

Assessment of mesalamine in the alterations of metabolic parameters in comorbid ulcerative colitis and metabolic syndrome patients: A retrospective study

Graziella R. Paniz¹, Fray M. Arroyo-Mercado¹, Christina L. Ling¹, E. Eunice Choi², Harry E. Snow², Neal E. Rakov¹, and *Eliseo F. Castillo^{1,2}.

¹ Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Department of Internal Medicine, University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, Albuquerque, NM 87131

² Clinical and Translational Science Center, University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, Albuquerque, NM 87131

***Correspondence**

Email: ecastillo@salud.unm.edu

1 University of New Mexico
Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology
Department of Internal Medicine
University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center
Albuquerque, NM 87131, USA.
505-272-5703

Short title: Mesalamine alters metabolic risk factors

Key words: mesalamine, metabolic syndrome, ulcerative colitis, dyslipidemia, hyperglycemia

BACKGROUND & AIMS:

It is unclear how the gut targeting medication mesalamine alters metabolic parameters associated with Metabolic Syndrome (MetS). We completed a retrospective analysis on ulcerative colitis (UC) and MetS comorbid patients receiving mesalamine to examine the effects of mesalamine on the metabolic risk factors associated with MetS.

METHODS:

We performed a retrospective chart review using Cerner's Health Facts (from July 2007 to July 2017). We identified UC patients with a MetS comorbidity and who were prescribed mesalamine within +/- 7 days of an encounter in which they were diagnosed with UC. We then collected the patient's blood pressure, labs, and body measurement index (BMI) for each of these patient at the index date and the closest values to 12 months after the index date. We used analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to determine the effect of mesalamine therapy in patients with both UC and MetS on the metabolic parameters after 12 months of treatment compared to baseline.

RESULTS:

Our search of Cerner Health Facts identified 6,197 UC patients with concomitant MetS who were prescribed mesalamine. Of these individuals, 48% were female and 52% were male and within this cohort 88.3% received oral mesalamine and 11.7% received mesalamine via the rectal route. Oral mesalamine reduced fasting glucose levels and increased HDL cholesterol in these patients. C-reactive protein levels and erythrocyte sedimentation rate were also significantly reduced. Rectal mesalamine only reduced BMI. Further analysis revealed several MetS conditions risk factors were further

improved when mesalamine was taken in the absence of medication for hypertension, hyperglycemia or dyslipidemia.

CONCLUSION:

In a retrospective chart study of UC-MetS patients, we found oral mesalamine improved several metabolic parameters associated with MetS. Our findings suggest the PPAR agonist mesalamine that targets the gastrointestinal tract could prove beneficial in improving hypertension, hyperglycemia and dyslipidemia.

INTRODUCTIONS

Metabolic Syndrome (MetS) identifies a group of risk factors that increases an individual's risk for several clinical conditions such as cardiovascular disease, stroke and cancer¹⁻¹⁰. An individual must have at least three of the following risk factors to be diagnosed with MetS: abdominal (central) obesity, high blood pressure/hypertension, elevated blood sugar/insulin resistance (*i.e.*, hyperglycemia), increased triglycerides and low high-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol (*i.e.*, dyslipidemia)¹¹. Both hyperglycemia and dyslipidemia are also highly associated with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) which may be the liver manifestation of MetS¹²⁻²⁰. It is estimated over a quarter of the world's population and up to one-third of United States adults have MetS²¹⁻²³. Unfortunately, there are no medications approved to treat MetS nor NAFLD. Furthermore, the prescribed medications only control the risk factors associated with MetS including blood pressure, hyperglycemia and dyslipidemia. Given the current

incidence and prevalence of MetS, it is critical to identify the etiological factors leading to this disease to provide targeted interventional strategies, as changes in lifestyle alone may not be enough to reverse these conditions.

Recent studies in humans and rodents have suggested a role for the gastrointestinal (GI) tract in contributing to numerous diseases and disorders associated with metabolic dysfunction such as dyslipidemia and hyperglycemia²⁴⁻³⁸. Currently, peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor (PPAR) agonist are therapeutically targeted to treat dyslipidemia and hyperglycemia³⁹⁻⁵⁰. PPARs are a group of transcription factors involved in numerous aspects of cellular differentiation and function including the regulation of energy homeostasis and inflammation⁵¹⁻⁵⁷. In the GI tract, PPAR- γ activity is decreased in individuals diagnosed with inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) such as ulcerative colitis (UC) and Crohn's disease⁵⁸⁻⁶². Interestingly, there are some individuals who present with UC and have comorbid conditions that are linked with MetS such as dyslipidemia, insulin resistance, hypertension, and increased abdominal obesity⁶³⁻⁶⁹. NAFLD is also frequently reported in patients with IBD^{63, 70, 71}. Mesalamine, a PPAR agonist, has been documented to have beneficial effects in active, mild to moderate UC⁷²⁻⁷⁴. It has also been used successfully in maintenance therapy for UC⁷⁵. Mesalamine is an aminosalicylate compound also known as 5-aminosalicylic acid (5-ASA). Mesalamine is only approved for IBD but is considered relatively safe for individuals making it a great therapeutic drug to repurpose for MetS and NAFLD. Therefore, we performed a retrospective analysis on individuals who were diagnosed with UC, received mesalamine, and had at least three of the five following MetS conditions^{13, 76-78}: hypertriglyceridemia, low HDL, hypertension, hyperglycemia, and a

BMI over 27 to determine the beneficial effects of targeting the GI tract with a PPAR agonist on these metabolic parameters.

METHODS

Data Acquisition

All data were collected according to our institutional review board-approved protocol (20-369). Our study was a retrospective chart review, involving the use of existing data with no or minimal risk to participants, it had an institutional review board and patient consent exempt status under human subject regulations. All data used in this study come from Cerner Health Facts database. There were 478,236,643 unique encounters from 68,696,329 unique patients in Health Facts. Data in Health Facts was extracted directly from the electronic medical records (EMR) from hospitals in which Cerner has a data use agreement. Encounters included pharmacy, clinical and microbiology laboratory, admission, and billing information from affiliated patient care locations. All admissions, medication orders and dispensing, laboratory orders and specimens were date and time stamped, providing a temporal relationship between treatment patterns and clinical information. Cerner Corporation has established Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act-compliant operating policies to establish de-identification for Health Facts. In all, Health Facts was used to find individuals who were diagnosed with UC with a MetS comorbidity that received mesalamine.

