Published in final edited form as:

Metabolism. 2008 June ; 57(6): 725–732. doi:10.1016/j.metabol.2008.01.009.

Short Term Effects of rhGH and Feeding on Gluconeogenesis in Humans

Walid Kaplan, Agneta L. Suneag, Harry Dao, and Morey W. Haymond

Children's Nutrition Research Center Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas 77030

Abstract

Aims—Following a short term fast lactating women have increased rates of glucose production but not gluconeogenesis despite relative hypoinsulinemia. We explored the effects of non-insulin dependent increase in glucose utilization and rhGH on glucose production, glycogenolysis and gluconeogenesis in both the fed and overnight fasted condition.

Method—Six controls and seven lactating women were studied twice, in random order, following seven days of saline or rhGH. Glucose kinetics and gluconeogenesis (GNG), were measured using [U-¹³C]glucose MIDA.

Results—RhGH increased milk production in the lactating women and IGF-I in both groups. Glycogenolysis and GNG were higher in fasting lactating women than controls following either saline or rhGH ($p < 0.05$). Following rhGH administration, GNG remained higher ($p < 0.02$) in the lactating women than controls. Gluconeogenesis was not suppressed in either group during 5 h of continuous meal ingestion, despite a 5 fold increase in plasma insulin. Lactating women had similar glucose but lower insulin and C-peptide concentrations than controls following both rhGH and saline treatment ($p < 0.01$), although RhGH decreased ($p < 0.01$) insulin sensitivity in both groups ($p < 0.05$).

Conclusions—Gluconeogenesis is not affected by short term increases in insulin and/or rhGH and suggests a fundamental rethinking of the role of insulin in acutely regulating gluconeogenesis.

Keywords

Stable Isotopes; Lactation; Gluconeogenesis; Lactation; Growth hormone; Milk; glucose production

Introduction

Over the past several years, we have studied the impact of lactation on maternal metabolism of glucose and other endogenous substrates. We have demonstrated that the fasting lactating women has a 30% higher rate of glucose turnover following 24 h of fasting and that the primary (but not exclusive) source of milk lactose is plasma glucose (1,2). In addition, rGH increases milk production in lactating women, as it does in other mammalian species, and thus, potentially places further stress on the glucose production of these normal women (3,4,5).

© 2008 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved

Address all correspondence and reprint requests to: Morey W. Haymond, MD Children's Nutrition Research Center 1100 Bates St. Room 7062 Houston, TX, 77030-2600 713-798-6776 Fax: 713-798-7119 Email: mhaymond@bcm.tmc.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Much is known about the regulation of glucose production in human under a wide variety of physiologic and non-physiologic conditions. However, we have not had the investigative tools to partition glucose production into that from glycogenolysis and gluconeogenesis until recently (6-10). As a result, we know little of the substrate and hormone factors that actually regulate gluconeogenesis in humans. Thus, the lactating woman provides a unique model to explore the regulation of glucose production from gluconeogenesis and glycogenolysis during both feeding and fasting, as well as, to determine the effects of rhGH on these processes.

We designed the present studies to explore the effects of feeding and rhGH on gluconeogenesis in healthy women with normal glucose homeostasis and with accelerated non-insulin mediated increased glucose disposal as result of lactation.

Material and Method

Tracers

Sterile and pyrogen free [U- ^{13}C]glucose (99 atom% ^{13}C ; 93.8% $^{13}\text{C}_6$) was purchased from Cambridge Isotope Laboratories (Andover, MA) and prepared as previously described (10).

Study Design

Subjects

Following approval by the IRB for Human Subjects at Baylor College of Medicine and the General Clinical Research Center (GCRC) Advisory Committee, written consent was obtained from each of the subjects. Seven (7) healthy lactating women [age 30.7 ± 2.6 y (mean $\pm$ SEM), BMI 24.8 ± 1.0 kg/m², Height 162.7 ± 2.2 cm and Weight 65.3 ± 2.5 kg; 6 Caucasian and 1 African-American and their healthy infants] and six (6) healthy, non-pregnant, controls [age 23.5 ± 2.5 y, BMI 23.6 ± 1.0 kg/m², Height 161.6 ± 3.0 cm and Weight 61.3 ± 3.1 kg (mean $\pm$ SEM), 2 Caucasian, 2 African-American and 2 American-Hispanic] were recruited. All women studied had a negative pregnancy test at the time of study. Their infants weighed 5.49 ± 0.16 kg at the time of the initial study and weighed 6.01 ± 0.24 kg at the time of the second study. To exclude any pregnancy related changes in hormones, all lactating women were studied between 6 and 12 weeks post partum. This is a period of time during which most women are exclusively breast feeding their infants and during which milk production is quite constant (11-16). No attempt was made to study the control women at a specific time in their menstrual cycle. None of the women had a history of gestational diabetes or first degree relative with diabetes. None were taking any medications that would affect insulin sensitivity.

