

Pharmacogenomics

Pharmacogenetics of oral antidiabetic therapy

Journal:	<i>Pharmacogenomics</i>
Manuscript ID	PGS-2017-0195.R1
Manuscript Type:	Review
Keywords:	Type 2 Diabetes (T2D), oral antidiabetic drugs (OAD), interindividual differences

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review Only

Abstract

Type 2 diabetes prevalence is still on the rise worldwide. Antidiabetic drugs are widely prescribed to patients with type 2 diabetes. Most patients start with metformin which is mostly well tolerated. However, a high percentage of patients fail to achieve glycaemic control. The effectiveness of metformin as well as most other antidiabetic drugs depends among other factors on interindividual genetic differences that are up to now ignored in the treatment of type 2 diabetes. Interestingly, many genes influencing the effectiveness of antidiabetic drugs are type 2 diabetes risk genes making matters worse. Here, we shed light on these interindividual genetic differences.

Keywords: Type 2 Diabetes (T2D), oral antidiabetic drugs (OAD), interindividual differences

Executive Summary:

- The treatment success of most oral antidiabetic drugs depends among other factors on polymorphisms in classic pharmacogenomics genes but also in known T2D risk genes
- Even though many patients don't achieve desired blood glucose levels with metformin treatment and there are many polymorphisms known to influence treatments outcome in most cases it is not replaced but merely supplemented by one or more antidiabetic drugs
- Pharmacogenomic testing would lead to reduced costs for medication and hospitalization but also to personal health benefits for the patients

Introduction

Type 2 Diabetes (T2D) comprises a group of heterogeneous disorders with the common trait of peripheral insulin resistance combined with pancreatic beta-cell impairment leading to hyperglycaemia (1). A high percentage of patients with T2D remain undiagnosed and among those treated for the disease many have poorly controlled diabetes prompting neurological as well as renal complications and peripheral vascular disease, leading to increased health care expenditures (2). T2D prevalence is still on the rise worldwide especially in the developing world with serious health-related and socioeconomic consequences (3), making more effective T2D management to be desired. Genetics play a role in disease development but also in oral antidiabetic drug (OAD) treatment outcomes and may help define individually tailored therapies. The first T2D risk genes to be identified were *PPARG* (rs1801282), *KCNJ11/ABCC8* (rs5219/rs757110) and *TCF7L2* (rs7903146) (4), respectively. Shortly after, it was discovered that polymorphisms in *KCNJ11* and *PPARG* act in additive manner to increase T2D risk (5). However there are also polymorphisms that can rescue T2D-provoking traits of polymorphisms like it is the case in *TCF7L2* and *Nor-1* as we were able to show (6), leading to a complicated interaction of different polymorphisms. Aggravatingly, it gets more and more obvious that the treatment outcome of OADs depends on polymorphisms in a plethora of genes. This review will discuss well-studied polymorphisms.

T2D medication

Currently there are 12 drug classes available for T2D management: biguanides (metformin), thiazolidinediones (glitazones), α -glucosidase inhibitors, sulfonylureas (SU), meglitinides (glinides), dipeptidyl peptidase 4 (*DPP4*) inhibitors (gliptins), incretin mimetics (aka **GLP-1 receptor agonists**), sodium/glucose cotransporter 2 (*SGLT2*) inhibitors (gliflozins), amylin mimetics, bile acid sequestrants, dopamine agonists and insulin/insulin analogues. This review will focus on oral antidiabetic drugs rather than injectable antidiabetic drugs due to a lack of pharmacogenetics data to date on the latter. Apart from amylin mimetics, incretin mimetics and insulin/insulin analogues, all are administered orally. **Together with lifestyle intervention**, metformin is usually prescribed as first-line therapy. Only when metformin is not well tolerated or the treatment goal is still not achieved after several months of treatment a combination therapy of metformin and one or more other antidiabetic drugs are prescribed. The extent to which these drugs are efficient or cause side effects significantly varies within the T2D population. This is due to physiological (age, sex, BMI) and pathological (liver or

1
2
3 kidney diseases) conditions, as well as lifestyle-related factors (alcohol and drug use,
4 smoking) (7). A major factor, however, are interindividual genetic differences. The relatively
5 new field in diabetes research, pharmacogenomics, is addressing this issue. By understanding
6 interindividual variations in DNA sequence related to drug treatment outcomes, this field of
7 research aims at developing a more personalized T2D management.
8
9
10

11 It is estimated that 20% to 40% of interindividual differences in metabolism and response to
12 pharmacological drugs is accounted for by genetic factors (8). Even though the field of
13 pharmacogenomics has existed for decades, the implementation of genetic testing in patient
14 care has been very slow. In the field of diabetes, only testing for monogenic diabetes is
15 already standard. Test results are crucially influencing further treatment (9). Pharmacogenetic
16 testing in T2D is in its infancy even though evidence is accumulating that distinct common
17 polymorphisms may robustly influence oral antidiabetic drug treatment outcomes.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Biguanides (Metformin)**

25
26 Most patients with T2D needing pharmacological intervention start on metformin (10). By
27 now metformin is the only available biguanide since other drugs in this class were shown to
28 increase the risk for lactic acidosis, e.g. phenformin and buformin. Metformin might induce
29 lactic acidosis in patients with renal insufficiency, therefore it is not prescribed in this
30 subgroup of patients with T2D (11). Metformin is in clinical use since 1959 but its molecular
31 mechanisms of action are still not entirely understood. One proposed mode of action is AMP-
32 activated protein kinase (AMPK) activation (12). Metformin works as an insulin sensitizer,
33 enhancing insulin sensitivity in liver, skeletal muscle and adipose tissue (13). Metformin
34 shows benefits in patients with T2D beyond glucose lowering, like reduced cancer incidence
35 and mortality (14) and reduced cardiovascular risk (15;16). This drug is also used in
36 reproduction management in women with polycystic ovary syndrome where it reduces the
37 risk of miscarriage (17).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Metformin reduces hepatic glucose output, therefore reducing blood glucose levels and
48 HbA1c by 1-2% (18). However, there is considerable variation in response to metformin
49 monotherapy, with about 35% of the patients failing to achieve glycaemic control (19) and
50 many patients becoming less responsive to metformin over time (20). In addition, side effects
51 like nausea, vomiting, stomach upset, diarrhoea and metallic taste in the mouth can occur,
52 leading to discontinuance of the treatment in some cases (21). Glycaemic response to
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 metformin is heritable and is thus, in part, attributed to genetics (22). The genetic
4 contribution to this variability in response to metformin treatment has been studied with a
5 focus on pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics. Metformin is not metabolized in the liver
6 (23), but its efficacy is highly dependent on several transport proteins, including organic
7 cation transporter (OCT) family members OCT1-3 (solute carrier (SLC) family members
8 22A1-3, *SCL22A1-3*), the equilibrative nucleoside transporter 4 (ENT4, aka *SLC29A4*), and
9 the multidrug and toxin extrusion transporters 1 and 2-K (MATE1 and MATE2-K, aka
10 *SLC47A1* and *SLC47A2*) (19). Metformin is absorbed in the gut by ENT4 and OCT3
11 expressed on enterocytes and passed on into the blood stream via OCT1. Metformin is
12 excreted via bile or urine. In the liver, OCT1 and OCT3 transport metformin into the
13 hepatocyte while MATE1 excrete it into the bile. In the kidney, OCT2 is responsible for the
14 uptake of metformin into renal tubular cells, and it is excreted into the urine via MATE2-K,
15 MATE1 and OCT1. Polymorphisms in these transporter proteins may influence the uptake as
16 well as the excretion of metformin. We recently published a very detailed account of these
17 polymorphisms and their reported effects (24). Polymorphisms in the highly polymorphic
18 OCT1 gene are reported to predominantly reduce metformin release from the enterocyte into
19 the bloodstream compared with the attenuation of hepatic metformin uptake. Research
20 focuses on the following polymorphisms: Arg61Cys, Gly401Ser, Met420del, Gly465Arg and
21 Ser189Leu. The more polymorphisms one subject carries, the lower is the effect of
22 metformin on blood glucose and HbA1c reduction. Additionally, metformin intolerance was
23 seen in carriers of two reduced-function alleles compared to carriers of one or none allele
24 (25). The exact localisation of OCT1 in the enterocyte is still debated. It is not clear whether
25 OCT1 polymorphisms lead to increased intra-enterocyte concentrations or whether reduced
26 absorption of metformin leads to increased luminal metformin concentration. Increased
27 metformin concentrations in the gut may affect intestinal serotonin concentration, bile salt
28 absorption or alter the microbiome potentially leading to gastrointestinal side effects. One
29 factor also leading to metformin intolerance is concomitant treatment with OCT1 inhibiting
30 drugs like citalopram, PPIs, verapamil, doxazosin, and codeine (25).

