Diagnostic Workup of Peripheral Neuropathy Among Medicare Beneficiaries Is Inconsistent and Often Not Evidence-Based

Callaghan B, McCammon R, Kerber K, et al. Tests and expenditures in the initial evaluation of peripheral neuropathy. Arch Intern Med 2012;172:127–32.

Study Overview

Objective. To describe the practice patterns of providers caring for Medicare patients with a diagnosis of peripheral neuropathy.

Design. Retrospective cohort study, with a matched case-control comparison reported in an online supplement to this article.

Setting and participants. Patients were in the Health and Retirement Survey (HRS), a longitudinal panel study that surveys a representative sample of more than 26,000 Americans over age 50 every 2 years. The survey is linked with Medicare claims data. Respondents were included in the current study if they had participated in the HRS between 1998 and 2006 and had received an incident diagnosis of peripheral neuropathy during that time period. New neuropathy diagnosis was established by the presence of a pertinent ICD-9 code with no such code in the 30 months prior. Respondents had to be 65 years or older at the start of their baseline period and be continuously enrolled in Medicare parts A and B fee-for-service from at least 30 months prior to 6 months after their neuropathy diagnosis.

The investigators identified a large number of baseline covariates from HRS data and the matched Medicare claims. Diabetics were included in the cohort and diabetes was defined using the presence of 1 inpatient or 2 outpatient diagnosis codes during the baseline period. In addition to analyzing those patients diagnosed with neuropathy, a comparison group of patients without a diagnosis of peripheral neuropathy was created using propensity score matching (1:1 ratio) on the following criteria: age, gender, race/ethnicity, Charlson index, chronic kidney disease, rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, cancer, diabetes, and year of HRS survey participation.

Main outcome measures. Patient claims were reviewed for evidence of laboratory and other diagnostic procedures ordered in the period surrounding a neuropathy diagnosis. CPT coding was used to identify the ordering of the following blood tests: fasting glucose level, hemoglobin A1c, glucose tolerance testing (GTT), serum protein electrophoresis (SPEP), vitamin B12 levels, antinuclear antibodies (ANA), erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR), thyroglobulin (TSH), complete blood count

(CBC), and complete metabolic panel (CMP). CPT coding was also used to evaluate the ordering of imaging and electrodiagnostic procedures, namely MRI of the brain, cervical, thoracic or lumbar spine, and electromyographic (EMG) testing. Claims data were used to calculate total Medicare expenditures during 3 time periods for cases and matched controls: a baseline period (6–18 months pre-diagnosis), diagnostic period (6 months pre- to 6 months post-diagnosis) and a follow-up period (6–18 months post-diagnosis).

Results. Just over 8% of HRS respondents, or 1031 patients, had incident peripheral neuropathy and met all inclusion criteria. The mean (SD) age among these patients was 77.4 (6.8) years. Forty-six percent were men, 79.7% were white, 7.9% were Hispanic, and 12.3% were black. Patients were distributed approximately evenly between educational levels, which the investigators described by number of years of schooling rather than degree attainment (0–11, 12, ≥ 13 years). Approximately two-thirds of the patients were overweight or obese by BMI. The vast majority (78.1%) reported drinking no alcohol. A large proportion (41.5%) of patients were diabetic at baseline. Other types of chronic illness were prevalent in the cohort as well—10.4% had chronic kidney disease, 28% had either osteoarthritis or rheumatoid arthritis, and 14.5% had a diagnosis of cancer (type not specified).

Among diabetic patients, 44% ultimately received a diagnosis of "polyneuropathy in diabetes," and 47.8% of them were diagnosed with idiopathic neuropathy. Of patients without pre-existing diabetes, the vast majority (80%) were diagnosed with idiopathic neuropathy. The remaining 20% of initially nondiabetic patients had a variety of causes for their neuropathy, including a new diagnosis of diabetes (3.5%), hereditary neuropathy (4.7%), mononeuritis multiplex (1%), acute inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy (1%), and "other diseases" (12%).

Testing patterns varied widely across the diagnosed patient population, with a median of 4 individual (blood and/or imaging) tests ordered per patient prior to the diagnosis of peripheral neuropathy. Of the more than 400 different workup patterns observed, there was no clear dominant strategy. In fact, the most common testing pattern (not specified by authors) only occurred in 4.8% of patients.

Overall, 43.2% of neuropathic patients had a hemoglobin A1c ordered during the diagnostic period, but the rate varied substantially depending on whether or not patients had pre-existing diabetes (from only 17% among those with no existing diagnosis of diabetes, to above 80% among patients with known diabetes). Furthermore, 23.4% of all diagnosed patients had a fasting plasma glucose ordered—a test which also varied in use based on the presence or absence of known diabetes (ordering rate of 20% among nondiabetics vs. 30% among diabetics). Serum B12 levels were also quite common, being ordered in 32% of patients with neuropathy during the diagnostic period. SPEP was only performed 13% of the time in the overall group, but 18.7% of nondiabetic patients received one. Only 1% of patients underwent GTT as part of their diagnostic workup. In comparison, nearly three-quarters (73%) of patients had a CBC ordered and just over half had TSH testing (55.2%) or a CMP (53.2%).

