

1 **Lower limb events in individuals with type 2 diabetes: evidence for an increased risk**
2 **associated with diuretic use**

3 Louis Potier^{1,2,3}, Ronan Roussel^{1,2,3}, Gilberto Velho³, Pierre-Jean Saulnier^{4,5,6}, Anisoara
4 Bumbu¹, Odette Matar¹, Fabrice Schneider^{4,5,6,7}, Stéphanie Ragot^{4,5,6}, Michel Marre^{1,2,3,8},
5 Kamel Mohammedi^{9,10,11}, Samy Hadjadj¹²

6 ¹Assistance Publique – Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP), Bichat Hospital, DHU FIRE, Department
7 of Diabetology, Endocrinology and Nutrition, Paris, France; ²Paris Diderot University,
8 Sorbonne Paris Cité, UFR de Médecine, Paris, France; ³INSERM, UMRS 1138, Cordeliers
9 Research Center, Paris, France; ⁴INSERM, CIC1402, Poitiers, France; ⁵Poitiers University,
10 UFR de Médecine et Pharmacie, Poitiers, France; ⁶CHU de Poitiers, Clinical investigation
11 centre CIC1402, Poitiers, France; ⁷Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Poitiers, Department
12 of Vascular surgery, Poitiers, France; ⁸Fondation Ophtalmologique Adolphe de Rothschild,
13 Paris, France; ⁹Hôpital Haut-Lévêque, Department of Diabetology, Endocrinology and
14 Nutrition, Bordeaux, France; ¹⁰Bordeaux University, Bordeaux, France; ¹¹INSERM U1219
15 "Bordeaux Population Health", Bordeaux, France; ¹²Institut du thorax, INSERM, CNRS,
16 CHU Nantes, Nantes, France.

17 **Correspondence to :** Dr. Louis Potier

18 Service d'Endocrinologie Diabétologie Nutrition

19 Groupe Hospitalier Bichat - Claude Bernard

20 46 rue Henri Huchard 75877 Paris Cedex 18

21 Phone : +33 1 40 25 73 01, Fax : +33 40 25 88 42, e-mail : louis.potier@gmail.com

22 **Tweet:** Is higher rate of amputations, believed to be associated with SGLT2 inhibitors, could
23 be related to diuretic effect? Potier et al. found a higher risk of amputations in diuretic users
24 from a French observational study compared with non-users. Figure 1 could be included in
25 the tweet.

26 Word count: 3001

27

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Aims/hypothesis:** Recently, safety data signaled an increased risk of amputations in patients
3 taking canagliflizon, a SGLT2 inhibitor. If this side effect is due to drug-induced
4 hypovolemia, diuretics should also increase that risk. The aim of this study was to analyze the
5 association between diuretics use and the risk of lower limb events (LLE) in patients with
6 type 2 diabetes.

7 **Methods:** SURDIAGENE is a prospective observational cohort including type 2 diabetes
8 patients enrolled from 2002 to 2012 and followed-up until onset of LLE, death, or December
9 31, 2015, whichever came first. Primary outcome was the first occurrence of LLE, a
10 composite of lower limb amputations (LLA) and lower limb revascularizations (LLR). Rate
11 of primary outcome was compared between participants taking or not diuretics at baseline in
12 Cox adjusted model.

13 **Results:** At baseline, of the 1459 included participants, 670 were taking diuretics (in
14 participants with and without diuretics, mean age was 67.1 and 62.9; 55.8% and 59.8% were
15 men, respectively). During a median follow-up of 7.1 years, the incident of LLE was 1.80 per
16 100 patient.years in diuretics users versus 1.00 in non-users ($p < 0.001$). The hazard ratio for
17 LLE in users vs. non-users was 2.08 [95%CI, 1.49, 2.93; $p < 0.001$]. This association remained
18 significant in **multivariable** adjusted model (1.49 [1.01, 2.19; $p = 0.04$]) and similar after
19 considering death as a competing risk (subhazard ratio 1.89 [1.35, 2.64; $p < 0.001$]). When
20 separated, LEA but not LLR were associated with the use of diuretics (2.01 [1.14, 3.54;
21 $p = 0.02$] and 1.05 [0.67, 1.64; $p = 0.84$], respectively in the **multivariable** adjusted model).

22 **Conclusions:** Among patients with type 2 diabetes treated with diuretics, there was a
23 significant increase in the risk of LLE, predominantly LLA.

24

25 **Key words:** diuretics, lower limb amputation, lower limb revascularization, type 2 diabetes

1

2 **List of abbreviations**

3 ACR: albumin-to-creatinine ratio

4 CANVAS: Canagliflozin Cardiovascular Assessment Study

5 LLA: lower limb amputation

6 LLE: lower limb events

7 LLR: lower limb revascularization

8 PAD: peripheral arterial disease

9 RAAS: renin angiotensin aldosterone system

10 SGLT2: sodium/glucose cotransporter 2

11

12 **Research in context**

13• **What is already known about this subject?**

14 • Lower limb amputations and revascularizations are highly prevalent in patients with
15 type 2 diabetes

16 • Recently, some evidence from randomized controlled trial and observational data
17 suggested that SGLT2 inhibitors could be associated with an increased risk of lower
18 limb amputations

19 • A potential mechanism for the increased risk of lower limb amputations observed with
20 SGLT2 inhibitors could be the glycosuria-induced osmotic diuresis

21• **What is the key question?**

22 • Is there an association between diuretics use and lower limb events in patients with
23 type 2 diabetes?