Protocol

Each woman (and her infant for lactating subjects) was admitted to the GCRC on the evening prior to study. At 1800 h, two intravenous catheters were introduced under Emla® cream analgesia, one in the antecubital fossa or forearm vein for isotope infusion and the other in the dorsum of the hand or in a forearm vein of the contra-lateral arm for blood sampling. Subjects were fed a supper meal of 10 kcal/kg around 1800 h and were subsequently fasted, except for water, overnight. Intravenous fluid of 0.45 NS was started at 0300h at the rate of 20 ml / h. At 0400h baseline breast milk (lactating subjects) and blood samples (7ml) were obtained following which the subject received a primed constant rate infusion of [U- ^{13}C]glucose ($60 \mu\text{mol/kg}$; $1.04 \pm 0.01 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ during the fasting period, and $80 \mu\text{mol/kg}$, $2.72 \pm 0.06 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ during the feeding period). Blood samples were collected at 0, 180, 240, 255, 270, 285 and 300 min of the study time. Five minutes prior to blood sampling, the hand was placed in a hot pad to obtain arterialized venous blood (17,18). At 300 min study time, a Boost High Protein® drink (caloric source is 55% CHO, 20% fat and 25% protein) was taken orally every 15 min in the amount of 34 g (36 kcal/drink) for control and 45 g (48 kcal/drink) for

lactating women for the following 360 min. The difference in caloric intake reflects the estimated need to maintain an isocaloric intake due to the caloric loss for milk production (1). A total of 36 drinks were given throughout the feeding phase. During the feeding time, blood samples were obtained at 480, 660, 705, 720, 735, 750, 765, 780, 795, 810, 825 and 840 min. Infants were fed from both breasts (alternatively) at each nursing, and were weighed before and after each feeding. Attempts were made to breast feed the infants on a 3 hourly schedule. A breast pump was used to empty the breasts and collect milk samples at the end of every feeding.

The women were studied on two separate occasions in random order; following seven days of subcutaneous injections of either normal saline or rhGH ($0.05 \text{ mg} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1} \cdot \text{d}^{-1}$). rhGH and saline were given by our nurse in the afternoon time. The basis of 7 days was selected because of its proven effects on milk production and glucose homeostasis (4,5,19). Subjects were blinded to the administration of rhGH or Saline. The studies were separated by a “wash out” period of two weeks.

Analytical Methods

Plasma glucose was measured using a glucose analyzer (YSI, Inc. Glucose Analyzer, Yellow Springs, OH). Plasma insulin, glucagon and C-peptide were measured using RIA kits (Linco Research, Inc., St. Charles, MO) (inter-assay coefficient of variation of replicate analyses 15% for both). IGF-I concentrations were measured by RIA (Esoterix Inc. Calabasas Hills, CA). FFA and β -hydroxybutyrate were measured using a Cobas Fara II Analyzer (Roche Diagnostic Systems, Inc., Montclair, NJ). The penta-acetate derivative of glucose was prepared and the samples were analyzed using GCMS in the positive chemical ionization mode as described previously (3). Milk samples were defatted, deproteinized, derivatized and analyzed as previously described (2).

Calculations

Total Glucose Entry and Glucose Production

The total rate of appearance (R_a) of glucose into the systemic circulation was calculated under near steady-state condition ($CV \leq 10\%$ and a slope not different from zero) using standard isotope dilution equation:

$$R_{a\text{-total}} = [E_i/E_p] \times I,$$

E_i and E_p are the enrichments of the $[U\text{-}^{13}\text{C}]$ glucose in the infusate and the plasma, respectively, and I is the rate of infusion of the $[U\text{-}^{13}\text{C}]$ glucose.

In the fasting state, glucose production rate (GPR) was calculated by subtracting the amount of infused $[U\text{-}^{13}\text{C}]$ glucose from the glucose R_a :

$$\text{GPR} = R_{a\text{-total}} - I$$

Gluconeogenesis

Using mass isotopomer distribution analysis as described by Haymond and Suneag (10), the fraction of glucose derived from gluconeogenesis (GNG %) was calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{GNG}\% = \left[\frac{\Sigma_{M1-M5}}{\Sigma_{M1-M6}} \right] \times \left[\frac{\Sigma_{M1-M5} (^{12}\text{C})}{\Sigma_{M1-M5} (^{13}\text{C})} \right].$$

M1 is the glucose molecule with one ^{13}C (labeled carbon) and five ^{12}C (unlabeled carbons) in any position; M2 is the glucose molecule with two ^{13}C and four ^{12}C in any position, and so forth. M6 is the glucose molecule that is uniformly labeled with ^{13}C and has no ^{12}C .

The rate of gluconeogenesis (GNG) is:

$$\text{GNG} = \text{GNG}\% \times R_{a-\text{total}}$$

Glycogenolysis

The rate of glycogenolysis during fasting was determined as:

$$\text{Glycogenolysis}_{\text{fast}} = \text{GPR} - \text{GNG}.$$

During meal ingestion, rates of glycogenolysis were estimated from the carbohydrate content in the Boost® drink (~14 g/100 ml). We previously demonstrated that ~75% of orally ingested glucose enters the systemic circulation during both saline and rhGH treatment (19) and that the splanchnic extraction of glucose in lactating and non-lactating women are essentially identical (10). Thus, knowing the rate of ingestion of glucose, the rate of appearance of dietary glucose into the plasma pool ($R_{a-\text{meal}}$) and the rate of glycogenolysis during feeding was estimated as:

$$\text{Glycogenolysis}_{\text{feed}} = R_{a-\text{total}} - (\text{GNG} + R_{a-\text{meal}})$$

Insulin Sensitivity

Insulin sensitivity in the fasting condition was calculated from the averaged baseline insulin and glucose values using the HOMA_R and QUICKI methods (20) according to the following formulae:

$$\text{HOMA}_R = [\text{glucose (mmol/l)} \times \text{insulin } (\mu\text{U/ml})] / 22.5$$

$$\text{QUICKI} = 1 / [\log \text{ glucose (mg/dl)} \times \log \text{ insulin } (\mu\text{U/ml})]$$

Milk Production

Milk production was calculated by adding the milk volume expressed from the breast to the milk consumed by infant. The latter was determined as the difference in infant's weight just prior to and immediately after each feeding (assuming milk specific gravity of 1.0). Milk production was expressed as ml per kg (infant's weight) per hour of feeding.