Data Inclusion

We found patients between July 1, 2007 and July 1, 2017 who had International Classification of Diseases (ICD) code for UC. All patients were age 18 or older. This yielded 52,676 patients. Among these patients we found patients who also had a

mesalamine prescription within +/- 7 days of an encounter in which they were diagnosed with UC. Mesalamine included sulfasalazine and 5-aminosalicylic acid. For each patient with UC who also had a mesalamine prescription, we identified the mesalamine start date as the index date. From this, we then found all relevant diagnoses, labs, medications of interest, blood pressures, body mass index (BMI) measurements, heights and weights in the medical record within +/- 12 months of each patient's index date. This information was used to calculate the five risk factors of metabolic syndrome. This included increased blood pressure (130/85 mmHg), high blood sugar levels (≥ 110 mg/dL), high triglycerides (≥ 150 mg/dL), low levels of HDL (Men < 40 mg/dL; Women < 50 mg/dL), and overweight status as defined by BMI (≥ 25.0 kg/m²). In computing factors, a diagnosis of obesity was enough to satisfy the factor of BMI > 27 . Height and weight were used to compute BMI when BMI was not available. There were 6,197 patients who had UC with a MetS comorbidity who were prescribed mesalamine within +/- 7 days of an encounter in which they were diagnosed with UC. For each of these patient, we looked for the closest values before the index date, and then the closest values to 12 months after the index date for the patient's blood pressure, labs, and BMI.

Statistical Analysis

Paired t-test or Wilcoxon Rank Sum test were used for continuous variables, and McNemar's test for categorical variables. For inferential statistics, we used analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to determine the effect of mesalamine therapy in patients with both UC and MetS on the metabolic parameters after 12 months of treatment compared to baseline.

RESULTS

Identified Population and Use of Mesalamine

Our search of Cerner Health Facts identified 52,676 UC patients between July 2007 and July 2017. Of these individuals, 6,197 UC patients with concomitant MetS and were prescribed mesalamine within +/- 7 days of an encounter in which they were diagnosed with UC. MetS complications included diabetes (19.7%), hypertension (45.6%), and hyperlipidemia (9.7%) (**Table 1**). Approximately 48% of the individuals identified were female and 52% were male with an overall mean age of 53.8 (± 19.9) (**Table 1**). Within this cohort, 88.3% received mesalamine orally and 11.7% via the rectal route (**Table 1**).

Influence of oral mesalamine on metabolic parameters in UC-MetS comorbid patients.

For the 5,472 individuals taking oral mesalamine that had an ICD code for both UC and MetS risk factors, we examined specific metabolic parameters (HDL cholesterol, triglycerides, fasting glucose, blood pressure, and BMI) in these individuals at baseline and after 12 months on mesalamine. We found the levels of HDL cholesterol were significantly increased ($P < 0.001$) and fasting glucose levels were significantly decreased ($P < 0.001$) (**Table 2**) after 12 months on oral mesalamine. No significant change was observed for BMI, triglyceride levels, or systolic blood pressure; however, diastolic blood pressure was raised from 70.1 mmHg to 71.6 mmHg ($P < 0.001$) on mesalamine (**Table 2**). Oral mesalamine usage also significantly reduced C-reactive protein (CRP) levels ($P < 0.001$) as well as the erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) ($P < 0.001$) in UC-MetS comorbid patients (**Table 2**). Comparing the different doses of oral

mesalamine on HDL cholesterol levels, fasting glucose, CRP and ESR

(**Supplementary Table 1**), we found high dose (1200 – 1000 mg) mesalamine had an average increase in HDL cholesterol levels of 48.9 mg/dL while medium dose (500, 400, 375 mg) was 43.8 mg/dL, and low dose (250 mg) was 42.7 mg/dL. Average fasting glucose levels were 142.0 mg/dL for high dose mesalamine, 139.3 mg/dL for medium dose, and 142.0 mg/dL for low dose (**Supplementary Table 1**). For CRP, high dose mesalamine had the lowest CRP average at 3.9 mg/dL, while medium dose was 4.6 mg/dL and low dose was 6.1 mg/dL. ESR followed the same trend with high dose mesalamine having an average ESR at 41.8 mm/h, while medium dose was 42.2 mm/h and low dose was 44.8 mm/h (**Supplementary Table 1**).

Given some UC-MetS comorbid patients were on medication (**Supplementary Table 2**) to treat hypertension, diabetes or hyperlipidemia, we assessed if the effects described above were dependent on these other medications. Surprisingly, we found individuals on oral mesalamine without hypertension medication had a significant decrease in systolic and diastolic blood pressure ($P < 0.01$) as well as BMI ($P < 0.01$) and fasting glucose levels ($P < 0.01$) compared to individuals taking both mesalamine and hypertension medication (**Supplementary Table 3**). Assessing individuals taking mesalamine without anti-diabetic medication, we observed a significant decrease in BMI ($P < 0.01$) and fasting glucose levels ($P < 0.01$) as well as an increase in HDL cholesterol levels ($P < 0.05$) than individuals taking both mesalamine and anti-diabetic medication (**Supplementary Table 4**). When individuals were taking mesalamine and medications to treat hyperlipidemia (**Supplementary Table 5**), a significant decrease in

total cholesterol ($P = 0.01$) and low-density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol levels ($P = 0.01$) were observed. Significant changes were also observed for both systolic and diastolic blood pressure. However, triglyceride ($P = 0.01$) and fasting glucose ($P < 0.01$) levels were significantly lower in individuals taking mesalamine without statins or cholesterol lowering medication. (**Supplementary Table 5**). No major difference were observed for CRP or ESR when individuals were on mesalamine with or without medications to treat hypertension, diabetes or hyperlipidemia (**Supplementary Table 3-5**).

Influence of rectal mesalamine on metabolic parameters in UC-MetS comorbid patients.