24

1• **What are the new findings?**

- 2 • In a single centre prospective observational cohort of patients with type 2 diabetes,
3 diuretics use was associated with a higher risk of lower limb amputations and
4 revascularizations

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

- 6 • Clinical implications might be to use diuresis-inducing drugs with caution and careful
7 assessment of the volemia in patients with diabetes and peripheral arterial disease or
8 foot ulcers.

9

1 **BACKGROUND**

2 Diabetes mellitus is the leading cause of lower limb amputations (LLA) [1]. The high
3 prevalence of this debilitating complication in patients with diabetes is explained by a wide
4 range of factors such peripheral arterial disease (PAD), diabetic neuropathy, impaired wound
5 healing, susceptibility to infection and others [2]. Ischemia is associated with a dramatic
6 increase risk of LLA in patients with diabetes and foot ulcer [3]. Hypovolemia could further
7 decrease peripheral perfusion in patients with PAD, favoring decompensation and eventually
8 LLA. There is evidence from case reports that extracellular volume depletion could lead to
9 lower limb or mesenteric ischemia [4, 5].

10 Recently, in the CANVAS trial (Canagliflozin Cardiovascular Assessment Study), the
11 use of canagliflozin, compared to placebo, has been associated with doubling of the risk of
12 LLA [6]. Canagliflozin, a sodium/glucose cotransporter 2 (SGLT2) inhibitor, is a glucose-
13 lowering agent with a mild diuretic action consequent to glycosuria-induced osmotic diuresis.
14 A potential mechanism for the increased risk of LLA in CANVAS could be this drug-induced
15 hypovolemia. With this hypothesis, diuretics should also show a similar safety profile. A few
16 previous studies analyzed the association between diuretics use and LLA but were limited
17 regarding type of diuretics or number of participants with diabetes [7, 8].

18 In this study, we analyzed the association between diuretics and the incidence of lower
19 limb events (LLE), LLA or lower limb revascularization (LLR), in a prospective
20 observational cohort of patients with type 2 diabetes.

21

22 **METHODS**

23 **Study Protocols and Participants**

24 SURDIAGENE study is a French prospective single-center cohort of patients with
25 type 2 diabetes regularly visiting the Diabetes Department at Poitiers University Hospital,

1 France [9]. Patients aged ≥ 18 years with a definite diagnosis of T2D for ≥ 2 years were
2 recruited from 2002 to 2012. Outcome update has been performed prospectively every two
3 years from 2007 till 2015. The main exclusion criteria were non-diabetic kidney disease and
4 follow-up duration < 1 month. The Poitiers University Hospital Ethics Committee approved
5 the study design (CPP Ouest III). All participants provided a written informed consent.

6 Clinical and biological data, including personal medical history and medication use
7 were collected at baseline. Medications use were physician reported and collected at baseline
8 through drug prescription analyses. Diuretics class included thiazide, loop and potassium-
9 sparing diuretics. Mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists were not considered as a diuretic in
10 our analysis. No data were available on the type of diuretics used by each participant and
11 diuretics users were assembled in a single group. Date of the first initiation of treatments was
12 not available in this cohort. A prevalent user design was used here. Estimated glomerular
13 filtration rate (eGFR) was calculated using the Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology
14 Collaboration formula [10].

15 **Clinical outcomes**

16 The primary outcome was the first occurrence of a LLE during follow-up. LLE was
17 defined as a composite of LLA or lower limb revascularization (LLR), whichever came first.
18 LLA was defined as an amputation at or above the metatarsophalangeal joint. LLR was
19 defined as the requirement of peripheral (aorta or lower-limb arteries) revascularization
20 procedure by angioplasty or bypass. None of the reported amputations were traumatic. Each
21 LLE outcome was considered separately as a secondary endpoint. Outcomes were
22 individually determined from patients' hospital records, French death certificate registries,
23 and interviews with their general practitioners. Patients moving out of the hospital area
24 (Poitou–Charentes district) were censored at the time of their departure. An independent
25 adjudication committee reviewed every prospectively collected event [9]. Each endpoint was

1 reviewed by two independent physicians, and, in case of disagreement, the whole committee
2 discussed the end-point until agreement was found. Dates of event reported by the
3 adjudication committee were the exact date of events.

4 **Statistical analyses**

5 Continuous variables are expressed as mean \pm SD, or as median (25th, 75th percentile)
6 for those with skewed distribution. Categorical variables are expressed as the number of
7 participants with corresponding percentage. Comparisons between users and non-users of
8 diuretics were conducted using *t*-test, Wilcoxon, or χ^2 tests.

9 Participants with at least one missing value of any of the covariates used in the
10 adjusted Cox model were removed from all analyses including this covariate.