CNS imaging was widely utilized in patients undergoing diagnostic workup for peripheral neuropathy, with 23.2% of patients undergoing an MRI of their brain or spine. Furthermore, only 19.8% had EMGs performed, with a mean (SD) of 8.8 (6.9) nerves tested per study.

Patterns of ordering amongst the group of matched controls revealed that these similar patients who were not diagnosed with neuropathy were significantly less likely to undergo all of the aforementioned laboratory tests, as well as all forms of MRI (brain, C/T/L spine) and EMG.

Using a *t* test, mean Medicare expenditures were compared between the baseline and diagnostic periods for patients diagnosed with neuropathy. The investigators found a significant increase from a baseline mean expenditure of $8067 to a diagnostic-period mean of $14,362 ($P < 0.001$). Expenditures in the follow-up period (> 6 months after diagnosis) decreased but remained slightly higher than they had been at baseline ($11,748). These patterns were consistent when excluding diabetic patients from the analysis.

Matched controls displayed similar expenditures as patients in the study population during the baseline period and the 6 months prior to diagnosis; however in the 0–18 months after diagnosis, expenditures of patients with neuropathy were higher.

Conclusion. In a sample of Medicare beneficiaries diagnosed predominantly with idiopathic or diabetes-related peripheral neuropathy, diagnostic evaluation was varied

(continued on page 153)

Help adult patients with type 2 diabetes gain greater access

Get to know Victoza® on a deeper level.

Powerful reductions in A1C from -0.8% to -1.5%*

Low rate of hypoglycemia

Flexible dosing any time of day, independent of meals

May reduce weight
—Victoza® is not indicated for the management of obesity, and weight change was a secondary end point in clinical trials

VictozaCare™ helps patients stay on track with ongoing support
—Patients enrolled in **VictozaCare™** were more adherent to Victoza® than those not enrolled†

To see how Victoza® works for your patients, visit **VictozaPro.com/GLP1.**

novo nordisk®

VICTOZA®
liraglutide (rDNA origin) injection

Indications and usage

Victoza® is indicated as an adjunct to diet and exercise to improve glycemic control in adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus.

Because of the uncertain relevance of the rodent thyroid C-cell tumor findings to humans, prescribe Victoza® only to patients for whom the potential benefits are considered to outweigh the potential risk. Victoza® is not recommended as first-line therapy for patients who have inadequate glycemic control on diet and exercise.

In clinical trials of Victoza®, there were more cases of pancreatitis with Victoza® than with comparators. Victoza® has not been studied sufficiently in patients with a history of pancreatitis to determine whether these patients are at increased risk for pancreatitis while using Victoza®. Use with caution in patients with a history of pancreatitis.

Victoza® is not a substitute for insulin. Victoza® should not be used in patients with type 1 diabetes mellitus or for the treatment of diabetic ketoacidosis, as it would not be effective in these settings.

The concurrent use of Victoza® and insulin has not been studied.

Important safety information

Liraglutide causes dose-dependent and treatment-duration-dependent thyroid C-cell tumors at clinically relevant exposures in both genders of rats and mice. It is unknown whether Victoza® causes thyroid C-cell tumors, including medullary thyroid carcinoma (MTC), in humans, as human relevance could not be ruled out by clinical or nonclinical studies. Victoza® is contraindicated in patients with a personal or family history of MTC and in patients with Multiple Endocrine Neoplasia syndrome type 2 (MEN 2). Based on the findings in rodents, monitoring with serum calcitonin or thyroid ultrasound was performed during clinical trials, but this may have increased the number of unnecessary thyroid surgeries. It is unknown whether monitoring with serum calcitonin or thyroid ultrasound will mitigate human risk of thyroid C-cell tumors. Patients should be counseled regarding the risk and symptoms of thyroid tumors.

If pancreatitis is suspected, Victoza® should be discontinued. Victoza® should not be re-initiated if pancreatitis is confirmed.

When Victoza® is used with an insulin secretagogue (e.g. a sulfonylurea) serious hypoglycemia can occur. Consider lowering the dose of the insulin secretagogue to reduce the risk of hypoglycemia.

Renal impairment has been reported postmarketing, usually in association with nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, or dehydration, which may sometimes require hemodialysis. Use caution when initiating or escalating doses of Victoza® in patients with renal impairment.

There have been no studies establishing conclusive evidence of macrovascular risk reduction with Victoza® or any other antidiabetic drug.

The most common adverse reactions, reported in ≥5% of patients treated with Victoza® and more commonly than in patients treated with placebo, are headache, nausea, diarrhea, and anti-liraglutide antibody formation. Immunogenicity-related events, including urticaria, were more common among Victoza®-treated patients (0.8%) than among comparator-treated patients (0.4%) in clinical trials.

Victoza® has not been studied in type 2 diabetes patients below 18 years of age and is not recommended for use in pediatric patients.