Fractional Hexoneogenesis

Hexoneogenesis of milk glucose and galactose and the impact of rhGH, feeding and fasting on this process was measured using the isotopomer distribution (M+1, M+2, M+3 and M+6) in the milk glucose and galactose versus that of plasma glucose (2).

Statistical analysis

Values over the steady state period (240-300 and 780-840 min, respectively) were averaged for each subject, and the mean $\pm$ SEM was calculated for each group. Data within group were compared using a paired Student's t-test, and data between groups were compared using a non-paired t-test. Since we hypothesized that rhGH would increase the rate of gluconeogenesis, we used one tail t-test in our statistical analyses. Comparison were made between

- a. Effect of saline vs. rhGH in each group of women during feeding and fasting.
- b. Difference between lactating women and controls following the administration of either saline or rhGH, and during feeding and fasting .
- c. Effect of fasting vs. feeding conditions within each group.

Results

Effect of rhGH on IGF-I, Milk Volume and Hexoneogenesis

Baseline IGF-I concentration was higher in control women than lactating women (223 ± 30 vs. 129 ± 9 ng/ml, respectively; $p < 0.05$). Following the administration of rhGH, IGF-I concentration increased ($p < 0.01$) in both groups to nearly identical concentrations (385 ± 30 vs. 375 ± 42 ng/ml, respectively); the increase was greater in lactating women than controls ($p = 0.03$ using the delta values). RhGH increased milk volume from 5.3 ± 0.3 to 6.6 ± 0.2 ml•kg infant wt⁻¹•h⁻¹ ($p < 0.01$), a 25% increase.

The isotopomer distribution in plasma glucose was essentially identical to that in milk glucose and galactose following rhGH or saline regardless of feeding and fasting. Thus, we averaged the data obtained following the administration of rhGH and saline studies for each individual. By comparing the M+6 in milk glucose and galactose to that of plasma glucose (as previously described) (2), the calculated contribution of plasma glucose to milk lactose was $39 \pm 4\%$, during fasting, and $73 \pm 2\%$ during feeding (Table 2).

Plasma Substrate and Hormone Concentrations

Fasting—Following 14 h fasting, the plasma glucose, FFA and β -hydroxybutyrate concentrations were similar in the control and lactating subjects regardless of rhGH or saline treatment (Table 1). In contrast, the plasma insulin and C-peptide concentrations were higher in the controls when compared to lactating women following saline injections (Insulin 9.7 ± 1.8 vs. 4.7 ± 0.6 μ U/ml, respectively, $p < 0.05$; C-peptide 1.88 ± 0.14 vs. 0.99 ± 0.17 ng/ml, respectively, $p < 0.05$). RhGH treatment increased ($p < 0.05$) the plasma insulin and C-peptide concentrations in both the control and lactating women (insulin 21.9 ± 5.1 and 11.8 ± 0.9 μ U/ml, control vs. lactating women, respectively, and C-peptide 2.94 ± 0.60 vs. 2.40 ± 0.28 μ U/ml, respectively) and the difference ($p < 0.05$) between the groups was maintained regarding insulin but not C-peptide (Table 1). No differences were observed in plasma glucagon concentrations between the lactating and control women following either saline or growth hormone (Table 1).

The insulin sensitivity was greater in the lactating women than in the control women (HOMA 0.96 ± 0.12 vs. 2.09 ± 0.41 , $p < 0.01$; QUICKI 0.84 ± 0.10 vs. 0.58 ± 0.07 , $p < 0.02$, respectively). RhGH treatment decreased insulin sensitivity (HOMA 2.86 ± 0.22 and 3.38 ± 1.66 for the lactating and control women, respectively, $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$, respectively; and QUICKI 0.47 ± 0.01 and 0.41 ± 0.04 respectively, $p < 0.01$ for both) but the relative difference between the lactating and non-lactating women was maintained.

