Contribution of endogenous glucagon-like peptide 1 to prandial counterregulatory responses to hypoglycemia after bariatric surgery
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ABSTRACT

Aims/hypothesis: Exogenous glucagon-like peptide 1 (GLP-1) infusion lowers endogenous glucose production (EGP) in euglycemic or hyperglycemic settings. Previously, we have shown that prandial EGP during insulin-induced hypoglycemia is smaller in non-diabetic subjects with gastric bypass (GB) and sleeve gastrectomy (SG), where prandial GLP-1 concentrations are increased by 5-10 fold compared to non-operated controls. The goal of this study was to determine the effect of endogenous GLP-1 on prandial counterregulatory response to hypoglycemia.

Methods: Glucose fluxes and islet-cell and gut hormone responses before and after mixed-meal ingestion were compared among 8 subjects with prior GB, 7 with prior SG, and 5 matched non-surgical controls during a hyperinsulinemic (120 mU/min/m²) hypoglycemic (~3.2 mmol/l) clamp with and without a specific GLP-1 receptor (GLP-1R) antagonist exendin-(9-39) (Ex-9).

Results: Before meal ingestion, plasma glucagon and glucose fluxes were similar among 3 groups. GLP-1R blockade had no effect on insulin secretion or insulin action before or after meal ingestion whereas prandial glucagon was enhanced in all 3 groups (P < 0.05). Ex-9 infusion raised prandial EGP response to hypoglycemia in surgical groups (P < 0.05) but decreased this parameter in controls (P = 0.08 for interaction). The rates of systemic appearance of ingested glucose or prandial glucose utilization did not differ among 3 groups and between studies with and without Ex-9 infusion.

Conclusions/interpretation: Under hypoglycemic condition, the glucagonostatic effect, but not insulinotropic action of GLP-1, is preserved in the prandial condition in humans. Endogenous GLP-1 contributes to the impaired post-meal glucose counterregulatory response to hypoglycemia in non-diabetic subjects after bariatric surgery.
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Abbreviations: CN, non-surgical controls; EGP, endogenous glucose production; Ex-9, exendin-(9-39); GB, gastric bypass; GIR, glucose infusion rate; GLP-1, glucagon-like peptide 1; ICR, insulin
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**RESEARCH IN CONTEXT**

What is already known about this subject?

- The physiologic response to hypoglycemia includes the inhibition of insulin secretion, followed by stimulation of counterregulatory hormones, mainly glucagon, raising endogenous glucose production (*EGP*).
- Glucagon-like peptide 1 (GLP-1) has been shown to diminish *EGP* by direct or indirect effect on liver glucose metabolism.
- Rerouted gut after gastric bypass or sleeve gastrectomy, where prandial GLP-1 secretion is enhanced, leads to a blunted *EGP* response to insulin-induced hypoglycemia in the fed state.

What is the key question?

- To determine the contribution of *endogenous* GLP-1 to post-meal counterregulatory response to hypoglycemia in individuals with and without prior bariatric surgery.

What are the new findings?

- Under hypoglycemic conditions, the glucagonostatic effect, but not insulinotropic action of GLP-1 is preserved, indicating differential glucose-dependency of this peptide on pancreatic alpha- versus beta-cells.
- Endogenous GLP-1 contributes to diminished prandial *EGP* response to hypoglycemia in non-diabetic subjects after bariatric surgery.

How might this impact on clinical practice in the foreseeable future?

- The results of this study support the use of GLP-1 receptor antagonists as therapeutic targets in post-bariatric hypoglycemia and related conditions.
INTRODUCTION

Glucagon-like peptide 1 (GLP-1) plays a key regulatory role in prandial glucose metabolism, primarily by increasing insulin secretion and suppressing glucagon secretion [1] in a glucose-dependent fashion [2]. By reducing glucagon/insulin ratio, GLP-1 inhibits endogenous glucose production (EGP) [3]. Also, beyond its pancreatic effects, exogenous GLP-1 infusion has been shown to reduce EGP by ~20% under euglycemic conditions [4] and by ~60% in the hyperglycemic state [5].

In non-diabetic humans without history of gastrointestinal tract-altering surgery, the recovery from hypoglycemia is brought about by early inhibition of insulin secretion in response to glycemic decline, diminished glucose clearance, followed by stimulation of counterregulatory hormones, mainly glucagon, raising EGP [6-8]. We have recently reported that prandial EGP response to insulin-induced hypoglycemia is diminished in non-diabetic patients with prior history of gastric bypass (GB) or sleeve gastrectomy (SG) compared to matched non-operated controls despite higher prandial glucagon concentrations, indicating resistance to glucagon [9].