31
32 Renal excretion of metformin is mainly mediated by OCT2 (26;27). It harbours an interesting
33 polymorphism, Ala270Ser (rs316019): in Caucasian and African American subjects it is
34 associated with enhanced clearance of metformin (28), while in Asian subjects it is associated
35 with higher plasma metformin levels and reduced renal clearance (29;30). Another OCT2
36 variant, Thr201Met, is associated to higher HbA1c, fasting glucose levels, insulin resistance
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and insulin secretion during metformin treatment (31). Latest research indicates a role for
4 OCT3 polymorphisms in metformin action (32). Two polymorphisms in the 5'-flanking
5 region of *SCL22A2* (OCT2), rs3119309 and rs7757336, and one in the 5'-flanking region of
6 *SCL22A3* (OCT3), rs2481030, were associated with short-term response to metformin
7 monotherapy in patients with T2D (32). Several polymorphisms in *SLC47A1* (MATE1)
8 (rs2252281 (33), rs2289669 (34), rs8065082 (35)) were identified to be associated with
9 metformin performance. They were however not confirmed in the South Danish Diabetes
10 Study (36). A-allele carriers of rs12943590 in *SLC47A2* (MATE2-K) show higher renal
11 metformin clearance and higher glucose levels during oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT)
12 (33). Finally, ENT4 gene (*SLC29A4*) polymorphisms rs2685753, rs3889348, rs4720572,
13 rs4299914, and rs6971788 were associated with lower metformin concentrations in blood
14 possibly due to impaired enterocytic metformin uptake (36).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 However, a vast number of these associations were not replicated in a large-scale meta-
24 analysis across the cohorts of the Metformin Genetics (MetGen) Consortium, questioning the
25 impact transporter gene variants have on the variability of glycemic response to metformin in
26 T2D (37). Whether kinds of transporter gene variants not assessed yet, such as rare variants,
27 copy number variants or epigenetic modifications, may play a role in the variation of
28 treatment response to metformin has to be addressed in future studies.
29
30
31
32
33

34 Obvious pharmacogenetic candidates for metformin action are the genes encoding for AMPK
35 subunits. An interesting large-scale candidate gene genotyping study in 2010 analysed the
36 association of polymorphisms in 40 genes associated to T2D with metformin treatment
37 outcome. Among others, they found SNPs in the AMPK subunit genes *PRKAA1* and
38 *PRKAA2* to interact with metformin response (35). Other interesting polygenic genes in this
39 context were the AMPK upstream regulatory kinase serine/threonine kinase 11 (*STK11*, aka
40 liver kinase B1 (LKB1); rs741765 C>T), the AMPK downstream transcription factors
41 myocyte-specific enhancer factor (MEF) 2A and *MEF2D* (rs4424892 A>G and rs6666307
42 A>T, respectively), and in the T2D risk genes *HNF1B* (rs11868513 G>A), *HNF4A*
43 (rs11086926 T>G), *ABCC8* (rs4148609 G>A), *KCNJ11* (rs7124355 G>A), *GCK* (rs2908289
44 G>A), and *CAPN10* (rs3792269 A>G) (35). Among the aforementioned SNPs, Tkac *et al.*
45 tested SNPs in *PRKAA1*, *STK11*, *HNF4A*, and *CAPN10* for association with treatment
46 success (HbA1c <7 %) and absolute reduction in HbA1c after six months of metformin
47 monotherapy in 148 drug-naïve patients with T2D but could only show less treatment success
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in G-allele carriers of *CAPN10* SNP rs3792269 A>G (38). However this population was
4 much smaller than the at-risk population of the Diabetes Prevention Program (DPP) with 990
5 participants on metformin. Using a large Scottish observational genetic cohort of European
6 ancestry the GoDARTS (Genetics of Diabetes and Audit Research Tayside Study) identified
7 a common polymorphism at a locus containing the ataxia telangiectasia mutated (*ATM*) gene
8 to be associated with metformin treatment success. The well powered GWA study identified
9 rs11212617 to increase the treatment success 1.35-fold, and reduced the HbA1c by 0.11% per
10 minor C-allele (39). In this case, GWAS was very useful since *ATM* does not harbour an
11 established candidate gene and would have been missed in a hypothesis-led approach. The
12 MetGen Consortium identified rs8192675 in the intron of *SLC2A2*, encoding the facilitated
13 glucose transporter GLUT2, to be associated with greater metformin-induced HbA1c
14 reduction in 10,577 participants of European ancestry. The same SNP was associated with
15 GLUT2 expression in the liver. The transporter is thought to be one target of metformin by
16 which hepatic glucose output reduction is achieved (40). GLUT2 also represents a T2D risk
17 allele (41). Another approach taken was to analyse transcription factors controlling transport
18 gene expression revealing polymorphisms in SP1, AP2, HNF4- α , and PPAR- α to be
19 associated with metformin action (42). SP1 is probably regulating the expression of several
20 transport proteins in the liver involved in metformin elimination. The role of PPAR- α on the
21 other hand is less clear. However these transcription factors are also implicated in the
22 pharmacogenomics of other drugs. For example *PPARA* *Leu162Val* (rs1800206) is
23 implicated in the efficacy of gemfibrozil and fenofibrate, two drugs prescribed for
24 hypertriglyceridemia and dyslipidaemia (43), common metabolic disorders in T2D. These
25 pharmacogenetic data at least partly explain why metformin does not work in all patients.
26 Still, metformin in most cases is not substituted by a different OAD when treatment goals are
27 not achieved but is further prescribed even though it might not be effective at all in the first
28 place.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Genome-wide analyses of the MetGen consortium that provided with *SLC2A2* rs8192675 a
47 very robust and mechanistically very plausible result were unable to replicate any of the other
48 candidate gene variants affecting metformin pharmacodynamics (40). However, the small
49 effect size of the GLUT2 variant is insufficient to explain a relevant part of the variation in
50 treatment response. It therefore remains to be shown whether kinds of candidate gene variants
51 not investigated yet (e.g., rare variants, copy number variants or epigenetic modifications)
52 may play a role in the variation of treatment response.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Hence, even though metformin is still the drug of choice for starting pharmacological T2D management (10;44;45), there are more and more publications demanding more personalized approaches (46;47). Additionally many patients initially on metformin require escalation of therapy (48) and about 20% of patients fail to meet glycaemic goals in the first 5 years of metformin therapy (20). In young patients with newly diagnosed T2D the failure rate even exceeds 50% (49). Therefore, a substantial part of patients with T2D requires one or more oral antidiabetic drugs in addition to metformin. The list of oral antidiabetic drugs might seem long, however it is shortened by the fact that glitazones are no longer marketed in some European countries and are put under selling restrictions in the US due to a possibly increased risk of myocardial infarction and increased risks of distal fractures of long bones, bladder cancer and heart failure (50). Additionally, 12% to 45% of patients with T2D receiving pioglitazone or rosiglitazone failed to achieve sufficient HbA1c reduction (51). Polymorphisms in *PPARG*, *ADIPOQ1*, *CYP2C8*, *CYP2C9* and *CYP3A4* (52) are associated with effectiveness of glitazones. Among others, polymorphisms in *CYP2P9* are also associated with the effectiveness of ACE inhibitors often prescribed to patients with T2D (53). Treatment with α -glucosidase inhibitors often leads to adverse gastrointestinal side-effects like flatulence and diarrhoea and are rarely prescribed (54). Until now no pharmacogenetic data emerged for α -glucosidase inhibitors. Bile acid sequestrants and dopamine agonists are rarely prescribed for T2D management. Remaining are sulfonylurea, meglitinides, DPP4 inhibitors and SGLT2 inhibitors that are prescribed for T2D management.

