

Insulin Resistance and Pulmonary Arterial Hypertension

R Dovle^{1,2} R Zamanian^{1,2}, J Faul^{1,2}, J Liu^{1,2}, M Rabinovitch^{1,3}, G Reaven⁴ Vera M. Wall Center for Pulmonary Vascular Disease¹, Division of Pulmonary & Critical Care Medicine², Division of Pediatric Cardiology³, Division of Endocrinology⁴, Stanford University School of Medicine

Abstract

In view of the importance of insulin resistance (IR) and associated abnormalities in the genesis of cardiovascular disease (CVDz) it is reasonable to think IR could play a role in the pathogenesis and clinical course of pulmonary arterial hypertension (PAH). Lines of evidence which suggest this hypothesis are (1) the endothelial dysfunction characteristic of PAH is similar to that in cardiovascular and peripheral vascular disease, in which IR has been shown to play an important role; (2) obesity and low physical activity are clearly associated with insulin resistance; (3) the prevalence of obesity is increased in patients with pulmonary arterial hypertension; (4) PAH patients tend to be sedentary. In order to test thi hypothesis we reviewed the clinical characteristics and fasting lipid profiles on a convenience cohort of 79 patients with PAH from the Stanford PH Database, excluding patients with a known history of liver disease, congenital heart disease (uncorrected) cancer, and diabetes. The average BMI of these patients was 29.6 kg/m2 (SD 8.4) and 56 patients (71%) were overweight or obese by conventional criteria. The average triglyceride/HDL ratio (TG/HDL) (a marker of insulin resistance when > 3) among all 79 patients was 3.1 (SD 1.8; range 0.8-10.2), consistent with an increased prevalence of insulin resistance. Thirtyfour of the 79 patients (43%) had TG/HDL ratios greater than 3, indicating insulin resistance, while 39/79 or 36.7% had ratios of less than 2 and were insulin sensitive (IS). Furthermore IR patients appeared to be sicker as indicated by higher NYHA class III/IV (56% in IR group versus 48% in IS group) and a greater number of those on prostanoid therapy (50% in IR group versus 34% in IS group). We have demonstrated an increased prevalence of IR among a cohort of PAH patients. While the etiology of PAH is likely to be multi-factorial these results suggest that IR may represent an important contributing factor to disease development or disease progression, or both in PAH. If this hypothesis is true then treatment aimed at improving insulin resistance may have benefit for a large percentage of patients.

Introduction

Individuals who are insulin resistant (IR) and hyperinsulinemic are more likely to be hypertensive and have a dyslipidemia characterized by a high plasma triglyceride (TG) and low high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL) concentration. They are also at increased risk for cardiovascular disease. IR is associated with various manifestations of endothelial dysfunction including increased adherence of mononuclear cells to endothelium, elevated plasma levels of PAI-1, elevated levels of adhesion molecules and elevated levels of ADMA, an endogenous inhibitor of nitric oxide synthase. Plasma concentrations of several markers of vascular inflammation, including white blood cells and C-reactive protein, are also increased in insulin resistant individuals. The strong link between insulin resistance and systemic vascular disease and endothelial dysfunction suggests that insulin resistance may also contribute to the vascular abnormalities which characterize PAH. In support of a relationship between PAH and IR the Rabinovitch lab has generated preliminary data showing that BMP2R, mutations of which form the genetic basis for familial PAH, induces PPAR gamma gene regulation. While being overweight or obese is not the only determinant of IR being obese increases the likelihood of an individual being insulin resistant. The tendency towards insulin resistance is further accentuated by low levels of physical activity. Adult PAH patients are often obese and inactive (prominent features of IR) and many PAH associated conditions such as sleep apnea and the use of stimulants and appetite suppressants may be by-products of a fundamental metabolic disturbance. The average BMI for patients with PAH in the Stanford PAH Database is 30.6 kg/m2 (n=377). The association of IR with cardiovascular disease and endothelial dysfunction, the association of obesity with IR and the high prevalence of obesity in PAH all suggest that IR may contribute to the pathogenesis of PAH.