Victoza® should be used with caution in patients with hepatic impairment.

Please see brief summary of Prescribing Information on adjacent page.

*Victoza® 1.2 mg and 1.8 mg when used alone or in combination with OADs.
†Crossix ScoreBoard™ Report, September 2011. Adherence measured by number of actual Victoza® prescriptions filled for existing Victoza® patients enrolled in **VictozaCare**™ versus a match-pair control group not enrolled in **VictozaCare**™ through first 8 months of enrollment.

1111-00006045-1 January 2012

Victoza® (liraglutide [rDNA origin] injection)

Rx Only

BRIEF SUMMARY. Please consult package insert for full prescribing information.

WARNING: RISK OF THYROID C-CELL TUMORS: Liraglutide causes dose-dependent and treatment-duration-dependent thyroid C-cell tumors at clinically relevant exposures in both genders of rats and mice. It is unknown whether Victoza® causes thyroid C-cell tumors, including medullary thyroid carcinoma (MTC), in humans, as human relevance could not be ruled out by clinical or nonclinical studies. Victoza® is contraindicated in patients with a personal or family history of MTC and in patients with Multiple Endocrine Neoplasia syndrome type 2 (MEN 2). Based on the findings in rodents, monitoring with serum calcitonin or thyroid ultrasound was performed during clinical trials, but this may have increased the number of unnecessary thyroid surgeries. It is unknown whether monitoring with serum calcitonin or thyroid ultrasound will mitigate human risk of thyroid C-cell tumors. Patients should be counseled regarding the risk and symptoms of thyroid tumors *[see Contraindications and Warnings and Precautions].*

INDICATIONS AND USAGE: Victoza® is indicated as an adjunct to diet and exercise to improve glycemic control in adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus. **Important Limitations of Use:** Because of the uncertain relevance of the rodent thyroid C-cell tumor findings to humans, prescribe Victoza® only to patients for whom the potential benefits are considered to outweigh the potential risk. Victoza® is not recommended as first-line therapy for patients who have inadequate glycemic control on diet and exercise. In clinical trials of Victoza®, there were more cases of pancreatitis with Victoza® than with comparators. Victoza® has not been studied sufficiently in patients with a history of pancreatitis to determine whether these patients are at increased risk for pancreatitis while using Victoza®. Use with caution in patients with a history of pancreatitis. Victoza® is not a substitute for insulin. Victoza® should not be used in patients with type 1 diabetes mellitus or for the treatment of diabetic ketoacidosis, as it would not be effective in these settings. The concurrent use of Victoza® and insulin has not been studied.

CONTRAINDICATIONS: Victoza® is contraindicated in patients with a personal or family history of medullary thyroid carcinoma (MTC) or in patients with Multiple Endocrine Neoplasia syndrome type 2 (MEN 2).