Sulfonylureas

Sulfonylureas lower blood glucose by blocking the K_{ATP} channels in the β cells and thereby increasing insulin secretion. Additionally SU limit hepatic gluconeogenesis (due to increased insulin levels) and the clearance of insulin in the liver. They are prescribed as second-line or add-on treatment in T2D management (55). However, sulfonylureas are β -cell stressors and are suspected to accelerate the exhaustion of endogenous insulin secretion (56). Further unwanted side effects are weight gain, increased risk of hypoglycaemia (57) and increased risk of cardiovascular events and mortality (58). *KCNJ11/ABCC8* and *TCF7L2* belong to a long list of genetic markers predicting sulfonylurea treatment outcomes. Other genes associated with SU treatment outcomes are *IRS1*, *CDKAL1*, *CDKN2A/2B* and *KCNQ1* (59). Interestingly, all these genes are also T2D susceptibility genes. Polymorphisms in *KCNJ11*

1
2
3 and *ABCC8* affect the pharmacodynamics of sulfonylureas. They encode for the inward-
4 rectifier potassium ion channels (Kir6.2) and ATP-binding cassette transporters known as
5 sulfonylurea receptors (SUR-1). Four of each form the K_{ATP} channel (ATP-sensitive K^+
6 channel). SU bind directly to the K_{ATP} channel on SUR-1 resulting in their closure and
7 depolarisation which in turn leads to a cascade of events leading to insulin release from the β
8 cells (60). Latest studies on polymorphisms in *KCNJ11* and *ABCC8* and their effect on OAD
9 treatment outcomes strongly vary in SU concentration used, duration and ethnicity of the
10 population. The most widely studied *KCNJ11* polymorphism to date is rs5219 that leads to
11 the replacement of glutamine (E) by lysine (K) in the amino-acid sequence of the protein. It
12 seems that the E23K polymorphism in long-term SU treatment is associated with secondary
13 failure to SU (61), while there is a report showing an improvement of HbA1c after only 2
14 months of SU treatment in E23K carriers (62). *ABCC8* harbours three polymorphisms
15 associated to SU response (rs757110 (S1369A), rs1799854 (intron) and rs1799859
16 (AGG1273AGA)). Carriers of the rs757110 missense polymorphism in the SUR-1 protein
17 seem to have higher odds of responding to gliclazide treatment. However, after short-term
18 treatment there doesn't seem to be an association (63). E23K in *KCNJ11* and S1369A in
19 *ABCC8*, are in strong linkage disequilibrium.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 The evidence for the involvement of *TCF7L2* polymorphisms in sulfonylurea action is more
32 compelling. There are several well-powered studies showing under similar conditions an
33 increased risk of sulfonylurea failure in T-allele carriers of the rs7903146 variant. Patients
34 were treated over a period of six months with SU in combination with metformin, and
35 sulfonylurea failure was defined as failure to lower HbA1c below 7%. Interestingly, between
36 25% and 30% of the world population are T-allele carriers while the proportion in East Asian
37 populations is below 5%. As a common T2D risk allele, it is by nature even higher in patients
38 with T2D. *TCF7L2* harbours a second polymorphism, rs12255372, associated with reduced
39 response to SU treatment and increased T2D risk, which is in strong linkage disequilibrium
40 with rs7903146 (64).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *IRS1* gene polymorphism rs1801278 is strongly associated with insulin resistance but also
49 with sulfonylurea failure as was shown in an Italian as well as in an Egyptian population (59).
50 As for many other drugs SU action is affected by CYP450 enzymes. In this context, *CYP2C9*
51 and *CYP2C19* are of interest. Individuals with variants in these genes are labelled poor
52 metabolizers. It was found that Dutch carriers of *CYP2C9**1/3, *2/3 or *3/3 needed
53 significantly lower tolbutamide dose compared to *CYP2C9**1/*1, *1/*2 or *2/*2 carriers
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

probably due to higher blood concentrations of the drug accounted for by lower metabolism by the CYP2C9 enzyme in the risk allele carriers (65). Interestingly the CYP2C19 variants are very common in Asians (19%) compared to Caucasians (2%) which is clinically relevant (65).

According to FDA black-box warnings on drug labels, certain sulfonylureas (<https://www.fda.gov/drugs/scienceresearch/researchareas/pharmacogenetics/ucm083378.htm>) should be prescribed with precaution in patients with underlying *glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase* (G6PD) deficiency since haemolytic acute anaemia can occur depending of G6PD enzymatic activity (66). The gene for G6PD is on the X chromosome and G6PD deficiency is caused by various mutations and polymorphisms in this gene (67). G6PD activity is tested by quantitative spectrophotometric assay in red blood cells or with commercially available kits (67). Interestingly, G6PD deficiency is also associated with an increased prevalence of diabetes in 45-65-year-old patients with this deficiency (68). G6PD is most prevalent in sub-Saharan Africa, Asia and the Mediterranean but also in the United States and South America (69). But, with people migrating to all parts of the world the lines get more and more blurred.

