Greetings, I am Dr Karl Nath, the Editor-in-Chief of Mayo Clinic Proceedings, and I am pleased to welcome you to the multimedia summary for the journal’s January 2020 issue. There are 4 articles that have been selected as our Editor’s Choice or Highlights articles this month.

Our Editor’s Choice is the next contribution to the Thematic Reviews on Vaccines entitled “Vaccination of Adults in General Medical Practice.” The article is authored by Dr Paul Hunter from the University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee and colleagues from Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia, and the University of Los Angeles, in California.

The success story of vaccination is a striking example of the time-honored adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Milestones in the story of vaccination are also compelling, based as they are on astute clinical observations and clear scientific reasoning: Edward Jenner noted that dairy maids previously infected with cowpox became immune to smallpox, and then demonstrated in 1796 that inoculation with cowpox conferred resistance to smallpox. Smallpox not only holds a special place in the early history of vaccination, but also has the distinction of being the only infectious disease globally eradicated because of vaccination. Since Jenner’s time, vaccination has triumphed against many other infectious diseases.

In October 2019, under the editorial leadership of Dr Priya Sampathkumar, Mayo Clinic Proceedings began a thematic review series on vaccination; in her editorial introducing this thematic review, Dr Sampathkumar outlined the history of vaccination, its success, and the threat posed by the anti-vaccine movement. This thematic review series thus far has discussed vaccines for health care personnel and international travel and Zika vaccine development. In the present issue of Mayo Clinic Proceedings, Hunter et al review vaccination in adults focusing on influenza, pneumococcal, hepatitis A and B, human papilloma virus, and zoster vaccines.

This team of experts participates in the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, the body that reviews the use of vaccines in the United States with special attention to efficacy, safety, and indications. This
advisory committee makes recommendations to the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) which then leads to CDC’s official position. The discussion by Hunter et al on influenza encompasses such salient considerations as epidemiology of influenza; how vaccine strains are selected; types of available vaccines and the basis for the timing of vaccination; age and other determinants of response to vaccination; and the current recommendations regarding the significance of egg allergy.

In discussing pneumococcal vaccination, Hunter et al highlight the two available vaccines which are different in composition and may have age-specific and risk-specific indications. Hunter et al review recommendations for tetanus, diphtheria, and acellular pertussis vaccine in general and in pregnancy in particular as this provides an effective and safe way of preventing pertussis in neonates. The indications for vaccination against hepatitis A and B, and human papilloma virus are discussed; points of special consideration include the availability of a newer hepatitis B vaccine that requires only two doses over one month, and that vaccination for human papilloma virus is most effective at preventing human papilloma virus-associated cancers when given in early adolescence.

As regards herpes zoster, the recombinant inactivated zoster vaccine, as pointed out, is preferable to the live vaccine as it is much more effective. In the second part of their article, Hunter et al emphasize the need to increase rates of vaccination in adults. An essential approach is to assess vaccination status at each clinical visit; to offer needed vaccines or refer elsewhere for vaccination; and to participate in state registries. Hunter et al delineate the specific challenges that impede vaccination efforts; these include patient perceptions, vaccine hesitancy, and process-related issues at clinics and health care systems.

Vaccine advocacy by clinicians at regional, state, and federal levels provide an important strategy in increasing rates of vaccination. Hunter et al are to be applauded for their timely review on these specific vaccines and for their broader call for clinician involvement in and advocacy for strategies aimed at increasing rates of vaccination. The importance of vaccination in promoting global public health is exceeded only by a supply of clean
water—safeguarding and augmenting rates of vaccination is thus a national and global imperative.

Our first Highlight is on two articles focusing on diabetes and chronic kidney disease. The first is an Original Article entitled “A Safety Comparison of Metformin vs Sulfonylurea Initiation in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes and Chronic Kidney Disease: A Retrospective Cohort Study.” It is authored by Mr Reid Whitlock from Seven Oaks General Hospital, in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, and colleagues from other Canadian universities. The second is an Original Article entitled “Outcomes for Inappropriate Renal Dose Adjustment of Dipeptidyl Peptidase-4 Inhibitors in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes: Population-Based Study.” It is authored by Dr Sangmo Hong from Hallym University Dongtan Sacred Heart Hospital in Hwaseong-si, Republic of Korea, and colleagues from other universities and hospitals in Korea.