Feeding—Continuous feeding of Boost HP® over a 6 h period increased ($p < 0.05$) the plasma glucose concentrations in control and lactating women without rhGH and in the lactating women during rhGH treatment (Table 1). However, no significant change was observed during rhGH treatment in the control women. Plasma FFA and β -hydroxybutyrate concentrations were suppressed ($p < 0.05$) as a result of feeding in both groups of subjects. No differences were observed between the lactating and control women regardless of rhGH treatment (Table 1). In contrast to the plasma glucose concentrations, which increased by only 15 - 20%, plasma insulin and C-peptide concentrations nearly doubled ($p < 0.05$) with feeding in both groups following saline injections and were again higher in the control women (insulin: 49.3 ± 3.0 vs. 26.7 ± 3.8 $\mu\text{U/ml}$, $p < 0.05$; C-peptide: 7.03 ± 0.69 vs. 5.65 ± 1.00 ng/ml, respectively, $p < 0.05$) despite a higher rate of carbohydrate ingestion in the lactating women. RhGH treatment resulted in doubling of the insulin concentrations in both groups (insulin: 107.5 ± 26.0 in controls vs. 51.9 ± 13.5 $\mu\text{U/ml}$ in the lactating women, respectively, $p < 0.05$). The plasma C-peptide concentrations were statistically unaffected by rhGH (9.19 ± 1.25 vs. 8.04 ± 1.51 ng/ml) but the relative difference ($p < 0.05$) between the lactating and control women was unchanged (Table 1). Plasma glucagon concentrations were similar in both groups with or without growth hormone (Table 1).

Glucose Kinetics

Fasting—In the post-absorptive 14 h fasted condition and following saline injection, the rate of glucose production in the lactating women was 30% higher than in the controls (13.4 ± 0.4 $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ vs. 10.2 ± 0.4 , $p < 0.05$). In this study of lactating women, the increase in glucose production when compared to that of the control women was the result of a nearly 46 % increase in the rate of glycogenolysis (7.0 ± 0.4 $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ vs. 4.8 ± 0.3 , $p < 0.05$) and a 23% increase in gluconeogenesis (6.2 ± 0.5 $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ vs. 5.0 ± 0.3 , $p < 0.05$) (Figure 1).

RhGH treatment increased glucose production in the lactating women from 13.4 ± 0.4 vs. 15.8 ± 0.5 $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ ($p < 0.01$) but not in the controls (10.2 ± 0.4 vs. 11.8 ± 0.9 , $p = 0.15$). The relatively higher ($p < 0.05$) rate of glucose production was maintained in the lactating women when compared to control women.

RhGH treatment had no effect on gluconeogenesis in the control women but increased gluconeogenesis in the lactating women (6.2 ± 0.5 vs. 8.2 ± 0.7 $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$, $p < 0.05$). The rates of glycogenolysis ($p < 0.05$) but not gluconeogenesis were lower in the control compared with the lactating women.

Feeding—During meal absorption following saline injection, the total rate of systemic glucose appearance was increased ($p < 0.01$) to 27.9 ± 0.9 and 36.5 ± 2.4 $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ in the control and lactating women, respectively. As described above, the lactating women ingested Boost HP at a higher rate than the controls to maintain energy neutrality, which accounted for the higher total glucose rate of appearance in the lactating women. Utilizing previously derived estimates of systemic entry of dietary glucose (19), we estimated the entry rate of dietary glucose into the systemic circulation to be 22.6 ± 0 vs. 28 ± 0 $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ in the control and lactating women, respectively, during both the saline and rhGH studies ().

The rates of gluconeogenesis were 8.0 ± 1.3 and 7.7 ± 1.1 $\mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ in the control and lactating women, respectively. Thus, the rates of gluconeogenesis did not decrease during meal absorption. They actually increased slightly from the fasted state in the control subjects ($p < 0.05$) while no change was observed in the lactating women (Figure 1). The rate of glycogenolysis was suppressed ($p < 0.05$) to values indistinguishable ($p > 0.40$) from 0 (-1.3

± 1.9 and $2.3 \pm 2.4 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ in the control and lactating women, respectively) (Figure 1).

During meal absorption, rhGH treatment had no effect on the total rate of entry of glucose (27.9 ± 0.9 vs. $38.0 \pm 1.5 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ in the control and lactating women, respectively) but the difference between the two groups was maintained. The rates of gluconeogenesis were 8.2 ± 1.0 vs. $8.8 \pm 1.4 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ in the control and lactating women, respectively. The calculated rates of glycogenolysis were again suppressed to values indistinguishable from zero (-0.2 ± 1.2 vs. $1.8 \pm 1.7 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ in the control and lactating women, respectively) (Figure 1).

Discussion

Until recently, we have long accepted that glucose production after an overnight fast is almost exclusively from glycogenolysis and that with fasting, glucose production from gluconeogenesis increases as glycogenolysis decreases (21). Euglycemic hyperinsulinemic clamp studies have reinforced this assumption since the endogenous rate of glucose production has been reported to be suppressed to 0 (or below) (22). Although with improved techniques, glucose production during euglycemic hyperinsulinemic clamps values of glucose production are reported to be between 0 and $1 \text{ mg}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ in adult volunteers (22). No data exist demonstrating whether this residual glucose production is from gluconeogenesis, glycogenolysis or an artifact of the methodology.

