

1 Manuscript Full Title: BMI Variability and Cardiovascular Outcomes Within Clinical Trial
2 and Real-World Environments in Type 2 Diabetes: An IMI2 SOPHIA study

3 Short running title: BMI Variability and 3P-MACE in Type 2 Diabetes

4 Authors: Robert J Massey¹, Yu Chen², Marina Panova-Noeva³, Michaela Mattheus³,
5 Moneeza K Siddiqui^{1,4}, Nanette C Schloot⁵, Antonio Ceriello⁶, Ewan R Pearson¹, Adem Y
6 Dawed¹

7 Affiliations: ¹Population Health & Genomics, University of Dundee, UK; ²Lilly Research
8 Laboratories, Eli Lilly and Company, IN, USA; ³Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co.
9 KG, Ingelheim, Germany; ⁴Centre for Primary Care, Wolfson Institute of Population Health,
10 Queen Mary University of London; ⁵Lilly Deutschland GmbH, Bad Homburg, Germany;
11 ⁶IRCCS MultiMedica, Via Milanese 300, 20099 Sesto San Giovanni, MI, Italy.

12 Address for correspondence: Adem Yusef Dawed, Division of Population Health and
13 Genomics, School of Medicine, University of Dundee, DD1 9SY, UK; Email:
14 aydawed@dundee.ac.uk, Tel: +44 1382 386715

15

16 Original Article

17 Abstract word count: 251

18 Whole manuscript word count: 5921

1 Abstract

2 Aims:

3 BMI variability has been associated with increased cardiovascular disease risk in individuals
4 with type 2 diabetes, however comparison between clinical studies and real-world
5 observational evidence has been lacking. Furthermore, it is not known whether BMI
6 variability has an effect independent of HbA1c variability.

7 Methods and Results:

8 We investigated the association between BMI variability and 3P-MACE risk in the Harmony
9 Outcomes trial (n = 9198), and further analysed placebo arms of REWIND (n = 4440) and
10 EMPA-REG OUTCOME (n = 2333) trials, followed by real-world data from the Tayside
11 Bioresource (n = 6980) using Cox regression modelling. BMI variability was determined
12 using average successive variability (ASV), with first major adverse cardiovascular event of
13 non-fatal stroke, non-fatal myocardial infarction, and cardiovascular death (3P-MACE) as the
14 primary outcome.

15 After adjusting for cardiovascular risk factors, a +1 SD increase in BMI variability was
16 associated with increased 3P-MACE risk in Harmony Outcomes (HR 1.12, 95% CI 1.08 –
17 1.17, P < 0.001). The most variable quartile of participants experienced an 87% higher risk of
18 3P-MACE (P < 0.001) relative to the least variable. Similar associations were found in
19 REWIND and Tayside Bioresource. Further analyses in the EMPA-REG OUTCOME trial
20 did not replicate this association. BMI variability's impact on 3P-MACE risk was
21 independent of HbA1c variability.

22 Conclusion:

23 In individuals with type 2 diabetes, increased BMI variability was found to be an independent
24 risk factor for 3P-MACE across cardiovascular outcome trials and real-world datasets. Future

- 1 research should attempt to establish a causal relationship between BMI variability and
- 2 cardiovascular outcomes.

1 1. Introduction

2 Repeated cycles of weight loss and weight regain is often referred to as weight “cycling”,
3 “fluctuation”, or “variability”. This variability may be harmful, as a variety of studies have
4 found that variability in clinical biomarkers predict worse outcomes (1-3). Indeed, an increase
5 in weight variability has recently been found to be associated with an increase in the risk of
6 cardiovascular disease and major adverse cardiovascular events (3P-MACE) (4, 5). We
7 recently performed a literature review and meta-analysis which observed an increase in the
8 risk of cardiovascular morbidity and mortality associated with body weight and BMI
9 variability independent of type 2 diabetes status (6). Despite these findings however, the topic
10 of weight variability remains controversial, as not all studies have observed this relationship
11 between weight variability and 3P-MACE (7, 8), whilst others have observed that weight
12 variability predicted lower cardiovascular disease risk (9).

13 A potential explanation for this observed heterogeneity may be due to differences in the
14 statistical models utilised. These models frequently control for disparate confounding
15 variables or may be inadequately adjusted for important variables. For example, no BMI
16 variability study to date has controlled for the established effect of HbA1c variability on
17 cardiovascular health in individuals with type 2 diabetes (1). Given the intrinsic link between
18 HbA1c and BMI variability, it is possible that the cardiovascular risk signal associated with
19 BMI variability is influenced by HbA1c variability (10). Moreover, while previous analyses
20 have separately examined clinical and observational cohorts, none have explored the impact
21 of BMI variability in both types of cohorts using a standard statistical model. This is
22 important as differences inherent to these cohorts may explain some of the observed
23 variability between studies.