11 Probability of remaining free of LLE and individual components of LLE were plotted
12 as Kaplan-Meier curves according to use of diuretics at baseline and compared using the log-
13 rank test. Cox proportional hazards regression models were fitted to estimate hazard ratios
14 (HR), with associated 95% CI, for endpoints during follow-up for participants taking diuretics
15 compared with participants not on diuretics. We included in our multivariable Cox model all
16 baseline **characteristics** with $p < 0.10$ in the comparison between participants with incident
17 outcomes during follow-up and those with no events : age, diabetes duration, sex, body mass
18 index, systolic blood pressure, hypertension, diabetic retinopathy, previous cardiovascular
19 disease, previous amputation, previous peripheral arterial disease, HDL-cholesterol, albumin
20 to creatinine ratio, eGFR, antiplatelet/anticoagulant, blood pressure lowering agents, statins,
21 biguanides and insulin use (data from ESM Table 1). Due to the high rate of comorbidities in
22 participants prone to LLE, a large proportion of participants may succumb to deaths before
23 LLE occur. Thus, analyses were also adjusted for death considered as a competing risk using
24 the Fine and Gray method [11]. The Schoenfeld residuals method was used to assess the
25 proportional hazards assumption for the association between primary endpoint and diuretics

1 use ($p=0.83$).

2 Since diuretics are preferentially prescribed to patients with heart failure, the latter
3 could lead to allocation bias. However, baseline data for heart failure was not available in our
4 cohort. To overcome this limitation, we did a sensitivity analysis in a subgroup of participants
5 without a congestive heart failure episode occurring during follow up ($n=1212$), assuming that
6 this group should have a lower prevalence of heart failure at baseline compared with
7 participants experiencing congestive heart failure during follow-up.

8 We also compared diuretics users to an active comparator class, renin angiotensin
9 aldosterone system (RAAS) blockers (e.g. angiotensin conversion enzyme inhibitors and
10 angiotensin receptor blockers). The choice of this comparator was based on the number of
11 participants taking only one class for comparison and because both classes have opposite
12 action on RAAS which has been shown to be involved in peripheral arterial disease[12].

13 Finally, to better account for differences in baseline characteristics of participants
14 taking or not diuretics, participants were propensity- score- matched (1:1) based on baseline
15 characteristics using a “nearest neighbor matching” algorithm and a caliper at 0.1 [13].
16 Baseline characteristics used for matching included: age, sex, diabetes duration, body mass
17 index, smoking, systolic and diastolic blood pressure, history of hypertension, history of
18 cardiovascular disease, history of myocardial infarction, history of LLE, total-cholesterol,
19 HDL-cholesterol, triglycerides, diabetic retinopathy, albuminuria, HbA1c, eGFR, antiplatelet
20 or anticoagulant use, blood pressure lowering drugs use, beta blockers use, RAAS blockers
21 use, statins use and insulin use). We matched 964 participants (71.9% and 61.1% of diuretics
22 users and non-users before matching, respectively). After propensity score matching, all
23 absolute standardized differences were $<10\%$, indicating robust matching [13]. Cox models
24 were fitted for endpoints with diuretics as covariate in the matched cohort.

25 Statistics were performed with JMP (SAS Institute, Cary, NC) and R software (version

1 3.4.2). Two-sided p-values less than 0.05 were considered significant.

2 **RESULTS**

3 **Baseline characteristics**

4 Among the 1468 participants enrolled in the full cohort, 9 participants were excluded
5 for missing baseline data on diuretics use. Characteristics of participants at baseline are shown
6 in Table 1. Participants taking diuretics at baseline were significantly older, had significantly
7 lower eGFR, higher ACR, used more frequently other blood pressure lowering medications
8 and more often had history of cardiovascular disease compared to those not on diuretics. LLE
9 occurred in 142 participants (9.7%) during follow-up (first event to occur in case of
10 recurrence). During a follow-up of 7.1 years, the incidence rate of LLE was 1.38 per 100
11 person.years. Taken individually, LLA occurred in 79 (5.4%) and LLR in 98 (6.7%)
12 participants. The incidence rate of LLA and LLR were 0.78 and 0.98 person.years,
13 respectively. Participants who experienced either event, compared with those who did not,
14 were more often males, had longer duration of diabetes, higher rates of complications and
15 previous cardiovascular diseases. They had higher rates of previous amputation and peripheral
16 arterial disease and were more often treated with cardioprotective medications (blood pressure
17 lowering drugs, statins, antiplatelet and anticoagulant agents) (ESM Table 1).

18 **Diuretics use and lower limb events during follow-up**

19 During a median follow-up of 7.1 years, incident rate of LLE was 1.80 per 100
20 patient.years in diuretics users versus 1.00 in non-users ($p<0.001$). The probabilities of
21 remaining event-free during follow-up according to diuretics use are presented in Figure 1.
22 Cox proportional hazards survival regression analyses showed significant association between
23 the use of diuretics and the incidence of LLE. After adjustment for cofounders, the rate of
24 LLE remained higher in participants on diuretics compared to non-users (Table 2).

1 Among participants taking or not diuretics at baseline, incident rates for LLA were
2 1.07 versus 0.50 per 100 patient.years respectively ($p<0.001$), and for LLR were 1.14 and
3 0.80 per 100 patient.years respectively ($p=0.04$). Differences in LLA incidence were not
4 significant depending on the site of amputation (transfemoral, transtibial or transmetatarsal)
5 ($p=0.86$). Rate of LLA remained significantly increased after adjustment whereas risk of LLR
6 was no longer significant among diuretics users in adjusted model (Table 2).

7 All-cause death occurred in 542 participants (37.1%) during follow-up, including 78
8 participants with any LLE during follow-up. In competing risk regression analyses, subhazard
9 ratios for LLE, LLA and LLR were similar to hazard ratio from the Cox model (Table 2),
10 indicating that death was not a competing risk in the association of diuretics with outcomes.