Type 2 diabetes is a major risk factor for chronic kidney disease, and when the latter occurs, the outcomes for patients with type 2 diabetes are considerably worsened. Such adverse effects of chronic kidney disease are largely imposed because chronic kidney disease and uremia further augment the already increased risk for cardiovascular diseases in type 2 diabetes, and diabetic chronic kidney disease is often a progressive process that culminates in end-stage kidney disease.

The occurrence of chronic kidney disease also significantly influences glycemic control: First, chronic kidney disease reduces the cellular sensitivity to insulin and impairs the catabolism of insulin by the renal proximal tubules, effects that may predispose to hyperglycemia and hypoglycemia respectively; and, second, the metabolic clearance of several oral antihyperglycemic agents is decreased with declining kidney function. In the present issue of Mayo Clinic Proceedings, two studies address the use of oral antihyperglycemic agents for type 2 diabetes in the setting of chronic kidney disease.

In a retrospective cohort study undertaken in Manitoba, Canada, Whitlock et al compared the safety profiles of metformin (approximately
20,000 users) and sulfonylureas (approximately 2000 users), as first line monotherapy for type 2 diabetes, in the setting of normal kidney function and varying stages of chronic kidney disease. Metformin is generally regarded as the first line drug in type 2 diabetes as it reduces plasma glucose concentration (by increasing the sensitivity to insulin and suppressing hepatic glucose production) without a gain in body weight or an increase in plasma insulin concentrations; metformin is generally well tolerated and relatively inexpensive; and its use may be attended by improved outcomes for cardiovascular disease in type 2 diabetes. Because metformin is cleared from the body by active secretion into urine by the renal proximal tubules, there are concerns regarding the use of metformin in the setting of advanced chronic kidney disease, with the rare risk of lactic acidosis, and its use is proscribed for stage IV chronic kidney disease and lower.

The analysis of Whitlock et al demonstrates that metformin usage as compared with that of sulfonylurea was attended by lower risk of major hypoglycemic episodes, cardiovascular events, and all-cause mortality. Chronic kidney disease was an effect modifier for mortality in that for an estimated glomerular filtration rate less than 60 ml/min/1.73 m², no differences in mortality were observed between these two classes of oral antihyperglycemic agents, whereas irrespective of the severity of chronic kidney disease, use of metformin was still attended with a lower risk for hypoglycemic episodes and cardiovascular events.

Also in this issue of *Mayo Clinic Proceedings* is the observational cohort study by Hong et al involving more than 80,000 adults with type 2 diabetes and chronic kidney disease treated with dipeptidyl peptidase-4, DPP-4, inhibitors; this study utilized the Korean National Health Information Database, and DPP-4 inhibitors were prescribed either as monotherapy or in combination with other oral antihyperglycemic agents. The essential conclusion was that a significant number of patients on DPP-4 inhibitors received dosages that were excessive because of accompanying chronic kidney disease, and that such inappropriate dosing of DPP-4 inhibitors in patients concomitantly treated with other oral antihyperglycemic agents was associated with an increased risk for severe hypoglycemia, visits to the emergency department, and mortality.
Both these studies thus underscore the common theme that underlying chronic kidney disease can significantly influence outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes treated with oral antihyperglycemic agents: the study by Whitlock et al concludes in favor of the use of metformin over sulfonylureas in chronic kidney disease, while the study by Hong et al calls attention to adverse outcomes in chronic kidney disease with inappropriate dosing of DPP-4 inhibitors when used with other oral antihyperglycemic agents.

Our third Highlight article is a Review article entitled “Acute Myocardial Infarction in Young Individuals.” The article is authored by Dr Rajiv Gulati and colleagues from Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota.