Taken all these data together, it might explain why the use of sulfonylureas is more and more discontinued due to adverse effects with the UK being an exception (10). This trend started around the year 2000 in Germany, Belgium and Sweden (70).

Meglitinides

Meglitinides (glinitides) are short-acting (in contrast to SU) insulin secretagogues stimulating insulin secretion by blocking ATP-dependent potassium channels and causing calcium influx to pancreatic β cells. Most of the drugs in this class show a weak binding to SUR1, however, repaglinide might also bind to Kir6.2 (71). The response to meglitinides was associated to SNPs in *SLCO1B1*, *OATP1B1*, *CYP2C9*, *CYP2C8* and *CYP3A4* (72).

DPP4 inhibitors

In response to food intake, the intestinal L- and K-cells secrete the incretin hormones glucagon-like peptide 1 (GLP1) and gastric inhibitory peptide (GIP). Their natural half-life is short (1.5-2min) because the enzyme dipeptidyl peptidase 4 (DPP4) cleaves and inactivates the incretins rapidly (73). DPP4 inhibitors inhibit the degradation of incretins and therefore

1
2
3 prolong incretin-stimulated insulin secretion by pancreatic β cells (73). Even though DPP4
4 inhibitors are in general well tolerated and prescribed as a second-line therapy on a regular
5 basis (10), there is still a considerable inter-individual variance in the responsiveness to these
6 drugs (74). TCF7L2 acts downstream of the incretin receptors and is involved in the
7 exocytosis of insulin. Homozygous T2D risk allele carriers of the rs7903146 variant showed
8 reduced responsiveness to linagliptin in regard to HbA1c lowering (75). Using a genotyping
9 array designed for genetic studies, a locus near *CTRB1/2* rs7202877, which is a known
10 susceptibility gene for T2D, was identified to associate with reduced lowering of HbA1c in
11 minor G-allele carriers (76). The gene encoding for DPP4 also harbours a locus (rs6741949)
12 associated with markedly reduced glucose-induced GLP1 levels, reduced insulin secretory
13 capacity, and increased fasting and 2-hour glucose concentrations during an OGTT (77).
14 DPP4 gene polymorphism rs12617656 is associated to T2D in Malaysian subjects (78).
15 Latest research has revealed several new genes involved in DPP4 inhibitor responsiveness. In
16 a Korean cohort of patients with T2D, a variant in the *GLP-1R* gene, encoding the GLP1
17 receptor, was associated with better response to DPP4 inhibitors. Among the carriers of the
18 minor A-allele were more responders compared to the major genotype (GG) (79). Another
19 polymorphism rs6923761 (Gly168Ser) in *GLP-1R* was identified in 140 European patients
20 with T2D after 6 months of gliptin treatment. Here reduced HbA1c was the main outcome of
21 the study (80). A polymorphism in the T2D risk gene *KCNQ1* (rs163184) was found to
22 associate with less HbA1c reduction in the minor G-allele homozygotes compared to TT-
23 major allele carriers (81). In a small Taiwanese T2D population, several genes were
24 identified using an assumption-free genome-wide association study as possible genes
25 involved in DPP4 inhibitor response (*PRKD1*, *CNTN3*, *ASK*, and *LOC10537792*). *PRKD1*
26 (rs57803087) was strongly associated to DPP4 inhibitor response, however results did not
27 reach statistical significance after Bonferroni correction and therefore need to be replicated in
28 larger cohorts (82). Even though to this day there are no studies published yet analysing the
29 pharmacogenomics of incretin mimetics, it is conceivable that polymorphisms affecting
30 incretin action like those in *TCF7L2* and *WFS1* might be of interest (83) as are
31 polymorphisms in *GLP-1R* that lead to loss of peptide-induced response (84). But it also
32 needs to be taken into account that there are polymorphisms counteracting the effect of other
33 polymorphisms as it is the case for Nor-1 (*NR4A3*): we were able to show rs12686676 in
34 *NR4A3* fully rescues incretin resistance provoked by *TCF7L2* rs7903146 (6). This makes
35 things more complicated, but of course explains why there is no absolute effect of single
36 polymorphisms.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

SGLT2 inhibitors

SGLT2 inhibitors lower blood glucose by increasing glucose excretion via the urine. SGLT2 and SGTL1 are expressed in the proximal convoluted tubule of the nephron and are reabsorbing 90% and 3% of the glucose from the urine, respectively (85). Therefore, inhibition of the cotransporters significantly lowers blood glucose. SGLT2 was also shown to be expressed in the pancreatic islets of Langerhans and inhibition induced glucagon secretion (86). Co-treatment of mice with metformin and SGLT2 inhibitors exhibits beneficial effects by suppressing endogenous glucose production (87). SGLT2 inhibitors are well tolerated and show cardioprotective properties (88). However, there were some side effects reported like increased risk for ketoacidosis, urinary tract infections and hypoglycaemia (88). Also, an increased risk for lower limb amputation was reported for canagliflozin treatment (88). Common noncoding polymorphisms (rs9924771 G/A and rs9934336 G/A in intron 1 and rs3813008 G/A and rs3116150 G/A in intron 5) in SGLT2 did not show any effects on fasting nor glucose-suppressed plasma glucagon concentrations (89). But rs3116150 was associated with fasting glycaemia, glucose excursions during the 5-point OGTT (AUC glucose), and systolic blood pressure (90). In another study, rs9934336 was associated with 2-hour insulin concentrations during OGTT in two German cohorts (91). Since the SGLT2 inhibitors are a very novel class of drugs in T2D management, there are not many data available yet in regard to their pharmacogenomics. Four tested polymorphisms in SGLT2 don't seem to have any impact on SGLT2 inhibitor responsiveness (90).

It has to be noted that the variants shown in small studies to interact with treatment response to sulfonylureas, meglitinides, DPP4- and SGLT2 inhibitors clearly should be considered as hypothesis-generating candidates that need to be followed up in larger treatment studies and in meta-analyses thereof. Time will bring more clarity which gene-drug pairs will withstand large-scale replication efforts and, for instance, will have the potential to be integrated in electronic health records.

Conclusions & future perspective

It is becoming increasingly evident that the treatment outcome with OAD differs strongly between individuals and that a personalized approach would make sense. Among other factors influencing the effectiveness of OAD are gene polymorphisms. However, the current guidelines do not consider individual variation to therapeutic response yet. Since sequencing