24 Therefore, the primary aim of this study was to comprehensively investigate the association
25 between BMI variability and the risk of 3-point MACE (non-fatal stroke, non-fatal

1 myocardial infarction, and cardiovascular death) within clinical trial datasets and
2 observational cohorts comprised of individuals with type 2 diabetes using standard statistical
3 models. The secondary aim of this study was to investigate if BMI variability and glycaemic
4 variability are independent risk factors for 3P-MACE. A Cox proportional hazards model was
5 created to assess the association between BMI variability and 3-point MACE using the
6 Harmony Outcomes trial as a discovery dataset; this model was then used to perform separate
7 analyses within the placebo arms of the Researching cardiovascular Events with a Weekly
8 Incretin in Diabetes (REWIND) and Empagliflozin Cardiovascular Outcome Event Trial in
9 Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Patients–Removing Excess Glucose (EMPA-REG) OUTCOME
10 trials. We then used the same model for a further analysis within the real-world observational
11 data collected from the Genetics of Diabetes Audit and Research Tayside and Scotland
12 (GoDARTS) and the Scotland Health Research Register (SHARE) cohorts, combined into a
13 single cohort referred to as Tayside Bioresource.

1 2. Methods

2 2.1. Study Design and Participants

3 Trial data sets: Post-hoc analyses of trial data from the Harmony Outcomes consisting of
4 9,463 participants was used as a discovery cohort. First round replication was performed
5 using the placebo arm of the REWIND study (n = 4440) and final replication attempt was
6 performed using data from the placebo arm of the EMPA-REG OUTCOME trial (n = 2333).
7 All three trials, involving patients with type 2 diabetes, were international multi-centre,
8 randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled studies that independently investigated the
9 effect of antidiabetic medications on 3P-MACE risk; Harmony Outcomes and REWIND
10 investigated the efficacy of glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists (GLP-1RAs)
11 albiglutide and dulaglutide, respectively, whereas EMPA-REG OUTCOME investigated the
12 efficacy of sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitor (SGLT2i) empagliflozin. Detailed
13 descriptions of the included clinical cohorts can be found in the supplementary material
14 (Appendix 1).

15 Real-world data analysis: A retrospective follow-up survival study was performed among
16 participants from a combination of observational cohorts from the GoDARTS and the
17 SHARE studies. Further details on these cohorts can be found in the supplementary material
18 (Appendix 1). Electronic health records (from primary and secondary care), biochemistry,
19 prescribing records, and data from the Scottish death register are pooled from the Scottish
20 Care Information – Diabetes Collaboration, GoDARTS, and SHARE to form the Tayside
21 Bioresource. Data collected between January 1st 1994 to January 1st 2020 were considered for
22 this study. Entry to study for each individual was either the date of 1st recorded BMI
23 measurement or date of type 2 diabetes diagnosis, whichever was latest. Our analysis of
24 Tayside Bioresource consisted of 2 phases: a 5 year exposure phase where we calculated BMI
25 variability and other baseline variables, followed by a 10 year longitudinal phase for the

1 observation of 3P-MACE where the Cox regression analysis was performed. We identified
2 individuals with type 2 diabetes that had at least 3 recorded measurements of BMI during the
3 exposure phase. Participants that experienced a primary outcome event during this exposure
4 phase were removed from the study as we believed this would impact calculated BMI
5 variability. Similarly, patients recorded as pregnant or having undergone a limb amputation
6 during these five years were also excluded. Patients meeting these criteria entered the
7 longitudinal phase of the study where they were then followed either until they experienced a
8 primary outcome event or their final BMI measurement within the 10 years of follow-up;
9 whichever came first. If an individual's 10-year follow-up period extended beyond January
10 1st, 2020, they were excluded from the analysis. This meant the latest possible entry to the
11 study was January 1st, 2005; individuals entering the study after this date could not undergo
12 the full 15 years of analysis and were thus removed.

13

14 2.2. Study Outcomes

15 The primary outcomes of Harmony Outcomes, REWIND, EMPA-REG OUTCOME, and
16 Tayside Bioresource were similar, each defined as the first occurrence of 3-point MACE,
17 which was a composite of cardiovascular death, non-fatal myocardial infarction, and non-
18 fatal stroke (fatal and non-fatal in Harmony Outcomes). In our study, we defined the primary
19 outcome as the first occurrence of 3-point MACE, as defined in each study by their respective
20 study designs (11-13).

21 The primary outcome of the analysis of Tayside Bioresource was also defined as 3-point
22 MACE, the first incidence of non-fatal myocardial infarction, non-fatal stroke, and
23 cardiovascular mortality.

24

1 2.3. Measurement of BMI Variability

2 For post-hoc analyses, BMI variability was defined as the fluctuation in BMI across visits,
3 measured using average successive variability (ASV). In Harmony Outcomes, REWIND, and
4 EMPA-REG OUTCOME, at least 3 BMI measurements per person were required for ASV
5 calculation. ASV was based on all available data until 3P-MACE occurrence or censoring.

6 In Tayside Bioresource analysis, BMI variability was defined similarly but adjusted for
7 irregular visit patterns by dividing the absolute difference between BMI measurements by the
8 time interval between them. A minimum 90-day interval between BMI measurements and at
9 least 3 recorded measurements per person were required for inclusion.

10

11 2.4. Statistical Analyses

12 The association between BMI variability as calculated by ASV and the risk of 3P-MACE
13 outcomes was analysed by considering body-weight variability as both a continuous and
14 categorical variable. Within the trial cohorts, any individuals that experienced 3P-MACE
15 events before 4 months of follow up were excluded as this was the minimum date at which
16 BMI variability could be calculated.