Cerner Health Facts identified 725 individuals taking mesalamine via the rectal route. Analysis of the various metabolic parameters (*i.e.*, HDL cholesterol, triglycerides, fasting glucose, blood pressure, and BMI) in these UC-MetS comorbid patients at baseline and after 12 months on rectal mesalamine, we only found a statistically significant reduction in BMI after mesalamine treatment (**Table 3**). Additionally, the average levels of CRP and ESR were reduced; however, these changes were not significant (**Table 3**). These parameters were also assessed for individuals taking medication for hypertension, diabetes or hyperlipidemia while on rectal mesalamine. Once again individuals taking rectal mesalamine in the absence of medication for hypertension had a significant reduction in systolic blood pressure ($P < 0.01$), BMI ($P = 0.04$), and fasting glucose levels ($P = 0.01$) (**Supplementary Table 6**). Fasting glucose levels were also significantly reduced in individuals taking rectal mesalamine in the absence of anti-

diabetic medication ($P < 0.01$) (**Supplementary Table 7**). No major difference were observed for individuals taking rectal mesalamine and medication to treat hyperlipidemia (**Supplementary Table 8**). No major difference were observed for CRP or ESR when individuals were on rectal mesalamine with or without medications to treat hypertension, diabetes or hyperlipidemia (**Supplementary Table 6-8**). Lastly, alkaline phosphatase levels were significantly reduced when individuals were receiving rectal mesalamine in the absence of medication for diabetes or dyslipidemia (**Supplementary Table 7-8**).

DISCUSSION

In this retrospective study, we examined the beneficial effects of mesalamine on various metabolic parameters associated with MetS. Given mesalamine is only approved to treat mild to moderate UC, the effects of mesalamine were examined in UC patients who also had MetS. Using Cerner Health Facts, we identified UC-MetS comorbid patients receiving both oral and rectal mesalamine. In our assessment, we found oral mesalamine proved beneficial in improving several metabolic parameters. This included increasing HDL cholesterol levels and reducing fasting glucose levels (**Table 2**). Other factors that are frequently increased in MetS such as CRP levels and increased ESR but also associated with UC were also significantly decreased⁷⁹⁻⁸³. Interestingly, oral mesalamine proved beneficial for other metabolic parameters (BMI, blood pressure, triglycerides) when individuals were not on medications to treat hypertension, diabetes or dyslipidemia (**Supplementary Table 3-5**). Rectal mesalamine was associated with decreased BMI and appeared more impactful when taken in the absence of medications

for hypertension. Overall, our findings suggest targeting the gut with the PPAR agonist mesalamine could prove beneficial in improving metabolic parameters associated with MetS.

While our study has several limitations including underlying chronic intestinal inflammation, lack of data for steroid use, and reliance on documentation and coding, it is the first large retrospective study that considers the effect of mesalamine on metabolic parameters associated with MetS. We suspect the true effect of mesalamine on these MetS risk factors may be underrepresented due to the chronic intestinal inflammation that characterizes UC. Nevertheless, mesalamine has proved beneficial in reducing fasting glucose levels and hepatic steatosis in an animal model of diet-induced obesity⁸⁴. Within the last decade, numerous studies have shown the GI tract contributes to metabolic dysfunction²⁴⁻³⁸. Specifically, chronic consumption of a high-fat diet (HFD) enhances intestinal barrier defects leading to enhanced intestinal permeability (IP), dysbiosis (i.e. alteration/reduction in microbial diversity and metabolites), and low-level of inflammation^{38, 85-89}. Dysbiosis can also increase IP as well as modulate the intestinal immune system⁹⁰⁻⁹². Both IP and dysbiosis can result in low-grade inflammation that affects weight gain, hyperglycemia and insulin resistance, dyslipidemia, and hypertension^{28-30, 93-95}. In addition, increased IP and dysbiosis have been observed in individuals who have been diagnosed with NAFLD (as well as individuals who develop nonalcoholic steatohepatitis, NASH), type 2 diabetes, and obesity^{25-27, 93, 96-106}. The mechanism of action of mesalamine is believed to work on three areas of the gut to maintain intestinal homeostasis: the microbiota, intestinal barrier, and the immune

system^{84, 107-116}. Mesalamine can directly inhibit proinflammatory pathways NF-κB and MAPK that promote the expression of proinflammatory cytokines (e.g., TNFα, IL-6 and IL-1β)^{84, 117-123}. Mesalamine also dampens COX-2 expression that leads to PGE₂ and PGF₂ production^{117, 120, 123-126}. Recent reports have demonstrated mesalamine increases the diversity of the gut microbiota through metabolic changes and direct effects on the microbiota^{113, 127-129}. Lastly, mesalamine has been shown to decrease IP and restore epithelial barrier function^{84, 111, 112}. Therefore, targeting the gut with mesalamine in individuals with MetS or NAFLD could prove beneficial in treating metabolic disorders.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: Supported in part by the National Center for Research Resources and the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) through grant no. UL1TR001449 (E.F.C.) and NIH Clinical and Translational Science Award to UNMHSC, the Biostatistics, Epidemiology, and Research Design (BERD) Core of the UNM HSC Clinical & Translational Science Center (CTSC) through grant no. UL1TR001449. C.L.L. is now part of the Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Medicine, University of California, Irvine, Irvine, CA 92697.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: None declared.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS: G.R.P., C.L.L. and E.F.C. designed the study. H.S. and E.H.C. contributed to data acquisition and statistical analysis. G.R.P, F.M.A-M, C.L.L.,

N.E.R. and E.F.C. analyzed and interpreted data. G.R.P., F.M.A-M, and E.F.C wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors reviewed, edited and approved the manuscript.

DATA AVAILABILITY: The datasets generated and analyzed during this study are not publicly available because of institutional review board restrictions, but data acquisition is described in methods.

Table 1

Characteristics	Total patients n=6197
Age, mean \pm SD	53.8 \pm 19.9
Sex:	
Female	3275 (52.9%)
Male	2922 (47.2%)
Race:	
White	4836 (78.0%)
Black	814 (13.1%)
Asian	62 (1.0%)
Native American	59 (1.0%)
Hispanic	46 (0.7%)
Other	380 (6.1%)
Product strength:	
250 mg	542 (10.4%)
375 mg	80 (1.5%)
400 mg	2520 (48.5%)
500 mg	928 (17.9%)
1000 mg	388 (7.5%)
1200 mg	735 (14.2%)
Oral	5472 (88.3%)
Rectal	725 (11.7%)
Dose Form:	
Capsule, extended release	756 (12.2%)
Delayed release capsule	1030 (16.6%)
Enema	329 (5.3%)
Enteric coated tablet	2999 (48.4%)
Suppository	396 (6.4%)
Tablet	686 (11.1%)
Metabolic Syndrome complications:	
Diabetes	1220 (19.7%)
Hypertension	2825 (45.6%)
Hyperlipidemia	598 (9.7%)

Table 1. Demographics of Cohort, Mesalamine usage and Metabolic Syndrome complications among the Cohort.