Objectives

(1) To review fasting lipid profiles on a convenience cohort of PAH patients and determine the prevalence of insulin resistance

(2) To explore the relationship between IR and clinical status

Methods

We reviewed the clinical characteristics and lipoprotein values on a convenience cohort of 79 patients with PAH from the Stanford PH Database, excluding patients with a known history of liver disease, congenital heart disease (uncorrected) cancer, and diabetes. Patients in the Stanford PH database are followed prospectively while alive and outcomes such as death or transplantation are tracked. The retention rate in this cohort is greater than 90%. The current database includes information on 377 patients, 278 of whom are alive and followed quarterly at Stanford. Detailed information is gathered at the initial visit and each follow-up clinic visit and entered into a relational database. The information includes national demographics, PH classification, concomitant illnesses, medical and surgical history, family history, medication exposure, NYHA class, exercise capacity (six minute walk test), BMI and diagnostic test results (including pulmonary function tests, echocardiograms, right heart catheterizations, V/Q scans, polysomnograms and chest computed tomography). Statistical analyses consisted of a t test and 1-Way ANOVA for comparisons. Results were considered significant if the p value was < 0.5.

Results

The average BMI of all patients was 29.6 ± 8.4 kg/m2 and 56 patients (71%) were overweight or obese by conventional criteria. The average TG/HDL-C ratio among all 79 patients was 3.1 ± 1.8 with (range 0.8-10.2), consistent with an increased prevalence of insulin resistance. The average TG/HDL ratio in the patients who were overweight or obese was 3.3 ± 2, well above the threshold indicating insulin resistance. In terms of the etiology of PAH among this cohort 20 (25.3%) had iPAH, 18 (22.8%) had PAH associated with anorexigen or stimulant exposure, 16 (20.3%) had PAH associated with collagen vascular disease, 11 (13.9%) had PAH associated with congenital heart disease (CHD); the rest included patients with portopulmonary HTN (3.8%), chronic thrombembolic disease (6.3%), OSA (3.8%), and miscellaneous causes (3.8%) which included 1 patient with sarcoidosis and 2 patients with HIV (TABLE 1.) Thirty-four of the 79 patients (43%) had TG/HDL ratios greater than 3 and were thus presumed to be insulin resistant (IR), while 29/79 or 41.3% had ratios of less than 2 and were insulin sensitive (IS) (TABLE 2) A comparison of patients who insulin sensitive (IS) with a TG-HDL ratio < 2 with those who were insulin resistant (TG-HDL ratio >3) suggests that the two groups were similar with respect to average age, male:female ratio and average BMI. This latter point emphasizes that while BMI influences IR it is not necessarily correlated with it. (FIGURE 1). In comparing the IS and IR groups there were more patients with CHD in the IR group (5 or 14.7%) than in the IS group (1 or 3.4%). In terms of NYHA classification there were significantly more NYHA III/V patients in the IR group (5 or 14.7%) than in the IS group (1 or 3.4%). than in the IS group (48%); similarly there were more NYHA I/II patients in the IS versus the IR group. Hemodynamics were not significantly different among the IR versus IS groups. However, more IR patients required prostanoid therapy (50%) when compared to patients who were insulin sensitive (34.%).