17 To analyse the risk of 3P-MACE associated with BMI variability as a continuous variable
18 within the Harmony Outcomes trial, 5 Cox proportional-hazards regression models were
19 created to estimate the hazard ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals. Each model
20 investigated the HR of 3P-MACE associated with an increase of ASV BMI by 1 standard
21 deviation (SD). Model 1 was unadjusted; model 2 included trial arm (treatment vs placebo) as
22 a covariate; model 3 added baseline BMI to model 2 as a covariate; model 4 further included
23 baseline age, sex, type 2 diabetes duration at baseline, smoking history, baseline systolic
24 blood pressure, statin use, baseline HbA1c, the number of BMI measures, and baseline

1 cardiovascular risk to model 3; model 5 was then created with ASV of HbA1c (+1 SD) added
2 to model 4. This was primarily to test whether the 3P-MACE risk associated with BMI
3 variability was independent of the 3P-MACE risk associated with HbA1c variability. The
4 analyses of models 4 and 5 were then created within the REWIND, EMPA-REG
5 OUTCOME, and Tayside Bioresource cohort data, with a few adjustments due to data
6 availability: in REWIND, the covariate for history of previous cardiovascular disease was
7 included instead of baseline cardiovascular risk, and type 2 diabetes duration at baseline was
8 not included; for the EMPA-REG OUTCOME trial data the models were constructed with a
9 covariate for lipid controlling drug use at baseline instead of statin use at baseline; the models
10 constructed within the Tayside Bioresource cohort did not include covariates for
11 cardiovascular risk, statin use, or baseline systolic blood pressure, but instead included
12 covariates for lipid-controlling and antihypertensive drug use. Additionally, the age covariate
13 within the models constructed within the Tayside Bioresource cohort was split into quartiles
14 in order to allow the models to meet the proportional hazards assumption.

15 To analyse the risk of 3P-MACE associated with BMI variability as a categorical variable,
16 participants were divided into quartiles based on calculated ASV BMI values. Cox
17 proportional-hazards regression analyses were performed to estimate the relative risk of 3P-
18 MACE of each quartile of BMI variability compared to the lowest quartile.

19 Further analyses were performed using continuous BMI variability in order to investigate the
20 effect of baseline BMI on the risk relationship observed between BMI variability and 3P-
21 MACE. We assigned individuals in each trial to one of 3 groups: normal baseline BMI (≤ 25
22 kg/m^2); overweight (>25 to ≤ 30 kg/m^2); and obese (>30 kg/m^2). Cox proportional-hazards
23 regression analyses (fitting model 5 as above) were then performed to estimate the risk of 3P-
24 MACE per +1 SD increase in ASV BMI.

1 Finally, we performed two meta-analyses of trial results using summary statistics from
2 Harmony Outcomes, REWIND, and EMPA-REG OUTCOME, for continuous and
3 categorical BMI variability. We then performed an additional two meta-analyses for
4 continuous and categorical BMI variability, this time including Tayside Bioresource. For
5 continuous BMI variability, this was done by taking the HR estimates for +1 SD increase in
6 ASV BMI from model 5 of each cohort and pooling them via a fixed effects model. The
7 meta-analysis of categorical BMI variability was conducted by the same methodology,
8 whereby HR estimates for the most fluctuating quartiles from model 4 of each were
9 combined. These meta-analyses were performed using the ‘metafor’ package in R (version
10 4.1.1).

11

12 2.5. Data availability statement

13 The datasets generated during and/or analysed in the current study are available from the
14 corresponding author upon reasonable request.

1 3. Results

2 3.1. Population Characteristics

3 The study population sizes from the Harmony Outcomes and the placebo arms of REWIND,
4 and EMPA-REG OUTCOME trials were 9198, 4440, and 2171, respectively. The number of
5 individuals from the Tayside Bioresource cohort that met inclusion criteria for the current
6 investigation was 6980. The clinical features of the participants of each of these 4 cohorts are
7 listed in Table S1.

8

9 3.2. BMI variability and 3P-MACE

10 In our post-hoc analysis of the discovery cohort from the Harmony Outcomes 6.75% of
11 participants experienced a 3P-MACE event (n = 621). When BMI variability was considered
12 as a continuous covariate in the fully adjusted model (model 4), an increase in ASV BMI of 1
13 SD was associated with an increase in the risk of a 3P-MACE outcome (HR 1.12, 95%
14 confidence intervals (CI) 1.08 – 1.17, P < 0.001; Figure 1a). This was independent of
15 traditional cardiovascular risk factors. Furthermore, this effect was independent of GLP1RA
16 drug use, where albiglutide treatment was still associated with decreased 3P-MACE risk (HR
17 0.70, 95% CI 0.60 – 0.82, P < 0.001). When BMI variability was treated as a categorical
18 variable, individuals in the top quartile of BMI variability compared to individuals in the
19 lowest quartile of variability had an increased risk of 3P-MACE outcomes (HR 1.87, 95% CI
20 1.49 – 2.36, P < 0.001; Figure S1a).