It is well recognized that GB and, to lesser degree, SG increases prandial GLP-1 secretion [10-13], particularly in those who develop the late-complication of hyperinsulinemic hypoglycemic syndrome [14-16]. Further, we and others have shown that blocking GLP-1 receptor (GLP-1R) by exendin-(9-39) (Ex-9) infusion diminishes insulin secretory response to meal ingestion in subjects after GB [17-20] or SG [13] and corrects postprandial hypoglycemia in patients with recurrent hypoglycemia after GB [16].

However, it remains largely unknown whether enhanced prandial GLP-1 secretion after GB [10-12] or SG [13] also can disturb the glucose counterregulatory response to hypoglycemia after meal ingestion. In the present study, using acute infusion of Ex-9, we examined the contribution of endogenous GLP-1 to post-meal glucose fluxes and islet-cell secretory responses during hyperinsulinemic hypoglycemic clamp. A test meal containing 15 g glucose mixed with protein and
fat, which replicates the recommended treatment for acute hypoglycemia [21]. Outcomes of interest were compared in 3 groups of non-diabetic subjects with prior history of GB and SG as well as non-surgical controls.

**METHODS**

**Subjects** Eight patients with prior GB, seven patients with prior SG and five BMI-matched non-surgical controls of a cohort who were studied to address insulin clearance and glucose regulatory response to hypoglycemia [9, 22] were recruited in order of their presentation to the clinic or response to advertisement. None of the subjects had diabetes. Subjects with prior bariatric surgery had an average of 5 years since surgery and all subjects were weight stable for at least 3 months prior to enrollment. The Institutional Review Board of the University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio approved the protocol (HSC20180070H), and all subjects gave their written informed consent prior to participation.

**Peptides** Synthetic exendin-(9-39) (CS Bio, Menlo Park, California) was greater than 95 % pure, sterile, and free of pyrogens. Lyophilized peptide was prepared in 0.25 % human serum albumin on the day of study. The use of synthetic exendin-(9-39) is approved under the U.S. Food and Drug Administration Investigational New Drug 123,774.

**Experimental procedures** Subjects were instructed to consume > 200 g of carbohydrate daily and not to engage in strenuous activity for three days prior to the experiments. Subjects reported to the Bartter Clinical Research Unit at Audie Murphy Hospital, South Texas Veteran Health Care System, in the morning after an overnight fast. Body composition was assessed using dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (Hologic, Inc. Marlborough, Massachusetts, US), and waist circumference was measured. Intravenous catheters were placed in a handvein and contralateral antecubital vein.
for blood sampling and infusion of glucose, insulin and exendin-(9-39), respectively. The hand was continuously kept warm with a heating pad.

**Mixed-meal test under hypoglycemic conditions with and without exendin-(9-39) infusion (Fig. 1)** After fasting blood samples were drawn at –120 min, a prime-continuous infusion of [6,6-2H₂]-glucose (28 µmol/kg prime and 0.28 µmol/kg/min constant) was initiated and continued for 2 hours, when the rate was reduced to half in anticipation of the insulin-mediated reduction in EGP for the remainder of the study [9]. At time point 0, a primed-continuous infusion of recombinant human insulin (Humulin 100 IU/ml) diluted in isotonic saline and mixed with 2 ml of the subjects’ blood was started and continued at 120 mU/min/m² for the duration of the study [9]. Blood was sampled every 5-10 min and a variable infusion of 20% glucose (1% enriched with [6,6-2H₂]-glucose) was infused to maintain plasma glucose concentration at a target of ~3.2 mmol/l. At 60 minutes subjects received a prime-continuous infusion of exendin-(9-39) (Ex-9) (7500 pmol/kg prime and 750 pmol/kg/min constant) [16] or saline for the remainder of the study or saline. At 120 minutes subjects ingested a 140 ml liquid meal containing 33 g whey protein, 12.7 g corn oil, and 14 g glucose mixed with 0.2 g [U-13C]-glucose over 10 minutes. The plasma glucose concentration was maintained at the sub-basal glucose target (3.2 mM) for 3 hours after meal ingestion. Blood samples were collected at timed intervals and stored in ice; plasma was separated within 60 minutes and stored at –80 °C until assayed.