Despite the proposal of the Cori Cycle in the 1929 (23), regulation of glucose production from gluconeogenesis has long been inferred from a variety of indirect measurements (24-32). Because of the interconversion of carbon atoms among the gluconeogenic precursors (lactate, pyruvate, alanine, glutamine and glutamate) from cycling in and out of the TCA cycle and the lack of an accurate measure of the in vivo precursor pool(s), these isotope dilution methods failed to provide a total integrated rate of gluconeogenesis in vivo (6-8). We now have a variety of isotopic methodologies which are generally accepted with which to measure gluconeogenesis in vivo (7-10)

Despite these advancements, the measurement of gluconeogenesis in vivo continues to be problematic. Accurate measurement of the fraction of glucose derived from gluconeogenesis (or the change in the fraction derived from gluconeogenesis) requires that the entire glucose pool has come to a new near steady state for the isotope for both isotopic enrichment and substrate concentration, which under basal conditions takes 4 to 5 h (1). This excludes the use of non-steady state conditions such as a single bolus feed for an experimental protocol. Therefore, to achieve near substrate and isotopic steady state conditions, we utilized the continuously feed model which may have blunted the rise in plasma glucose but did result in a 2 to 3 fold increase in glucose turnover and a 5 to 6 fold increase in plasma insulin during the feed portion of these studies.

The present studies using $[\text{U-}^{13}\text{C}]$ glucose support our original observation using $[\text{2-}^{13}\text{C}]$ glycerol (1) that gluconeogenesis is not suppressed during meal absorption despite significant hyperinsulinemia. In addition, a week of high dose subcutaneous rhGH had little effect on gluconeogenesis in either the control or lactating women (Table 2, Figure 1) (1). The rate of gluconeogenesis actually increased in the controls during the 6 h of continuous meal ingestion. Our data are in concordance with those from euglycemic hyperinsulinemic clamps in normal volunteers and subcutaneous insulin injection in individuals with type 1 diabetes, despite relatively short periods of isotope infusions (34,35). Thus, we conclude that gluconeogenesis in humans is not affected by acute changes (4 to 6 h) in plasma insulin. Estimating the fraction of enterally ingested glucose delivered to the systemic circulation (19), we found that

glycogenolysis was essentially totally suppressed during meal ingestion. This is in complete agreement with the well established in vitro effects of insulin on glycogenolysis and glycogen synthesis (36).

As has been known for decades (19,37), acute administration of hGH resulted in insulin resistance. Despite induction of insulin resistance, rhGH had little or no effect on the plasma concentrations of glucose, FFA, or β -hydroxybutyrate following either a 14 h fast or 6 h of continuous feeding. RhGH increased insulin resistance in both groups of subjects but did not affect the relative difference in insulin resistance between the two groups. The rhGH induced increase in insulin resistance in the control women provided a potential explanation for the increase in glycogenolysis observed in the fasting condition but does not explain why a similar effect was not observed in the fasting lactating women. Improved insulin sensitivity during lactation has been reported in rats (38). However, studies in lactating women with history of gestational diabetes report improved β cells function without changing insulin sensitivity as measured by frequently sampled IVGTT (39). In addition, Kjos and co-workers (40) also reported that lactation, even for short duration, has beneficial effects on glucose metabolism in women with gestational diabetes.

The increased insulin sensitivity in the lactating women is most likely secondary to the 25% increase in non-insulin dependent utilization of plasma glucose for milk production. However, it is not clear if this alone could contribute to the striking differences in insulin values or measures of insulin sensitivity using HOMA and QUICKI. The role of milk production and the effects of other factors such as plasma prolactin and/or oxytocin remain to be investigated. The lack of difference in C-peptide concentrations following rhGH in both groups of subjects is interesting. The kidneys (41) clear a substantial proportion of C-peptide and rhGH increases the glomerular filtration rate (GFR) (42). Whether the effect of rhGH on renal GFR is greater in one group of women or the other remains to be determined but this factor alone complicates the interpretation of the C-peptide data under these conditions. However, the discrepancy in the insulin and C-peptide responses to rhGH in our present study is nearly identical to the changes observed in a group of normal men and women treated with either saline or rhGH (37).

RhGH increases milk production in humans (4,5) to a similar extent as that reported with species specific GH in goats and cows (34,35). Every woman receiving rhGH in a blinded fashion in the present studies complained of mild breast engorgement on day 2 to 3 of only rhGH treatment, which resolved by day 4 or 5. Similar isotopomer distribution of ^{13}C in the milk glucose and galactose under all conditions studied suggests that the increased milk production is not the result of increased hexoneogenesis in the mammary epithelium. Thus rhGH, whether in the lactating breast or the liver, has little effect on the conversion of 3 carbon precursors to glucose (and galactose). The precise biochemical and/or molecular mechanism (s) involved in the rhGH induced increase in milk production remains to be determined.

Our current and previous data (33) and those of others (4,40) suggest a rethinking of the acute effects of insulin and growth hormone on the regulation of glucose homeostasis. During feeding and short term fasting, gluconeogenesis remains constant despite changes in plasma insulin. As a consequence, the maintenance of euglycemia in the fed condition must be the result of only the balance between decreased glycogenolysis and increased peripheral glucose utilization but not changes in gluconeogenesis. With more prolonged fasting and virtual depletion of glycogen stores, the increased availability of FFA and ketone bodies results in decreased glucose utilization, offsetting the decreasing glucose production. In addition, the metabolic acidosis induced by ketonemia will most likely increase renal gluconeogenesis(43, 44). We have no data on the effects of the prolonged exposure of high or low plasma concentrations of GH, cortisol, epinephrine or insulin on gluconeogenesis. However, were

gluconeogenesis unaffected by these conditions as it appears to be during feeding and short term fasting, we may need to rethink fundamentally our understanding of the glucose homeostasis in a number of medical conditions which are known to cause hyper- or hypoglycemia.