Table 2

Measurement	Baseline	12 months	difference	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	p value
Body Mass Index (BMI)	31.2	31.0	-0.2	-0.4	0.1	0.17
Systolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	127.4	128.3	0.8	-0.2	1.8	0.10
Diastolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	70.1	71.6	1.5	0.8	2.1	<0.01*
Total Cholesterol (mg/dL)	159.9	159.9	0.1	-2.7	2.9	0.96
HDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	44.3	46.0	1.7	0.8	2.5	<0.01*
LDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	91.7	90.2	-1.5	-4.0	1.1	0.25
Triglycerides (mg/dL)	129.4	130.4	1.0	-4.1	6.2	0.95
Fasting glucose (mg/dL)	142.7	139.5	-3.2	-5.2	-1.2	<0.01*
BUN (mg/dL)	18.2	19.5	1.2	0.8	1.6	<0.01*
C-Reactive Protein (mg/dL)	5.5	4.2	-1.3	-1.7	-0.8	<0.01*
Alkaline Phosphatase (IU/L)	89.0	93.3	4.3	1.2	7.4	<0.01*
Albumin (g/L)	3.1	3.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.01*
Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate (mm/h)	44.3	41.5	-2.7	-4.5	-1.0	<0.01*

Table 2. Comparison of metabolic parameters in 5,472 UC-MetS Patients taking oral mesalamine.

BUN, blood urea nitrogen; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; LDL, low-density lipoprotein.

Table 3

Measurement	Baseline	12 months	difference	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	p value
Body Mass Index (BMI)	27.9	27.1	-0.8	-1.6	0.0	0.02*
Systolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	138.2	138.2	0.0	-2.8	2.9	0.97
Diastolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	75.5	76.2	0.8	-1.1	2.6	0.42
Total Cholesterol (mg/dL)	133.9	139.8	5.9	-9.6	21.4	0.45
HDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	43	44.7	1.7	-3.5	6.9	0.52
LDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	82.3	76.4	-5.9	-19.8	8.0	0.40
Triglycerides (mg/dL)	97.7	75.7	-22.1	-41.8	-2.4	0.11
Fasting glucose (mg/dL)	162.1	161.1	-1.0	-7.6	5.6	0.43
BUN (mg/dL)	20.8	22.8	2.0	0.6	3.4	0.01*
C-Reactive Protein (mg/dL)	10.8	9.7	-1.1	-2.2	0.1	0.06
Alkaline Phosphatase (IU/L)	133.7	139.1	5.4	-2.2	12.9	0.19
Albumin (g/L)	2.6	2.7	0.1	-0.1	0.2	0.34
Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate (mm/h)	31.0	26.8	-4.2	-11.7	3.3	0.30

Table 3. Comparison of metabolic parameters in 725 UC-MetS Patients taking rectal mesalamine.

BUN, blood urea nitrogen; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; LDL, low-density lipoprotein.

Supplementary Table 1

Oral mesalamine (dose)	high	med	low
Body Mass Index (BMI)	31.5	31.3	30.6
Systolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	129.3	128.0	126.4
Diastolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	72.4	70.5	69.6
Cholesterol (mg/dL)	160.4	153.7	165.6
HDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	48.9	43.8	42.7
LDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	89.3	86.8	96.8
Triglycerides (mg/dL)	139.1	127.8	122.8
Fasting glucose (mg/dL)	142.0	139.3	142.0
BUN (mg/dL)	18.8	18.8	18.9
C-Reactive Protein (mg/dL)	3.9	4.6	6.1
Alkaline Phosphatase (IU/L)	87.8	92.3	93.4
Albumin (g/L)	3.1	3.2	3.1
Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate (mm/h)	41.8	42.2	44.8

Supplementary Table 1. Dose effect of oral mesalamine on metabolic parameters in 5,472 UC-MetS Patients.

Supplementary Table 2

Medication	Description
Nifedipine	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Amlodipine	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Amiloride-hydrochloro	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Amlodipine-benazepril	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Amlodipine – valsartan	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Benazepril-hydrochloro	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Bisoprolol-hydrochloro	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Candesartan-hydrochloro	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Captopril	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Carvedilol	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Enalapril	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Hydrochlorothiazide	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Hydrochlorothiazide-I	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Hydrochlorothiazide-O	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Hydrochlorothiazide-S	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Hydrochlorothiazide-T	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Hydrochlorothiazide-V	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Lisinopril	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Losartan	Antihypertensive drug (BP meds)
Rosuvastatin	Statin and cholesterol medication
simvastatin	Statin and cholesterol medication
Atorvastatin	Statin and cholesterol medication
Ezetimibe	Statin and cholesterol medication
Ezetimibe-simvastatin	Statin and cholesterol medication
Fenofibrate	Statin and cholesterol medication
Gemfibrozil	Statin and cholesterol medication
Glipizide	Antidiabetic medication
Glyburide	Antidiabetic medication
Glyburide-metformin	Antidiabetic medication
Pioglitazone	Antidiabetic medication
Insulin-aspart	insulin
Insulin-aspart-insul	insulin
Insulin-lispro	insulin
Insulin-lispro-insul	Insulin

Supplementary Table 2. List of medications to treat hypertension, dyslipidemia or hyperglycemia in study cohort.

Supplementary Table 3

Oral mesalamine	Without BP Meds	With BP Meds	P value
Body Mass Index (BMI)	30.3	32.0	<0.01*
Systolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	122.0	133.7	<0.01*
Diastolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	69.5	72.2	<0.01*
Total Cholesterol (mg/dL)	162.6	157.1	0.06
HDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	45.2	45.0	0.84
LDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	91.9	90.1	0.48
Triglycerides (mg/dL)	128.7	131.1	0.15
Fasting glucose (mg/dL)	137.3	144.9	<0.01*
BUN (mg/dL)	16.9	20.8	<0.01*
C-Reactive Protein (mg/dL)	5.0	4.8	0.67
Alkaline Phosphatase (IU/L)	94.3	88.0	0.41
Albumin (g/L)	3.1	3.1	0.55
Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate (mm/h)	42.4	43.4	0.55

Supplementary Table 3. Comparison of metabolic parameters in UC-MetS Patients

taking oral mesalamine with or without blood pressure medication.

BP, blood pressure medication.