WARNINGS AND PRECAUTIONS: Risk of Thyroid C-cell Tumors: Liraglutide causes dose-dependent and treatment-duration-dependent thyroid C-cell tumors (adenomas and/or carcinomas) at clinically relevant exposures in both genders of rats and mice. Malignant thyroid C-cell carcinomas were detected in rats and mice. A statistically significant increase in cancer was observed in rats receiving liraglutide at 8-times clinical exposure compared to controls. It is unknown whether Victoza® will cause thyroid C-cell tumors, including medullary thyroid carcinoma (MTC), in humans, as the human relevance of liraglutide-induced rodent thyroid C-cell tumors could not be determined by clinical or nonclinical studies *[see Boxed Warning, Contraindications].* In the clinical trials, there have been 4 reported cases of thyroid C-cell hyperplasia among Victoza®-treated patients and 1 case in a comparator-treated patient (1.3 vs. 0.6 cases per 1000 patient-years). One additional case of thyroid C-cell hyperplasia in a Victoza®-treated patient and 1 case of MTC in a comparator-treated patient have subsequently been reported. This comparator-treated patient with MTC had pre-treatment serum calcitonin concentrations >1000 ng/L suggesting pre-existing disease. All of these cases were diagnosed after thyroidectomy, which was prompted by abnormal results on routine, protocol-specified measurements of serum calcitonin. Four of the five liraglutide-treated patients had elevated calcitonin concentrations at baseline and throughout the trial. One liraglutide and one non-liraglutide-treated patient developed elevated calcitonin concentrations while on treatment. Calcitonin, a biological marker of MTC, was measured throughout the clinical development program. The serum calcitonin assay used in the Victoza® clinical trials had a lower limit of quantification (LLOQ) of 0.7 ng/L and the upper limit of the reference range was 5.0 ng/L for women and 8.4 ng/L for men. At Weeks 26 and 52 in the clinical trials, adjusted mean serum calcitonin concentrations were higher in Victoza®-treated patients compared to placebo-treated patients but not compared to patients receiving active comparator. At these timepoints, the adjusted mean serum calcitonin values (~ 1.0 ng/L) were just above the LLOQ with between-group differences in adjusted mean serum calcitonin values of approximately 0.1 ng/L or less. Among patients with pre-treatment serum calcitonin below the upper limit of the reference range, shifts to above the upper limit of the reference range which persisted in subsequent measurements occurred most frequently among patients treated with Victoza® 1.8 mg/day. In trials with on-treatment serum calcitonin measurements out to 5-6 months, 1.9% of patients treated with Victoza® 1.8 mg/day developed new and persistent calcitonin elevations above the upper limit of the reference range compared to 0.8-1.1% of patients treated with control medication or the 0.6 and 1.2 mg doses of Victoza®. In trials with on-treatment serum calcitonin measurements out to 12 months, 1.3% of patients treated with Victoza® 1.8 mg/day had new and persistent elevations of calcitonin from below or within the reference range to above the upper limit of the reference range, compared to 0.6%, 0% and 1.0% of patients treated with Victoza® 1.2 mg, placebo and active control, respectively. Otherwise, Victoza® did not produce consistent dose-dependent or time-dependent increases in serum calcitonin. Patients with MTC usually have calcitonin values >50 ng/L. In Victoza® clinical trials, among patients with pre-treatment serum calcitonin <50 ng/L, one Victoza®-treated patient and no comparator-treated patients developed serum calcitonin >50 ng/L. The Victoza®-treated patient who developed serum calcitonin >50 ng/L had an elevated pre-treatment serum calcitonin of 10.7 ng/L that increased to 30.7 ng/L at Week 12 and 53.5 ng/L at the end of the 6-month trial. Follow-up serum calcitonin was 22.3 ng/L more than 2.5 years after the last dose of Victoza®. The largest increase in serum calcitonin in a comparator-treated patient was seen with glimepiride in a patient whose serum calcitonin increased from 19.3 ng/L at baseline to 44.8 ng/L at Week 65 and 38.1 ng/L at Week 104. Among patients who began with serum calcitonin <20 ng/L, calcitonin elevations to >20 ng/L occurred in 0.7% of Victoza®-treated patients, 0.3% of placebo-treated patients, and 0.5% of active-comparator-treated patients, with an incidence of 1.1% among patients treated with 1.8 mg/day of Victoza®. The clinical significance of these findings is unknown. Counsel patients regarding the risk for MTC and the symptoms of thyroid tumors (e.g. a mass in the neck, dysphagia, dyspnea or persistent hoarseness). It is unknown whether monitoring with serum calcitonin or thyroid ultrasound will mitigate the potential risk of MTC, and such monitoring may increase the risk of unnecessary procedures, due to low test specificity for serum calcitonin and a high background incidence of thyroid disease. Patients with thyroid nodules noted on physical examination or neck imaging obtained for other reasons should be referred to an endocrinologist for further evaluation. Although routine monitoring of serum calcitonin is of uncertain value in patients treated with Victoza®, if serum calcitonin is measured and found to be elevated, the patient should be referred to an endocrinologist for further evaluation. **Pancreatitis:** In clinical trials of Victoza®, there were 7 cases of pancreatitis among Victoza®-treated patients and 1 case among comparator-treated patients (2.2 vs. 0.6 cases per 1000 patient-years). Five cases with Victoza® were reported as acute pancreatitis and two cases with Victoza® were reported as chronic pancreatitis. In one case in a Victoza®-treated patient pancreatitis, with necrosis, was observed and led to death; however clinical causality could not be established. One additional case of pancreatitis has subsequently been reported in a Victoza®-treated patient. Some patients had other risk factors for pancreatitis, such as a history of cholelithiasis or alcohol abuse. There are no conclusive data establishing a risk of pancreatitis with Victoza® treatment. After initiation of Victoza®, and after dose increases, observe patients carefully for signs and symptoms of pancreatitis (including persistent severe abdominal pain, sometimes radiating to the back and which may or may not be accompanied by vomiting). If pancreatitis is suspected, Victoza® and other potentially suspect medications should be discontinued promptly, confirmatory tests should be performed and appropriate management should be initiated. If pancreatitis is confirmed, Victoza® should not be restarted. Use with caution in patients with a history of pancreatitis. **Use with Medications Known to Cause Hypoglycemia:** Patients receiving Victoza® in combination with an insulin secretagogue (e.g., sulfonylurea) may have an increased risk of hypoglycemia. In the clinical trials of at least 26 weeks duration, hypoglycemia requiring the assistance of another person for treatment occurred in 7 Victoza®-treated patients and in two comparator-treated patients. Six of these 7 patients treated with Victoza® were also taking a sulfonylurea. The risk of hypoglycemia may be lowered by a reduction in the dose of sulfonylurea or other insulin secretagogues *[see Adverse Reactions].* **Renal Impairment:** Victoza® has not been found to be directly nephrotoxic in animal studies or clinical trials. There have been postmarketing reports of acute renal failure and worsening of chronic renal failure, which may sometimes require hemodialysis in Victoza®-treated patients *[see Adverse Reactions].* Some of these events were reported in patients without known underlying renal disease. A majority of the reported events occurred in patients who had experienced nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, or dehydration *[see Adverse Reactions].* Some of the reported events occurred in patients receiving one or more medications known to affect renal function or hydration status. Altered renal function has been reversed in many of the reported cases with supportive treatment and discontinuation of potentially causative agents, including Victoza®. Use caution when initiating or escalating doses of Victoza® in patients with renal impairment. **Macrovascular Outcomes:** There have been no clinical studies establishing conclusive evidence of macrovascular risk reduction with Victoza® or any other antidiabetic drug.