21 When we performed this analysis within the placebo arm of the REWIND trial, we found
22 similar results. In this cohort, 11.58% experienced a 3P-MACE outcome (n = 514). When
23 BMI variability was included into model 4 as a continuous covariate, we found that an
24 increase in ASV BMI of 1 SD was associated with an increase in 3P-MACE risk (HR 1.09,

1 95% CI 1.02 – 1.16, P = 0.016; Figure 1b). This increase was again independent of the 3P-
2 MACE risk associated with classic cardiovascular risk factors. Treating BMI variability
3 categorically, there was a significantly increased risk of 3P-MACE for individuals in the top
4 quartile of BMI variability compared to the lowest quartile (HR 1.95, 95% CI 1.50 – 2.54, P
5 <0.001; Figure S1b).

6 We then performed our analysis within the placebo arm of the EMPA-REG OUTCOME trial.
7 In this cohort, 9.40% experienced a 3P-MACE outcome (n = 204). When BMI variability was
8 included into model 4 as a continuous variable, an increase in ASV BMI of +1 SD was
9 shown to be associated with a decrease in 3P-MACE risk (HR 0.80, 95% CI 0.65 – 0.97, P =
10 0.0251; Figure 1c). This association was independent of the classic 3P-MACE risk factors
11 included into the model. Similarly, when BMI variability was considered as a categorical
12 variable, the individuals in the most fluctuating quartile experienced a significantly decreased
13 risk of 3P-MACE (HR 0.61, 95% CI 0.42 – 0.90, P = 0.0115; Table S2).

14 Finally, we performed our analysis with the Tayside Bioresource cohort. Among the 6980
15 individuals in this cohort, 11.60% experienced a 3P-MACE outcome (n = 812). When BMI
16 variability was included into model 4 as a continuous variable, an increase in ASV BMI of +1
17 SD was associated with an increase in the risk of a 3P-MACE event (HR 1.14, 95% CI 1.09 –
18 1.20, P <0.001; Figure 1d) after controlling for classic cardiovascular risk factors. When BMI
19 variability was treated as a categorical variable, the risk of 3P-MACE for individuals in the
20 most fluctuating quartile was significantly increased (HR 1.47, 95% CI 1.18 – 1.80, P <
21 0.001; Figure S1c) relative to the least fluctuating quartile.

22

3.3. Baseline BMI, BMI variability, and 3P-MACE

The majority of participants of all cohorts were either overweight or obese. In the Harmony Outcomes trial, 90.01% (n = 8287) of individuals had a BMI >25 kg/m²; within REWIND, 93.53% (n = 4153); within EMPA-REG OUTCOME, 87.52% (n = 1900); and within the Tayside Bioresource cohort, 88.17% participants (n = 5867) were either overweight or obese.

When stratifying participants in Harmony Outcomes, REWIND, EMPA-REG OUTCOME, and Tayside Bioresource into normal weight, overweight, or obese categories, we found that baseline BMI did not appear to modify the association between BMI variability and 3P-MACE risk. Detailed results of the statistical analyses can be found in Appendix 2.

3.4. HbA1c variability, BMI variability, and 3P-MACE

In the Harmony Outcomes cohort, a +1 SD increase in ASV HbA1c was associated with an increase in 3P-MACE risk (HR 1.14, 95% CI 1.03 – 1.27, P = 0.014; Figure S2(a)) and this increase in risk was independent from the increase in risk associated with a +1 SD increased in ASV BMI (HR 1.20, 95% CI 1.12 – 1.29, P < 0.001; Figure S2(a)). When we analysed the REWIND cohort we observed that a +1 SD increase in ASV HbA1c was not associated with an increase in 3P-MACE risk (HR 0.99, 95% CI 0.86 – 1.15, P = 0.924; Figure S2(b)), however the inclusion of ASV HbA1c as a covariate did not attenuate the observed 3P-MACE risk associated with a +1 SD increase in ASV BMI (HR 1.09, 95% 1.02 – 1.16, P = 0.016; Figure S2(b)). When this analysis was performed in the EMPA-REG OUTCOME cohort, a +1 SD increase in HbA1c was not associated with an increase in 3P-MACE risk (HR 1.04, 0.93 – 1.17, P = 0.4764; Table S3), and this was independent of an association between a +1 SD increase in ASV BMI and significantly decreased 3P-MACE risk (HR 0.80, 95% CI 0.66 – 0.97, P = 0.0261; Table S3). Within the real-world data of the Tayside

1 Bioresource cohort however, a +1 SD in the variability of HbA1c was again associated with
2 significantly increased risk (HR 1.05, 95% CI 1.01 – 1.10, P = 0.014; Figure S2(c)),
3 independent of the risk associated with a +1 SD increase in BMI variability (HR 1.14, 95%
4 CI 1.09 – 1.20, P <0.001; Figure S2(c)).

5

6 3.5. Meta-analysis of BMI variability and 3P-MACE outcomes

7 To investigate the overall effect of BMI variability on 3P-MACE risk we performed 2
8 separate meta-analyses using effect estimates from model 5 in each trial. The first meta-
9 analysis investigated 3P-MACE risk associated with BMI variability as a continuous variable.
10 The second meta-analysis investigated 3P-MACE risk associated with BMI variability treated
11 as a categorical variable. These meta-analyses involved a total of 15,809 participants of
12 whom 1,339 (8.47%) experienced a 3P-MACE outcome. We then performed 2 more meta-
13 analyses identical to the meta-analyses described above with the addition of the summary
14 effect estimate from model 5 of Tayside Bioresource. These latter two meta-analyses
15 involved a total of 22,789 participants of whom 2,151 (9.45%) experienced a 3P-MACE
16 outcome.