**Assays** Plasma glucose was determined on-site using Analox GM9 Glucose Analyzer (Analox Instruments, Stourbridge, UK). Insulin (DIAsourve, Neuve, Belgium). C-peptide and glucagon (Millipore, Billerica, Massachusetts, US) were measured by commercial radioimmunoassay. The Millipore glucagon RIA kit has a sensitivity of ~10 pmol/l and a cross-reactivity of <2 % with oxyntomodulin and glicentin [23]. GLP-1 and GIP were measured using commercial Multiplex ELISA (Millipore, Billerica, Massachusetts, US) according to manufacturer’s instructions. Tracer enrichment was measured using GC-MS, as previously described [24].
Calculations Fasting plasma glucose and hormone concentration represent the average of 3 samples drawn before the start of insulin. Insulin secretion rate (ISR) was derived from deconvolution of the plasma C-peptide concentration curve [22]. Rates of glucose disappearance (Rd), appearance of orally ingested glucose (RaO), and EGP were calculated from [6,6-2H2]-glucose and [U-13C]-glucose data using the Steele equation, as previously described [16].

Prandial glucose fluxes and islet-cell and gut hormone responses were calculated as the incremental areas-under-the-curve (AUC) over pre-meal values using the trapezoidal rule. Insulin sensitivity was computed as the glucose clearance (Rd/glucose) divided by the corresponding plasma insulin concentration at fasting, steady-state period (110-120 min), and after meal ingestion (120-300 min) [25].

Statistical analysis Data are reported as mean ± standard error of mean. Differences among the groups (GB, SG, CN) and between studies with and without Ex-9 infusion were compared using two-way ANOVA with repeated measures, and Tukey’s test was used to adjust P values for pairwise comparisons. Pearson’s correlation test was used to investigate the associations between variables. P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Statistical analyses were done using SPSS 28 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL). The STROBE cross-sectional reporting guidelines were used [26].

RESULTS

Subject characteristics (Table 1) Subjects in GB, SG and CN groups had similar BMI, fat and fat-free mass. The majority of participants were female. Time since surgery and post-operative weight loss were similar among the two surgical groups.

Portions of glucose, insulin and glucagon data during the saline studies previously were reported as part of an investigation that focused on the insulin clearance and glucose counterregulatory
response to hypoglycemia [9, 22]. The effect of endogenous GLP-1 on glucose fluxes and hormonal response are reported in the current manuscript.

**Glucose and GIR:** Fasting plasma glucose concentration was lower in SG-treated subjects than in GB-treated or CN subjects ($P < 0.05$) ([Table 2, Fig. 1A-C](#)). By the steady-state period (110-120 min), plasma glucose was similarly reduced to the target value of ~3.2 mmol/l during studies with and without Ex-9 infusion in all 3 groups. Glucose infusion rates at steady-state were similar among the groups.

To maintain plasma glucose at target levels after meal ingestion, GIR was reduced by ~90% in all groups alike ([Fig. 1A-C insets](#)). Despite a complete discontinuation of the glucose infusion, the average glucose levels were above the target glucose in 3 GB, 1 SG and 1 CN subject. The average coefficient of variation (CV) of glycemic concentration for each study from 60-300 minutes was higher in GB-treated subjects versus SG-treated and controls ($16 \pm 1.7\%$ versus $11 \pm 1.3$ and $8.6 \pm 1.5\%; P < 0.01$). However, the average CV of glycemic levels from 60-300 minutes from studies with and without Ex-9 in each subject was $3.1 \pm 1.0$, $4.9 \pm 1.2$ and $3.1 \pm 0.9\%$ for GB, SG, and CN, respectively, indicating similar glucose concentrations between the two studies. The amount of glucose infused to maintain the plasma glucose concentration constant at steady-state or post-meal conditions was unaffected by GLP-1R blockade.