Acknowledgement

This work is a publication of the USDA/ARS Children's Nutrition Research Center, Department of Pediatrics, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of policies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement from the U.S. Government. We thank the technicians in our laboratory (Patricia Breitenfelder, Shaji Chacko, Dan Donaldson, Kathryn Louie, Lauren Loyal), our nurse coordinators (Andrea Dotting Jones, RN and Amy Pontius, RN), the staff in the Metabolic Research Unit and Kitchen, and the staff of the General Clinical Research Unit who greatly facilitated the execution of these studies.

The study was supported by NIH Grants: GCRC: 5M01RR000188, RO1 HD044609 and RO1 HD037957. Novo Nordisk (Princeton, NJ) donated rhGH for these studies.

Abbreviations

rhGH, recombinant human growth hormone; GNG, gluconeogenesis; GPR, glucose production rate.

References

1. Tigas S, Sunehag A, Haymond MW. Metabolic adaptation to feeding and fasting during lactation in humans. *J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab* 2002;87:302–307. [PubMed: 11788664]
2. Sunehag AL, Louie K, Bier JL, Tigas S, Haymond MW. Hexoneogenesis in the human breast during lactation. *J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab* 2002;87:297–301. [PubMed: 11788663]
3. Hodate K, Ozawa A, Johke T. Effect of a prolonged release formulation of recombinant bovine somatotropin on plasma concentrations of hormones and metabolites, and milk production in dairy cows. *Endocrinol. Jpn* 1991;38:527–532. [PubMed: 1843273]
4. Gunn AJ, Gunn TR, Rabone DL, Breier BH, Blum WF, Gluckman PD. Growth hormone increases breast milk volumes in mothers of preterm infants. *Pediatrics* 1996;98:279–282. [PubMed: 8692630]
5. Milsom SR, Rabone DL, Gunn AJ, Gluckman PD. Potential role for growth hormone in human lactation insufficiency. *Horm. Res* 1998;50:147–150. [PubMed: 9762002]
6. Katz H, Butler P, Homan M, Zerman A, Caumo A, Cobelli C, Rizza R. Hepatic and extrahepatic insulin action in humans: measurement in the absence of nonsteady-state error. *Am. J Physiol* 1993;264:E561–E566. [PubMed: 8476034]
7. Landau BR, Wahren J, Chandramouli V, Schumann WC, Ekberg K, Kalhan SC. Use of 2H₂O for estimating rates of gluconeogenesis. Application to the fasted state. *J Clin. Invest* 1995;95:172–178. [PubMed: 7814612]
8. Radziuk J, Pye S. Hepatic glucose uptake, gluconeogenesis and the regulation of glycogen synthesis. *Diabetes Metab. Res. Rev* 2001;17:250–272. [PubMed: 11544610]
9. Neese RA, Schwarz JM, Faix D, Turner S, Letscher A, Vu D, Hellerstein MK. Gluconeogenesis and intrahepatic triose phosphate flux in response to fasting or substrate loads. Application of the mass isotopomer distribution analysis technique with testing of assumptions and potential problems. *J Biol. Chem* 1995;270:14452–14466. [PubMed: 7782307]
10. Haymond MW, Sunehag AL. The reciprocal pool model for the measurement of gluconeogenesis by use of [U-(13)C]glucose. *Am. J. Physiol. Endocrinol. Metab* 2000;278:E140–E145. [PubMed: 10644548]
11. Dewey KG, Lonnerdal B. Milk and nutrient intake of breastfed infants from 1-6 months. *J Pediatr. Gastroenterol Nutr* 1983;2:497–506. [PubMed: 6620057]
12. Hartmann PE, Sherriff JL, Kent JC. Maternal Nutrition and the regulation of milk synthesis. *Proc. Nutr. Soc* 1995;54:379–389. [PubMed: 8524885]