Traditional atherosclerotic cardiovascular risk factors and age-related multimorbidity are both less common in relatively younger individuals (less than age 55 years) as compared with older individuals. Drawing upon these observations, along with the relative cardioprotective effect of the pre- and peri-menopausal state in women, Gulati et al comprehensively and expertly discuss in this issue of Mayo Clinic Proceedings the basis for and clinical presentation and management of acute myocardial infarction in young individuals. These authors start from the sobering premise that while acute myocardial infarction is significantly less common in younger individuals, it is still a significant contributor to morbidity and mortality in this age range, and has not evinced the decline in mortality from cardiovascular diseases seen in recent years in older individuals.

Approximately two-thirds of acute myocardial infarction in young individuals reflect, as in the older range, traditional risk factors and the occurrence of plaque rupture. Less common causes include illicit drug use (cocaine and methamphetamine); spontaneous coronary artery dissection; myocarditis; coronary embolism; myocardial infarction due to atheromatous coronary artery disease but without critical stenosis; and coronary vasospasm. Notable sex differences exist in young individuals with acute myocardial infarction. For example, while the incidence of acute myocardial infarction is lower in women as compared with men, women experience a longer interval before receiving medical attention for acute myocardial infarction; have worse outcomes when hospitalized with acute
myocardial infarction; are much more likely to have myocardial infarction with nonobstructive coronary artery disease; and are predisposed to spontaneous coronary artery dissection, a disease that may reflect underlying fibromuscular dysplasia and is more likely to occur in pregnancy.

Gulati et al comprehensively discuss the management of various types of myocardial infarction in young individuals, which range from management of myocardial infarction where the approach is broadly agreed upon (for example, current management guidelines for acute myocardial infarction due to traditional cardiovascular risk factors) to myocardial infarction where management is surrounded by uncertainty (for example, spontaneous coronary artery dissection).

The authors conclude their article with very clear algorithms that determine the following: whether thrombus is detected in the coronary arteries and whether there are accompanying traditional cardiovascular risk factors; how to differentiate between spontaneous coronary artery dissection and coronary microvascular dysfunction in patients with nonobstructive coronary artery disease; and how to home in on underlying causes for acute myocardial infarction in patients with nonobstructive coronary artery disease as well as a negative initial workup.

As is generally underscored in medical teaching, the diagnosis of a specific disease first requires an appreciation that such a disease may occur. Awareness of the occurrence of acute myocardial infarction in young individuals may be blunted because acute myocardial infarction in this age range is relatively uncommon, may present atypically, and may be underpinned by uncommon diseases. This important review by Gulati et al raises the awareness of and sensitivity to this disease, discusses how it is diagnosed and its underlying cause delineated, and outlines key principles and approaches in the management of the various subtypes.

You can access these Highlights and Editor’s Choice articles free of charge during the entire month of January. When you visit our Mayo Clinic Proceedings website at www.mayoclinicalproceedings.org, you will find links
to our social media by clicking the buttons at the top of the home page to follow us on Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube. On our YouTube channel, you will find full-length author interviews called Insights, 60-second video article synopses, and our “Mayo Clinic Proceedings Fireside Chat” recordings, which are available from our website on the home page, as well as through iTunes. You will also find our online only feature “Pioneers and Legends in Medicine,” which are video interviews of people who have made a strong impact in their field of study. You will see many news stories on our website that are based on articles published in Mayo Clinic Proceedings, and finally you will see other free content and articles published online ahead of print. As always, we greatly thank you for your interest in, and support of, Mayo Clinic Proceedings.

We hope you found this presentation from the content of our website valuable. Our journal’s mission is, “To promote the best interests of patients by advancing the knowledge and professionalism of the physician community.” If you are interested in more information about us, our homepage is www.mayoclinicproceedings.org. There you will find access to information for our social media content, such as additional videos on our YouTube Channel: www.YouTube.com/MayoProceedings, or journal updates on Facebook: www.facebook.com/Mayo-Clinic-Proceedings. You can also follow us on Twitter: www.Twitter.com/MayoProceedings. More information about health care at Mayo Clinic is available at: www.MayoClinic.org. This video content is copyrighted by Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research.