ADVERSE REACTIONS: Clinical Trials Experience: Because clinical trials are conducted under widely varying conditions, adverse reaction rates observed in the clinical trials of a drug cannot be directly compared to rates in the clinical trials of another drug and may not reflect the rates observed in practice. The safety of Victoza® was evaluated in a 52-week monotherapy trial and in five 26-week, add-on combination therapy trials. In the monotherapy trial, patients were treated with Victoza® 1.2 mg daily, Victoza® 1.8 mg daily, or glimepiride 8 mg daily. In the add-on to metformin trial, patients were treated with Victoza® 0.6 mg, Victoza® 1.2 mg, Victoza® 1.8 mg, placebo, or glimepiride 4 mg. In the add-on to glimepiride trial, patients were treated with Victoza® 0.6 mg, Victoza® 1.2 mg, Victoza® 1.8 mg, placebo, or rosiglitazone 4 mg. In the add-on to metformin + glimepiride trial, patients were treated with Victoza® 1.8 mg, placebo, or insulin glargine. In the add-on to metformin + rosiglitazone trial, patients were treated with Victoza® 1.2 mg, Victoza® 1.8 mg or placebo. *Withdrawals:* The incidence of withdrawal due to adverse events was 7.8% for Victoza®-treated patients and 3.4% for comparator-treated patients in the five controlled trials of 26 weeks duration or longer. This difference was driven by withdrawals due to gastrointestinal adverse reactions, which occurred in 5.0% of Victoza®-treated patients and 0.5% of comparator-treated patients. The most common adverse reactions leading to withdrawal for Victoza®-treated patients were nausea (2.8% versus 0% for comparator) and vomiting (1.5% versus 0.1% for comparator). Withdrawal due to gastrointestinal adverse events mainly occurred during the first 2-3 months of the trials. Tables 1, 2 and 3 summarize the adverse events reported in ≥5% of Victoza®-treated patients in the six controlled trials of 26 weeks duration or longer.

Table 1: Adverse events reported in ≥5% of Victoza®-treated patients or ≥5% of glimepiride-treated patients: 52-week monotherapy trial

	All Victoza® N = 497	Glimepiride N = 248
Adverse Event Term	(%)	(%)
Nausea	28.4	8.5
Diarrhea	17.1	8.9
Vomiting	10.9	3.6
Constipation	9.9	4.8
Upper Respiratory Tract Infection	9.5	5.6
Headache	9.1	9.3
Influenza	7.4	3.6
Urinary Tract Infection	6.0	4.0
Dizziness	5.8	5.2
Sinusitis	5.6	6.0
Nasopharyngitis	5.2	5.2
Back Pain	5.0	4.4
Hypertension	3.0	6.0

Table 2: Adverse events reported in ≥5% of Victoza®-treated patients and occurring more frequently with Victoza® compared to placebo: 26-week combination therapy trials

Add-on to Metformin Trial			
	All Victoza® + Metformin N = 724	Placebo + Metformin N = 121	Glimepiride + Metformin N = 242
Adverse Event Term	(%)	(%)	(%)
Nausea	15.2	4.1	3.3
Diarrhea	10.9	4.1	3.7
Headache	9.0	6.6	9.5
Vomiting	6.5	0.8	0.4
Add-on to Glimepiride Trial			
	All Victoza® + Glimepiride N = 695	Placebo + Glimepiride N = 114	Rosiglitazone + Glimepiride N = 231
Adverse Event Term	(%)	(%)	(%)
Nausea	7.5	1.8	2.6
Diarrhea	7.2	1.8	2.2

Constipation	5.3	0.9	1.7
Dyspepsia	5.2	0.9	2.6
Add-on to Metformin + Glimepiride			
	Victoza® 1.8 + Metformin + Glimepiride N = 230	Placebo + Metformin + Glimepiride N = 114	Glargine + Metformin + Glimepiride N = 232
Adverse Event Term	(%)	(%)	(%)
Nausea	13.9	3.5	1.3
Diarrhea	10.0	5.3	1.3
Headache	9.6	7.9	5.6
Dyspepsia	6.5	0.9	1.7
Vomiting	6.5	3.5	0.4

Add-on to Metformin + Rosiglitazone		
	All Victoza® + Metformin + Rosiglitazone N = 355	Placebo + Metformin + Rosiglitazone N = 175
Adverse Event Term	(%)	(%)
Nausea	34.6	8.6
Diarrhea	14.1	6.3
Vomiting	12.4	2.9
Decreased Appetite	9.3	1.1
Anorexia	9.0	0.0
Headache	8.2	4.6
Constipation	5.1	1.1
Fatigue	5.1	1.7