17 The meta-analysis of BMI variability as a continuous variable within Harmony Outcomes,
18 REWIND, and EMPA-REG OUTCOME found that an increase in ASV BMI by +1 SD was
19 significantly associated with an increase in the summary risk estimate of 3P-MACE (HR
20 1.12, 95% CI 1.07 – 1.17, P <0.001; Figure S8), with significant heterogeneity observed ($I^2 =$
21 87.50%; P for heterogeneity <0.001). The meta-analysis of BMI variability as a categorical
22 measure found that individuals in the top quartile of BMI variability compared to those in the
23 least variable quartile had a significantly increased summary risk estimate of 3P-MACE (HR

1 1.56, 95% CI 1.33 – 1.83, P <0.001; Figure S7), with this meta-analysis again showing
2 significant heterogeneity ($I^2 = 92.50\%$; P for heterogeneity <0.001).

3 The inclusion of Tayside Bioresource into the meta-analysis caused little adjustment to these
4 results: an increase in ASV BMI by +1 SD was significantly associated with an increase in
5 the summary risk estimate of 3P-MACE (HR 1.13, 95% CI 1.09 – 1.17, P <0.001; Figure S9),
6 with significant heterogeneity observed ($I^2 = 81.80\%$; P for heterogeneity <0.001). The meta-
7 analysis of BMI variability as a categorical measure found that individuals in the top quartile
8 of BMI variability compared to those in the least variable quartile had a significantly
9 increased summary risk estimate of 3P-MACE (HR 1.52, 95% CI 1.34 – 1.73, P <0.001;
10 Figure S10), with this meta-analysis again showing significant heterogeneity ($I^2 = 88.90\%$; P
11 for heterogeneity <0.001).

1 4. Discussion

2 In our post-hoc survival analyses of the participants from three trials and a real-world
3 observational cohort, we found that BMI variability was significantly associated with an
4 increase in the risk of 3P-MACE. These observed associations were independent of
5 variability in HbA1c and other classic cardiovascular risk factors.

6 Our results add to the growing body of evidence that treatment plans for individuals with type
7 2 diabetes may also need to consider the risk to cardiovascular health contributed by weight
8 variability. Several studies have previously investigated the effect of weight variability on
9 cardiovascular health within individuals with type 2 diabetes in a variety of demographics (4,
10 14-19). The majority of these studies also observed the association between weight variability
11 and cardiovascular disease, however, some studies found contradictory results. We have
12 previously proposed that this contradiction may be attributed to discrepancies in cohorts and
13 methodology. Heterogeneity in cohort demographic, type of cohort analysed (i.e. clinical trial
14 versus observational), data collection, definition of cardiovascular events, and the definition
15 of weight variability (e.g. coefficient of variation, SD, ASV, etc.) may lead to heterogeneity
16 in observation (6). One novel finding of our study is that this heterogeneity does not appear to
17 be caused by any inherent difference between trial and observational cohorts, as the results
18 seen in our analyses of Harmony Outcomes, REWIND, and Tayside Bioresource were
19 similar. Furthermore, the similarity of these results provides reinforcement to the idea that
20 heterogeneity in the literature may be in large part due to differences in how BMI variability
21 is defined as well as the covariates controlled for by the statistical models employed.
22 However, despite almost identical methodology used for our analyses, we did not see a
23 replication of our results within the EMPA-REG OUTCOME cohort. The reason for this
24 discrepancy is unclear; there are few differences between the populations of each cohort, and
25 each analysis was adjusted for the same covariates that are typical predictors of

1 cardiovascular disease. Our results suggest that inter-study heterogeneity in the association
2 between BMI variability and 3P-MACE risk is not sufficiently explained by differences
3 between cohorts and methodology, and that further research into this phenomenon may reveal
4 some other explanatory variable.

5 HbA1c variability has been previously observed to increase cardiovascular disease risk (1,
6 20, 21). It is known that BMI and type 2 diabetes, as well as glycaemic control, are strongly
7 correlated (22-24). It therefore stands to reason that the increased cardiovascular risk
8 associated with BMI variability may instead be generated by HbA1c variability. However, to
9 our knowledge, no one has yet investigated the contribution of HbA1c variability to the
10 increased risk of cardiovascular events associated with weight variability. Whilst we did also
11 find that HbA1c variability is associated with increased cardiovascular risk among the
12 majority of our cohorts, inclusion of HbA1c variability into our fully adjusted models did not
13 attenuate the estimated risk contributed by BMI variability. This would suggest that BMI
14 variability is a risk factor for cardiovascular events independent of HbA1c variability, as well
15 as other classic cardiovascular risk factors. Indeed, our adjusted models suggest that an
16 increase in BMI variability contributes similar cardiovascular risk estimate to that associated
17 with a history of smoking, of the need for lipid-controlling drugs, being male, and having
18 elevated HbA1c. This highlights the clinical relevance of BMI variability, as well as the
19 necessity of further research into how BMI variability develops and how it can be effectively
20 managed or controlled. Treatment of type 2 diabetes in the future may need to take BMI and
21 HbA1c variabilities into consideration.

