



Insulin glargine and cancer: cause and effect unproven

The inference that insulin glargine may cause cancer¹⁻⁵ is the latest in a series of controversies to hit diabetes over the last few years, to include the alleged risk of rosiglitazone causing heart disease⁶ and that intensive glycaemic control can kill.⁷ Although careful analysis of the data, along with new information has since refuted these earlier allegations, their impact persists.⁸⁻¹³

In a recent issue of *Diabetologia*,¹ reference was made to a possible link between insulin glargine and cancer based on the analysis of four separate databases in Germany,² Sweden,³ Scotland⁴ and the UK.⁵ The editors concluded that further investigation is now necessary. In a press release, as well as in 'information for patients', the EASD prematurely recommended that in the circumstances an alternative insulin preparation could be considered.¹⁴

In brief, the German cohort study from the Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care (IQWiG)² involving 127,031 insulin treated subjects from a health insurance database concluded that there appeared to be an increased risk of malignancies in persons exposed only to a high dose of insulin glargine. The study employed unjustified and unconventional statistical analysis adjusting for insulin dosage while failing to adjust for body weight which is a key confounder when exploring the relationship between cancer and insulin. These critical limitations raise serious doubts about the validity of their findings and interpretation of the data. However, in the insulin glargine group, there was an overall decrease in the unadjusted hazard ratio (HR) for both cancer risk (HR 0.86, 95% CI 0.79-0.94) and all-cause mortality (HR 0.68, 95% CI 0.65-0.72) comparing insulin glargine alone with other insulins. In the Swedish study³ however, which had access to 114,841 insulin treated persons with diabetes from their Prescribed Drug, Cancer and Causes of Death Registers, an increased risk of breast cancer in females using insulin glargine only was observed compared to the other insulins. This risk was not found when insulin glargine was used in combination with the other unspecified insulin preparations. Of note, as in the German study, there was no overall increase in malignancies with insulin glargine use (HR 1.07, 95% CI 0.91-1.27) and all-cause mortality was again reduced (HR 0.83, 95% CI 0.71-0.96). Similarly, the Scottish study⁴ utilising 49,197 subjects from the Scottish National Diabetes and Cancer Registers revealed no overall increased risk of cancer when all insulin glargine users were included (HR 1.02, 95% CI 0.77-1.36). There was an increase in risk in the group of insulin glargine only users (n=447) where the majority of subjects (~97%) had type 2 diabetes, in contrast to 62% in the group on glargine in combination with other insulins (n=3512) who had type 1 diabetes and were younger and leaner. No increase in breast cancer with insulin glargine was seen in this study. Finally, the THIN study,⁵ an analysis of 10,067 subjects from The Health Information Network, an UK general practice database, clearly re-affirmed that there was neither an increase in

overall risk of cancer (HR 0.81, 95% 0.59-1.11) or breast cancer in subjects exposed to insulin glargine or to pre-mixed insulin preparations.

The overriding concern regarding the relevance of these studies is the treatment selection bias due to the absence of randomisation between treatment types. There is almost complete lack of information about the other insulins used alone or together with insulin glargine. Neither is there any information about critical confounders such as adiposity, body weight or BMI, essential for assessing risk of cancer and determining a possible insulin dose response. The flawed methodology used to determine the dose-response relationship of insulin glargine with cancer in the German study makes the allegations groundless. The deficiency of information on major risk factors is evident through the inconsistencies seen in the results which clearly reflect important differences between the populations, both between and within the study groups being compared. The duration of follow-up between 1 to 3 years is also relatively short in relation to the cancer question being addressed.

A smaller but randomised control trial conducted over 5 years to assess the risk of diabetic retinopathy in 1017 subjects with type 2 diabetes using insulin glargine once daily versus twice daily NPH insulin was published in the same issue of *Diabetologia*.¹⁵ There was no excess risk of diabetic retinopathy with insulin glargine over NPH insulin¹⁵ neither was there an increased risk for all neoplasms RR for insulin glargine (0.90, 95% CI 0.64-1.26) or breast cancer with insulin glargine.¹⁶

The theoretical basis for concern relating to insulin glargine has emerged from the findings of enhanced affinity for the IGF-1 receptors and mitogenic response in malignant cell lines.^{17,18} Earlier studies involving a variety of cell lines have not shown significant differences between insulin glargine and human insulin in insulin and IGF-1 receptor binding, mitogenic response and growth promoting activity.¹⁹⁻²⁴ Affinity of insulin glargine for the IGF-1 receptor is 200-fold less than for endogenous circulating IGF-1.²¹ It is only at very high concentration that insulin glargine is preferentially bound to IGF-1 receptors when compared with human insulin in cells from normal subjects and type 2 diabetes.²² The carcinogenicity studies over two years in mice and rats (dose up to 12.5 IU per kg) revealed no increased incidence of malignancy,²⁴ in particular there was no proliferation of mammary tumours in these animals. It is also important to remember that a significant fraction of insulin glargine absorbed from the subcutaneous site of injection is metabolised within a short space of time. In the two active metabolites, two arginine amino acids (B31, B32) are removed from the C-terminus of the β chain of insulin glargine (M1 and M2). Both retain the equivalent glucose lowering potency of the parent compound whereas affinity for the IGF-1 receptor is markedly reduced. The extrapolation from *in vitro* studies



where equivalent molar concentrations of insulin glargine and human insulin are compared do not account for the metabolic processing.