Table 3: Treatment-Emergent Adverse Events in 26 Week Open-Label Trial versus Exenatide (Adverse events with frequency ≥5% and occurring more frequently with Victoza® compared to exenatide are listed)

	Victoza® 1.8 mg once daily + metformin and/or sulfonylurea N = 235	**Exenatide 10 mcg twice daily + metformin and/or sulfonylurea** N = 232
Preferred Term	(%)	(%)
Diarrhea	12.3	12.1
Dyspepsia	8.9	4.7
Constipation	5.1	2.6

Gastrointestinal adverse events: In the five clinical trials of 26 weeks duration or longer, gastrointestinal adverse events were reported in 41% of Victoza®-treated patients and were dose-related. Gastrointestinal adverse events occurred in 17% of comparator-treated patients. Events that occurred more commonly among Victoza®-treated patients included nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, dyspepsia and constipation. In a 26-week study of Victoza® versus exenatide, both in combination with metformin and/or sulfonylurea overall gastrointestinal adverse event incidence rates, including nausea, were similar in patients treated with Victoza® and exenatide. In five clinical trials of 26 weeks duration or longer, the percentage of patients who reported nausea declined over time. Approximately 13% of Victoza®-treated patients and 2% of comparator-treated patients reported nausea during the first 2 weeks of treatment. In a 26 week study of Victoza® versus exenatide, both in combination with metformin and/or sulfonylurea, the proportion of patients with nausea also declined over time. *Immunogenicity:* Consistent with the potentially immunogenic properties of protein and peptide pharmaceuticals, patients treated with Victoza® may develop anti-liraglutide antibodies. Approximately 50-70% of Victoza®-treated patients in the five clinical trials of 26 weeks duration or longer were tested for the presence of anti-liraglutide antibodies at the end of treatment. Low titers (concentrations not requiring dilution of serum) of anti-liraglutide antibodies were detected in 8.6% of these Victoza®-treated patients. Sampling was not performed uniformly across all patients in the clinical trials, and this may have resulted in an underestimate of the actual percentage of patients who developed antibodies. Cross-reacting anti-liraglutide antibodies to native glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) occurred in 6.9% of the Victoza®-treated patients in the 52-week monotherapy trial and in 4.8% of the Victoza®-treated patients in the 26-week add-on combination therapy trials. These cross-reacting antibodies were not tested for neutralizing effect against native GLP-1, and thus the potential for clinically significant neutralization of native GLP-1 was not assessed. Antibodies that had a neutralizing effect on liraglutide in an *in vitro* assay occurred in 2.3% of the Victoza®-treated patients in the 52-week monotherapy trial and in 1.0% of the Victoza®-treated patients in the 26-week add-on combination therapy trials. Among Victoza®-treated patients who developed anti-liraglutide antibodies, the most common category of adverse events was that of infections, which occurred among 40% of these patients compared to 36%, 34% and 35% of antibody-negative Victoza®-treated, placebo-treated and active-control-treated patients, respectively. The specific infections which occurred with greater frequency among Victoza®-treated antibody-positive patients were primarily nonserious upper respiratory tract infections, which occurred among 11% of Victoza®-treated antibody-positive patients; and among 7%, 7% and 5% of antibody-negative Victoza®-treated, placebo-treated and active-control-treated patients, respectively. Among Victoza®-treated antibody-negative patients, the most common category of adverse events was that of gastrointestinal events, which occurred in 43%, 18% and 19% of antibody-negative Victoza®-treated, placebo-treated and active-control-treated patients, respectively. Antibody formation was not associated with reduced efficacy of Victoza® when comparing mean HbA_{1c} of all antibody-positive and all antibody-negative patients. However, the 3 patients with the highest titers of anti-liraglutide antibodies had no reduction in HbA_{1c} with Victoza® treatment. In clinical trials of Victoza®, events from a composite of adverse events potentially related to immunogenicity (e.g. urticaria, angioedema) occurred among 0.8% of Victoza®-treated patients and among 0.4% of comparator-treated patients. Urticaria accounted for approximately one-half of the events in this composite for Victoza®-treated patients. Patients who developed anti-liraglutide antibodies were not more likely to develop events from the immunogenicity events composite than were patients who did not develop anti-liraglutide antibodies. *Injection site reactions:* Injection site reactions (e.g., injection site rash, erythema) were reported in approximately 2% of Victoza®-treated patients in the five clinical trials of at least 26 weeks duration. Less than 0.2% of Victoza®-treated patients discontinued due to injection site reactions. *Papillary thyroid carcinoma:* In clinical trials of Victoza®, there were 6 reported cases of papillary thyroid carcinoma in patients treated with Victoza® and 1 case in a comparator-treated patient (1.9 vs. 0.6 cases per 1000 patient-years). Most of these papillary thyroid carcinomas were <1 cm in greatest diameter and were diagnosed in surgical pathology specimens after thyroidectomy prompted by findings on protocol-specified screening with serum calcitonin or thyroid ultrasound. *Hypoglycemia:* In the clinical trials of at least 26 weeks duration, hypoglycemia requiring the assistance of another person for treatment occurred in 7 Victoza®-treated patients (2.6 cases per 1000 patient-years) and in two comparator-treated patients. Six of these 7 patients treated with Victoza® were also taking a sulfonylurea. One other patient was taking Victoza® in combination with metformin but had another likely explanation for the hypoglycemia (this event occurred during hospitalization and after insulin infusion) (Table 4). Two additional cases of hypoglycemia requiring the assistance of another person for treatment have subsequently been reported in patients who were not taking a concomitant sulfonylurea. Both patients were receiving Victoza®, one as monotherapy and the other in combination with metformin. Both patients had another likely explanation for the hypoglycemia (one received insulin during a frequently-sampled intravenous glucose tolerance test, and the other had intracranial hemorrhage and uncertain food intake).