11 **Sensitivity analyses**

12 We calculated hazard ratio in the subgroup of participants without incident episode of
13 congestive heart failure during follow-up ($n=1212$). Incident rate of LLE and LEA remained
14 significantly higher in participants taking diuretics compared with those not taking diuretics.
15 This increased rate was not observed for LLR (ESM Table 2).

16 We also compared participants taking diuretics but no RAAS blockers ($n=143$) to
17 participants taking RAAS blockers but no diuretics ($n= 393$). Adjusted hazard ratio was 1.84
18 (95%CI 0.97, 3.47; $p= 0.06$) for LLE.

19 After propensity score matching, baseline characteristics between groups were better
20 balanced with no significant difference between diuretics users and non-users (ESM Table 3).
21 In Cox proportional hazards survival regression analyses, we observed a significant increased
22 rate of primary outcomes in participants on diuretics compared with non-diuretics users
23 (Table 3). Similar and significant increase risk of LLA was observed with diuretics use while
24 LLR was not significantly different according to diuretics use (Table 3).

25

1 **DISCUSSION**

2 In this analysis of 1459 participants with type 2 diabetes, use of diuretics was strongly
3 and independently associated with an increased risk of LLE, and more specifically of LLA.
4 We observed consistent findings after multiple adjustment methods on confounding
5 covariates. Previous epidemiological data have already suggested a similar association in
6 individuals with and without diabetes[7, 8]. The absolute risk of LLE is much higher in long-
7 standing diabetes, but, to our knowledge, this is the first longitudinal study supporting an
8 association between diuretics use and LLE in type 2 diabetes.

9 The association between antihypertensive medications and LLA in diabetes has been
10 investigated in 450 000 participants in a cross-sectional study on electronic medical records
11 [7]. In line with our results, the authors reported a positive association between thiazides and
12 LLA compared with other antihypertensive drugs. However, the design was cross-sectional
13 and other classes of diuretics (loop and potassium-sparing diuretics) were not included in the
14 analyses. In another cross-sectional study of 1000 participants with known PAD, a 1.5-fold
15 increased risk of critical limb ischemia with use of loop diuretics was reported but no
16 information was available regarding other types of diuretics [8]. Randomized controlled trials
17 testing diuretics would have been the best design to assess causality, but relevant reports did
18 not include precise data on LLE, likely because these events are unfrequently expected to
19 occur in this setting. However, the large Antihypertensive and Lipid Lowering Treatment to
20 Prevent Heart Attack Trial (ALLHAT) showed a trend towards a lower rate of peripheral
21 artery disease events with amlodipine versus chlorthalidone (Hazard Ratio: 0.87 (0.75, 1.01;
22 $p=0.06$) [14]. The Intervention as a Goal in Hypertension Treatment (INSIGHT) trial reported
23 also a higher incidence of peripheral vascular disorders with co-amlozide versus nifedipine
24 (5.3% vs 3.0%, $p<0.0001$) [15]. In line with our results, it could be argued that the trend

1 observed in these trials might be related to a deleterious effect of diuretics rather than a
2 protective action of calcium channel blockers.

3 While beyond the scope of this observational analysis, we can speculate on the
4 potential underlying mechanism between diuretic exposure and LLE. The most likely
5 mechanism that could explain our results is the extracellular volume depletion induced by
6 diuretics. Indeed, hypovolemia and dehydration could decrease lower extremity perfusion,
7 trigger hemodynamic decompensation and increase blood viscosity, leading to ischemia and
8 amputation. Few cases series of leg or mesenteric ischemia related to extracellular volume
9 deficit induced by diuretics have been reported in the seventies [4, 5]. Similarly, Tzoulaki et
10 al. showed that increased hematocrit, a marker of volemia, was significantly associated with
11 incident peripheral artery disease events[16]. Nonetheless, diuretic induced volume depletion
12 is not similar between the different classes of diuretics. Volume depletion effect is much more
13 important with loop than thiazide diuretics. It would have been useful to compare the effect of
14 each class of diuretic to assess this hypervolemia-driven hypothesis. However, such data were
15 not available in our cohort. Another theoretical mechanism may be the intracellular swelling
16 due to diuretic-induced electrolyte changes which has been shown to contribute to ischemic
17 process [17].

18 Recently, The CANVAS trial showed that LLA occurred about twice as often in
19 participants treated with canagliflozin compared with placebo [6]. Consistent with this result,
20 in a population-based cohort study of 25 258 propensity matched participants, Udell et al.
21 observed a 2-fold risk of below-knee lower extremity amputation associated with SGLT2
22 inhibitors initiation [18]. Although mechanisms involved are still unknown, in the light of our
23 results, one potential culprit could be the diuretic-like effect of SGLT2 inhibition. If this side-
24 effect is caused by drug-induced hypovolemia, it should be shared throughout the class.
25 However, whether this risk of amputation is singly with canagliflozin or is a class effect

1 remains controversial. Recent observational studies and meta-analyses have reported
2 conflicting results [19-27]. Increased risk of LLA was not observed in participants on
3 empagliflozin in the EMPA-REG OUTCOME trial (Empagliflozin Cardiovascular Outcome
4 Event Trial in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Patients); however, LLA were identified manually in
5 a post-hoc analysis [28]. Nonetheless, in a recent analysis of nationwide registers from
6 Sweden and Denmark including 34 426 propensity matched participants, use of SGLT2
7 inhibitors, with only 1% of canagliflozin users, was associated with a 2-fold risk of lower
8 limb amputation compared with GLP1 receptor agonists [27]. Although no data are available
9 regarding a potential different diuretic effect of SGLT2 inhibitors molecules, this could be an
10 explanation of the discrepancy observed for amputation risk in these studies.