22 A further question our research addresses is whether baseline BMI modulates the
23 cardiovascular risk associated with weight variability. Previous studies performed by
24 Bangalore et al. have observed that obese individuals experience a greater cardiovascular risk
25 associated with weight fluctuations when compared to individuals of a normal weight (4, 15).

1 Our analysis of the Harmony Outcomes and REWIND cohorts found no such association:
2 weight variability was associated with a similar 3P-MACE risk estimate in obese,
3 overweight, and normal weight populations, with no real trend in risk estimates observed.
4 This was also true within our analysis of the Tayside Bioresource cohort. Furthermore, our
5 analysis of the EMPA-REG OUTCOME cohort found no difference in the association of
6 weight variability and MACE across normal weight, overweight, and obese individuals.
7 These findings are consistent with the results of our previously published meta-analysis
8 which also observed that in the literature baseline BMI did not modify the association
9 between BMI variability and cardiovascular events (6).

10 There are a few limitations to our current study. The key limitation of this and other studies is
11 that we have only investigated an association between weight variability and cardiovascular
12 events; from this data we cannot prove causation. While our current study has gone further to
13 show that the increased cardiovascular risk associated with weight variability is independent
14 of other cardiovascular risk factors, it is still possible that an unmeasured variable could
15 cause the increased risk. Another limitation persistent in studies investigating the relationship
16 between weight variability and cardiovascular events, and a limitation to the present study, is
17 the impact of intentionality of weight loss on cardiovascular disease. While it could be argued
18 that the majority of individuals with type 2 diabetes will be intentionally trying to lose
19 weight, and thus intentionality may have little effect on the cardiovascular risk observed, our
20 current research cannot state this conclusively. Further, in the assessment of BMI variability
21 we do not differentiate between weight loss and weight gain, which could both contribute to
22 an increase in variability, and both may have different effects on the risk of cardiovascular
23 events. Similarly, we cannot conclusively state that medication has no effect of body weight
24 variability and cardiovascular risk. It is possible for instance that the sickest patients changed

1 their glycaemic and cardiovascular care more frequently, resulting in greater body weight
2 variability with or without change in cardiovascular risk.

3 5. Conclusions

4 Our analyses found that variability in BMI is associated with increase in the risk of 3P-
5 MACE outcomes to a similar extent in both clinical and observational cohorts. This effect
6 appears to be independent of HbA1c variability and other traditional cardiovascular risk
7 factors. Further research into establishing a causative relationship between weight variability
8 and cardiovascular events is recommended.

9

1 6. Acknowledgments

2 Personal Thanks: The authors would like to personally thank all members of the SOPHIA
3 consortium for their input and helpful discussions during the development of this study. We
4 would also like to thank Enrique Soto, University of Dundee, UK, for their help in the
5 development and QC of the statistical models used for these analyses. Dr. Soto received no
6 financial support for his participation.

7 Funding and assistance: This manuscript is part of a Stratification of Obesity Phenotypes to
8 Optimize Future Obesity Therapy (SOPHIA) project (www.imisophia.eu). SOPHIA has
9 received funding from the Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 Joint Undertaking under grant
10 agreement No. 875534. This Joint Undertaking support from the European Union's Horizon
11 2020 research and innovation program and EFPIA and T1D Exchange, JDRF, and Obesity
12 Action Coalition.

13 Conflicts of interest: Y.C. is employed by Eli Lilly and Company and owns stock. N.C.S. is
14 employed by Lilly Deutschland GmbH and owns stock. A.Y.D. is employed by Novo
15 Nordisk. M.M. and M.P.N. are employed by Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co.KG.

16 Author contributions and guarantor statement: AD conceived the original hypothesis and
17 planned the framework of the presented analysis. AD, RM, YC, and MM performed the
18 computational analyses of the Harmony Outcome, Tayside Bioresource, REWIND, and
19 EMPA-REG OUTCOME cohorts, respectively. The results presented were discussed with
20 MKS, EP, NCS, AC, and MPN, and all authors contributed to the final manuscript. AD
21 assumes responsibility for the integrity and accuracy of the analyses within this article. The
22 communication reflects the author's view and neither the IMI nor the European Union,
23 EFPIA, or any Associated Partners are responsible for any use that may be made of the
24 information contained therein. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