**Incretin concentrations:** Fasting and steady-state incretin concentrations were similar among the groups and between studies with and without Ex-9. Post-meal AUC for GLP-1 over the first 60 minutes of meal study was higher in GB-treated compared with SG or CN ($P < 0.01$) ([Table 2](#)). Blockade of GLP-1R similarly increased prandial AUC 3hr for GLP-1 in all 3 groups ([Fig. 2A-C](#)), consistent with previous reports [16]. Prandial GIP were similar among the 3 groups and between studies with Ex-9 and saline ([Fig. 2D-F](#)).
Glucose fluxes: After an overnight fast, at baseline total glucose utilization (Rd) equals endogenous glucose production (EGP) and was similar among the three groups (Table 3). In parallel with plasma glucose concentrations, baseline EGP was slightly lower during Ex-9 studies compared to saline (Table 3). During the hypoglycemic clamp before meal ingestion, Rd progressively increased whereas EGP was similarly suppressed in the first 60 minutes (by ~90 %) in all 3 groups but rose thereafter due to prolonged hypoglycemia, as previously reported [9] (Table 3). Neither Rd nor EGP at steady-state before meal consumption were affected by GLP-1R blockade.

Temporal trends in oral glucose appearance (RaO) into the circulation were in line with accelerated gastric emptying by bariatric surgery as AUC RaO₁hr was higher in GB than SG and in SG compared to CN subjects (P < 0.001) (Fig. 3A-C). However, the AUC RaO₃hr was similar among the groups. Following meal ingestion total glucose utilization (Rd) were similar among the 3 groups (Fig. 3D-F). Meal ingestion raised EGP levels in the first hour of absorptive period in all 3 groups (Fig. 3G-I). Blockade of GLP-1R had no effect on RaO or Rd after meal ingestion. However, prandial EGP increased further by Ex-9 in both surgical groups and decreased in CN (P = 0.08 for interaction) (Table 3, Fig. 3G-I). Consistent with this, a significant increase in prandial AUC EGP₃hr during saline versus Ex-9 was observed among surgical subjects (mean ± SEM during saline versus Ex-9: 474 ± 67.8 versus 254 ± 73.1 µmol/kg; P < 0.05).

Among GB-treated subjects, those with an average post-meal glucose above the target range had a lower Rd (Supplementary Fig. 1A) compared to those whose glucose remained at the target, despite similar RaO and EGP values among the two groups (Supplementary Fig. 2B-C).

Beta- and alpha-cell secretory response: Insulin concentrations and ISR were similar at baseline among the groups and between two studies (Table 2, Fig. 4A-F). As previously reported [27], the relative reductions in ISR from baseline to steady-state (110-120 min) were attenuated to a larger extent in CN compared to surgical groups (by 82, 81 and 89 % GB, SG and CN, respectively, P < 0.01), but were unaffected by Ex-9 infusion. Fasting plasma glucagon concentrations were similar
among the 3 groups and between the two studies, rose slightly during hypoglycemic clamp prior to meal ingestion (Fig. 4G-I), but remained unaffected by GLP-1R blockade.

During the meal study ISR excursion mimicked that of plasma glucose, with an early transient rise in GB, although prandial AUC 3hr for ISR were similar among the 3 groups (Fig. 4D-F). Meal ingestion enhanced plasma glucagon concentrations in all 3 groups (Table 3, Fig. 4G-I), but the levels tended to be higher in surgical than CN subjects ($P < 0.09$). Under hypoglycemic conditions, prandial ISR remained unchanged by Ex-9 infusion whereas GLP-1R blockade increased plasma glucagon concentrations in all groups.

There was no difference among GB subjects with and without glycemic deviation from target in insulin or glucagon concentrations (Supplementary Fig. 1D).

**Insulin action and clearance:** Insulin sensitivity at baseline or during steady-state were similar among the groups (Table 2). Basal insulin clearance did not differ among the groups and was similarly reduced (by ~80 %) when the plasma insulin concentrations were increased to steady-state levels in all groups during the hypoglycemic insulin clamp (Table 2). Neither insulin sensitivity nor insulin clearance before meal ingestion were affected by GLP-1R blockade.

Post-meal insulin action was similar among the 3 groups and between the two studies with and without Ex-9 infusion. Prandial insulin clearance ($AUC_{ICR, 3hr}$) was higher in GB compared with SG ($P < 0.05$) but was unchanged by blocking GLP-1R.