11 This diuresis-driven hypothesis could have been reinforced with a stronger association
12 in participants with PAD at baseline as observed in CANVAS trial and the study of Udell et al
13 [6, 18]. However, the number of such participants in our study was too limited to test this
14 hypothesis (n=73) (ESM Table 1). Larger studies are certainly required for further
15 assessment.

16 Our study had several limitations. Most of the weakness and limitations were related
17 to the nature of the dataset. Indeed, we analyzed a prospective observational cohort initially
18 created to assess the genetic determinant of diabetic nephropathy and not a drug effect. So,
19 the lack of details on treatments and the potential residual confounding due to the
20 observational nature of our cohort were the main limitations of our study. First, we assessed
21 only baseline exposure to diuretics, leaving some uncertainty with regards to their
22 introduction or interruption, possibly blurring our results. Similarly, since index date for drug
23 initiation was not available, we could not assess time-varying hazards and drug effects
24 associated with treatment duration. Lack of data on date of initiation and interruption of
25 diuretics was a major limitation to our results. Second, because of its observational design,

1 our study did not allow any direct exploration of a causal relationship between diuretics use
2 and LLE. We are aware that the most relevant method to examine such a deleterious effect of
3 diuretics would be to focus on a new user cohort and compare users of diuretics to users of
4 other non-diuretics antihypertensives to minimize selection bias and immortal time bias.
5 However, despite limited number of participants, we found a similar trend toward a higher
6 risk of LLE with RAAS blockers use. SURDIAGENE cohort was also conducted in a single
7 French diabetes department and may not be representative of all populations with type 2
8 diabetes. However, since decision of amputation practice is not standardized and likely not
9 similar among different centres, it could lead to bias in such study, so the single centre design
10 (with homogenous practice for amputation) of our cohort can be a point of strength. Our
11 findings can only be generalized for Caucasians people with type 2 diabetes. Moreover,
12 **measures** to assess volemic status were not available in this cohort to test our volemia
13 hypothesis. Finally, despite multiple adjustments, we cannot avoid the possibility of residual
14 confounding from both potential unmeasured confounders and residual confounding in
15 measured confounders. As baseline characteristics of participants showed a clear higher
16 burden of complications, risk of confounding by indication was high. As sensitivity analysis,
17 we analyzed association between outcomes and diuretics use after propensity score
18 adjustment and propensity score matched sample with well-balanced covariates across both
19 groups. However, despite all the adjustments, we cannot exclude that our findings are more
20 the consequence of an invisible pre-selection of participants instead of a drug effect.

21 **CONCLUSIONS**

22 In conclusion, we consolidate and expand previous findings showing that diuretics are
23 associated with an increased risk of LLA and LLR in participants with type 2 diabetes. Our
24 results could provide a potential explanation for the increased risk of LLA observed with
25 canagliflozin. However, the SURDIAGENE cohort was not designed to assess impact of

- 1 drugs on outcomes and our results should be interpreted with caution and further analyses are
- 2 needed for confirmation.
- 3

1 **Acknowledgments**

2 We thank all participants included and followed up in the cohort study for their kind
3 participation in this research; the nurses and technicians who contributed to this clinical study;
4 Elise Gand for her help in data management.

5 Independent adjudication committee of the SURDIAGENE study includes:

6 Jean Michel Halimi (Chairman Tours, France), Gregory Ducrocq (Paris, France), Ronan
7 Roussel (Paris, France), Pierre Llatty (Poitiers, France), Vincent Rigalleau (Bordeaux,
8 France), Charlotte Hulin (Poitiers, France), David Montaigne (Lille, France) and Philippe
9 Zaoui (Grenoble, France).

10 Some of the data were presented as an abstract at the EASD meeting in 2018 (Session 7,
11 Abstract 12).

12 **Data availability**

13 The datasets analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due to consideration
14 of intellectual property and continuing analyses by the study investigators but are available
15 from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

16 **Funding**

17 The SURDIAGENE study was supported by grants from the French Ministry of Health
18 (Programme Hospitalier de Recherche Clinique [PHRC]-Poitiers 2004) and Association
19 Française des Diabetiques (AFD) (Research Grant 2003). The sponsors had no role in the
20 design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the
21 data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; or decision to submit the manuscript
22 for publication.

23 **Duality of interest**

24 Dr. POTIER reports grants, personal fees and non-financial support from NOVO NORDISK,
25 grants, personal fees and non-financial support from SANOFI, personal fees and non-