13. Cox DB, Owens RA, Hartmann PE. Blood and milk prolactin and the rate of milk synthesis in women. *Exp. Physiol* 1996;78:741–755.
14. Dewey, KG.; Finley, DA.; Strobe, MA.; Lonnerdal, B. Relationship of maternal age to breast milk volume and composition. In: Hamosh, M.; Goldman, AS., editors. *Human Lactation2; Maternal and Environmental Factors*. Plenum Press; new York, London: 1986. p. 263-273.
15. Butte, NF.; Lopez-Azarcon, MG.; Garza, C. Nutrient Adequacy of Exclusive Breastfeeding for the Term Infant During the First Six Months of Life. WHO; Geneva: 2002.
16. Neville MC, Keller R, Seacat J, Neifert M, Casey C, Allen J, Archer P. Studies in human lactation: milk volumes in lactating women during the onset of lactation and full lactation. *Am. J Clin. Nutr* 1988;48:1375–1386. [PubMed: 3202087]
17. Sonnenberg GE, Keller U. Sampling of arterialized heated-hand venous blood as a noninvasive technique for the study of ketone body kinetics in man. *Metabolism* Jan;1982 31(1):1–5. [PubMed: 6804743]
18. Nauck MA, Blietz RW, Qualmann C. Comparison of hyperinsulinaemic clamp experiments using venous, 'arterialized' venous or capillary euglycaemia. *Clin Physiol* Nov;1996 16(6):589–602. [PubMed: 8937798]
19. Horber FF, Marsh HM, Haymond MW. Differential effects of prednisone and growth hormone on fuel metabolism and insulin antagonism in humans. *Diabetes* 1991;40:141–149. [PubMed: 2015969]
20. Conwell LS, Trost SG, Brown WJ, Batch JA. Indexes of insulin resistance and secretion in obese children and adolescents: a validation study. *Diabetes Care* 2004;27:314–319. [PubMed: 14747206]
21. Cahill GF Jr. Starvation in man. *N. Engl. J Med* 1970;282:668–675. [PubMed: 4915800]
22. Rizza RA, Mandarino LJ, Gerich JE. Mechanisms of insulin resistance in man. Assessment using the insulin dose-response curve in conjunction with insulinreceptor binding. *Am. J Med* 1981;70:169–176. [PubMed: 7006389]
23. Cori C, Cori G. Glycogen Formation in the Liver from d- and l-Lactic Acid. *J Biol. Chem* 1929;81:389–403.
24. Exton JH, Park CR. The stimulation of gluconeogenesis from lactate by epinephrine, glucagon, cyclic 3',5'-adenylate in the perfused rat liver. *Pharmacol. Rev* 1966;18:181–188. [PubMed: 5904135]
25. Krebs HA. The effects of ethanol on the metabolic activities of the liver. *Adv. Enzyme Regul* 1968;6:467–480. [PubMed: 4305296]
26. Bjorkman O, Felig P, Wahren J. The contrasting responses of splanchnic and renal glucose output to gluconeogenic substrates and to hypoglucagonemia in 60-h-fasted humans. *Diabetes* 1980;29:610–616. [PubMed: 6108272]
27. Owen OE, Felig P, Morgan AP, Wahren J, Cahill GF Jr. Liver and kidney metabolism during prolonged starvation. *J Clin. Invest* 1969;48:574–583. [PubMed: 5773093]
28. Frazer TE, Karl IE, Hillman LS, Bier DM. Direct measurement of gluconeogenesis from [2,3]13C2 alanine in the human neonate. *Am. J Physiol* 1981;240:E615–E621. [PubMed: 7246731]
29. Jenssen T, Nurjhan N, Consoli A, Gerich JE. Dose-response effects of lactate infusions on gluconeogenesis from lactate in normal man. *Eur. J Clin. Invest* 1993;23:448–454. [PubMed: 8404995]
30. Waterhouse C, Keilson J. Cori cycle activity in man. *J Clin. Invest* 1969;48:2359–2366. [PubMed: 5355347]
31. McGuinness OP, Murrell S, Moran C, Bracy D, Cherrington AD. The effect of acute glucagon removal on the metabolic response to stress hormone infusion in the conscious dog. *Metabolism* 1994;43:1310–1317. [PubMed: 7934986]
32. Gan-Gaisano M, Horber F, Haymond M. In vivo estimates of gluconeogenesis using labeled bicarbonate, leucine or KIC. *Diabetes* 1990;39
33. Tigas SK, Sunehag AL, Haymond MW. Impact of duration of infusion and choice of isotope label on isotope recycling in glucose homeostasis. *Diabetes* 2002;51:3170–3175. [PubMed: 12401707]
34. Adkins A, Basu R, Persson M, Dicke B, Shah P, Vella A, Schwenk WF, Rizza R. Higher insulin concentrations are required to suppress gluconeogenesis than glycogenolysis in nondiabetic humans. *Diabetes* 2003;52:2213–2220. [PubMed: 12941759]

35. Boden G, Cheung P, Homko C. Effects of acute insulin excess and deficiency on gluconeogenesis and glycogenolysis in type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes* 2003;52:133–137. [PubMed: 12502503]
36. Nuttall FQ, Gilboe DP, Gannon MC, Niewoehner CB, Tan AW. Regulation of glycogen synthesis in the liver. *Am. J. Med* 1988;85:77–85. [PubMed: 3143265]
37. Daughaday WH, Kipnis DM. The growth-promoting and anti-insulin actions of somatotropin. *Recent Prog. Horm. Res* 1966;22:49–99. [PubMed: 5334632]
38. Burnol AF, Leturque A, Ferre P, Kande J, Girard J. Increased insulin sensitivity and responsiveness during lactation in rats. *Am. J. Physiol* 1986;251:E537–E541. [PubMed: 3535531]
39. McManus RM, Cunningham I, Watson A, Harker L, Finegood DT. Beta-cell function and visceral fat in lactating women with a history of gestational diabetes. *Metabolism* 2001;50:715–719. [PubMed: 11398150]
40. Kjos SL, Henry O, Lee RM, Buchanan TA, Mishell DR Jr. The effect of lactation on glucose and lipid metabolism in women with recent gestational diabetes. *Obstet. Gynecol* 1993;82:451–455. [PubMed: 8355952]
41. Henriksen JH, Tronier B, Bulow JB. Kinetics of circulating endogenous insulin, C-peptide, and proinsulin in fasting nondiabetic man. *Metabolism* 1987;36:463–468. [PubMed: 3553849]
42. Christiansen JS, Gammelgaard J, Orskov H, Andersen AR, Telmer S, Parving HH. Kidney function and size in normal subjects before and during growth hormone administration for one week. *Eur. J Clin. Invest* 1981;11:487–490. [PubMed: 6800824]
43. Gerich JE, Meyer C, Woerle HJ, Stumvoll M. Renal gluconeogenesis: its importance in human glucose homeostasis. *Diabetes Care* 2001;24:382–391. [PubMed: 11213896]
44. Goodman AD, Fuisz RE, Cahill GF Jr. Renal gluconeogenesis in acidosis, alkalosis, and potassium deficiency: its possible role in regulation of renal ammonia production. *J Clin. Invest* 1966;45:612–619. [PubMed: 5937032]

Figure 1.