**Heart rate (HR) and blood pressure (BP):** At baseline HR and BP were similar among the groups. In response to hypoglycemia HR increased, SBP was unchanged and DBP decreased in all groups alike (Supplementary Table 1). Meal ingestion increased HR above pre-meal values by $9 \pm 5\%$, $6 \pm 1\%$ and $-2 \pm 1\%$ in GB, SG and CN, respectively ($P < 0.05$) without any additional effect on BP. Blocking the GLP-1R had no effect on HR and BP responses to either hypoglycemia or meal ingestion in any of the 3 groups.
DISCUSSION

The beneficial role of GLP-1 in mediating improved glucose tolerance after bariatric surgery by stimulating insulin secretion can be complicated by the development of post-bariatric hypoglycemia syndrome (PBH), where prandial GLP-1 secretion and insulinotropic effect of GLP-1 are exaggerated [21]. In this study, we examined the role of endogenous GLP-1 on the prandial counterregulatory response to insulin-induced hypoglycemia in non-diabetic subjects with and without bariatric surgery. We found that blocking GLP-1R increased prandial EGP response to insulin-induced hypoglycemia in GB- and SG-treated subjects but tended to decrease this parameter in non-operated controls (Fig. 3G-H). Further, we observed that under hypoglycemic condition after meal ingestion, insulinotropic action of GLP-1 is muted while glucagon suppressing effect is preserved in subjects with and without bariatric surgery, suggesting a differential glucose-dependency of endogenous GLP-1 action on pancreatic beta-cells versus alpha-cells in the fed state. The effect of GLP-1R blockade on counterregulatory responses to hypoglycemia is solely observed in prandial condition and not fasting state. For the first time, to our knowledge, these findings demonstrate that endogenous GLP-1 contributes to the blunted prandial counterregulatory response to hypoglycemia after bariatric surgery.

The major finding in our experiment, is the differential effect of endogenous GLP-1 on prandial EGP response to hypoglycemia among non-diabetic subjects with and without bariatric surgery (Fig. 3G-I). We have previously shown that EGP response to insulin-induced hypoglycemia in the fed condition is blunted after GB or SG [9]. Here, we extend these findings by demonstrating that endogenous GLP-1 accounts for the impaired post-meal EGP response during hypoglycemic clamp after GB or SG. We cannot discern whether variations in prandial EGP response to hypoglycemia among the surgical versus non-surgical groups is caused by a direct action of GLP-1 on liver glucose metabolism or the glucagon effect of GLP-1 from our current methodology.
The liver effect of GLP-1 previously has been examined using *exogenous* GLP-1 infusion during pancreatic clamp, where plasma insulin and glucagon are not allowed to change and glycemia is maintained at basal concentrations or hyperglycemic levels [4, 5]. The findings from these two studies using different methods suggest that exogenous GLP-1 lowers endogenous glucose production in proportion to the increase in plasma glucose concentration; i.e., a greater EGP reducing effect of GLP-1 was observed during hyperglycemia compared to euglycemia (~60 % [5] versus ~20 % [4]).

Whether there is a glycemic threshold for liver effect of GLP-1 cannot be addressed by the current experimental design, but our data shows that *endogenous* GLP-1 has no influence on glucose counterregulatory response to hypoglycemia in fasting condition. Nonetheless, in our study, GLP-1R blockade enhanced prandial EGP in bariatric subjects but lowered EGP in non-operated controls despite a similar rise in glucagon concentration among the 3 groups by Ex-9 infusion. This suggests that variations in the effect of GLP-1 on liver glucose metabolism are independent of the plasma glucagon concentration among bariatric and non-bariatric subjects. Future studies are needed to directly examine the effect of rerouted gut after bariatric surgery on prandial liver glucose metabolism mediated by GLP-1. However, our novel observation about differential effect of GLP-1 blockade on EGP effect among surgical and non-surgical subjects in the prandial state indicates that, even at plasma glucose concentrations below fasting values, blockade *endogenous* GLP-1 action can interfere with normal glucose counterregulatory response after bariatric surgery. Consistent with previous observations [28-32], neither peripheral glucose disposal nor insulin sensitivity were affected by GLP-1R blockade.

In patients with type 2 diabetes, the insulinoergic and glucagonostatic effects of *exogenous* GLP-1 infusion dissipate by normalization of the plasma glucose concentration [2], indicating that the pancreatic islet-cell effects of this peptide are glucose-dependent. In non-diabetic individuals with normal GI anatomy [33] or prior history of GB [34], however, acute administration of *exogenous*
GLP-1 or GLP-1R agonist results in greater insulin secretion during hyperinsulinemic hypoglycemic (2.7-3.0 mmol/l) clamp while glucagon inhibitory effect of these compounds disappears as glycemic concentration declines to 2.7-3.0 mmol.