Taking all this into consideration, the four observational studies mentioned above²⁻⁵ have serious and widely acknowledged methodological limitations which question the validity of the findings and therefore do not allow any meaningful interpretation of the relationship between insulin glargine and cancer. The randomised control trial is reassuring,¹⁵ however it involved a relatively small number of subjects over a longer but still relatively short period of time. Further epidemiological investigation of existing and more extensive databases is now warranted representing a true collaboration between academia and industry in an effort to resolve this dilemma.

Our commentary merely restates what has been more eloquently represented by others^{25,26} including statements released by regulatory bodies like the FDA²⁷ and European Medicines Agency's (EMA) Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use²⁸ along with national diabetes associations such as the American Diabetes Association,²⁹ Diabetes UK,³⁰ and other associations like the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists.³¹ The consistent and emphatic message is that there is inconclusive evidence to associate insulin glargine with an excess risk of cancer and therefore there is no basis for denying subjects the known benefits of using insulin glargine as a basal insulin.

In hindsight a more measured response in respect to the recent publications would have prevented an 'unwarranted alarm' engendered in our patients and carers alike. A salutary lesson to be learnt!

Professor David R Owens, CBE, MD, Professor and Consultant Diabetologist, Diabetes Research Unit, University Hospital Llandough, Penarth, UK
Julio Rosenstock, MD, Dallas Diabetes and Endocrine Center at Medical City, Texas, USA
Professor Geremia B Bolli, MD, Department of Internal Medicine, Endocrinology and Metabolism, University of Perugia, Perugia, Italy