1 financial support from ELI LILLY, non-financial support from SERVIER, outside the
2 submitted work and all modest; Dr. ROUSSEL reports grants, personal fees and non-financial
3 support from sanofi, personal fees and non-financial support from MSD, grants from Amgen,
4 personal fees from Physiogenex, personal fees from Astra-Zeneca, grants and personal fees
5 from Novo Nordisk, personal fees from Janssen, personal fees from Eli Lilly, personal fees
6 from Abbott, personal fees from Medtronic, personal fees from Servier, outside the submitted
7 work and all modest; Dr. VELHO has nothing to disclose; Dr. SCHNEIDER has nothing to
8 disclose; S. RAGOT has nothing to disclose; Dr. BUMBU reports non-financial support from
9 Sanofi, non-financial support from Novonordisk, non-financial support from Elivie, outside
10 the submitted work and all modest; Dr. Matar has nothing to disclose; Dr. MARRE reports
11 personal fees from ABBOTT, personal fees from INTARCIA, personal fees from ELI
12 LILLY, personal fees from MSD, grants, personal fees and non-financial support from
13 NOVO NORDISK, grants and personal fees from SANOFI, grants and personal fees from
14 SERVIER, grants from MSD, grants from NOVARTIS, outside the submitted work and all
15 modest; Dr. SAULNIER has nothing to disclose; Dr. MOHAMMEDI reports personal fees
16 and non-financial support from Novo Nordisk, personal fees and non-financial support from
17 Sanofi, non-financial support from VitalAir, outside the submitted work and all modest; Dr.
18 HADJADJ reports personal fees and non-financial support from ASTRA ZENECA, personal
19 fees and non-financial support from BRISTOL MYESR SQUIBB, personal fees from
20 ABBOTT, personal fees from BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM , personal fees from ELI LLIY,
21 personal fees and non-financial support from JANSSEN, personal fees and non-financial
22 support from MSD, personal fees from NOVARTIS, personal fees from NOVO NORDISK,
23 personal fees and non-financial support from SANOFI, personal fees from SERVIER,
24 personal fees from TAKEDA, outside the submitted work and all modest.

25

1 **Contribution statement**

2 LP had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the
3 data and the accuracy of the data analysis. LP, RR, KM, and SH made substantial
4 contributions to conception and design of the study. All authors made substantial
5 contributions to acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data and gave final approval of the
6 version to be published. LP and RR drafted the manuscript and all the authors made critical
7 revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content.

1 REFERENCES

- 2 [1] van Houtum WH, Lavery LA, Harkless LB (1996) The impact of diabetes-related
3 lower-extremity amputations in The Netherlands. *J Diabetes Complications* 10: 325-330
- 4 [2] Davis WA, Norman PE, Bruce DG, Davis TM (2006) Predictors, consequences and
5 costs of diabetes-related lower extremity amputation complicating type 2 diabetes: the
6 Fremantle Diabetes Study. *Diabetologia* 49: 2634-2641
- 7 [3] Martinez-De Jesus FR (2010) A checklist system to score healing progress of diabetic
8 foot ulcers. *Int J Low Extrem Wounds* 9: 74-83
- 9 [4] Sharefkin JB, Silen W (1974) Diuretic agents: inciting factor in nonocclusive
10 mesenteric infarction? *JAMA* 229: 1451-1453
- 11 [5] O'Rourke DA, Hede JE (1978) Reversible leg ischaemia due to diuretics. *Br Med J* 1:
12 1114
- 13 [6] Neal B, Perkovic V, Mahaffey KW, et al. (2017) Canagliflozin and Cardiovascular
14 and Renal Events in Type 2 Diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 377: 644-657
- 15 [7] Erkens JA, Klungel OH, Stolk RP, Spoelstra JA, Grobbee DE, Leufkens HG (2004)
16 Antihypertensive drug therapy and the risk of lower extremity amputations in
17 pharmacologically treated type 2 diabetes patients. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 13: 139-146
- 18 [8] Gary T, Belaj K, Hafner F, et al. (2015) Graz Critical Limb Ischemia Score: A Risk
19 Score for Critical Limb Ischemia in Peripheral Arterial Occlusive Disease. *Medicine*
20 (Baltimore) 94: e1054
- 21 [9] Hadjadj S, Fumeron F, Roussel R, et al. (2008) Prognostic value of the
22 insertion/deletion polymorphism of the ACE gene in type 2 diabetic subjects: results from the
23 Non-insulin-dependent Diabetes, Hypertension, Microalbuminuria or Proteinuria,
24 Cardiovascular Events, and Ramipril (DIABHYCAR), Diabete de type 2, Nephropathie et

1 Genetique (DIAB2NEPHROGENE), and Survie, Diabete de type 2 et Genetique
2 (SURDIAGENE) studies. *Diabetes Care* 31: 1847-1852

3 [10] Levey AS, Stevens LA, Schmid CH, et al. (2009) A new equation to estimate
4 glomerular filtration rate. *Ann Intern Med* 150: 604-612

5 [11] Fine JP (2001) Regression modeling of competing crude failure probabilities.
6 *Biostatistics* 2: 85-97

7 [12] Ebrahimian TG, Tamarat R, Clergue M, Duriez M, Levy BI, Silvestre JS (2005) Dual
8 effect of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibition on angiogenesis in type 1 diabetic mice.
9 *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol* 25: 65-70

10 [13] Austin PC (2011) An Introduction to Propensity Score Methods for Reducing the
11 Effects of Confounding in Observational Studies. *Multivariate Behav Res* 46: 399-424

12 [14] Officers A, Coordinators for the ACRGTA, Lipid-Lowering Treatment to Prevent
13 Heart Attack T (2002) Major outcomes in high-risk hypertensive patients randomized to
14 angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor or calcium channel blocker vs diuretic: The
15 Antihypertensive and Lipid-Lowering Treatment to Prevent Heart Attack Trial (ALLHAT).
16 *JAMA* 288: 2981-2997