In contrast, our findings demonstrate that endogenous GLP-1 has no effect on prandial insulin secretion during hypoglycemia (~3.2 mmol/l) in non-diabetic subjects with or without bariatric surgery despite similar or greater prandial plasma GLP-1 concentrations achieved in the present study (120-250 pmol/l) (Fig. 2A-B) compared to those produced by exogenous GLP-1 infusion in the previous report (~120 pmol/l) [33]. Further, the glucagon inhibitory effect of endogenous GLP-1, in our study, was preserved in prandial state despite glycemic decline to sub-basal values. The discrepancy between the present findings and those of previous reports can be explained by differences in methodology but also by potential differences in glycemic threshold needed to turn off the insulinotropic or glucagonostatic properties of endogenous versus exogenous GLP-1.

As previously reported [35], prandial glucagon levels during hypoglycemia tended to be higher in GB and SG compared to non-surgical subjects. It remains unclear whether prandial hyperglucagonemia after bariatric surgery is produced by intestinal L-cells or pancreatic alpha-cells [36, 37]. However, similar enhancement in plasma glucagon by blocking GLP-1R among the surgical and non-surgical subjects despite lack of difference in nutrient flux between the two studies with and without Ex-9 infusion argues for a direct alpha-cell [38] rather than L-cell action of GLP-1 in this setting.

There are some limitations to our study that merit discussion. Antecedent hypoglycemia has been shown to alter glucose counterregulation and EGP responses to future hypoglycemia [39] in non-diabetic humans. However, the counterregulatory adaptation should be similar during studies with and without Ex-9 infusion. Therefore, the reported EGP effect of GLP-1R blockade should not be affected by antecedent hypoglycemia in this study. Also, the rise in prandial glucose concentrations above the target level in 4 GB, 1 SG, and 1 CN could have an effect on the EGP and glucagon
responses. However, we found that the glycemic deviation after meal ingestion in this small subgroup is caused by a reduced action of insulin rather than alteration in $EGP$ or $RaO$ (Supplementary Fig. 1). Our target plasma insulin concentration is larger than observed in clinical conditions of hypoglycemia. Although, as previously demonstrated in humans [9, 40, 41] counterregulatory signals are still activated by hypoglycemia and can be evaluated at these levels of insulin. Further, the number of study participants in each group is relatively small reducing generalizability of these findings to a wider range of individuals after bariatric surgery. However, the groups were similar in gender, age, and BMI, and the surgical groups did not differ in the time and weight loss since surgery.