Supplementary Table 4

Oral mesalamine	Without Antidiabetic Meds	With Antidiabetic Meds	P value
Body Mass Index (BMI)	28.6	33.7	<0.01*
Systolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	127.2	128.6	0.57
Diastolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	71.5	70.1	0.35
Cholesterol (mg/dL)	164.1	155.7	0.22
HDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	47.5	42.8	0.05*
LDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	92.9	89.0	0.48
Triglycerides (mg/dL)	130.1	129.7	0.59
Fasting glucose (mg/dL)	121.3	160.9	<0.01*
BUN (mg/dL)	17.2	20.5	<0.01*
C-Reactive Protein (mg/dL)	5.1	4.6	0.72
Alkaline Phosphatase (IU/L)	90.6	91.7	0.78
Albumin (g/L)	3.1	3.2	0.36
Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate (mm/h)	38.0	47.8	0.07

Supplementary Table 4. Comparison of metabolic parameters in UC-MetS Patients

taking oral mesalamine with or without antidiabetic medication.

Supplementary Table 5

Oral mesalamine	Without Cholesterol Meds	With Cholesterol Meds	P value
Body Mass Index (BMI)	30.9	31.4	0.25
Systolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	126.6	129.2	0.01*
Diastolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	71.9	69.8	<0.01*
Cholesterol (mg/dL)	163.6	156.1	0.01*
HDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	45.5	44.8	0.55
LDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	94.6	87.4	0.01*
Triglycerides (mg/dL)	126.4	133.4	0.01*
Fasting glucose (mg/dL)	137.9	144.3	<0.01*
BUN (mg/dL)	17.0	20.7	<0.01*
C-Reactive Protein (mg/dL)	5.0	4.7	0.40
Alkaline Phosphatase (IU/L)	91.1	91.2	0.83
Albumin (g/L)	3.1	3.2	0.10
Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate (mm/h)	42.1	43.7	0.24

Supplementary Table 5. Comparison of metabolic parameters in UC-MetS Patients

taking oral mesalamine with or without medication to treat high cholesterol.

Supplementary Table 6

Rectal mesalamine	Without BP Meds	With BP Meds	P value
Body Mass Index (BMI)	25.9	29.2	0.04*
Systolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	132.4	144.0	<0.01*
Diastolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	74.9	76.8	0.30
Cholesterol (mg/dL)	136.9	136.7	0.98
HDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	46.1	41.6	0.35
LDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	76.4	82.3	0.47
Triglycerides (mg/dL)	70.6	102.8	0.07
Fasting glucose (mg/dL)	153.5	169.8	0.01*
BUN (mg/dL)	19.8	23.7	<0.01*
C-Reactive Protein (mg/dL)	10.0	10.6	0.69
Alkaline Phosphatase (IU/L)	144.5	128.3	0.52
Albumin (g/L)	2.8	2.5	0.09
Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate (mm/h)	22.3	35.5	0.13

Supplementary Table 6. Comparison of metabolic parameters in UC-MetS Patients

taking rectal mesalamine with or without blood pressure medication.

BP, blood pressure medication.

Supplementary Table 7

Rectal mesalamine	Without Antidiabetic Meds	With Antidiabetic Meds	P value
Body Mass Index (BMI)	24.2	30.8	0.22
Systolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	134.2	142.2	0.37
Diastolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	77.1	74.6	0.64
Cholesterol (mg/dL)	160.4	113.3	0.17
HDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	47.0	40.6	0.65
LDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	108.5	50.1	0.11
Triglycerides (mg/dL)	108.9	64.4	0.60
Fasting glucose (mg/dL)	123.6	199.6	<0.01*
BUN (mg/dL)	15.7	27.8	<0.01*
C-Reactive Protein (mg/dL)	8.0	12.6	0.20
Alkaline Phosphatase (IU/L)	97.0	175.7	0.02*
Albumin (g/L)	2.9	2.4	0.27
Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate (mm/h)	26.8	31.0	0.61

Supplementary Table 7. Comparison of metabolic parameters in UC-MetS Patients

taking rectal mesalamine with or without antidiabetic medication.

Supplementary Table 8

Rectal mesalamine	Without Cholesterol Meds	With Cholesterol Meds	P value
Body Mass Index (BMI)	26.3	28.8	0.23
Systolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	136.7	139.7	0.43
Diastolic Blood pressure (mmHg)	76.8	74.9	0.41
Cholesterol (mg/dL)	136.4	137.2	0.94
HDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	46.1	41.6	0.37
LDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	76.5	82.2	0.50
Triglycerides (mg/dL)	82.3	91.1	0.67
Fasting glucose (mg/dL)	160.4	162.8	0.68
BUN (mg/dL)	20.4	23.1	0.05*
C-Reactive Protein (mg/dL)	11.2	9.4	0.37
Alkaline Phosphatase (IU/L)	117.6	155.2	0.03*
Albumin (g/L)	2.7	2.6	0.61
Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate (mm/h)	32.6	25.2	0.31

Supplementary Table 8. Comparison of metabolic parameters in UC-MetS Patients

taking rectal mesalamine with or without medication to treat high cholesterol.