Age - (yrs) 443 Gender - No (%) 11 Female 66 BMI (kg/m²) 2 Etiology - No (%) 12 BMI (kg/m²) 2 Etiology - No (%) 12 BPAH 21 Stam & Appetite Supp 12 CHD 1 CVD 11 CTEPH 14 PHTIN 15 Misc 16 Misc 17 UN 18 II 32 IV 1 Unknown 12 ETA 11 Prostanoid 20 ETA 1 PDE-I 17 PDE-I 17 Prostanoid 20 ETA 11 Prostanoid 21 Prostanoid + ETA 11	Total (n=79) 5.8±12.2 9 (24.1) 0 (75.9) 19.6±8.4 0 (25.3) 8 (22.8) 1 (13.9) 6 (20.3) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 1 (32.2) 9 (36.7)	Sensitive (n=2) Insulin Sensitive (n=29) 48.17±13.5 6 (20.7) 23 (79.3) 30.1±9.1 8 (27.6) 6 (20.7) 1 (3.4) 0 410±163 1 (3.4) 1 (3.4) 1 (3.4) 1 (3.4) 1 (3.4) 1 (3.4) 1 (3.4)	Insulin Resistant (n=34) 43.41±9 6 7 (20.6) 27 (79.4) 30.1±8.4 10 (29.4) 8 (23.6) 5 (14.7) 6 (17.7) 1 (2.9) 0 1 (2.9) 3 (8.8) 369±135 1 (2.9) 11 (32.4)	11- 10- 9- 9- 9- 7- 7- 7- 7- 7- 7- 7- 7- 7- 7- 7- 7- 7-	ficantly correlated line represents 1 ating 95% confid gh-Density Lipop	20 40 Body Mass Index resistance profile 1 d with body mass linear regression li rotein ratio.	index (r2 = 0.0 ne with dotted
Age - (yrs) 45 Gender - No (%) 1 Male 12 Female 60 BMI (kg/m²) 2 Etiology - No (%) 1 iPAH 21 Stm & Appetite Supp 12 CHD 10 CTEPH 10 PPHTIN 10 OSA 10 Misc 31 Misc 11 11 32 III 32 IV 11 Unknown 12 Therapies - No (%) 21 Prostanoid 22 ETA 11 PDE-I 11 Prostanoid + ETA 10	5.8±12.2 9 (24.1) 0 (75.9) 19.6±8.4 0 (25.3) 8 (22.8) 1 (13.9) 6 (20.3) 5 (6.3) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 8(6±145 3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)	48 17±13.5 6 (20.7) 23 (79.3) 30.1±9.1 8 (27.6) 6 (20.7) 1 (3.4) 8 (27.6) 2 (6.9) 3 (10.4) 1 (3.4) 0 410±163 1 (3.9) 12 (41.4)	43.41±9 6 7 (20.6) 27 (79.4) 30.1±8.4 10 (29.4) 8 (23.6) 5 (14.7) 6 (17.7) 1 (2.9) 0 1 (2.9) 3 (68) 369±135 1 (2.9)	10- 9- 8- 97 7 4 6- 5- 2- 1- 0- 0- 0 8- 2- 1- 0- 0 9 8- 1- 0 9 7 1- 0 9 9 7 1- 0 9 9 7 1- 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	ficantly correlated line represents 1 ating 95% confid gh-Density Lipop	Body Mass Index resistance profile b d with body mass linear regression lir ence interval. TG/I	by TG/HDL is index $(r^2 = 0.0)$ ne with dotted
Gender – No (%) Male 11 Male 11 Female 66 BMI (kg/m ³) 2 2 Etiology – No (%) 11 Litudogy – No (%) 11 21 11 11 CVD 10 11 12 11 <td>9 (24.1) 0 (75.9) 9.6=8.4 0 (25.3) 8 (22.8) 1 (13.9) 6 (20.3) 5 (6.3) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 8(6=145 3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)</td> <td>6 (20.7) 23 (79.3) 30.1±9.1 8 (27.6) 6 (20.7) 1 (3.4) 8 (27.6) 2 (69) 3 (10.4) 1 (3.4) 0 410±163 1 (3.9) 12 (41.4)</td> <td>7 (20.6) 27 (79.4) 30.1\pm8.4 10 (29.4) 