In conclusion, we have shown that blockade of GLP-1R enhances prandial glucagon but not ISR response under insulin-induced hypoglycemia in obese humans with and without prior bariatric surgery, suggesting that the insulinotropic but not glucagonostatic activity of endogenous GLP-1 is glucose-dependent. Although not affecting $Rd$, endogenous GLP-1 reduces (either directly or indirectly) prandial $EGP$ response to hypoglycemia in post-bariatric individuals. Taken together with our previous results which showed an enhanced prandial GLP-1-induced insulin secretion after bariatric surgery [13, 17-20], these findings indicate that prandial GLP-1 also can predispose to hypoglycemia by interfering with counterregulatory response to hypoglycemia. Our observations also provide the foundation for future studies to determine the effectiveness of GLP-1R antagonists as therapeutic targets for improving the counterregulatory response to hypoglycemia in post-bariatric patients.
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### Table 1. Subject characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>GB (n = 8)</th>
<th>SG (n = 7)</th>
<th>CN (n = 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>42.9 ± 4.2</td>
<td>48.3 ± 3.8</td>
<td>44.2 ± 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (F/M)</td>
<td>7/1</td>
<td>5/2</td>
<td>4/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg/m²)</td>
<td>31.8 ± 2.3</td>
<td>32.3 ± 1.9</td>
<td>30.8 ± 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>87.9 ± 5.3</td>
<td>88.2 ± 5.5</td>
<td>82.1 ± 10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat mass (kg)</td>
<td>30.7 ± 3.6</td>
<td>29.9 ± 4.4</td>
<td>33.7 ± 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat-free mass (kg)</td>
<td>54.5 ± 2.4</td>
<td>55.7 ± 4.6</td>
<td>46.8 ± 6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HbA₁c (mmol/mol)</td>
<td>35.0 ± 1.6</td>
<td>34.4 ± 1.7</td>
<td>35.5 ± 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time since surgery (years)</td>
<td>5.8 ± 2.0</td>
<td>4.7 ± 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-operative BMI (kg/m²)</td>
<td>47.1 ± 2.3</td>
<td>46.6 ± 2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight loss since surgery (kg)</td>
<td>43.0 ± 6.5</td>
<td>39.2 ± 5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons by one-way ANOVA or χ² test.
All differences non-significant.
CN, non-surgical controls; BMI, body-mass index; GB, subjects with prior gastric bypass surgery; HbA₁c, glycated hemoglobin; SG, subjects with prior sleeve gastrectomy.
Table 2. Islet cell and incretin responses to insulin-induced hypoglycemia and mixed-meal test during saline and exendin-(9-39) infusion in GB, SG and CN groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Time (min)</th>
<th>Saline</th>
<th>Ex-9</th>
<th>Two-way ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glucose (nmol/l)</td>
<td>Basal</td>
<td>5.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>5.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>3.3 ± 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110-120 min</td>
<td>3.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>3.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>3.2 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin (pmol/l)</td>
<td>Basal</td>
<td>42.0 ± 6.6</td>
<td>29.6 ± 5.5</td>
<td>49.7 ± 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110-120 min</td>
<td>1437 ± 66.9</td>
<td>1458 ± 141</td>
<td>1819 ± 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC&lt;sub&gt;Insulin&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>120-180 min</td>
<td>-3.3 ± 2.9</td>
<td>5.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>3.2 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120-300 min</td>
<td>-9.8 ± 10.7</td>
<td>21.1 ± 10.7</td>
<td>13.6 ± 25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISR (pmol/m²/min)</td>
<td>Basal</td>
<td>1.35 ± 25.6</td>
<td>85.8 ± 6.6</td>
<td>93.0 ± 11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110-120 min</td>
<td>26.6 ± 9.5</td>
<td>16.3 ± 1.6</td>
<td>9.8 ± 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC&lt;sub&gt;ISR&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>120-180 min</td>
<td>2.4 ± 1.4</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120-300 min</td>
<td>1.3 ± 1.6</td>
<td>-0.2 ± 0.3</td>
<td>-0.0 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glucagon (pg/ml)</td>
<td>Basal</td>
<td>135.5 ± 25.6</td>
<td>85.8 ± 6.6</td>
<td>93.0 ± 11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110-120 min</td>
<td>26.6 ± 9.5</td>
<td>16.3 ± 1.6</td>
<td>9.8 ± 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC&lt;sub&gt;Glucagon&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>120-180 min</td>
<td>4.4 ± 0.8</td>
<td>4.8 ± 0.9</td>
<td>1.8 ± 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120-300 min</td>
<td>4.1 ± 0.7</td>
<td>4.8 ± 0.9</td>
<td>1.8 ± 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLP-1 (ng/ml × min)</td>
<td>120-180 min</td>
<td>7.6 ± 1.2</td>
<td>3.8 ± 0.7*</td>
<td>2.0 ± 0.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120-300 min</td>
<td>15.9 ± 2.4</td>
<td>10.3 ± 1.9</td>
<td>7.3 ± 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin sensitivity (ml/[min × kg] per nmol/l)</td>
<td>Basal</td>
<td>3.5 ± 0.6</td>
<td>3.5 ± 0.7</td>
<td>3.5 ± 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120-300 min</td>
<td>5.8 ± 0.9</td>
<td>5.6 ± 1.1</td>
<td>3.1 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin clearance (L/[min × m²])</td>
<td>Basal</td>
<td>3.5 ± 0.6</td>
<td>3.5 ± 0.7</td>
<td>3.5 ± 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120-300 min</td>
<td>5.8 ± 0.9</td>
<td>5.6 ± 1.1</td>
<td>3.1 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are presented as mean ± SEM.

*P < 0.05 compared with GB, *P < 0.05 compared with SG.