REFERENCES

1. Zhang J, Wu H, Wang R. Metabolic syndrome and esophageal cancer risk: a systematic review and metaanalysis. *Diabetol Metab Syndr* 2021;13:8.
2. Tune JD, Goodwill AG, Sassoon DJ, et al. Cardiovascular consequences of metabolic syndrome. *Transl Res* 2017;183:57-70.
3. Mariani M, Sassano M, Boccia S. Metabolic syndrome and gastric cancer risk: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Cancer Prev* 2021;30:239-250.
4. Kwon HM, Kim BJ, Lee SH, et al. Metabolic syndrome as an independent risk factor of silent brain infarction in healthy people. *Stroke* 2006;37:466-70.
5. Han AL. Association of Cardiovascular Risk Factors and Metabolic Syndrome with non-alcoholic and alcoholic fatty liver disease: a retrospective analysis. *BMC Endocr Disord* 2021;21:91.
6. Gonzalez-Chavez A, Chavez-Fernandez JA, Elizondo-Argueta S, et al. Metabolic Syndrome and Cardiovascular Disease: A Health Challenge. *Arch Med Res* 2018;49:516-521.
7. Dong S, Wang Z, Shen K, et al. Metabolic Syndrome and Breast Cancer: Prevalence, Treatment Response, and Prognosis. *Front Oncol* 2021;11:629666.
8. DeBoer MD, Filipp SL, Sims M, et al. Risk of Ischemic Stroke Increases Over the Spectrum of Metabolic Syndrome Severity. *Stroke* 2020;51:2548-2552.
9. Chen H, Zheng X, Zong X, et al. Metabolic syndrome, metabolic comorbid conditions and risk of early-onset colorectal cancer. *Gut* 2021;70:1147-1154.
10. Chaayasit K, Wiwanitkit V. Underlying metabolic syndrome, cancer and brain infarction: the story line. *Diabetes Metab Syndr* 2012;6:214.
11. Sherling DH, Perumareddi P, Hennekens CH. Metabolic Syndrome. *J Cardiovasc Pharmacol Ther* 2017;22:365-367.
12. Katsiki N, Perez-Martinez P, Anagnostis P, et al. Is Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Indeed the Hepatic Manifestation of Metabolic Syndrome? *Curr Vasc Pharmacol* 2018;16:219-227.
13. Yki-Jarvinen H. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease as a cause and a consequence of metabolic syndrome. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2014;2:901-10.
14. Rinaldi L, Pafundi PC, Galiero R, et al. Mechanisms of Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease in the Metabolic Syndrome. A Narrative Review. *Antioxidants (Basel)* 2021;10.
15. Lim S, Kim JW, Targher G. Links between metabolic syndrome and metabolic dysfunction-associated fatty liver disease. *Trends Endocrinol Metab* 2021.
16. Cho HJ, Hwang S, Park JI, et al. Improvement of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Reduces the Risk of Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *Gut Liver* 2019;13:440-449.
17. Heo NY. Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Is a Stepping Stone in the Path toward Diabetes Mellitus. *Gut Liver* 2019;13:383-384.
18. Fujii H, Kawada N, Japan Study Group Of Nafld J-N. The Role of Insulin Resistance and Diabetes in Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Int J Mol Sci* 2020;21.
19. Cohen DE, Fisher EA. Lipoprotein metabolism, dyslipidemia, and nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Semin Liver Dis* 2013;33:380-8.
20. Amor AJ, Perea V. Dyslipidemia in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Curr Opin Endocrinol Diabetes Obes* 2019;26:103-108.
21. Moore JX, Chaudhary N, Akinyemiju T. Metabolic Syndrome Prevalence by Race/Ethnicity and Sex in the United States, National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 1988-2012. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2017;14:E24.
22. Hirode G, Wong RJ. Trends in the Prevalence of Metabolic Syndrome in the United States, 2011-2016. *JAMA* 2020;323:2526-2528.
23. Saklayen MG. The Global Epidemic of the Metabolic Syndrome. *Curr Hypertens Rep* 2018;20:12.

24. Cani PD. Targeting gut microbiota with a complex mix of dietary fibers improves metabolic diseases. *Kidney Int* 2019;95:14-16.
25. Jiang W, Wu N, Wang X, et al. Dysbiosis gut microbiota associated with inflammation and impaired mucosal immune function in intestine of humans with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *Sci Rep* 2015;5:8096.
26. Gao R, Zhu C, Li H, et al. Dysbiosis Signatures of Gut Microbiota Along the Sequence from Healthy, Young Patients to Those with Overweight and Obesity. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2018;26:351-361.
27. Henao-Mejia J, Elinav E, Jin C, et al. Inflammasome-mediated dysbiosis regulates progression of NAFLD and obesity. *Nature* 2012;482:179-85.
28. Tilg H, Adolph TE. Influence of the human intestinal microbiome on obesity and metabolic dysfunction. *Curr Opin Pediatr* 2015;27:496-501.
29. Bleau C, Karelis AD, St-Pierre DH, et al. Crosstalk between intestinal microbiota, adipose tissue and skeletal muscle as an early event in systemic low-grade inflammation and the development of obesity and diabetes. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev* 2015;31:545-61.
30. Jouet P, Coffin B, Sabate JM. Small intestinal bacterial overgrowth in patients with morbid obesity. *Dig Dis Sci* 2011;56:615; author reply 615-6.
31. Stahel P, Xiao C, Nahmias A, et al. Role of the Gut in Diabetic Dyslipidemia. *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne)* 2020;11:116.
32. Rubino F, Forgione A, Cummings DE, et al. The mechanism of diabetes control after gastrointestinal bypass surgery reveals a role of the proximal small intestine in the pathophysiology of type 2 diabetes. *Ann Surg* 2006;244:741-9.
33. Tomkin GH. The intestine as a regulator of cholesterol homeostasis in diabetes. *Atheroscler Suppl* 2008;9:27-32.
34. Zhao M, Liao D, Zhao J. Diabetes-induced mechanophysiological changes in the small intestine and colon. *World J Diabetes* 2017;8:249-269.
35. Nascimento JC, Matheus VA, Oliveira RB, et al. High-Fat Diet Induces Disruption of the Tight Junction-Mediated Paracellular Barrier in the Proximal Small Intestine Before the Onset of Type 2 Diabetes and Endotoxemia. *Dig Dis Sci* 2020.
36. Ridaura VK, Faith JJ, Rey FE, et al. Gut microbiota from twins discordant for obesity modulate metabolism in mice. *Science* 2013;341:1241214.
37. Cani PD, Amar J, Iglesias MA, et al. Metabolic endotoxemia initiates obesity and insulin resistance. *Diabetes* 2007;56:1761-72.
38. Fayfman M, Flint K, Srinivasan S. Obesity, Motility, Diet, and Intestinal Microbiota-Connecting the Dots. *Curr Gastroenterol Rep* 2019;21:15.
39. Cariou B, Zair Y, Staels B, et al. Effects of the new dual PPAR alpha/delta agonist GFT505 on lipid and glucose homeostasis in abdominally obese patients with combined dyslipidemia or impaired glucose metabolism. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:2008-14.
40. Patel H, Giri P, Patel P, et al. Preclinical evaluation of saroglitazar magnesium, a dual PPAR-alpha/gamma agonist for treatment of dyslipidemia and metabolic disorders. *Xenobiotica* 2018;48:1268-1277.
41. Jain N, Bhansali S, Kurpad AV, et al. Effect of a Dual PPAR alpha/gamma agonist on Insulin Sensitivity in Patients of Type 2 Diabetes with Hypertriglyceridemia- Randomized double-blind placebo-controlled trial. *Sci Rep* 2019;9:19017.
42. Rastogi A, Dunbar RL, Thacker HP, et al. Abrogation of postprandial triglyceridemia with dual PPAR alpha/gamma agonist in type 2 diabetes mellitus: a randomized, placebo-controlled study. *Acta Diabetol* 2020;57:809-818.