Effects of 7 days of either saline or rhGH injections on glucose rate of appearance, gluconeogenesis and glycogenolysis in control and lactating women following 14 h of fasting or 6 h of continuous feeding with Boost HP®. ^a $p < 0.05$ rhGH vs. saline within group, ^b $p < 0.05$ feeding vs. fasting within group, ^c $p < 0.05$ lactating vs. control under the same treatment condition.

Table 1

Plasma substrate and hormone concentrations in control and lactating women following 7 d of either saline or rhGH injections. FASTING was 14 h following the last meal at supper and FEEDING was following 6 h of continuous consumption of small feedings of Boost HP®.

	CONTROL WOMEN				LACTATING WOMEN			
	FASTING		FEEDING		FASTING		FEEDING	
	Saline	rhGH	Saline	rhGH	Saline	rhGH	Saline	rhGH
Glucose (mmol/l)	4.9 ± 0.1	5.3 ± 0.3	5.6 ± 0.1 ^e	5.7 ± 0.1	4.6 ± 0.1	5.4 ± 0.1 ^d	5.6 ± 0.2 ^e	6.0 ± 0.1 ^e
Insulin (μU/ml)	9.7 ± 1.8	21.9 ± 5.2 ^a	49.3 ± 3.0 ^e	107.5 ± 26.0 ^{de}	4.7 ± 0.6 ^c	11.8 ± 0.9 ^{dc}	26.7 ± 3.8 ^{ce}	51.9 ± 13.5 ^{ace}
C-peptide (ng/ml)	1.88 ± 0.14	2.94 ± 0.60 ^d	7.03 ± 0.69	9.19 ± 1.25	0.99 ± 0.17	2.40 ± 0.28 ^d	5.65 ± 1.00	8.04 ± 1.51
Glucagon (pg/ml)	47.7 ± 6.3	38.3 ± 6.6	53.9 ± 4.3	43.5 ± 5.1	53.4 ± 5.4	48.0 ± 6.1	57.6 ± 5.8	56.6 ± 3.4
Free Fatty Acids (mmol/l)	0.49 ± 0.13	0.52 ± 0.11	0.05 ± 0.02 ^e	0.06 ± 0.03 ^e	0.46 ± 0.08	0.70 ± 0.06	0.06 ± 0.01 ^e	0.11 ± 0.02 ^e
βOHB (μmol/l)	0.07 ± 0.01	0.24 ± 0.11	0.04 ± 0.01	0.04 ± 0.01	0.13 ± 0.05	0.19 ± 0.04	0.04 ± 0.01	0.05 ± 0.01 ^e
HOMA	2.09 ± 0.41	5.38 ± 1.66 ^d			0.96 ± 0.12 ^d	2.86 ± 0.22 ^b		
QUICKI	0.68 ± 0.07	0.41 ± 0.04 ^b			0.84 ± 0.10	0.47 ± 0.01 ^b		

^a $p < 0.05$ rhGH vs. saline

^b $p < 0.01$ rhGH vs. saline

^c $p < 0.05$ lactating vs. control

^d $p < 0.01$ lactating vs. control

^e $p < 0.05$ feeding vs. fasting

Table 2

The ratios of the isotopomer distribution (M+1, M+2, M+3 and M+6) in milk glucose and galactose to that in plasma glucose in lactating women following 7 days of either saline or rhGH injections. FASTING was 14 h following the last meal at supper and FEEDING was following 6 h of continuous consumption of small feedings of Boost HP®.

	FASTING							
	Milk glucose / Plasma glucose			Milk galactose / Plasma glucose				
	M+1	M+2	M+3	M+6	M+1	M+2	M+3	M+6
Saline	1.07 ± 0.02	0.94 ± 0.02	0.52 ± 0.05	0.46 ± 0.09	1.01 ± 0.01	1.02 ± 0.02	0.92 ± 0.09	0.31 ± 0.06
rhGH	1.07 ± 0.02	0.97 ± 0.03	0.60 ± 0.05	0.47 ± 0.05	1.01 ± 0.01	1.05 ± 0.02	0.94 ± 0.05	0.30 ± 0.03
	FEEDING							
	Milk glucose / Plasma glucose			Milk galactose / Plasma glucose				
	M+1	M+2	M+3	M+6	M+1	M+2	M+3	M+6
Saline	1.09 ± 0.01	1.10 ± 0.03	0.96 ± 0.12	0.81 ± 0.03	1.10 ± 0.01	1.46 ± 0.09	2.94 ± 0.48	0.60 ± 0.02
rhGH	1.10 ± 0.01	1.11 ± 0.03	1.19 ± 0.09	0.90 ± 0.05	1.13 ± 0.01	1.52 ± 0.03	4.06 ± 0.21	0.65 ± 0.04