17 [15] Brown MJ, Palmer CR, Castaigne A, et al. (2000) Morbidity and mortality in patients
18 randomised to double-blind treatment with a long-acting calcium-channel blocker or diuretic
19 in the International Nifedipine GITS study: Intervention as a Goal in Hypertension Treatment
20 (INSIGHT). *Lancet* 356: 366-372

21 [16] Tzoulaki I, Murray GD, Lee AJ, Rumley A, Lowe GD, Fowkes FG (2007)
22 Inflammatory, haemostatic, and rheological markers for incident peripheral arterial disease:
23 Edinburgh Artery Study. *Eur Heart J* 28: 354-362

24 [17] Leaf A (1973) Cell swelling. A factor in ischemic tissue injury. *Circulation* 48: 455-
25 458

- 1 [18] Udell JA, Yuan Z, Rush T, Sicignano NM, Galitz M, Rosenthal N (2018)
2 Cardiovascular Outcomes and Risks After Initiation of a Sodium Glucose Cotransporter 2
3 Inhibitor: Results From the EASEL Population-Based Cohort Study (Evidence for
4 Cardiovascular Outcomes With Sodium Glucose Cotransporter 2 Inhibitors in the Real
5 World). *Circulation* 137: 1450-1459
- 6 [19] Fadini GP, Avogaro A (2017) SGLT2 inhibitors and amputations in the US FDA
7 Adverse Event Reporting System. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 5: 680-681
- 8 [20] Khouri C, Cracowski JL, Roustit M (2018) SGLT-2 inhibitors and the risk of lower-
9 limb amputation: is this a class effect? *Diabetes Obes Metab*
- 10 [21] Adimadhyam S, Lee TA, Calip GS, Smith Marsh DE, Layden BT, Schumock GT
11 (2018) Risk of Amputations Associated with SGLT2 Inhibitors Compared to DPP-4
12 Inhibitors: A Propensity-Matched Cohort Study. *Diabetes Obes Metab*
- 13 [22] Yuan Z, DeFalco FJ, Ryan PB, et al. (2018) Risk of lower extremity amputations in
14 people with type 2 diabetes mellitus treated with sodium-glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitors
15 in the USA: A retrospective cohort study. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 20: 582-589
- 16 [23] Radholm K, Wu JH, Wong MG, et al. (2018) Effects of sodium-glucose cotransporter-
17 2 inhibitors on cardiovascular disease, death and safety outcomes in type 2 diabetes - A
18 systematic review. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 140: 118-128
- 19 [24] Dawwas GK, Smith SM, Park H (2018) Cardiovascular outcomes of sodium glucose
20 cotransporter-2 inhibitors in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Obes Metab*
- 21 [25] Chang HY, Singh S, Mansour O, Baksh S, Alexander GC (2018) Association Between
22 Sodium-Glucose Cotransporter 2 Inhibitors and Lower Extremity Amputation Among
23 Patients With Type 2 Diabetes. *JAMA Intern Med* 178: 1190-1198
- 24 [26] Ryan PB, Buse JB, Schuemie MJ, et al. (2018) Comparative effectiveness of
25 canagliflozin, SGLT2 inhibitors and non-SGLT2 inhibitors on the risk of hospitalization for

1 heart failure and amputation in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: A real-world meta-
2 analysis of 4 observational databases (OBSERVE-4D). *Diabetes Obes Metab* 20: 2585-2597
3 [27] Ueda P, Svanstrom H, Melbye M, et al. (2018) Sodium glucose cotransporter 2
4 inhibitors and risk of serious adverse events: nationwide register based cohort study. *BMJ*
5 363: k4365
6 [28] Inzucchi SE, Iliev H, Pfarr E, Zinman B (2018) Empagliflozin and Assessment of
7 Lower-Limb Amputations in the EMPA-REG OUTCOME Trial. *Diabetes Care* 41: e4-e5
8
9
10

