

A.15 Glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists – type 2 diabetes – EML

Reviewer summary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supportive of the proposal <input type="checkbox"/> Not supportive of the proposal Justification (based on considerations of the dimensions described below): Overall, GLP-1 receptor agonists have a favorable and meaningful balance of benefits to harm. Robust evidence shows clear long-term benefits in patients- important outcomes.
Does the EML and/or EMLc currently recommend alternative medicines for the proposed indication that can be considered therapeutic alternatives? (https://list.essentialmeds.org/)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Does adequate evidence exist for the efficacy/effectiveness of the medicine for the proposed indication? (e.g., evidence originating from multiple high-quality studies with sufficient follow up. This may be evidence included in the application, and/or additional evidence identified during the review process;) There is robust, high-quality evidence from large randomized controlled trials and meta-analyses supporting the effectiveness of GLP-1 RAs (mainly semaglutide) for the treatment of T2DM with established or high-risk CVD. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GLP-1 RAs, especially semaglutide, reduce major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE), stroke, and composite kidney events. • Benefits have also been seen in in reducing HbA1c, body weight, and improving cardiovascular outcomes. • In patients with high cardiovascular risk, semaglutide, liraglutide, and others significantly reduced all-cause mortality and cardiovascular death. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Does adequate evidence exist for the safety/harms associated with the proposed medicine? (e.g., evidence originating from multiple high-quality studies with sufficient follow up. This may be evidence included in the application, and/or additional evidence identified during the review process;) Available evidence shows that while GLP-1 RAs have known and manageable adverse effects, their safety profile is well-characterized and generally favorable. Unfortunately, there is limited information regarding potential side effects associated with extended use. Common adverse events of GLP-1 RAs include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gastrointestinal side effects (nausea, vomiting, diarrhea), which are usually dose-dependent and tend to improve over time. • Low risk of hypoglycemia Serious but rare risks include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential increased risk of medullary thyroid carcinoma (seen in rodents but not confirmed in humans), so caution is recommended in individuals with a personal or family history of medullary thyroid cancer. • Acute pancreatitis was a concern. Large trials have not confirmed a strong link. • Semaglutide has been associated with increased odds of diabetic retinopathy. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable

25th WHO Expert Committee on Selection and Use of Essential Medicines
Expert review

<p>Overall, does the proposed medicine have a favourable and meaningful balance of benefits to harms?</p> <p>GLP-1 receptor agonists have a favorable and meaningful balance of benefits to harm. The cardiovascular and glycemic benefits significantly outweigh the risks, particularly in patients with type 2 diabetes and established or high risk of cardiovascular disease.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
<p>Are there any special requirements for the safe, effective and appropriate use of the medicines? (e.g. laboratory diagnostic and/or monitoring tests, specialized training for health providers, etc)</p> <p>Monitoring and adjustment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor for gastrointestinal side effects (nausea, vomiting) especially during dose escalation. • Monitor for signs of diabetic retinopathy progression, especially in patients with pre-existing retinopathy. • Monitor for hypoglycemia when used in combination with insulin or sulfonylureas. <p>Training and healthcare system needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subcutaneous injection training is necessary. • Cold chain storage is required before first. • Providers should be trained to counsel patients about recognizing symptoms of pancreatitis and when to seek medical advice. <p>Medication-specific considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid combination with DPP-4 inhibitors. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
<p>Are there any issues regarding price, cost-effectiveness and budget implications in different settings?</p> <p>GLP-1 RAs, including semaglutide, are expensive, especially compared to older diabetes medications. This is a barrier to widespread use, particularly in LMICs.</p> <p>Cost-effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In high-income countries, semaglutide is considered cost-effective for patients with T2DM and high cardiovascular risk because it reduces costly events like heart attacks and strokes. • In lower-resource settings, cost-effectiveness is less certain, mainly because of the high drug price and limited health budgets. <p>It is important to highlight that prices are expected to fall significantly with patent expirations and the entry of generic/biosimilar versions.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
<p>Is the medicine available and accessible across countries? (e.g. shortages, generics and biosimilars, pooled procurement programmes, access programmes)</p> <p>Semaglutide and other GLP-1 receptor agonists are available and accessible in many countries, but access remains uneven across the world. True accessibility (especially in LMICs) is still limited due to high costs.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable

25th WHO Expert Committee on Selection and Use of Essential Medicines
Expert review

Does the medicine have wide regulatory approval? Approved by major regulatory agencies across high-, middle-, and some low-income countries	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, for the proposed indication <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, but only for other indications (off-label for proposed indication) <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
--	--