43. Kong AP, Yamasaki A, Ozaki R, et al. A randomized-controlled trial to investigate the effects of rivoglitazone, a novel PPAR gamma agonist on glucose-lipid control in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2011;13:806-13.
44. Goldstein BJ, Rosenstock J, Anzalone D, et al. Effect of tesaglitazar, a dual PPAR alpha/gamma agonist, on glucose and lipid abnormalities in patients with type 2 diabetes: a 12-week dose-ranging trial. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2006;22:2575-90.
45. Skrumsager BK, Nielsen KK, Muller M, et al. Ragaglitazar: the pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, and tolerability of a novel dual PPAR alpha and gamma agonist in healthy subjects and patients with type 2 diabetes. *J Clin Pharmacol* 2003;43:1244-56.
46. Chen W, Fan S, Xie X, et al. Novel PPAR pan agonist, ZBH ameliorates hyperlipidemia and insulin resistance in high fat diet induced hyperlipidemic hamster. *PLoS One* 2014;9:e96056.
47. Shiomi Y, Yamauchi T, Iwabuchi M, et al. A Novel Peroxisome Proliferator-activated Receptor (PPAR)alpha Agonist and PPARgamma Antagonist, Z-551, Ameliorates High-fat Diet-induced Obesity and Metabolic Disorders in Mice. *J Biol Chem* 2015;290:14567-81.
48. Rashid J, Alobaida A, Al-Hilal TA, et al. Repurposing rosiglitazone, a PPAR-gamma agonist and oral antidiabetic, as an inhaled formulation, for the treatment of PAH. *J Control Release* 2018;280:113-123.
49. Kumar DP, Caffrey R, Marioneaux J, et al. The PPAR alpha/gamma Agonist Saroglitazar Improves Insulin Resistance and Steatohepatitis in a Diet Induced Animal Model of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Sci Rep* 2020;10:9330.
50. Gawrieh S, Nouredin M, Loo N, et al. Saroglitazar, a PPAR-alpha/gamma Agonist, for Treatment of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: A Randomized Controlled Double-Blind Phase 2 Trial. *Hepatology* 2021.
51. Chawla A, Barak Y, Nagy L, et al. PPAR-gamma dependent and independent effects on macrophage-gene expression in lipid metabolism and inflammation. *Nat Med* 2001;7:48-52.
52. Cuzzocrea S, Mazzone E, Di Paola R, et al. The role of the peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor-alpha (PPAR-alpha) in the regulation of acute inflammation. *J Leukoc Biol* 2006;79:999-1010.
53. Murphy GJ, Holder JC. PPAR-gamma agonists: therapeutic role in diabetes, inflammation and cancer. *Trends Pharmacol Sci* 2000;21:469-74.
54. Lefebvre P, Chinetti G, Fruchart JC, et al. Sorting out the roles of PPAR alpha in energy metabolism and vascular homeostasis. *J Clin Invest* 2006;116:571-80.
55. Dubois V, Eeckhoutte J, Lefebvre P, et al. Distinct but complementary contributions of PPAR isotypes to energy homeostasis. *J Clin Invest* 2017;127:1202-1214.
56. Christofides A, Konstantinidou E, Jani C, et al. The role of peroxisome proliferator-activated receptors (PPAR) in immune responses. *Metabolism* 2021;114:154338.
57. Ju Z, Su M, Hong J, et al. Anti-inflammatory effects of an optimized PPAR-gamma agonist via NF-kappaB pathway inhibition. *Bioorg Chem* 2020;96:103611.
58. Sugawara K, Olson TS, Moskaluk CA, et al. Linkage to peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor-gamma in SAMP1/YitFc mice and in human Crohn's disease. *Gastroenterology* 2005;128:351-60.
59. Kozaiwa K, Sugawara K, Smith MF, Jr., et al. Identification of a quantitative trait locus for ileitis in a spontaneous mouse model of Crohn's disease: SAMP1/YitFc. *Gastroenterology* 2003;125:477-90.
60. Dignass A, Marteau P. Mesalamine in the treatment of active Crohn's disease. *Gastroenterology* 2005;128:245-6; author reply 246.
61. Hugot JP. PPAR and Crohn's disease: another piece of the puzzle? *Gastroenterology* 2005;128:500-3.

62. Yamamoto-Furusho JK, Penaloza-Coronel A, Sanchez-Munoz F, et al. Peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor-gamma (PPAR-gamma) expression is downregulated in patients with active ulcerative colitis. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2011;17:680-1.
63. Carr RM, Patel A, Bownik H, et al. Intestinal Inflammation Does Not Predict Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Severity in Inflammatory Bowel Disease Patients. *Dig Dis Sci* 2017;62:1354-1361.
64. Dragasevic S, Stankovic B, Kotur N, et al. Metabolic Syndrome in Inflammatory Bowel Disease: Association with Genetic Markers of Obesity and Inflammation. *Metab Syndr Relat Disord* 2020;18:31-38.
65. Nagahori M, Hyun SB, Totsuka T, et al. Prevalence of metabolic syndrome is comparable between inflammatory bowel disease patients and the general population. *J Gastroenterol* 2010;45:1008-13.
66. Kountouras J, Doulberis M, Polyzos SA, et al. Metabolic syndrome components including high abdominal obesity and sarcopenia in patients with inflammatory bowel disease. *Ann Gastroenterol* 2019;32:214.
67. Verdugo-Meza A, Ye J, Dadlani H, et al. Connecting the Dots Between Inflammatory Bowel Disease and Metabolic Syndrome: A Focus on Gut-Derived Metabolites. *Nutrients* 2020;12.
68. Michalak A, Mosinska P, Fichna J. Common links between metabolic syndrome and inflammatory bowel disease: Current overview and future perspectives. *Pharmacol Rep* 2016;68:837-46.
69. Morshedzadeh N, Rahimlou M, Shahrokh S, et al. The effects of flaxseed supplementation on metabolic syndrome parameters, insulin resistance and inflammation in ulcerative colitis patients: An open-labeled randomized controlled trial. *Phytother Res* 2021.
70. Sourianarayanan A, Garg G, Smith TH, et al. Risk factors of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in patients with inflammatory bowel disease. *J Crohns Colitis* 2013;7:e279-85.
71. Magri S, Paduano D, Chicco F, et al. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in patients with inflammatory bowel disease: Beyond the natural history. *World J Gastroenterol* 2019;25:5676-5686.
72. Murray A, Nguyen TM, Parker CE, et al. Oral 5-aminosalicylic acid for induction of remission in ulcerative colitis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2020;8:CD000543.
73. Schroeder KW, Tremaine WJ, Ilstrup DM. Coated oral 5-aminosalicylic acid therapy for mildly to moderately active ulcerative colitis. A randomized study. *N Engl J Med* 1987;317:1625-9.
74. Schreiber S, Howaldt S, Raedler A. Oral 4-aminosalicylic acid versus 5-aminosalicylic acid slow release tablets. Double blind, controlled pilot study in the maintenance treatment of Crohn's ileocolitis. *Gut* 1994;35:1081-5.
75. Ham M, Moss AC. Mesalamine in the treatment and maintenance of remission of ulcerative colitis. *Expert Rev Clin Pharmacol* 2012;5:113-23.
76. Gaggini M, Morelli M, Buzzigoli E, et al. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) and its connection with insulin resistance, dyslipidemia, atherosclerosis and coronary heart disease. *Nutrients* 2013;5:1544-60.
77. Godoy-Matos AF, Silva Junior WS, Valerio CM. NAFLD as a continuum: from obesity to metabolic syndrome and diabetes. *Diabetol Metab Syndr* 2020;12:60.
78. Targher G, Byrne CD, Tilg H. NAFLD and increased risk of cardiovascular disease: clinical associations, pathophysiological mechanisms and pharmacological implications. *Gut* 2020;69:1691-1705.
79. Alende-Castro V, Alonso-Sampedro M, Vazquez-Temprano N, et al. Factors influencing erythrocyte sedimentation rate in adults: New evidence for an old test. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2019;98:e16816.