1 7. References

- 2 1. Ceriello A, Lucisano G, Prattichizzo F, La Grotta R, Franzén S, Svensson A-M, et al.
3 HbA1c variability predicts cardiovascular complications in type 2 diabetes regardless
4 of being at glycemic target. *Cardiovascular Diabetology*. 2022;21(1):13.
- 5 2. Cohen AA, Leung DL, Legault V, Gravel D, Blanchet FG, Côté AM, et al. Synchrony
6 of biomarker variability indicates a critical transition: Application to mortality
7 prediction in hemodialysis. *iScience*. 2022;25(6):104385.
- 8 3. Ceriello A, Prattichizzo F. Variability of risk factors and diabetes complications.
9 *Cardiovasc Diabetol*. 2021;20(1):101.
- 10 4. Bangalore S, Fayyad R, DeMicco DA, Colhoun HM, Waters DD. Body Weight
11 Variability and Cardiovascular Outcomes in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus.
12 *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes*. 2018;11(11):e004724.
- 13 5. Nam GE, Kim W, Han K, Lee C-W, Kwon Y, Han B, et al. Body Weight Variability
14 and the Risk of Cardiovascular Outcomes and Mortality in Patients With Type 2
15 Diabetes: A Nationwide Cohort Study. *Diabetes care*. 2020;43(9):2234-41.
- 16 6. Massey RJ, Siddiqui MK, Pearson ER, Dawed AY. Weight variability and
17 cardiovascular outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Cardiovasc*
18 *Diabetol*. 2023;22(1):5.
- 19 7. Cho IJ, Chang HJ, Sung JM, Yun YM, Kim HC, Chung N. Associations of changes in
20 body mass index with all-cause and cardiovascular mortality in healthy middle-aged
21 adults. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(12):e0189180.
- 22 8. Sponholtz TR, van den Heuvel ER, Xanthakis V, Vasani RS. Association of
23 Variability in Body Mass Index and Metabolic Health With Cardiometabolic Disease
24 Risk. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2019;8(7):e010793.
- 25 9. Jeong S, Choi S, Chang J, Kim K, Kim SM, Hwang SY, et al. Association of weight
26 fluctuation with cardiovascular disease risk among initially obese adults. *Scientific*
27 *Reports*. 2021;11(1):10152.
- 28 10. Boye KS, Lage MJ, Shinde S, Thieu V, Bae JP. Trends in HbA1c and Body Mass
29 Index Among Individuals with Type 2 Diabetes: Evidence from a US Database 2012-
30 2019. *Diabetes Ther*. 2021;12(7):2077-87.
- 31 11. Gerstein HC, Colhoun HM, Dagenais GR, Diaz R, Lakshmanan M, Pais P, et al.
32 Design and baseline characteristics of participants in the Researching cardiovascular
33 Events with a Weekly INcretin in Diabetes (REWIND) trial on the cardiovascular
34 effects of dulaglutide. *Diabetes Obes Metab*. 2018;20(1):42-9.
- 35 12. Green JB, Hernandez AF, D'Agostino RB, Granger CB, Janmohamed S, Jones NP, et
36 al. Harmony Outcomes: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of the
37 effect of albiglutide on major cardiovascular events in patients with type 2 diabetes
38 mellitus-Rationale, design, and baseline characteristics. *Am Heart J*. 2018;203:30-8.
- 39 13. Zinman B, Inzucchi SE, Lachin JM, Wanner C, Ferrari R, Fitchett D, et al. Rationale,
40 design, and baseline characteristics of a randomized, placebo-controlled
41 cardiovascular outcome trial of empagliflozin (EMPA-REG OUTCOME™).
42 *Cardiovascular Diabetology*. 2014;13(1):102.
- 43 14. Aucott LS, Philip S, Avenell A, Afolabi E, Sattar N, Wild S. Patterns of weight
44 change after the diagnosis of type 2 diabetes in Scotland and their relationship with
45 glycaemic control, mortality and cardiovascular outcomes: a retrospective cohort
46 study. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(7):e010836.
- 47 15. Bangalore S, Fayyad R, Laskey R, DeMicco DA, Messerli FH, Waters DD. Body-
48 Weight Fluctuations and Outcomes in Coronary Disease. *New England Journal of*
49 *Medicine*. 2017;376(14):1332-40.

- 1 16. Ceriello A, Lucisano G, Prattichizzo F, Eliasson B, Franzén S, Svensson A-M, et al.
2 Variability in body weight and the risk of cardiovascular complications in type 2
3 diabetes: results from the Swedish National Diabetes Register. *Cardiovascular*
4 *Diabetology*. 2021;20(1):173.
- 5 17. Nam GE, Kim W, Han K, Lee CW, Kwon Y, Han B, et al. Body Weight Variability
6 and the Risk of Cardiovascular Outcomes and Mortality in Patients With Type 2
7 Diabetes: A Nationwide Cohort Study. *Diabetes Care*. 2020;43(9):2234-41.
- 8 18. Lee HJ, Choi EK, Han KD, Kim DH, Lee E, Lee SR, et al. High variability in
9 bodyweight is associated with an increased risk of atrial fibrillation in patients with
10 type 2 diabetes mellitus: a nationwide cohort study. *Cardiovasc Diabetol*.
11 2020;19(1):78.
- 12 19. Yeboah P, Hsu FC, Bertoni AG, Yeboah J. Body Mass Index, Change in Weight,
13 Body Weight Variability and Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (from the
14 ACCORD Trial). *Am J Cardiol*. 2019;123(4):576-81.
- 15 20. Li S, Nemeth I, Donnelly L, Hapca S, Zhou K, Pearson ER. Visit-to-Visit HbA(1c)
16 Variability Is Associated With Cardiovascular Disease and Microvascular
17 Complications in Patients With Newly Diagnosed Type 2 Diabetes. *Diabetes Care*.
18 2020;43(2):426-32.
- 19 21. Skriver MV, Sandbæk A, Kristensen JK, Støvring H. Relationship of HbA1c
20 variability, absolute changes in HbA1c, and all-cause mortality in type 2 diabetes: a
21 Danish population-based prospective observational study. *BMJ Open Diabetes*
22 *Research & Care*. 2015;3(1):e000060.
- 23 22. Drozd D, Alvarez-Pitti J, Wójcik M, Borghi C, Gabbianelli R, Mazur A, et al.
24 Obesity and Cardiometabolic Risk Factors: From Childhood to Adulthood. *Nutrients*.
25 2021;13(11).
- 26 23. . DSCJ, Dr. Saborni Dey , Dr. Rajesh Ranjan. To determine the correlation between
27 BMI and Glycated Hemoglobin (HbA1c) Level in Patients of Type 2 Diabetes
28 Mellitus. *European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine*. 2022;9(3):3014-8.
- 29 24. Bays HE, Chapman RH, Grandy S. The relationship of body mass index to diabetes
30 mellitus, hypertension and dyslipidaemia: comparison of data from two national
31 surveys. *Int J Clin Pract*. 2007;61(5):737-47.