8 (23.6) 5 (14.7) 6 (17.7) 1 (2.9) 0 (2.9) 3 (8.8) 369\pm135 1 (2.9)</td> <td>9 Figure 5</td> <td>ficantly correlated line represents 1 ating 95% confid gh-Density Lipop</td> <td>Body Mass Index resistance profile b d with body mass linear regression lir ence interval. TG/I</td> <td>by TG/HDL is index $(r^2 = 0.0)$ ne with dotted</td>	9 (24.1) 0 (75.9) 9.6=8.4 0 (25.3) 8 (22.8) 1 (13.9) 6 (20.3) 5 (6.3) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 8(6=145 3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)	6 (20.7) 23 (79.3) 30.1±9.1 8 (27.6) 6 (20.7) 1 (3.4) 8 (27.6) 2 (69) 3 (10.4) 1 (3.4) 0 410±163 1 (3.9) 12 (41.4)	7 (20.6) 27 (79.4) 30.1 \pm 8.4 10 (29.4) 8 (23.6) 5 (14.7) 6 (17.7) 1 (2.9) 0 (2.9) 3 (8.8) 369 \pm 135 1 (2.9)	9 Figure 5	ficantly correlated line represents 1 ating 95% confid gh-Density Lipop	Body Mass Index resistance profile b d with body mass linear regression lir ence interval. TG/I	by TG/HDL is index $(r^2 = 0.0)$ ne with dotted
Male 11 Female 66 BMI (kg/m ²) 2 Ethology - No (%) 1PAH 1PAH 21 Sim & Appetite Supp 11 CVD 11 CVD 10 PPHTN 9 OSA 3 Misc 3 Misc 3 II 3 II 2 IVTIA - No (%) 1 Therapies - No (%) 2 Prostanoid 20 ETA 1 PDF-I 1	0 (75.9) 9.6=8.4 0 (25.3) 8 (22.8) 1 (13.9) 6 (20.3) 5 (6.3) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)	23 (79.3) 30.1±9.1 8 (27.6) 6 (20.7) 1 (3.4) 8 (27.6) 2 (6.9) 3 (10.4) 1 (3.4) 0 410±163 1 (3.9) 12 (41.4)	$\begin{array}{c} 27\ (79.4)\\ 30.1\pm 8.4\\ 10\ (29.4)\\ 8\ (23.6)\\ 5\ (14.7)\\ 6\ (17.7)\\ 1\ (2.9)\\ 0\\ 1\ (2.9)\\ 3\ (6\ 8)\\ 369\pm 135\\ 1\ (2.9)\\ \end{array}$	3- 2- 1- 0+ 0 Solid indice to Hi	ficantly correlated line represents 1 ating 95% confid gh-Density Lipop	Body Mass Index resistance profile b d with body mass linear regression lir ence interval. TG/I	by TG/HDL is index $(r^2 = 0.0)$ ne with dotted
Male 11 Female 66 BMI (kg/m ²) 2 Ettology - No (%) 12 JPAH 2 Smm & Appetite Supp 11 CVD 11 CVD 11 OSA 3 Misc 3 Misc 3 II 3 II 3 II 2 IV II 2 VitA - No (%) 1 Dianova 2 Therapies - No (%) 2 ETA 1 PPOLI 1 Protanoid 2 ETA 1	0 (75.9) 9.6=8.4 0 (25.3) 8 (22.8) 1 (13.9) 6 (20.3) 5 (6.3) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)	23 (79.3) 30.1±9.1 8 (27.6) 6 (20.7) 1 (3.4) 8 (27.6) 2 (6.9) 3 (10.4) 1 (3.4) 0 410±163 1 (3.9) 12 (41.4)	$\begin{array}{c} 27\ (79.4)\\ 30.1\pm 8.4\\ 10\ (29.4)\\ 8\ (23.6)\\ 5\ (14.7)\\ 6\ (17.7)\\ 1\ (2.9)\\ 0\\ 1\ (2.9)\\ 3\ (6\ 8)\\ 369\pm 135\\ 1\ (2.9)\\ \end{array}$	3- 2- 1- 0+ 0 Solid indice to Hi	ficantly correlated line represents 1 ating 95% confid gh-Density Lipop	Body Mass Index resistance profile b d with body mass linear regression lir ence interval. TG/I	by TG/HDL is index $(r^2 = 0.0)$ ne with dotted