References

1. Smith U, Gale EAM. Does diabetes therapy influence the risk of cancer? *Diabetologia* 2009; doi: 10.1007/s00125-009-1441-45.
2. Hemkens LG, Grouven U, Bender R, *et al.* Risk of malignancies in patients with diabetes treated with human insulin or insulin analogues: a cohort study. *Diabetologia* 2009; doi 10.1007/s00125-009-1418-4.
3. Jonasson JM, Ljung R, Talbäck M, *et al.* Insulin glargine use and short-term incidence of malignancies – a population-based follow-up study in Sweden. *Diabetologia* 2009; doi 10.1007/s00125-009-1444-2.
4. SDRN Epidemiology Group. Use of insulin glargine and cancer incidence in Scotland: a study from the Scottish Diabetes Research Network Epidemiology Group. *Diabetologia* 2009; doi 10.1007/s00125-009-1447-z.
5. Currie CJ, Poole CD, Gale EAM. The influence of glucose lowering therapies on cancer risk in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetologia* 2009; doi 10.1007/s00125-009-1440-6.
6. Nissen SE, Wolski K. Effect of Rosiglitazone on the Risk of Myocardial Infarction and Death from Cardiovascular Causes. *N Engl J Med* 2007; **356**: 2457.
7. The Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes Study Group. Effects of Intensive Glucose Lowering in Type 2 Diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2008; **358**: 2545-2559.
8. ACCORD presentation – ADA, New Orleans 2009.
9. The ADVANCE Collaborative Group. Intensive Blood Glucose Control and Vascular Outcomes in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2008; **358**: 2560-2572.
10. Home PD, Pocock SJ, Beck-Nielsen H, *et al.* for the RECORD Study Team. Rosiglitazone evaluated for cardiovascular outcomes in oral agent combination therapy for type 2 diabetes (RECORD): a multicentre, randomised, open-label trial. *Lancet* 2009 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60953-3.
11. The BARI 2D Study Group. A Randomized Trial of Therapies for Type 2 Diabetes and Coronary Artery Disease. *N Engl J Med* 2009; **360**: 2503-2515.
12. Ray KK, Seshasai SRK, Wijesuriya S, *et al.* Effect of intensive control of glucose on cardiovascular outcomes and death in patients with diabetes mellitus: a meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Lancet* 2009; **373**: 1765-1772.
13. Veterans Affairs Diabetes Trial (VADT) presentation – ADA, San Francisco 2009.
14. EASD Statement: Lantus insulin: a possible link with cancer which requires further investigation – <http://webcast.easd.org/press/glargine/glargine.htm>
15. Rosenstock J, Fonseca V, McGill JB, *et al.* Similar risk of malignancy with insulin glargine and neutral protamine Hagedorn (NPH) insulin in patients with type 2 diabetes: findings from a 5 year randomised, open-label study. <http://webcast.easd.org/press/glargine/download/090940Rosenstockedited.pdf> (accessed July 27, 2009).
16. Rosenstock J, Fonseca V, McGill JB, *et al.* Similar progression of diabetic retinopathy with insulin glargine and neutral protamine Hagedorn (NPH) insulin in patients with type 2 diabetes: a long-term, randomised, open-label study. *Diabetologia* 2009; doi: 10.1007/s00125-009-1415-7 [accessed 27 July 2009].
17. Kurtzhals P, Schäffer L, Sørensen A, *et al.* Correlations of receptor binding and metabolic and mitogenic potencies of insulin analogs designed for clinical use. *Diabetes* 2000; **49**: 999-1005.
18. Mayer D, Shukla A, Enzmann H. Proliferative effects of insulin analogues on mammary epithelial cells. *Arch Physiol Biochem* 2008 **114**(1): 38-44.
19. Bähr M, Kolter T, Seipke G, *et al.* Growth promoting and metabolic activity of the human insulin analogue [GlyA21, argB31, ArgB32] insulin (HOE 901) in muscle cells. *Eur J Pharm* 1997; **320**: 259-265.
20. Berti L, Kellerer M, Bossenmaier B, *et al.* The long acting human insulin analog HOE 901: characteristics of insulin signalling in comparison to Asp (B10) and regular insulin. *Horm Met Res* 1998; **30**: 123-129.
21. Sandow J, Seipke G. In vitro pharmacology studies with insulin glargine and human insulin: IGF-1 receptor binding and thymidine incorporation. *Diabetes* 2001; **50**(Suppl 1): A429 Abstract 1787-PO.
22. Ciaraldi TP, Carter L, Seipke G, *et al.* Effects of the long-acting insulin analog insulin glargine on cultured human skeletal muscle cells: comparisons to insulin and IGF-1. *J Endo Metab* 2001; **86**: 5838-5847.
23. Kellerer M, Häring HU. Insulin analogues: impact of cell model characteristics on results and conclusions regarding mitogenic properties. *Exp Clin Endocrinol Diabetes* 2001; **109**: 63-64.
24. Stammberger I, Bube A, Durchfeld-Mayer B, *et al.* Evaluation of the carcinogenic potential of insulin glargine (LANTUS) in rats and mice. *Int J Toxicology* 2002; **21**: 171-179.
25. Garg SK, Hirsch IB, Skyler JS. Insulin Glargine and Cancer – An Unsubstantiated Allegation. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2009; **11**(8): 473-476.
26. Pocock SJ, Smeeth L. Insulin glargine and malignancy: an unwarranted alarm. *Lancet* 2009 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(09)61307-6.
27. FDA – Early Communication About Safety of Lantus (insulin glargine) 7/1/2009. www.fda.gov/Drugs/DrugSafety/Post_marketDrugSafetyInformationforPatientsandProviders/DrugSafetyInformationforHealthcareProfessionals/ucm169722.htm [accessed 27 July 2009]
28. European Medicines Agency Press Release – update on safety of insulin glargine www.emea.europa.eu/pressoffice/emea.htm – Doc. Ref. EMEA/470632/2009.
29. ADA – Insulin Glargine and Cancer: Questions & Answers, updated July 1, 2009 – www.diabetes.org/formedia/insulin-glargine-cancer.jsp
30. Diabetes UK – www.diabetes.org.uk/en/About_us/News_Landing_Page/Inconclusive-research-links-glargine-insulin-Lantus-with-cancer/.
31. AACE Response to Insulin Glargine Articles www.aace.com/newsroom/alerts/index.php.



Conflict of interest

Practical Diabetes International's policy is to include a conflict of interest statement on all Original Articles and Reviews. A conflict of interest statement is included in other articles where it is deemed necessary, particularly where pharmaceuticals are mentioned.

The leader article 'Insulin glargine and cancer: cause and effect unproven' (*Pract Diabetes Int* 2009; **26**[7]: 256-257) should have included the following conflict of interest statements.

Professor David Owens has received research support from sanofi-aventis and Novo Nordisk. He has served on the clinical advisory board for Roche Diagnostics, sanofi-aventis, Novo Nordisk, Merck Sharp & Dohme and Pfizer and has served as a consultant for Novo Nordisk and

sanofi-aventis. He has received honoraria from all of the above for consultancy and lecture fees.

Julio Rosenstock, MD, has served on advisory boards and received honorarium or consulting fees from Pfizer, Roche, sanofi-aventis, Novo Nordisk, Eli Lilly, MannKind, GlaxoSmithKline, Takeda, Daiichi Sankyo, Forest, Johnson & Johnson, Novartis and Amylin. He has received research grants from Merck, Pfizer, sanofi-aventis, Novo Nordisk, Roche, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Eli Lilly, Forest, GlaxoSmithKline, Takeda, Novartis, AstraZeneca, Amylin, Johnson & Johnson, Daiichi Sankyo and MannKind.

Professor Geremia B Bolli has received honoraria for advisory boards and research grants from Eli Lilly, sanofi-aventis, MannKind, Bristol-Mayers Squibb.