1
2
3 costs are constantly decreasing genetic testing in T2D may become feasible in the future and
4 could provide benefits for patients' outcome. One possibility could be a once-in-a-lifetime
5 genome-wide genetic test the patients could benefit their entire life from not only with respect
6 to T2D therapy (92). By avoiding inefficient or even adverse medication, genetic testing
7 could not only lead to reduced costs for medication and hospitalization but also to personal
8 health benefits for the patients (8). In other fields of medicine like breast cancer whole-
9 genome analysis is more common and costs have declined over time due to reduced
10 sequencing costs. However, they are still very costly to date and not expected to reach critical
11 thresholds within the next 10 years (93). But whole-genome analysis would have the benefit
12 over targeted sequencing in respect to the discovery of new polymorphisms in the future. No
13 further testing would be needed (94). The interpretation of such pharmacogenetic data is not
14 trivial and gene-gene (95) and gene-environment interaction for example must be taken into
15 account and generated data would have to be presented in a comprehensible manner to health
16 care providers.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Currently, it appears as if gene polymorphisms influencing the treatment outcome of OAD
can be roughly divided into two groups: the classical pharmacogenomics genes influencing
pharmacokinetics/pharmacodynamics (e.g., *SLC2A2*) and T2D risk genes. Like for many
other drugs, the effectiveness of OAD depends on metabolizing enzymes and transport
proteins (96). The former include drug transporters, CYP450 enzymes and transcription
regulators. These are already included in existing pharmacogenomic chips like the DMET™
Microarray (97). If replicated in larger studies and meta-analyses thereof, interindividual
variation in response to OADs could turn out to be associated with polymorphisms with the
highest odds ratio for T2D (98) (Table 1). The latter include polymorphisms in the T2D risk
genes *TCF7L2*, *KCNJ11*, *IRS1* and *PPARG*. If corroborated, these T2D risk genes involved
in OAD treatment outcome would have to be included in novel pharmacogenetic chips or in
the case of a genome-wide test would be needed to be taken into consideration.

These T2D risk genes represent a double edges sword. *TCF7L2* polymorphism rs7903146 for
example with an allele frequency of up to 30% (Europeans and South Asians) has a negative
impact on various aspects of β -cell function like impaired proinsulin conversion and insulin
secretion (99;100) and influences the treatment outcome of SU (59) and DPP4 inhibitors (75)
as discussed above. Therefore, not only do these genes increase the risk for developing T2D
and have an increased allele frequency in this patient group but they additionally influence

1
2
3 the treatment outcome of the very drugs intended to treat the disease. This could in part
4 explain the poor overall treatment success of OAD.
5

6
7 **Disclosures:** The authors have no conflicts of interest related to this work.

8
9 **Author contributions:** A.-M.O. wrote the manuscript. H.-U.H., M.H.d.A. and H.S.
10 commented on and edited the manuscript.
11

12 13 14 15 **Reference List**

- 16
17 (1) Cerf ME: Beta cell dysfunction and insulin resistance. *Front Endocrinol.(Lausanne)*
18 4, 37- (2013).
19
- 20 (2) Dall TM, Yang W, Halder P *et al*: Type 2 diabetes detection and management among
21 insured adults. *Popul.Health Metr.* 14, 43- (2016).
22
- 23 (3) IDF Diabetes Atlas - 7th Edition. [cited 2017 Apr 1]. Available from
24 www.diabetesatlas.org.
25
- 26 (4) Billings LK , Florez JC: The genetics of type 2 diabetes: what have we learned from
27 GWAS? *Ann.N.Y.Acad.Sci.* 1212, 59-77 (2010).
28
- 29 (5) Hansen SK, Nielsen EM, Ek J *et al*: Analysis of separate and combined effects of
30 common variation in KCNJ11 and PPARG on risk of type 2 diabetes.
31 *J.Clin.Endocrinol.Metab* 90(6), 3629-3637 (2005).
32
- 33 (6) Ordelheide AM, Gerst F, Rothfuss O *et al*: Nor-1, a novel incretin-responsive
34 regulator of insulin genes and insulin secretion. *Mol.Metab* 2(3), 243-255 (2013).
35
- 36 (7) Prescott LF: Pathological and Physiological Factors Affecting Drug Absorption,
37 Distribution, Elimination, and Response in Man. *Concepts in Biochemical*
38 *Pharmacology* (1975).
39
- 40 (8) Ventola CL: The role of pharmacogenomic biomarkers in predicting and improving
41 drug response: part 2: challenges impeding clinical implementation. *P.T.* 38(10), 624-
42 627 (2013).
43
- 44 (9) Owen KR: Treating young adults with type 2 diabetes or monogenic diabetes.
45 *Best.Pract.Res.Clin.Endocrinol.Metab* 30(3), 455-467 (2016).
46
- 47 (10) Overbeek JA, Heintjes EM, Prieto-Alhambra D *et al*: Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus
48 Treatment Patterns Across Europe: A Population-based Multi-database Study.
49 *Clin.Ther.* 39(4), 759-770 (2017).
50
- 51 (11) Pasquel FJ, Klein R, Adigweme A *et al*: Metformin-associated lactic acidosis.
52 *Am.J.Med.Sci.* 349(3), 263-267 (2015).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
- 2
- 3 (12) Rena G, Pearson ER, Sakamoto K: Molecular mechanism of action of metformin: old
- 4 or new insights? *Diabetologia* 56(9), 1898-1906 (2013).
- 5
- 6 (13) Giannarelli R, Aragona M, Coppelli A, Del Prato S: Reducing insulin resistance with
- 7 metformin: the evidence today. *Diabetes Metab* 29(4 Pt 2), 6S28-6S35 (2003).
- 8
- 9 (14) Heckman-Stoddard BM, DeCensi A, Sahasrabudde VV, Ford LG: Repurposing
- 10 metformin for the prevention of cancer and cancer recurrence. *Diabetologia* (2017).
- 11
- 12 (15) Dziubak A , Wojcicka G: The pathophysiological basis of the protective effects of
- 13 metformin in heart failure. *Postepy Hig.Med.Dosw.(Online.)* 71(1), 773-787 (2017).
- 14
- 15 (16) Effect of intensive blood-glucose control with metformin on complications in
- 16 overweight patients with type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 34). UK Prospective Diabetes
- 17 Study (UKPDS) Group. *Lancet* 352(9131), 854-865 (1998).
- 18
- 19 (17) De L, V, Musacchio MC, Piomboni P, Di Sabatino A, Morgante G: The
- 20 administration of metformin during pregnancy reduces polycystic ovary syndrome
- 21 related gestational complications. *Eur.J.Obstet.Gynecol.Reprod.Biol.* 157(1), 63-66
- 22 (2011).
- 23
- 24 (18) Bailey CJ: The Current Drug Treatment Landscape for Diabetes and Perspectives for
- 25 the Future. *Clin.Pharmacol.Ther.* 98(2), 170-184 (2015).
- 26
- 27 (19) Pawlyk AC, Giacomini KM, McKeon C, Shuldiner AR, Florez JC: Metformin
- 28 pharmacogenomics: current status and future directions. *Diabetes* 63(8), 2590-2599
- 29 (2014).
- 30
- 31 (20) Kahn SE, Haffner SM, Heise MA *et al*: Glycemic durability of rosiglitazone,
- 32 metformin, or glyburide monotherapy. *N.Engl.J.Med.* 355(23), 2427-2443 (2006).
- 33
- 34 (21) Nasri H , Rafieian-Kopaei M: Metformin: Current knowledge. *J.Res.Med.Sci.* 19(7),
- 35 658-664 (2014).
- 36
- 37 (22) Zhou K, Donnelly L, Yang J *et al*: Heritability of variation in glycaemic response to
- 38 metformin: a genome-wide complex trait analysis. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol.* 2(6),
- 39 481-487 (2014).
- 40
- 41 (23) Emami RA, Fisel P, Nies AT, Schaeffeler E, Schwab M: Metformin and cancer: from
- 42 the old medicine cabinet to pharmacological pitfalls and prospects. *Trends*
- 43 *Pharmacol.Sci.* 34(2), 126-135 (2013).
- 44
- 45 (24) Staiger H, Schaeffeler E, Schwab M, Haring HU: Pharmacogenetics: Implications for
- 46 Modern Type 2 Diabetes Therapy. *Rev.Diabet.Stud.* 12(3-4), 363-376 (2015).
- 47
- 48 (25) Dujic T, Zhou K, Donnelly LA, Tavendale R, Palmer CN, Pearson ER: Association of
- 49 Organic Cation Transporter 1 With Intolerance to Metformin in Type 2 Diabetes: A
- 50 GoDARTS Study. *Diabetes* 64(5), 1786-1793 (2015).
- 51
- 52 (26) Kimura N, Masuda S, Tanihara Y *et al*: Metformin is a superior substrate for renal
- 53 organic cation transporter OCT2 rather than hepatic OCT1. *Drug Metab*
- 54 *Pharmacokinet.* 20(5), 379-386 (2005).
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