	No diuretic	Diuretic	p	missing data n (%)
n	789	670		
Age, years	62.9 ± 11.1	67.1 ± 9.5	<0.001	0
Diabetes duration, years	13.1 ± 9.5	16.2 ± 10.2	<0.001	2 (0.1)
Sex (Male), n (%)	468 (59.3)	374 (55.8)	0.20	0
BMI, kg/m ²	30.7 ± 6.1	32.0 ± 6.4	<0.001	0
Current smokers, n (%)	99 (12.5)	54 (8.1)	0.02	18 (1.0)
Heart rate, bpm	71.6 ± 13.7	70.4 ± 14.0	0.12	8 (0.5)
Systolic blood pressure, mmHg	131.9 ± 17.1	133.2 ± 18.5	0.16	7 (0.5)
Diastolic blood pressure, mmHg	72.8 ± 10.9	71.9 ± 11.4	0.12	7 (0.5)
Hypertension, n (%)	540 (68.4)	668 (99.7)	<0.001	0
Renal replacement therapy, n (%)	12 (1.5)	9 (1.3)	0.95	0
Diabetic retinopathy, n (%)	328 (41.6)	311 (46.4)	0.07	6 (0.4)
Previous cardiovascular disease, n (%)	185 (23.4)	218 (32.5)	<0.001	0
Myocardial infarction	102 (12.9)	122 (18.2)	0.01	0
Coronary revascularization	98 (12.4)	121 (18.1)	0.003	0
Stroke	43 (5.4)	40 (6.0)	0.75	0
Carotid revascularization	14 (1.8)	21 (3.1)	0.13	0
Peripheral arterial disease	33 (4.2)	40 (6.0)	0.15	0
History of amputation, n (%)	31 (3.9)	42 (6.3)	0.06	0
Amputation level, n (%)				
Toe	16 (2.0)	23 (3.4)		0
Transmetatarsal	8 (1.0)	7 (1.0)		0
Transtibial	5 (0.6)	3 (0.4)		0
Transfemoral	2 (0.3)	9 (1.3)		0
HbA1c, % and mmol/mol	7.8 ± 1.6 61.9 ± 17.5	7.7 ± 1.5 61.1 ± 16.1	0.40	1 (0.06)
Total cholesterol, mmol/l	4.9 ± 1.1	4.7 ± 1.2	0.002	0
LDL- cholesterol, mmol/l	2.8 ± 0.9	2.6 ± 1.0	<0.001	59 (4.0)
HDL- cholesterol, mmol/l	1.2 ± 0.4	1.2 ± 0.4	0.35	8 (0.5)
Triglycerides, mmol/l ^a	1.6 [1.1, 2.2]	1.6 [1.2, 2.4]	0.07	5 (0.3)
ACR, mg/mmol ^a	2.4 [0.9, 9.9]	4.1 [1.2, 19.2]	<0.001	15 (1.0)
eGFR, mL/min/1.73m ²	77.6 ± 23.9	66.5 ± 25.2	<0.001	0
Antiplatelet or anticoagulant agent, n (%)	309 (39.2)	308 (46.0)	0.01	0
Blood pressure lowering treatments, n (%)	539 (68.3)	670 (100.0)	<0.001	0
RAAS blockers, n (%)	393 (49.8)	527 (78.7)	<0.001	0
Calcium channel blockers, n (%)	201 (25.5)	262 (39.1)	<0.001	0
Beta-blockers, n (%)	203 (25.7)	296 (44.2)	<0.001	0
Statins, n (%)	312 (39.5)	353 (52.7)	<0.001	0
Biguanides, n (%)	396 (50.2)	286 (42.7)	0.01	0
Sulfonylureas, n (%)	338 (42.8)	244 (36.4)	0.02	0
Thiazolidinediones, n (%)	11 (1.4)	6 (0.9)	0.52	0
Alpha glucosidase inhibitor, n (%)	52 (6.6)	28 (4.2)	0.06	0
Insulin, n (%)	455 (57.7)	425 (63.4)	0.03	0

1 **Table 1: Characteristics of participants at baseline according to diuretics use.** Data
2 expressed as mean \pm SD except (a) expressed as median (25% - 75% percentile). Statistics for
3 quantitative characteristics are t-test with log-transformed data, except (a) Wilcoxon test.
4 Hypertension: systolic blood pressure (SBP) >140 mmHg and/or diastolic blood pressure
5 (DBP) >90 mmHg or presence of antihypertensive medication and history of hypertension.
6 ACR: urine albumin-to-creatinine ratio. BMI: Body Mass Index. eGFR: estimated glomerular
7 filtration rate. RAAS: renin angiotensin aldosterone system.

8

1

	LLE		LLA		LLR	
	Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	<i>P</i>	Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	<i>P</i>	Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	<i>P</i>
Unadjusted	2.08 (1.49, 2.93)	<0.001	2.53 (1.61, 4.10)	<0.001	1.71 (1.15, 2.56)	0.01
Adjusted ^a	1.49 (1.01, 2.19)	0.04	2.01 (1.14, 3.54)	0.02	1.05 (0.67, 1.64)	0.84
	Subhazard Ratio (95% CI)	<i>P</i>	Subhazard Ratio (95% CI)	<i>P</i>	Subhazard Ratio (95% CI)	<i>P</i>
Death as competing risk ^b	1.89 (1.35, 2.64)	<0.001	2.28 (1.44, 3.62)	<0.001	1.52 (1.02, 2.27)	0.04

2

3 **Table 2: Hazard ratio of lower limb events (LLE), lower limb amputation (LLA) and**4 **lower limb revascularization (LLR) during follow-up associated with the use of**5 **diuretics at baseline. ^a Adjusted for age, diabetes duration, sex, BMI, SBP, hypertension,**6 **diabetic retinopathy, previous cardiovascular disease, previous amputation, previous**7 **peripheral arterial disease, HDL-cholesterol, albumin to creatinin ratio, eGFR,**8 **antiplatelet/anticoagulant, blood pressure lowering agents, statins, biguanides and insulin**9 **use. ^b Fine and Gray model (competing risk = all-cause death). Number of individuals**10 **included in the Cox analyses: 1459 in the unadjusted analysis, 1418 in the adjusted model**11 **and 1459 in the Fine and Gray model.**

12

13

1

LLE		LLA		LLR	
Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	P	Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	P	Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	P
1.53 (1.05, 2.24)	0.03	1.98 (1.15, 3.40)	0.01	1.11 (0.72, 1.71)	0.65

2

3

Table 3: Hazard ratio of lower limb events (LLE), lower limb amputation (LLA) and lower limb revascularization (LLR) during follow-up associated with the use of diuretics at baseline in the propensity score matched cohorts.

4

5

6

1

2 **FIGURE LEGEND**

3 **Figure 1:** Kaplan-Meier curves for cumulative outcomes free survival during follow-up with
4 and without diuretics use. A: lower limb events (LLA or LLR). B: lower limb amputation
5 (LLA). C: lower limb revascularization (LLR). Log-rank test: $p < 0.001$.

6

7

8

9