

## Editorial



# Clinical Significance of Newly Diagnosed Diabetes Mellitus in the Era of DES for Acute Myocardial Infarction

Hun-Jun Park , MD, PhD

Division of Cardiology, The Catholic University of Korea College of Medicine, Cardiovascular Center, Seoul St. Mary's Hospital, Seoul, Korea.

## OPEN ACCESS

**Received:** Jan 4, 2018

**Accepted:** Jan 25, 2018

### Correspondence to

Hun-Jun Park, MD, PhD

Division of Cardiology, The Catholic University of Korea College of Medicine, 222 Banpo-daero, Seocho-gu, Seoul 06951, Korea.  
E-mail: cardioman@catholic.ac.kr

**Copyright** © 2018. The Korean Society of Cardiology

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0>) which permits unrestricted noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

### ORCID iDs

Hun-Jun Park   
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8009-9546>

### Conflict of Interest

The author has no financial conflicts of interest.

The contents of the report are the author's own views and do not necessarily reflect the views of the *Korean Circulation Journal*.

► See the article “Long-term Prognosis and Clinical Characteristics of Patients with Newly Diagnosed Diabetes Mellitus Detected after First Acute Myocardial Infarction: from KAMIR-NIH Registry” in volume 48 on page 134.

Diabetes mellitus (DM) was an important independent predictor of mortality in patients with acute myocardial infarction (AMI), even after revascularization.<sup>1,2)</sup> However, DM status is an important factor affecting the risk of cardiovascular events in patients with AMI, controversy remains as to the exact role and extent of this influence. Especially, new onset diabetes is now major concern in preventive cardiology and diabetology to reduce cardiovascular risk for primary or secondary prevention. In the current issue of the *Korean Circulation Journal*, the authors reported long-term prognosis and clinical characteristics of patients with new-DM detected after the first AMI from the KAMIR-NIH registry.<sup>3)</sup> This multicenter nationwide prospective registry study was initiated in November 2011 and enrolled 10,455 patients with AMI and included in 6,236 patients with non-DM, 659 patients with new-DM, and 3,560 patients with known-DM, respectively. As a result, new-DM patients had a similar risk of cardiac events to that of non-DM patients, although known-DM patients showed a significantly higher risk of cardiac events than non-DM patients. These findings are different from the VALsartan In Acute myocardial iNfarcTion (VALIANT) trial,<sup>4)</sup> a multicenter large-population (n=14,703) prospective random study, which showed that the patients with previously known (n=3,400) and newly diagnosed diabetes (n=580) had similarly increased adjusted risks of mortality and cardiovascular events. Harmonizing Outcomes with RevascularizatiON and Stents in Acute Myocardial Infarction (HORIZONS-AMI) sub-study (n=3,599) also showed that those with DM (n=593) and new-DM (n=130) had higher 3-year rates of death and major adverse cardiac events compared with nondiabetics.<sup>5)</sup>

We can estimate the reasons why clinical significance of new-DM was different from VALIANT or HORIZONS-AMI trials: 1) introduction of new anti-diabetic drugs and intensive strategy of glucose control, 2) advanced stent platforms and percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) techniques, and 3) other risk controls of coronary artery disease (CAD), such as hypertension, dyslipidemia, and obesity. New anti-diabetic drugs include dipeptidyl peptidase 4 (DPP-4) inhibitors (2006), sodium-glucose cotransporter (SGLT2) inhibitors (2013), and glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor (GLP-1R) agonists (2010).<sup>6)</sup> Current guideline directed that the patients should be motivated to initiate pharmacotherapy without delaying when glycemic control is not achieved or if glycated hemoglobin (HbA1C) rises to 6.5% after 2–3 months of lifestyle intervention. If the HbA1C level rises to 7.5% while on medication or if the initial HbA1C is ≥9%, combination therapy with two oral agents, or with insulin, may be considered.<sup>7)</sup> Patients with DM have a higher burden of atherosclerosis, smaller coronary arteries, and a higher risk of repeat revascularization after stent implantation. Drug-eluting stents (DES) have been

widely tested in patients with diabetes and have consistently reduced the rate of restenosis, as compared with bare-metal stents.<sup>8)</sup> Early-generation DES released sirolimus or paclitaxel and had stainless-steel platforms, whereas new-generation DES release everolimus or zotarolimus and feature cobalt-chrome or platinum-chrome platforms with thinner strut thickness and more biocompatible, durable polymer coatings.<sup>9)</sup> Therefore, these advanced stent platforms can also contribute to reduce major adverse cardiovascular events (MACEs) in AMI patients with DM and these beneficial effects might be more remarkable in new-DM patients as expected with less comorbidities and lower extent of CAD.<sup>10)</sup>

In conclusion, even though it was a registry-based study with several limitations such as lack in follow-up glucose status and medication compliance, this article showed that new-DM was not associated with increased risk of death or adverse cardiovascular events compared to the risk noted for non-DM. These findings may reflect the impact of recent update of the treatment guideline of diabetic patients and advanced intervention skills with new generation DES in patients with AMI and DM.

## REFERENCES

1. Park HW, Yoon CH, Kang SH, et al. Early- and late-term clinical outcome and their predictors in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction and non-ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction. *Int J Cardiol* 2013;169:254-61.  
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
2. Norhammar A, Malmberg K, Diderholm E, et al. Diabetes mellitus: the major risk factor in unstable coronary artery disease even after consideration of the extent of coronary artery disease and benefits of revascularization. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2004;43:585-91.  
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
3. Park HW, Kang MG, Kim K, et al. Long-term prognosis and clinical characteristics of patients with newly diagnosed diabetes mellitus detected after the first acute myocardial infarction: from the KAMIR-NIH registry. *Korean Circ J*. 2018;48:134-47.  
[CROSSREF](#)
4. Aguilar D, Solomon SD, Køber L, et al. Newly diagnosed and previously known diabetes mellitus and 1-year outcomes of acute myocardial infarction: the VALsartan In Acute myocardial infarcTion (VALIANT) trial. *Circulation* 2004;110:1572-8.  
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
5. Ertelt K, Brener SJ, Mehran R, Ben-Yehuda O, McAndrew T, Stone GW. Comparison of outcomes and prognosis of patients with versus without newly diagnosed diabetes mellitus after primary percutaneous coronary intervention for ST-elevation myocardial infarction (the HORIZONS-AMI Study). *Am J Cardiol* 2017;119:1917-23.  
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
6. Standards of medical care in diabetes-2016: summary of revisions. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39 Suppl 1:S4-5.  
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
7. Chamberlain JJ, Rhinehart AS, Shaefer CF Jr, Neuman A. Diagnosis and management of diabetes: synopsis of the 2016 American Diabetes Association standards of medical care in diabetes. *Ann Intern Med* 2016;164:542-52.  
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
8. Levine GN, Bates ER, Blankenship JC, et al. 2011 ACCF/AHA/SCAI guideline for percutaneous coronary intervention. A report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines and the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2011;58:e44-122.  
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
9. Stefanini GG, Holmes DR Jr. Drug-eluting coronary-artery stents. *N Engl J Med* 2013;368:254-65.  
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
10. Bangalore S, Kumar S, Fusaro M, et al. Outcomes with various drug eluting or bare metal stents in patients with diabetes mellitus: mixed treatment comparison analysis of 22,844 patient years of follow-up from randomised trials. *BMJ* 2012;345:e5170.  
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)