 1 dia bêtes a prospective implemental study. Diabetologia 48(1):965-970.

Delamater AD (2007). Psychological care of children and adolescents with diabetes. Pediatr Diabetes 8:340-348.

Diabetes Control and Complications Trial Research Group (1993). The effect of intensive treatment of diabetes on the development and progression of long-term complications in insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. N. Engl. J. Med. 329:977-986.

Diabetes UK National Paediatric Diabetes Audit (2004). Results from the audit year 2002 London: Diabetes UK, Royal College of Nursing, RCPCH, British Society of Paediatric Endocrinology and Diabetes.

Ferreira SRG, Franco LJ, Vivolo MA, Negrato CA, Simões ACP, Venturelli CR(1993). Population based incidence of IDDM in the state of São Paulo, Brazil. Diabetes Care 16:701-704.

Fisher EB, Brownson CA, O'Toole ML, Anwuri VV, Shetty GS (2007). Perspectives on self-management from the diabetes initiative of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Diabetes Educ. 33:216-224.

Halimi S, Benhamou PY (2004). Diabetes, a worldwide disease. Presse Med. 33:37-40.

Koplatadze K, Koplatadze M, Kacharava L, James R (2003). Diabetes camps: An international experience. Mo. Med. 100(2):145-147.

Laron Z, Galatzer A, Amir S, Gil R, Karp M, Mimouni M (1979). A multidisciplinary, comprehensive, ambulatory treatment scheme for diabetes mellitus in children. Diabetes Care 2:342-348.

Leite SAO, Zanim LM, Granzotto PCD, Heupa S, Lamounier RN (2008). Educational program to type 1 diabetes mellitus patients: Basic topics. Arq. Bras. Endocrino. Metab. 52(2):233-242.

Liberatore Junior RDR, Dermatini AAC, Ono AHA, Andrade GC (2008). Prevalence of obesity in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes mellitus. Rev. Paul Pediatr. 26(2):142-145.

Liu LL, Lawrence JM, Davis C, Liese AD, Pettitt DJ, Pihoker C, Dabelea D, Hamman R, Waitzfelder B, Kahn HS; SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study Group (2010). Prevalence of overweight and obesity in youth with diabetes in USA: The SEARCH for diabetes in Youth Study. Pediatr. Diabetes 11:4-11.

Marques RMB, Fornés NS, Stringhini MLF (2011). Socioeconomic, demographic, nutritional, and physical activity factors in the glycemic control of adolescents with type 1 diabetes mellitus. Arq. Bras. Endocrinol. Metab. 55(3):194-202.

Moraes CM, Portella RB, Pinheiro VS, Oliveira MMS, Fuks AG, Cunha EF, Gomes MB (2003). Prevalence of overweight and obesity in type 1 diabetic patients. Arq. Bras. Endocrinol. Metab. 47(6):667-683.

Murphy HR, Rayman G, Skinner TC (2006). Psycho-educational interventions for children and young people with type 1 diabetes. Diabet. Med. 23:935-943.

Nascimento LC, Amaral MJ, Sparapani Vde C, Fonseca LM, Nunes MD, Dupas G (2011). Type 1 diabetes mellitus: evidence from the literature for appropriate management in children's perspective. Rev. Esc. Enferm. USP. 45(3):764-769.

Norris SL, Engelgau MM, Narayan KMV (2001). Effectiveness of self-management training in type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Care 24:561-587.

Jose LP, Cardoso-Demartini Ade A, Liberatore Junior RD, Paulino MF, Lemos-Marini SH, Guerra-Júnior G, Rodrigues AG (2009). Clinical and laboratory profile of pediatric and adolescent patients with type 1 diabetes. J. Pediatr. (Rio J) 85(6):490-494.

Paulino MFVM, Lemos-Marini SHV, Guerra-Junior G, Minicucci WJ, Mendes CT, Morcillo AM (2006). Growth and Body Composition in Children With Type 1 Diabetes Mellitus. Arq. Bras. Endocrinol. Metab. 50(3):490-498.

Rewers A, Klingensmith G, Davis C, Petitti DB, Pihoker C, Rodriguez B, Schwartz ID, Imperatore G, Williams D, Dolan LM, Dabelea D (2008). Presence of diabetic ketoacidosis at diagnosis of diabetes mellitus in youth: the Search for Diabetes in Youth Study. Pediatrics 121(5):e1258-1266.

Rickheim PR, Weaver TW, Flader JL, Kendall DM (2002). Assessment of group versus individual diabetes education. Diabetes Care 25:269-274.

Santiprabhob J, Likitmaskul S, Kiattisakthavee P, Weerakulwattana P, Chaichanwattanakul K, Nakavachara P, Peerapatdit T, Nitiyanant W (2008). Glycemic control and the psychosocial benefits gained by patients with type 1 diabetes mellitus attending the diabetes camp. Patient Educ. Couns. 73(1):60-66.

Secrest AM, Costacou T, Gutelius B, Miller RG, Songer TJ, Orchard TJ

(2011). Association of socioeconomic status with mortality in type 1 diabetes: The Pittsburgh epidemiology of diabetes complications study. Ann. Epidemiol. 21(5):367-373.
Silveira VMF, Menezes AMB, Post CLA, Machado EC (2001). A sample of type 1 diabetes patients in South Brazil. Arq. Bras. Endocrinol. Metab. 45(5):433-440.
Strock E, Robinson R, Cooper N, Lima J (2004). Staged diabetes management: Curriculum. Minneapolis, MN, USA: International Diabetes Center. Diabetes Educ. 2004.
Van Gaal L, De Leeuuw I, Joossen P, Abrams P (2002). Obesity and insulin resistance in type 1 diabetes and childhood. Diabetologia 45(suppl):A90.
Weyhreter H, Holl RW, Beerstecher AM, Borsch M (2008). Additional treatment supporting standard care for children and adolescents with diabetes mellitus type I - indication, acceptance and outcome: results from a multi-centre observational study. Klin. Padiatr. 220(2):70-76.
Wysocki T, Greco P, Harris MA, Bubb J, White NH (2001). Behavior therapy for families for adolescents of diabetes: Maintenance of treatment effects. Diabetes Care 24:441-446.

UPCOMING CONFERENCES

14th Annual Scottish Conference of the Diabetic Foot

20th World congress on Parkinson's Disease and Related Disorders, Geneva, Switzerland, 8 Dec 2013

Conferences and Advert

October 2013
7th World Congress on Diabetes & Obesity, Riga, Latvia, 24 Oct 2013

November 2013
4th International Diabetic Foot Conference

December 2013
20th World congress on Parkinson's Disease and Related Disorders, Geneva, Switzerland, 8 Dec 2013

Journal of Diabetes and Endocrinology



Related Journals Published by Academic Journals

- *African Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology*
- *Journal of Dentistry and Oral Hygiene*
- *International Journal of Nursing and Midwifery*
- *Clinical Reviews and Opinions*
- *Journal of AIDS and HIV Research*
- *International Journal of Nutrition and Metabolism*

academicJournals