- 1
2
3 (27) Leabman MK, Giacomini KM: Estimating the contribution of genes and environment
4 to variation in renal drug clearance. *Pharmacogenetics* 13(9), 581-584 (2003).
5
6 (28) Chen Y, Li S, Brown C *et al*: Effect of genetic variation in the organic cation
7 transporter 2 on the renal elimination of metformin. *Pharmacogenet.Genomics* 19(7),
8 497-504 (2009).
9
10 (29) Song IS, Shin HJ, Shim EJ *et al*: Genetic variants of the organic cation transporter 2
11 influence the disposition of metformin. *Clin.Pharmacol.Ther.* 84(5), 559-562 (2008).
12
13 (30) Wang ZJ, Yin OQ, Tomlinson B, Chow MS: OCT2 polymorphisms and in-vivo renal
14 functional consequence: studies with metformin and cimetidine.
15 *Pharmacogenet.Genomics* 18(7), 637-645 (2008).
16
17 (31) Kashi Z, Masoumi P, Mahrooz A, Hashemi-Soteh MB, Bahar A, Alizadeh A: The
18 variant organic cation transporter 2 (OCT2)-T201M contribute to changes in insulin
19 resistance in patients with type 2 diabetes treated with metformin. *Diabetes*
20 *Res.Clin.Pract.* 108(1), 78-83 (2015).
21
22 (32) Zaharenko L, Kalnina I, Geldnere K *et al*: Single nucleotide polymorphisms in the
23 intergenic region between metformin transporter OCT2 and OCT3 coding genes are
24 associated with short-term response to metformin monotherapy in type 2 diabetes
25 mellitus patients. *Eur.J.Endocrinol.* 175(6), 531-540 (2016).
26
27 (33) Stocker SL, Morrissey KM, Yee SW *et al*: The effect of novel promoter variants in
28 MATE1 and MATE2 on the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of metformin.
29 *Clin.Pharmacol.Ther.* 93(2), 186-194 (2013).
30
31 (34) Becker ML, Visser LE, van Schaik RH, Hofman A, Uitterlinden AG, Stricker BH:
32 Genetic variation in the multidrug and toxin extrusion 1 transporter protein influences
33 the glucose-lowering effect of metformin in patients with diabetes: a preliminary
34 study. *Diabetes* 58(3), 745-749 (2009).
35
36 (35) Jablonski KA, McAteer JB, de Bakker PI *et al*: Common variants in 40 genes
37 assessed for diabetes incidence and response to metformin and lifestyle intervention in
38 the diabetes prevention program. *Diabetes* 59(10), 2672-2681 (2010).
39
40 (36) Christensen MM, Brasch-Andersen C, Green H *et al*: The pharmacogenetics of
41 metformin and its impact on plasma metformin steady-state levels and glycosylated
42 hemoglobin A1c. *Pharmacogenet.Genomics* 21(12), 837-850 (2011).
43
44 (37) Dujic T, Zhou K, Yee SW *et al*: Variants in Pharmacokinetic Transporters and
45 Glycemic Response to Metformin: A Metgen Meta-Analysis. *Clin.Pharmacol.Ther.*
46 101(6), 763-772 (2017).
47
48 (38) Tkac I, Javorsky M, Klimcakova L *et al*: A pharmacogenetic association between a
49 variation in calpain 10 (CAPN10) gene and the response to metformin treatment in
50 patients with type 2 diabetes. *Eur.J.Clin.Pharmacol.* 71(1), 59-63 (2015).
51
52 (39) Zhou K, Bellenguez C, Spencer CC *et al*: Common variants near ATM are associated
53 with glycemic response to metformin in type 2 diabetes. *Nat.Genet.* 43(2), 117-120
54 (2011).
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (40) Zhou K, Yee SW, Seiser EL *et al*: Variation in the glucose transporter gene SLC2A2
4 is associated with glycemic response to metformin. *Nat.Genet.* 48(9), 1055-1059
5 (2016).
6
7 (41) Laukkanen O, Lindstrom J, Eriksson J *et al*: Polymorphisms in the SLC2A2 (GLUT2)
8 gene are associated with the conversion from impaired glucose tolerance to type 2
9 diabetes: the Finnish Diabetes Prevention Study. *Diabetes* 54(7), 2256-2260 (2005).
10
11 (42) Goswami S, Yee SW, Stocker S *et al*: Genetic variants in transcription factors are
12 associated with the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of metformin.
13 *Clin.Pharmacol.Ther.* 96(3), 370-379 (2014).
14
15 (43) Cresci S: PPAR Genomics and Pharmacogenomics: Implications for Cardiovascular
16 Disease. *PPAR.Res.* 2008, 374549- (2008).
17
18 (44) Lunger L, Melmer A, Oberaigner W *et al*: Prescription of oral antidiabetic drugs in
19 Tyrol - Data from the Tyrol diabetes registry 2012-2015. *Wien.Klin.Wochenschr.*
20 129(1-2), 46-51 (2017).
21
22 (45) Tanabe M, Motonaga R, Terawaki Y, Nomiyama T, Yanase T: Prescription of oral
23 hypoglycemic agents for patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: A retrospective cohort
24 study using a Japanese hospital database. *J.Diabetes Investig.* 8(2), 227-234 (2017).
25
26 (46) Holt RI: Personalized medicine for diabetes: a special issue. *Diabet.Med.* 33(6), 711-
27 (2016).
28
29 (47) Pearson ER: Personalized medicine in diabetes: the role of 'omics' and biomarkers.
30 *Diabet.Med.* 33(6), 712-717 (2016).
31
32 (48) Turner RC, Cull CA, Frighi V, Holman RR: Glycemic control with diet, sulfonylurea,
33 metformin, or insulin in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: progressive
34 requirement for multiple therapies (UKPDS 49). UK Prospective Diabetes Study
35 (UKPDS) Group. *JAMA* 281(21), 2005-2012 (1999).
36
37 (49) Zeitler P, Hirst K, Pyle L *et al*: A clinical trial to maintain glycemic control in youth
38 with type 2 diabetes. *N.Engl.J.Med.* 366(24), 2247-2256 (2012).
39
40 (50) Sinha B , Ghosal S: Pioglitazone--do we really need it to manage type 2 diabetes?
41 *Diabetes Metab Syndr.* 7(1), 52-55 (2013).
42
43 (51) Aquilante CL, Zhang W, McCollum M: Race, ethnicity, and use of thiazolidinediones
44 among US adults with diabetes. *Curr.Med.Res.Opin.* 23(3), 489-494 (2007).
45
46 (52) Aghaei Meybodi HR, Hasanzad M, Larijani B: Path to Personalized Medicine for
47 Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: Reality and Hope. *Acta Med.Iran* 55(3), 166-174 (2017).
48
49 (53) Flaten HK , Monte AA: The Pharmacogenomic and Metabolomic Predictors of ACE
50 Inhibitor and Angiotensin II Receptor Blocker Effectiveness and Safety.
51 *Cardiovasc.Drugs Ther.* (2017).
52
53 (54) Stein SA, Lamos EM, Davis SN: A review of the efficacy and safety of oral
54 antidiabetic drugs. *Expert.Opin.Drug Saf* 12(2), 153-175 (2013).
55
56
57
58
59