Table 4: Incidence (%) and Rate (episodes/patient year) of Hypoglycemia in the 52-Week Monotherapy Trial and in the 26-Week Combination Therapy Trials

	Victoza® Treatment	**Active Comparator**	**Placebo Comparator**
Monotherapy	**Victoza®** (N = 497)	**Glimepiride** (N = 248)	**None**
Patient not able to self–treat	0	0	—
Patient able to self–treat	9.7 (0.24)	25.0 (1.66)	—
Not classified	1.2 (0.03)	2.4 (0.04)	—
Add-on to Metformin	**Victoza® + Metformin** (N = 724)	**Glimepiride + Metformin** (N = 242)	**Placebo + Metformin** (N = 121)
Patient not able to self–treat	0.1 (0.001)	0	0
Patient able to self–treat	3.6 (0.05)	22.3 (0.87)	2.5 (0.06)
Add-on to Glimepiride	**Victoza® + Glimepiride** (N = 695)	**Rosiglitazone + Glimepiride** (N = 231)	**Placebo + Glimepiride** (N = 114)
Patient not able to self–treat	0.1 (0.003)	0	0
Patient able to self–treat	7.5 (0.38)	4.3 (0.12)	2.6 (0.17)
Not classified	0.9 (0.05)	0.9 (0.02)	0
Add-on to Metformin + Rosiglitazone	**Victoza® + Metformin + Rosiglitazone** (N = 355)	**None**	**Placebo + Metformin + Rosiglitazone** (N = 175)
Patient not able to self–treat	0	—	0
Patient able to self–treat	7.9 (0.49)	—	4.6 (0.15)
Not classified	0.6 (0.01)	—	1.1 (0.03)
Add-on to Metformin + Glimepiride	**Victoza® + Metformin + Glimepiride** (N = 230)	**Insulin glargine + Metformin + Glimepiride** (N = 232)	**Placebo + Metformin + Glimepiride** (N = 114)
Patient not able to self–treat	2.2 (0.06)	0	0
Patient able to self–treat	27.4 (1.16)	28.9 (1.29)	16.7 (0.95)
Not classified	0	1.7 (0.04)	0

In a pooled analysis of clinical trials, the incidence rate (per 1,000 patient-years) for malignant neoplasms (based on investigator-reported events, medical history, pathology reports, and surgical reports from both blinded and open-label study periods) was 10.9 for Victoza®, 6.3 for placebo, and 7.2 for active comparator. After excluding papillary thyroid carcinoma events *[see Adverse Reactions]*, no particular cancer cell type predominated. Seven malignant neoplasm events were reported beyond 1 year of exposure to study medication, six events among Victoza®-treated patients (4 colon, 1 prostate and 1 nasopharyngeal), no events with placebo and one event with active comparator (colon). Causality has not been established. **Laboratory Tests:** In the five clinical trials of at least 26 weeks duration, mildly elevated serum bilirubin concentrations (elevations to no more than twice the upper limit of the reference range) occurred in 4.0% of Victoza®-treated patients, 2.1% of placebo-treated patients and 3.5% of active-comparator-treated patients. This finding was not accompanied by abnormalities in other liver tests. The significance of this isolated finding is unknown. **Post-Marketing Experience:** The following additional adverse reactions have been reported during post-approval use of Victoza®. Because these events are reported voluntarily from a population of uncertain size, it is generally not possible to reliably estimate their frequency or establish a causal relationship to drug exposure. Gastrointestinal: nausea, vomiting and diarrhea sometimes resulting in dehydration *[see Warnings and Precautions]*. Renal and Urinary Disorders: increased serum creatinine, acute renal failure or worsening of chronic renal failure, which may sometimes require hemodialysis *[see Warnings and Precautions]*.

OVERDOSAGE: In a clinical trial, one patient with type 2 diabetes experienced a single overdose of Victoza® 17.4 mg subcutaneous (10 times the maximum recommended dose). Effects of the overdose included severe nausea and vomiting requiring hospitalization. No hypoglycemia was reported. The patient recovered without complications. In the event of overdosage, appropriate supportive treatment should be initiated according to the patient's clinical signs and symptoms.