BMI (kg/m²) 2 Etology - No (%) iPAH iPAH 2 Sim & Appetite Supp 11 CHD 1 CVD 10 CTEPH 2 PPHTN 3 Misc 3 Misc 1 OSA 3 NYHA - No (%) 1 II 3 III 2 IV 1 Uaknown 2 Protanoid 2 ETA 1 PDE-I 1	9.6±8.4 0 (25.3) 8 (22.8) 1 (13.9) 6 (20.3) 5 (6.3) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 86±145 3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)	30.1±9.1 8 (27.6) 6 (20.7) 1 (3.4) 8 (27.6) 2 (6.9) 3 (10.4) 1 (3.4) 0 410±163 1 (3.9) 12 (41.4)	30.1±8.4 10 (29.4) 8 (23.6) 5 (14.7) 6 (17.7) 1 (2.9) 0 1 (2.9) 3 (8.8) 369±135 1 (2.9)	3- 2- 1- 0+ 0 Solid indice to Hi	ficantly correlated line represents 1 ating 95% confid gh-Density Lipop	Body Mass Index resistance profile b d with body mass linear regression lir ence interval. TG/I	by TG/HDL is index $(r2 = 0.1)$ we with dotted
Enology – No (%) iPAH 22 Sum & Appetite Supp CHD 1 CVD 11 CVD 10 CTEPH 9 PPHTN 05A Misc 3 6MWT (meters) 3 NVHA – No (%) 1 II 3 III 22 IV 1 Unknown 3 Therapies – No (%) Prostanoid + ETA 1	0 (25.3) 8 (22.8) 1 (13.9) 6 (20.3) 5 (6.3) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 86±145 3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)	8 (27.6) 6 (20.7) 1 (3.4) 8 (27.6) 2 (6.9) 3 (10.4) 1 (3.4) 0 410±163 1 (3.9) 12 (41.4)	$\begin{array}{c} 10 \ (29.4) \\ 8 \ (23.6) \\ 5 \ (14.7) \\ 6 \ (17.7) \\ 1 \ (2.9) \\ 0 \\ 1 \ (2.9) \\ 3 \ (8.8) \\ 369 \pm 135 \\ 1 \ (2.9) \end{array}$	3- 2- 1- 0+ 0 Solid indice to Hi	ficantly correlated line represents 1 ating 95% confid gh-Density Lipop	Body Mass Index resistance profile b d with body mass linear regression lir ence interval. TG/I	by TG/HDL is index $(r2 = 0.1)$ we with dotted
iPAH 22 Smit & Appetite Supp 11 CHD 11 CVD 11 CTEPH 11 PPHTN 20 Misc 31 Misc 11 11 31 II 32 III 33 Thrapies – No (%) 21 Prostanoid 22 ETA 1 PDE-I 1 Prostanoid + ETA 11	8 (22.8) 1 (13.9) 6 (20.3) 5 (6.3) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 86±145 3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)	$\begin{array}{c} 6 (20.7) \\ 1 (3.4) \\ 8 (27.6) \\ 2 (6.9) \\ 3 (10.4) \\ 1 (3.4) \\ 0 \\ 410\pm163 \\ \\ 1 (3.9) \\ 12 (41.4) \end{array}$	8 (23.6) 5 (14.7) 6 (17.7) 1 (2.9) 0 1 (2.9) 3 (8.8) 369±135 1 (2.9)	Figu signi Solid indice to Hij	ficantly correlated line represents 1 ating 95% confid gh-Density Lipop	Body Mass Index resistance profile b d with body mass linear regression lir ence interval. TG/I	by TG/HDL is index ($r2 = 0$. we with dotted