- 1
2
3 (55) Chaudhury A, Duvoor C, Reddy D, V *et al*: Clinical Review of Antidiabetic Drugs:
4 Implications for Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Management. *Front Endocrinol.(Lausanne)*
5 8, 6- (2017).
6
7 (56) Donath MY, Ehses JA, Maedler K *et al*: Mechanisms of beta-cell death in type 2
8 diabetes. *Diabetes* 54 Suppl 2, S108-S113 (2005).
9
10 (57) McIntosh B, Cameron C, Singh SR *et al*: Second-line therapy in patients with type 2
11 diabetes inadequately controlled with metformin monotherapy: a systematic review
12 and mixed-treatment comparison meta-analysis. *Open.Med.* 5(1), e35-e48 (2011).
13
14 (58) Azoulay L , Suissa S: Sulfonylureas and the Risks of Cardiovascular Events and
15 Death: A Methodological Meta-Regression Analysis of the Observational Studies.
16 *Diabetes Care* 40(5), 706-714 (2017).
17
18 (59) Loganadan NK, Huri HZ, Vethakkan SR, Hussein Z: Genetic markers predicting
19 sulphonylurea treatment outcomes in type 2 diabetes patients: current evidence and
20 challenges for clinical implementation. *Pharmacogenomics.J.* 16(3), 209-219 (2016).
21
22 (60) de Wet H , Proks P: Molecular action of sulphonylureas on KATP channels: a real
23 partnership between drugs and nucleotides. *Biochem.Soc.Trans.* 43(5), 901-907
24 (2015).
25
26 (61) Sesti G, Laratta E, Cardellini M *et al*: The E23K variant of KCNJ11 encoding the
27 pancreatic beta-cell adenosine 5'-triphosphate-sensitive potassium channel subunit
28 Kir6.2 is associated with an increased risk of secondary failure to sulfonylurea in
29 patients with type 2 diabetes. *J.Clin.Endocrinol.Metab* 91(6), 2334-2339 (2006).
30
31 (62) Javorsky M, Klimcakova L, Schroner Z *et al*: KCNJ11 gene E23K variant and
32 therapeutic response to sulfonylureas. *Eur.J.Intern.Med.* 23(3), 245-249 (2012).
33
34 (63) Feng Y, Mao G, Ren X *et al*: Ser1369Ala variant in sulfonylurea receptor gene
35 ABCC8 is associated with antidiabetic efficacy of gliclazide in Chinese type 2
36 diabetic patients. *Diabetes Care* 31(10), 1939-1944 (2008).
37
38 (64) Pearson ER, Donnelly LA, Kimber C *et al*: Variation in TCF7L2 influences
39 therapeutic response to sulfonylureas: a GoDARTs study. *Diabetes* 56(8), 2178-2182
40 (2007).
41
42 (65) Xu H, Murray M, McLachlan AJ: Influence of genetic polymorphisms on the
43 pharmacokinetics and pharmaco-dynamics of sulfonylurea drugs. *Curr.Drug Metab*
44 10(6), 643-658 (2009).
45
46 (66) Vinzio S, Andres E, Perrin AE, Schlienger JL, Goichot B: Glibenclamide-induced
47 acute haemolytic anaemia revealing a G6PD-deficiency. *Diabetes Res.Clin.Pract.*
48 64(3), 181-183 (2004).
49
50 (67) Luzzatto L , Seneca E: G6PD deficiency: a classic example of pharmacogenetics with
51 on-going clinical implications. *Br.J.Haematol.* 164(4), 469-480 (2014).
52
53 (68) Heymann AD, Cohen Y, Chodick G: Glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase deficiency
54 and type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 35(8), e58- (2012).
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (69) Nkhoma ET, Poole C, Vannappagari V, Hall SA, Beutler E: The global prevalence of
4 glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase deficiency: a systematic review and meta-
5 analysis. *Blood Cells Mol.Dis.* 42(3), 267-278 (2009).
6
7 (70) Melander A, Folino-Gallo P, Walley T *et al*: Utilisation of antihyperglycaemic drugs
8 in ten European countries: different developments and different levels. *Diabetologia*
9 49(9), 2024-2029 (2006).
10
11 (71) Hansen AM, Hansen JB, Carr RD, Ashcroft FM, Wahl P: Kir6.2-dependent high-
12 affinity repaglinide binding to beta-cell K(ATP) channels. *Br.J.Pharmacol.* 144(4),
13 551-557 (2005).
14
15 (72) Avery P, Mousa SS, Mousa SA: Pharmacogenomics in type II diabetes mellitus
16 management: Steps toward personalized medicine. *Pharmgenomics.Pers.Med.* 2, 79-
17 91 (2009).
18
19 (73) Kim W , Egan JM: The role of incretins in glucose homeostasis and diabetes
20 treatment. *Pharmacol.Rev.* 60(4), 470-512 (2008).
21
22 (74) Monami M, Cremasco F, Lamanna C, Marchionni N, Mannucci E: Predictors of
23 response to dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitors: evidence from randomized clinical
24 trials. *Diabetes Metab Res.Rev.* 27(4), 362-372 (2011).
25
26 (75) Zimdahl H, Ittrich C, Graefe-Mody U *et al*: Influence of TCF7L2 gene variants on the
27 therapeutic response to the dipeptidylpeptidase-4 inhibitor linagliptin. *Diabetologia*
28 57(9), 1869-1875 (2014).
29
30 (76) 't Hart LM, Fritsche A, Nijpels G *et al*: The CTRB1/2 locus affects diabetes
31 susceptibility and treatment via the incretin pathway. *Diabetes* 62(9), 3275-3281
32 (2013).
33
34 (77) Bohm A, Wagner R, Machicao F *et al*: DPP4 gene variation affects GLP-1 secretion,
35 insulin secretion, and glucose tolerance in humans with high body adiposity. *PLoS*
36 *One* 12(7), e0181880- (2017).
37
38 (78) Ahmed RH, Huri HZ, Al Hamodi Z, Salem SD, Al Absi B, Muniandy S: Association
39 of DPP4 Gene Polymorphisms with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus in Malaysian Subjects.
40 *PLoS One* 11(4), e0154369- (2016).
41
42 (79) Han E, Park HS, Kwon O *et al*: A genetic variant in GLP1R is associated with
43 response to DPP-4 inhibitors in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Medicine (Baltimore)*
44 95(44), e5155- (2016).
45
46 (80) Javorsky M, Gotthardova I, Klimcakova L *et al*: A missense variant in GLP1R gene is
47 associated with the glycaemic response to treatment with gliptins. *Diabetes*
48 *Obes.Metab* 18(9), 941-944 (2016).
49
50 (81) Gotthardova I, Javorsky M, Klimcakova L *et al*: KCNQ1 gene polymorphism is
51 associated with glycaemic response to treatment with DPP-4 inhibitors. *Diabetes*
52 *Res.Clin.Pract.* 130, 142-147 (2017).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (82) Liao WL, Lee WJ, Chen CC *et al*: Pharmacogenetics of dipeptidyl peptidase 4
4 inhibitors in a Taiwanese population with type 2 diabetes. *Oncotarget*. 8(11), 18050-
5 18058 (2017).
6
7 (83) Mussig K, Staiger H, Machicao F, Haring HU, Fritsche A: Genetic variants affecting
8 incretin sensitivity and incretin secretion. *Diabetologia* 53(11), 2289-2297 (2010).
9
10 (84) Koole C, Wootten D, Simms J *et al*: Polymorphism and ligand dependent changes in
11 human glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor (GLP-1R) function: allosteric rescue of loss
12 of function mutation. *Mol.Pharmacol.* 80(3), 486-497 (2011).
13
14 (85) Poulsen SB, Fenton RA, Rieg T: Sodium-glucose cotransport.
15 *Curr.Opin.Nephrol.Hypertens.* 24(5), 463-469 (2015).
16
17 (86) Bonner C, Kerr-Conte J, Gmyr V *et al*: Inhibition of the glucose transporter SGLT2
18 with dapagliflozin in pancreatic alpha cells triggers glucagon secretion. *Nat.Med.*
19 21(5), 512-517 (2015).
20
21 (87) Neschen S, Scheerer M, Seelig A *et al*: Metformin supports the antidiabetic effect of a
22 sodium glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor by suppressing endogenous glucose
23 production in diabetic mice. *Diabetes* 64(1), 284-290 (2015).
24
25 (88) Neal B, Perkovic V, Mahaffey KW *et al*: Canagliflozin and Cardiovascular and Renal
26 Events in Type 2 Diabetes. *N.Engl.J.Med.* 377(7), 644-657 (2017).
27
28 (89) Ordelheide AM, Bohm A, Kempe-Teufel D *et al*: Common variation in the
29 sodium/glucose cotransporter 2 gene SLC5A2 does neither affect fasting nor glucose-
30 suppressed plasma glucagon concentrations. *PLoS One* 12(5), e0177148- (2017).
31
32 (90) Zimdahl H, Haupt A, Brendel M *et al*: Influence of common polymorphisms in the
33 SLC5A2 gene on metabolic traits in subjects at increased risk of diabetes and on
34 response to empagliflozin treatment in patients with diabetes.
35 *Pharmacogenet.Genomics* 27(4), 135-142 (2017).
36
37 (91) Enigk U, Breitfeld J, Schleinitz D *et al*: Role of genetic variation in the human
38 sodium-glucose cotransporter 2 gene (SGLT2) in glucose homeostasis.
39 *Pharmacogenomics.* 12(8), 1119-1126 (2011).
40
41 (92) Alagoz O, Durham D, Kasirajan K: Cost-effectiveness of one-time genetic testing to
42 minimize lifetime adverse drug reactions. *Pharmacogenomics.J.* 16(2), 129-136
43 (2016).
44
45 (93) Weymann D, Laskin J, Roscoe R *et al*: The cost and cost trajectory of whole-genome
46 analysis guiding treatment of patients with advanced cancers.
47 *Mol.Genet.Genomic.Med.* 5(3), 251-260 (2017).
48
49 (94) Lionel AC, Costain G, Monfared N *et al*: Improved diagnostic yield compared with
50 targeted gene sequencing panels suggests a role for whole-genome sequencing as a
51 first-tier genetic test. *Genet.Med.* (2017).
52
53 (95) Lane HY, Tsai GE, Lin E: Assessing gene-gene interactions in pharmacogenomics.
54 *Mol.Diagn.Ther.* 16(1), 15-27 (2012).
55
56
57
58
59