CN, non-surgical controls; Ex-9, exendin-(9-39); GB, subjects with prior gastric bypass surgery; GIP, glucose-dependent insulinotropic polypeptide; GLP-1, glucagon-like peptide 1; ICR, insulin clearance rate; ISR, insulin secretion rate; SG, subjects with prior sleeve gastrectomy.
Table 3. Glucose fluxes during insulin-induced hypoglycemia and mixed-meal test with saline and exendin-(9-39) infusion in GB, SG and CN groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Time (min)</th>
<th>Saline</th>
<th>Ex-9</th>
<th>Two-way ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ra</td>
<td>Basal</td>
<td>9.2 ± 0.4</td>
<td>9.3 ± 0.2</td>
<td>9.3 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(µmol/kg/min)</td>
<td>110-120 min</td>
<td>26.9 ± 3.2</td>
<td>26.6 ± 3.6</td>
<td>20.0 ± 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC_Ra</td>
<td>120-180 min</td>
<td>-350 ± 107</td>
<td>-220 ± 93.7</td>
<td>-10.2 ± 46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rd</td>
<td>Basal</td>
<td>9.2 ± 0.4</td>
<td>9.3 ± 0.2</td>
<td>9.3 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(µmol/kg/min)</td>
<td>110-120 min</td>
<td>27.1 ± 3.3</td>
<td>27.7 ± 4.0</td>
<td>20.5 ± 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC_Rd</td>
<td>120-180 min</td>
<td>-394 ± 113</td>
<td>-295 ± 109</td>
<td>-7.4 ± 113.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGP</td>
<td>Basal</td>
<td>9.2 ± 0.4</td>
<td>9.3 ± 0.2</td>
<td>9.3 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(µmol/kg/min)</td>
<td>110-120 min</td>
<td>5.5 ± 0.9</td>
<td>3.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>3.1 ± 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC_EGP</td>
<td>120-180 min</td>
<td>161 ± 46.9</td>
<td>214 ± 28.2</td>
<td>206 ± 71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(µmol/kg)</td>
<td>120-300 min</td>
<td>218 ± 113</td>
<td>297 ± 96.4</td>
<td>644 ± 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC_RaO</td>
<td>120-180 min</td>
<td>481 ± 31.3</td>
<td>438 ± 34.5</td>
<td>261 ± 68.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(µmol/kg)</td>
<td>120-300 min</td>
<td>545 ± 40.0</td>
<td>633 ± 46.5</td>
<td>495 ± 89.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are presented as mean ± SEM. AUCs are adjusted for pre-meal values.

*P < 0.05 compared with GB, *P < 0.05 compared with SG.

CN, non-surgical controls; EGP, endogenous glucose production; Ex-9, exendin-(9-39); GB, subjects with prior gastric bypass surgery; GIP, glucose-dependent insulintropic polypeptide; GLP-1, glucagon-like peptide 1; ISR, insulin secretion rate; Ra, rate of glucose appearance; Rd, rate of glucose disappearance; RaO, oral glucose appearance; SG, subjects with prior sleeve gastrectomy.
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Figure 1. Experimental protocol and plasma glucose excursion during hyperinsulinemic hypoglycemic clamp and mixed-meal ingestion in subjects with prior GB (A), SG (B) and in non-surgical controls (C). Solid and dashed lines and bars represent studies with saline and Ex-9 infusion, respectively. Glucose infusion rates (GIR) are shown on insets.

Figure 2. Plasma GLP-1 (A-C) and GIP (D-F) responses to a mixed-meal ingestion during hyperinsulinemic hypoglycemic clamp in subjects with prior GB (left panel), SG (middle panel) and in non-surgical controls (right panel). Solid and dashed lines and bars represent studies with saline and Ex-9 infusion, respectively. Corresponding AUCs from 120 to 180 min and 120 to 300 min are shown in insets. *P < 0.05 compared with GB; #P < 0.05 compared with saline.

Figure 3. Oral glucose appearance (A-C), glucose disappearance (D-F) and endogenous glucose production (G-I) during hyperinsulinemic hypoglycemic clamp and mixed-meal ingestion in subjects with prior GB (left panel), SG (middle panel) and in non-surgical controls (right panel). Solid and dashed lines and bars represent studies with saline and Ex-9 infusion, respectively. Corresponding AUCs from 120 to 180 min and 120 to 300 min are shown in insets. *P < 0.05 compared with controls; #P < 0.05 and †P < 0.10 for day × group interaction in two-way ANOVA.

Figure 4. Plasma insulin (A-C), ISR (D-F) and glucagon (G-I) responses to a mixed-meal ingestion during hyperinsulinemic hypoglycemic clamp in subjects with prior GB (left panel), SG (middle panel) and in non-surgical controls (right panel). Solid and dashed lines and bars represent studies with saline and Ex-9 infusion, respectively. Corresponding AUCs from 120 to 180 min and 120 to 300 min are shown in insets. *P < 0.05 compared with saline.