iPAH 22 Smit & Appetite Supp 11 CHD 11 CVD 11 CTEPH 11 PPHTN 20 Misc 31 Misc 11 11 31 II 32 III 33 Thrapies – No (%) 21 Prostanoid 22 ETA 1 PDE-I 1 Prostanoid + ETA 11	8 (22.8) 1 (13.9) 6 (20.3) 5 (6.3) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 86±145 3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)	$\begin{array}{c} 6 (20.7) \\ 1 (3.4) \\ 8 (27.6) \\ 2 (6.9) \\ 3 (10.4) \\ 1 (3.4) \\ 0 \\ 410\pm163 \\ \\ 1 (3.9) \\ 12 (41.4) \end{array}$	8 (23.6) 5 (14.7) 6 (17.7) 1 (2.9) 0 1 (2.9) 3 (8.8) 369±135 1 (2.9)	signii Solid indice to Hij	ficantly correlated line represents 1 ating 95% confid gh-Density Lipop	Body Mass Index resistance profile b d with body mass linear regression lir ence interval. TG/I	by TG/HDL is index ($r2 = 0$. we with dotted
CHD 1 CVD 10 CTEPH 11 OSA 30 Misc 31 SMWT (meters) 33 NYHA – No (%) 1 II 3 III 21 IV 11 Unknown 21 Prostanoid 22 ETA 1 Prostanoid + ETA 10	1 (13.9) 6 (20.3) 5 (6.3) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)	$\begin{array}{c} 1 & (3.4) \\ \$ & (27.6) \\ 2 & (6.9) \\ 3 & (10.4) \\ 1 & (3.4) \\ 0 \\ 410 \pm 163 \\ \\ 1 & (3.9) \\ 12 & (41.4) \end{array}$	5 (14.7) 6 (17.7) 1 (2.9) 0 1 (2.9) 3 (8.8) 369±135 1 (2.9)	signii Solid indice to Hij	ficantly correlated line represents 1 ating 95% confid gh-Density Lipop	Body Mass Index resistance profile b d with body mass linear regression lir ence interval. TG/I	by TG/HDL index $(r^2 = 0.00)$ ne with dotted
CVD 10 CTEPH PPHTN OSA Misc Misc Misc 6MWT (meters) 3 NYHA – No (%) 1 II 3 III 21 IV 1 Unknown 21 Prostanoid 22 ETA 1 PPostanoid + ETA 11	6 (20.3) 5 (6.3) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)	8 (27.6) 2 (6.9) 3 (10.4) 1 (3.4) 0 410±163 1 (3.9) 12 (41.4)	6 (17.7) 1 (2.9) 0 1 (2.9) 3 (8.8) 369±135 1 (2.9)	signii Solid indice to Hij	ficantly correlated line represents 1 ating 95% confid gh-Density Lipop	d with body mass linear regression lir ence interval. TG/l	index $(r^2 = 0)$ ne with dotted
CTEPH PHIN OSA Misc SMWT (meters) 3 SMWT (meters) 3 II 1 III 2 IV 1 Unknown 3 Prostanoid 20 ETA 1 PDesL 1 PDesL 1	5 (6.3) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)	$2 (6.9) 3 (10.4) 1 (3.4) 0 410\pm1631 (3.9)12 (41.4)$	1 (2.9) 0 1 (2.9) 3 (8.8) 369±135 1 (2.9)	signii Solid indice to Hij	ficantly correlated line represents 1 ating 95% confid gh-Density Lipop	d with body mass linear regression lir ence interval. TG/l	index $(r^2 = 0)$ ne with dotted
PPHTN OSA 3 Misc 3 SMWT (meters) 3 II 3 III 3 III 3 III 3 IPO (%) 1 Uv 1 Unknown 3 Prostanoid 22 ETA 1 Prostanoid + ETA 1	3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)	3 (10.4) 1 (3.4) 0 410±163 1 (3.9) 12 (41.4)	0 1 (2.9) 3 (8.8) 369±135 1 (2.9)	Solid indice to Hij	line represents 1 ating 95% confid gh-Density Lipop g 2	linear regression lir ence interval. TG/I	ne with dotted
