

These free insulin levels (resulting from both the constant intravenous insulin infusion that was maintained throughout the in-patient study days as well as any residual concentration remaining from the previous dose of subcutaneous or inhaled insulin) did not show changes from baseline to posttreatment values (mean of weeks 12 and 24) with either treatment (median baseline 16.6, 16.4; posttreatment 18.0, 18.4 uU/ml; inhaled and subcutaneous insulin, respectively).

Free insulin concentrations would not be expected to reconcile the lack of glucose changes observed in this study with pharmacokinetic changes observed in previous studies cited by Prof. Chantelau. In fact, the referenced investigations not only showed relationships between antibodies and free insulin levels, but also with postprandial glucose and other pharmacodynamic parameters (3–6). If insulin levels showed changes in the absence of glucodynamic consequences, the significance and/or accuracy of the insulin data would necessarily be called into question.

We also do not agree that use of the euglycemic clamp technique is the reason no glucodynamic correlates with insulin antibodies were demonstrated in our study. Importantly, the primary end point of the study, postprandial glucose, was not measured with the glucose clamp technique. Furthermore, the clamp technique is precise enough to determine glucodynamic changes secondary to insulin antibodies as was in fact demonstrated in one of the studies cited by Prof. Chantelau (6). We agree with others that the euglycemic clamp technique is the gold standard for assessment of pharmacodynamic responses to insulin (7,8).

The difference in glucodynamic results from this study compared with others may be related to methodologic differences (including prospective study design and optimization of test drug doses for test meal), as well as the ranges of insulin antibody levels achieved (as discussed in our article). Nevertheless, the results of this study show that insulin antibody levels measured prospectively during treatment with inhaled insulin are not associated with relevant changes in insulin pharmacodynamics or with adverse clinical effects.

TIM HEISE, MD¹
SUSANNE BOTT, MD¹
CORINNA TUSEK, MD¹

JENS-ARMIN STEPHAN, MD¹
TOM KAWABATA, PHD²
DEBORAH FINCO-KENT, MS²
CAMERON LIU, PHD²
ALAN KRASNER, MD²

From the ¹Profil Institute for Metabolic Research, Medical, Neuss, Germany; and ²Pfizer Global Research and Development, Groton, Connecticut.

Address correspondence to Tim C. Heise, MD, CEO, Clinical Science, Profil Institut für Stoffwechselforschung, Hellersbergstr 9, D-41460, Neuss, Germany. E-mail: tim.heise@profil-research.de.

© 2006 by the American Diabetes Association.

References

1. Chantelau E: The effect of insulin antibodies on the metabolic action of inhaled and subcutaneous insulin (Letter). *Diabetes Care* 29:477, 2006
2. Heise T, Bott S, Tusek C, Stephan JA, Kawabata T, Finco-Kent D, Liu C, Krasner A: The effect of insulin antibodies on the metabolic action of inhaled and subcutaneous insulin. *Diabetes Care* 28:2161–2169, 2005
3. Van Haeften TW: Clinical significance of insulin antibodies in insulin-treated diabetic patients. *Diabetes Care* 12:641–648, 1989
4. Bolli G, de Feo P, Compagnucci P, Cartechini MG, Angeletti G, Santeusano F, Brunetti P, Gerich JE: Abnormal glucose counterregulation in insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus: interaction of anti-insulin antibodies and impaired glucagon and epinephrine secretion. *Diabetes* 32:134–141, 1983
5. Chantelau E, Sonnenberg GE, Heding LG, Berger M: Impaired metabolic response to regular insulin in the presence of a high level of circulating insulin-binding immunoglobulin G. *Diabetes Care* 7:403–404, 1984
6. Peters A, Klose O, Hefty R, Keck F, Kerner W: The influence of insulin antibodies on the pharmacokinetics of NPH insulin in patients with type-1 diabetes treated with human insulin. *Diabet Med* 12:925–939, 1995
7. Heinemann L, Richter B: Clinical pharmacology of human insulin (Review). *Diabetes Care* 16 (Suppl. 3):90–100, 1993
8. European Agency for the Evaluation of Medicinal Products/Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products: Note for guidance on clinical investigation of medicinal products in the treatment of diabetes mellitus [article online], 2002. Available from <http://www.emea.eu.int/pdfs/human/ewp/108000en.pdf>. Accessed 31 October 2005

Autologous Transplantation of Granulocyte Colony-Stimulating Factor-Mobilized Peripheral Blood Mononuclear Cells Improves Critical Limb Ischemia in Diabetes

Response to Huang et al.

Huang et al. (1), in their small seminal clinical trial of cellular therapy for critical limb ischemia in diabetic patients, did not include presence of diabetic retinopathy among their exclusion criteria. It is known that individuals with diabetes are subjected to poor blood vessel growth in ischemic hearts and limbs and increased angiogenesis in retinal complications. This so-called “diabetic paradox” has been attributed to the differential regulation of angiogenic factors in the retina versus the systemic circulation (2). While decreased levels of endothelial progenitor cells are seen in diabetic patients with peripheral arterial disease (3), a role for endothelial progenitor cells in the development of proliferative diabetic retinopathy (PDR) also has been demonstrated (4). Possible harmful side effects of progenitor cell transplantation may include pathologic neoangiogenesis favoring the development or progression of cancer or PDR (5). Moreover, although data on blood cells are not presented, the increased blood viscosity due to the leukemoid response to granulocyte colony-stimulating factor may favor retinal vessel occlusion. Therefore, it was desirable that patients were screened for PDR before and after cell transplantation, in order to identify or exclude such an undesirable effect.

Finally, the achievement of a better metabolic control in the transplant group than in the control group is not unexpected and can be explained without postulating β -cell regeneration, since wound healing per se and reduced inflammation may have improved insulin sensitivity. The authors correctly cite the hypothesis that circulating progenitor cells may have a role in rescue of pancreatic endocrine function (6), but this has not been demonstrated thus far. Transplanted cells are