- 1
2
3 (96) Ahmed S, Zhou Z, Zhou J, Chen SQ: Pharmacogenomics of Drug Metabolizing
4 Enzymes and Transporters: Relevance to Precision Medicine. *Genomics*
5 *Proteomics.Bioinformatics*. 14(5), 298-313 (2016).
6
7 (97) Burmester JK, Sedova M, Shapero MH, Mansfield E: DMET microarray technology
8 for pharmacogenomics-based personalized medicine. *Methods Mol.Biol.* 632, 99-124
9 (2010).
10
11 (98) Ali O: Genetics of type 2 diabetes. *World J.Diabetes* 4(4), 114-123 (2013).
12
13 (99) Kirchhoff K, Machicao F, Haupt A *et al*: Polymorphisms in the TCF7L2, CDKAL1
14 and SLC30A8 genes are associated with impaired proinsulin conversion.
15 *Diabetologia* 51(4), 597-601 (2008).
16
17 (100) Schafer SA, Machicao F, Fritsche A, Haring HU, Kantartzis K: New type 2 diabetes
18 risk genes provide new insights in insulin secretion mechanisms. *Diabetes*
19 *Res.Clin.Pract.* 93 Suppl 1, S9-24 (2011).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: OAD and pharmacogenetically relevant target genes (T2D risk genes in bold)

Drug class	Metabolic drug effects	Pharmacogenetically relevant genes
Biguanides	Insulin sensitization	<i>SCL22A1-3, SLC29A4, SLC47A1, SLC47A2, PRKAA1, PRKAA2, STK11, MEF2A, MEF2D, HNF1B, HNF4A, ABCC8, KCNJ11, GCK, CAPN10, ATM, SLC2A2, SP1, AP2, PPARA</i>
Thiazolidinediones	Insulin sensitization	<i>PPARG, ADIPOQ1, CYP2C8, CYP2C9, CYP3A4</i>
Sulfonylureas	Glucose-independent stimulation of insulin secretion	<i>KCNJ11, ABCC8, TCF7L2, IRS1, CDKAL1, CDKN2A/2B, KCNQ1, CYP2C9, CYP2C19, G6PD</i>
Meglitinides	Glucose-independent stimulation of insulin secretion	<i>SLCO1B1, OATP1B1, CYP2C9, CYP2C8, CYP3A4</i>
DPP4 inhibitors	Glucose-independent stimulation of insulin secretion, inhibition of glucagon secretion	<i>TCF7L2, CTRB1/2, GLP-1R, KCNQ1, PRKD1, CNTN3, ASK, LOC10537792</i>
SGLT2 inhibitors	Renal glucose excretion	<i>SGLT2 (up to date no SNPs with relevant effects on treatment response described)</i>