OSA Misc 3 SMWT (meters) 3 II 3 II 3 III 2 IV 1 Unknown 3 Prostanoid 20 ETA 1 PDostanoid + ETA 10	3 (3.8) 3 (3.8) 86±145 3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)	1 (3.4) 0 410±163 1 (3.9) 12 (41.4)	1 (2.9) 3 (8.8) 369±135 1 (2.9)	indic to Hij	ating 95% confid gh-Density Lipop g 2	ence interval. TG/I	
Misc Misc SMWT (meters) 3 II 3 III 3 III 2 IV 1 Unknown 3 Interspies – No (%) 2 Prostanoid 2 ETA 1 PDet-I 1 PDrestanoid + ETA 1	3 (3.8) 86±145 3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)	0 410±163 1 (3.9) 12 (41.4)	3 (8.8) 369±135 1 (2.9)	to Hij	gh-Density Lipop g 2		mbe – mgiy
5MWT (meters) 3 NYHA – No (%) 1 II 3 III 2 IV 1 Unknown 2 Prostanoid 21 ETA 1 Prostanoid + ETA 1	3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)	410±163 1 (3.9) 12 (41.4)	369±135	Fi	g 2		
NYHA - No (%) I 3 III 3 III 22 IV 11 Unknown 2 Therapies - No (%) Prostanoid 22 ETA 1 PDE-I 1 Prostanoid + ETA 1	3 (3.8) 1 (39.2)	1 (3.9) 12 (41.4)	1 (2.9)		0		
I 3 III 3 III 22 IV 11 Uaknown 21 Prostanoid 22 ETA 1 PDE-I 1 Prostanoid + ETA 10	1 (39.2)	12 (41.4)		13	'n		
I 3 III 3 III 22 IV 11 Votanown 21 Prostanoid 22 ETA 12 PDE-I Prostanoid + ETA 11	1 (39.2)	12 (41.4)		13	°1		
II 3 III 22 IV 1 Unknown 3 Therapies – No (%) 9 Prostanoid 22 ETA 1 PDestanoid + ETA 10	1 (39.2)	12 (41.4)		111			
III 2: IV 1 Unknown 1 Prostanoid 2: ETA 1 PDE-I Prostanoid + ETA							
IV 1 Unknown 2 Prostanoid 22 ETA 1 PDE-1 Prostanoid + ETA 1 Prostanoid + ETA 1			13 (38.2)	11	-		
Unknown : Therapies – No (%) Prostanoid 20 ETA 1 PDE-I Prostanoid + ETA 10	1 (13.9)	4 (13.8)	6 (17.7)	10			
Prostanoid 24 ETA 1 PDE-I Prostanoid + ETA 10	5 (6.9)	2 (6.9)	3 (8.8)		,-		
Prostanoid 24 ETA 1 PDE-I Prostanoid + ETA 10					8-		
PDE-I Prostanoid + ETA 10	0 (25.3)	5 (17.3)	12 (35.3)	L		•	
Prostanoid + ETA 1	1 (13.9)	4 (13.8)	5 (14.7)	TG/HDL Ratio	· .		
	1 (1.3)	1 (3.4)	0	8	i-		
	0 (12.7)	5 (17.2)	2 (5.9)		1	•	**
Prostanoid + PDE-I	3 (3.8)	0	3 (8.8)	12 1		**	
ETA + PDE-I	3 (3.8)	2 (6.9)	1 (2.9)	4	н <u>ф</u>	:	
	1 (1.3)	0	0	111 .			
None 30	0 (37.9)	12 (41.4)	11 (32.4)			- <u>4*</u>	
Hemodynamics:						4	**** **
	5.9±15.3	53.1±19.4	57.2±12.6	1	- · ·	44	*
	2.2±0.7	2.3±0.5	2.1±0.89				
	2.8±6.5	12.0±6.5	12.9±7		Total	VRC	Non-VR
able 1 – Total population Demographics.		Table 2 – Characteristics base determined by TG/HDL ratio.	d on insulin resistance profile TG/HDL ratio <2.0 is considen	is Figur		ratios in vasoreactiv C) patients. Vasore	
		insulin sensitive, and >3.0 as in-		as 1:	5% increase in	cardiac output an sistance. Total n=7 l line represents	id/or 15% di '9, VRC n=20