More detailed information is available upon request.

For information about Victoza® contact: Novo Nordisk Inc., 100 College Road West, Princeton, New Jersey 08540, 1–877-484-2869

Date of Issue: May 18, 2011 **Version: 3**

Manufactured by: Novo Nordisk A/S, DK-2880 Bagsvaerd, Denmark

novo nordisk®

VICTOZA®
liraglutide (rDNA origin) injection

(*Outcomes Research in Review* continued from page 150)

and not in line with current guidelines. There appeared to be potential overutilization of MRI and certain laboratory tests, with underutilization of more evidence-based diagnostics such as GTT.

Commentary

In light of the current focus on providing more cost-effective, efficient patient care, studies focusing on the overutilization of diagnostic tests are an important step toward decreasing wasteful spending. Although many areas of medical diagnosis remain controversial, there are some conditions for which ample evidence exists around how best to proceed with a workup.

Peripheral neuropathy, in particular, distal symmetrical polyneuropathy (DSP), may be one of these. It is a common condition among Americans, with a prevalence of 15% in adults older than 40 years of age, and it can substantially impact activities of daily living and general quality of life [1,2]. As referenced in this article, the American Academy of Neurology (ANN) recently issued a systematic review focusing on this topic, and concluded that the highest-yield laboratory tests for a workup of DSP were serum glucose (followed by GTT or other tests for pre-diabetes if not clearly abnormal), serum B12 level, and serum protein electrophoresis [3]. Despite these findings and the well-known epidemiology of the condition, providers may still not be certain about which tests to obtain for patients.

Using a nationally representative sample of Medicare beneficiaries, the investigators in this study found that the workup ordered by providers for a new diagnosis of peripheral neuropathy was variable and not always consistent with recommendations on appropriate testing.

The strengths of this study include its use of a nationally representative sample, which, in theory, circumvented the potential issues of regional variation and the inherent practice pattern variability that can be observed in different areas of the country. Additionally, the topic itself is important, timely, and highly relevant due to the frequency with which physicians caring for older adults encounter this condition. The authors' use of propensity-matched controls for comparison with neuropathy patients helped to address the problem of exactly how much of the "excess" utilization was due to the evaluation of neuropathy, as opposed to the background rate of use for many of these common diagnostics in an elderly and chronically ill population.

The study had several notable limitations. Although the matched controls had lower rates of utilization on all of the major diagnostic tests evaluated, the absolute difference was not substantial. This was particularly true for commonly ordered tests in an elderly population, such as CBC, TSH, and CMP. Additionally, the article emphasizes potential overuse of diagnostics by using the total number of tests ordered that could possibly relate to neuropathy workup, rather than the relative increase in number of tests ordered (compared to controls). This may lead to an impression of greater overutilization for neuropathy workup than is actually the case. Regarding spending, the increase in total Medicare expenditures in the months following evaluation of neuropathy cannot be completely attributed to the diagnostic workup itself. As the authors acknowledge, there are a number of treatment-related costs likely incurred in the first few months after a diagnosis (eg, durable medical equipment, physical therapy, new medication) that represent appropriate spending.

Given that nearly half of this patient population was diabetic at baseline, reporting the underuse of GTT in the population as a whole may be misleading. The AAN report that recommends GTT in the evaluation of neuropathy actually first suggests a serum glucose level be checked, and that a GTT be ordered only in the case where serum glucose is not obviously abnormal at baseline [3]. Presumably, this would exempt diabetics or people who on screening had elevated glucose or A1c from requiring GTT. Finally, as the authors mention in their discussion section, the patients in this study were largely of advanced age, and therefore their findings regarding the workup of neuropathy may not be generalizable to the care of younger populations.

Applications for Clinical Practice

Although peripheral neuropathy is a widely prevalent condition encountered by most providers, this study concluded that Medicare patients may receive excessive and inconsistent workup for it. Rather than erring on the side of ordering comprehensive upfront testing (such as CNS imaging and blood testing for rare etiologies), providers should first consult the most recent and synthesized evidence for a step-wise approach. More thoughtful ordering of diagnostics will not only cut the costs of care, but result in fewer iatrogenic complications for patients.

—Review by Kristina Lewis, MD, MPH

References

1. Gregg EW, Sorlie P, Paulose-Ram R, et al. Prevalence of lower-extremity disease in the US adult population >=40 years of age with and without diabetes: 1999-2000 national health and nutrition examination survey. Diabetes Care 2004;27:1591–7.
2. Gordois A, Scuffham P, Shearer A, et al. The health care costs of diabetic peripheral neuropathy in the US. Diabetes Care 2003;26:1790–5.
3. England JD, Gronseth GS, Franklin G, et al. Practice parameter: evaluation of distal symmetric polyneuropathy: role of laboratory and genetic testing (an evidence-based review). Report of the American Academy of Neurology, American Association of Neuromuscular and Electrodiagnostic Medicine, and American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. Neurology 2009;72:185–92.