32

33

1 8. Figures

2 Figure 1(a): A forest plot summarising the adjusted hazard ratio (HR) and 95% confidence
3 interval (CI) of 3-point major adverse cardiovascular events (3P-MACE) risk associated with
4 a +1 standard deviation (SD) increase in BMI variability within the Harmony Outcomes trial
5 cohort (n = 9198) after adjustment for treatment, baseline BMI, sex, age, smoking, type 2
6 diabetes duration, systolic blood pressure, statin use, baseline HbA1c, and number of BMI
7 measurement. Risk estimates (HR and 95% confidence interval (CI)) presented based on Cox
8 regression model versus reference for categorical variables and for a one-unit increase for
9 continuous variables. ¹ reference Placebo, n = 4473; ² reference Female, n = 2733; ³
10 reference Never Smoked, n = 3710; ⁴ reference No Statin Use, n = 1411.

11

12 Figure 1(b): A forest plot summarising the adjusted hazard ratio (HR) and 95% confidence
13 interval (CI) of 3-point major adverse cardiovascular events (3P-MACE) risk associated with
14 a +1 standard deviation (SD) increase in BMI variability within the REWIND trial placebo-
15 arm cohort (n = 4440) after adjustment for age, sex, baseline BMI, systolic blood pressure,
16 baseline HbA1c, history of coronary artery disease (CAD), statin use, smoking, and number
17 of BMI measurement. Risk estimates (HR and 95% confidence interval (CI)) presented based
18 on Cox regression model versus reference for categorical variables and for a one-unit
19 increase for continuous variables. ¹ reference Female, n = 2060; ² reference No CAD, n =
20 3630; ³ reference No Statin Use, n = 760; ⁴ reference No Smoking, n = 3749.

21

22 Figure 1(c): A forest plot summarising the adjusted hazard ratio (HR) and 95% confidence
23 interval (CI) of 3-point major adverse cardiovascular events (3P-MACE) risk associated with
24 a +1 standard deviation (SD) increase in BMI variability within the EMPA-REG OUTCOME

1 trial placebo-arm cohort (n = 2171) after adjustment for baseline BMI, systolic blood
2 pressure, diastolic blood pressure, sex, age, number of BMI measurements, lipid controlling
3 drug use, smoking status, type 2 diabetes duration, and baseline HbA1c. Risk estimates (HR
4 and 95% confidence interval (CI)) presented based on Cox regression model versus reference
5 for categorical variables and for a one-unit increase for continuous variables. ¹ reference
6 Male, n = 2060; ² reference No Lipid Controlling Drugs, n = 3630; ³ reference No Smoking,
7 n = 760; ⁴ reference Diabetes Duration $x < 1$, n = 3749. Diabetes duration is split in to
8 categories: less than 1 year ($x < 1$); between 1 and 5 years ($1 < x \leq 5$); between 5 and 10 years
9 ($5 < x \leq 10$); over 10 years ($x > 10$).

10

11 Figure 1(d): A forest plot summarising the adjusted hazard ratio (HR) and 95% confidence
12 interval (CI) of 3-point major adverse cardiovascular events (3P-MACE) risk associated with
13 a +1 standard deviation (SD) increase in BMI variability within the Tayside Bioresource
14 cohort (n = 6980) after adjustment for sex, age, mean BMI, number of BMI measurements
15 used, lipid-controlling drug use, antihypertensive drug use, smoking status, type 2 diabetes
16 duration, and baseline HbA1c. The covariate “age” has been split into quartiles for this model
17 in order to allow the model to meet proportional hazards assumptions. Risk estimates (HR
18 and 95% confidence interval (CI)) presented based on Cox regression model versus reference
19 for categorical variables and for a one-unit increase for continuous variables. ¹ reference
20 Female, n = 3282; ² reference Age Quartile 1, n = 1745; ³ reference No Lipid Controlling
21 Drug Use, n = 5070; ⁴ reference antihypertensive drug use, n = 2124; ⁵ reference Never
22 Smoked, n = 2270.