Legend: iPAH = idiopathic Pulmonary Arterial Hypertension. PAH associated with congential heart diseases (CHD), collagen vasular diseases (CVD), stimulants and appetite suppressants (Stim & Appetite Supp), chronic thromboembolic disease (CTEPH), portopulmonary hypertension (OPHTN), & sleep apnea (OSA), Miscellaneous (Misce) causes includes ascridosis and HIV). Therapise included prostandisk endothelin antagonistic (ETA), sildentifi (IPE)-in al combination Hemodynamic measures include mean pulmonary artery pressures (mPAP), cardiac index, and pulmonary vascular resis (DVD)

non-ined in onidentifying insulin resistant patients. Bars indicate Mean±SEM.



Discussion & Conclusions

Even with the best current medical management no treatment for PAH has been shown to be universally effective or curative. Lung or heart-lung transplantation is the ultimate therapy for patients with PAH but the 5-year survival after transplantation is only 50%. Clearly newer therapeutic approaches that might slow or halt the progression of PAH are urgently needed. Insulin resistance has clearly been implicated in inflammation, endothelial dysfunction and vascular disease and is strongly associated with adverse clinical outcomes. We have shown that insulin resistance is quite prevalent among PAH patients, and may correlate with severity of disease as illustrated by the significantly higher number of NYHA III/IV patients and those or prostacylin in the IR group compared with the IS group. Among patients who had RHC data there was a non-significnat trend toward less vasoreactivity in those who were IR While the etiology of PAH is likely to be multi-factorial, with genetic and environmental factors contributing, we have shown that insulin resistance may represent an important contributing factor to disease development or disease progression, or both. If this is true then treatment aimed at improving insulin resistance may have benefit for a large percentage of PAH patients Since both excess adiposity and sedentary behavior adversely affect insulin action weight los and increased physical activity may represent simple maneuvers that could impact the course of PAH in individual patients. This is the first study to suggest a potential role for insulin resistance in PAH. The data presented is supportive of our hypotheses that (1) IR is a relatively common finding in patients with PAH, and (2) it may contribute to, or be a reflection of, the severity of disease. While these findings are provocative this retrospective study must be interpreted with caution. Further prospective studies with more rigorous study of insulin and lipid metabolism in patients with PAH are underway to better delineate the relationship between IR and PAH.

References

- · Reaven GM: Role of insulin resistance in human disease. Diabetes 1988; 37:1595-1607.
- · Reaven GM, Chen Y-DI, Jeppesen J, Maheux P, Krauss RM: Insulin resistance and hyperinsulinemia in individuals with small, dense, low density lipoprotein particles. J Clin Invest 1993; 92:141-146.
- Jeppesen J, Hollenbeck CB, Zhou M-Y, Coulston AM, Jones C, Chen Y-DI, Reaven GM Relation between insulin resistance, hyperinsulinemia, postheparin plasma lipoprotein lipase activity, and postprandial lipemia. Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol 1995; 15:320-324.
- · Abbasi F, McLaughlin T, Lamendola C, Lipinska I, Tofler G, Reaven, GM: Comparison of plasminogen activator inhibitor-1 concentration in insulin-resistant versus insulin-sensitive healthy women. Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol 1999;19: 2818-2828
- Abbasi F. McLaughlin T. Lamendola C. Yeni-Komshian H. Tanaka A. Wang T. Nakajima K. Reaven GM: Fasting remnant lipoprotein cholesterol and triglyceride con elevated in nondiabetic, insulin-resistant, female volunteers, J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1999; 84:3903-3906.
- · Stuhlinger MC, Abbasi F, Chu JW, Lamendola C, McLaughlin TL, Cooke JP, Reaven, GM, Tsao PS: Relationship between insulin resistance and an endogenous nitric oxide synthase inhibitor IAMA 2002: 287:1420-1426
- Kielstein JT, Bode-Boger SM, Hesse G, Martens-Lobenhoffer J, Takacs A, Fliser D, Hoeper MM: Asymmetrical dimethyl arginine in idiopathic pulmonary arterial hypertension. Arteriosdler Thromb Vasc Biol 2005; 25:1414-1418
- · Flegal KM, Carroll MD, Kuczmarski RJ, Johnson CL: Overweight and obesity in the United States: prevalence and trends, 1960-1994. Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord. 1998; 22:39-47.
- Kuczmarski RJ, Flegal KM, Campbell SM, Johnson CL: Increasing prevalence of overweight among US adults. The National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys, 1960 to 1991 JAMA 1994; 272:205-211.
- McLaughlin T, Allison G, Abbasi F, Lamendola C, Reaven G: Prevalence of insulin resistance and associated cardiovascular disease risk factors among normal weight, overweight, and obese individuals Metabolism 2004: 53:495-499
- Yeni-Komshian H, Caratoni M, Abbasi F, Reaven GM: Relationship between severa surrogate estimates of insulin resistance and quantification of insulin-mediated glucose disposal in 480 healthy nondiabetic volunteers. Diabetes Care 2000; 23:171-173.
- · Rich S, Rubin L, Walker AM, Schneeweiss S, Abenhaim L: Anorexigens and pulmonary hypertension in the United States: Results from the Surveillance of North American Pulmonary Hypertension Chest 2000: 117:870-874
- · Abenhaim L, Moride Y, Brenot F, et al : Appetite suppressant drugs and the risk of primary pulmonary hypertension. New Eng J Med 1996; 335(9):609-616

Support

This study was funded by the Vera Moulton Wall Center for Pulmonary Vascular Disease at Stanford