80. Pravenec M, Kajiya T, Zidek V, et al. Effects of human C-reactive protein on pathogenesis of features of the metabolic syndrome. *Hypertension* 2011;57:731-7.
81. Devaraj S, Singh U, Jialal I. Human C-reactive protein and the metabolic syndrome. *Curr Opin Lipidol* 2009;20:182-9.
82. Ridker PM, Hennekens CH, Buring JE, et al. C-reactive protein and other markers of inflammation in the prediction of cardiovascular disease in women. *N Engl J Med* 2000;342:836-43.
83. Ridker PM, Buring JE, Cook NR, et al. C-reactive protein, the metabolic syndrome, and risk of incident cardiovascular events: an 8-year follow-up of 14 719 initially healthy American women. *Circulation* 2003;107:391-7.
84. Luck H, Tsai S, Chung J, et al. Regulation of obesity-related insulin resistance with gut anti-inflammatory agents. *Cell Metab* 2015;21:527-42.
85. Rabot S, Membrez M, Blancher F, et al. High fat diet drives obesity regardless the composition of gut microbiota in mice. *Sci Rep* 2016;6:32484.
86. Marungruang N, Fak F, Tareke E. Heat-treated high-fat diet modifies gut microbiota and metabolic markers in apoe^{-/-} mice. *Nutr Metab (Lond)* 2016;13:22.
87. Serino M, Luche E, Gres S, et al. Metabolic adaptation to a high-fat diet is associated with a change in the gut microbiota. *Gut* 2012;61:543-53.
88. Shi C, Li H, Qu X, et al. High fat diet exacerbates intestinal barrier dysfunction and changes gut microbiota in intestinal-specific ACF7 knockout mice. *Biomed Pharmacother* 2019;110:537-545.
89. Hamilton MK, Boudry G, Lemay DG, et al. Changes in intestinal barrier function and gut microbiota in high-fat diet-fed rats are dynamic and region dependent. *Am J Physiol Gastrointest Liver Physiol* 2015;308:G840-51.
90. Thevaranjan N, Puchta A, Schulz C, et al. Age-Associated Microbial Dysbiosis Promotes Intestinal Permeability, Systemic Inflammation, and Macrophage Dysfunction. *Cell Host Microbe* 2017;21:455-466 e4.
91. Chen P, Starkel P, Turner JR, et al. Dysbiosis-induced intestinal inflammation activates tumor necrosis factor receptor I and mediates alcoholic liver disease in mice. *Hepatology* 2015;61:883-94.
92. Butto LF, Haller D. Dysbiosis in intestinal inflammation: Cause or consequence. *Int J Med Microbiol* 2016;306:302-309.
93. Nagpal R, Newman TM, Wang S, et al. Obesity-Linked Gut Microbiome Dysbiosis Associated with Derangements in Gut Permeability and Intestinal Cellular Homeostasis Independent of Diet. *J Diabetes Res* 2018;2018:3462092.
94. Porras D, Nistal E, Martinez-Florez S, et al. Intestinal Microbiota Modulation in Obesity-Related Non-alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Front Physiol* 2018;9:1813.
95. Bray GA. Current status of intestinal bypass surgery in the treatment of obesity. *Diabetes* 1977;26:1072-9.
96. Debedat J, Clement K, Aron-Wisnewsky J. Gut Microbiota Dysbiosis in Human Obesity: Impact of Bariatric Surgery. *Curr Obes Rep* 2019;8:229-242.
97. Aron-Wisnewsky J, Prifti E, Belda E, et al. Major microbiota dysbiosis in severe obesity: fate after bariatric surgery. *Gut* 2019;68:70-82.
98. Sato J, Kanazawa A, Ikeda F, et al. Gut dysbiosis and detection of "live gut bacteria" in blood of Japanese patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:2343-50.
99. Rosario D, Benfeitas R, Bidkhori G, et al. Understanding the Representative Gut Microbiota Dysbiosis in Metformin-Treated Type 2 Diabetes Patients Using Genome-Scale Metabolic Modeling. *Front Physiol* 2018;9:775.

100. Noureldein M, Bitar S, Youssef N, et al. Butyrate Modulates Diabetes-Linked Gut Dysbiosis: Epigenetic and Mechanistic Modifications. *J Mol Endocrinol* 2019.
101. Lee HC, Yu SC, Lo YC, et al. A high linoleic acid diet exacerbates metabolic responses and gut microbiota dysbiosis in obese rats with diabetes mellitus. *Food Funct* 2019;10:786-798.
102. Holmes D. Gut microbiota: Antidiabetic drug treatment confounds gut dysbiosis associated with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Nat Rev Endocrinol* 2016;12:61.
103. Shen F, Zheng RD, Sun XQ, et al. Gut microbiota dysbiosis in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *Hepatobiliary Pancreat Dis Int* 2017;16:375-381.
104. Da Silva HE, Teterina A, Comelli EM, et al. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease is associated with dysbiosis independent of body mass index and insulin resistance. *Sci Rep* 2018;8:1466.
105. Chi Y, Lin Y, Lu Y, et al. Gut microbiota dysbiosis correlates with a low-dose PCB126-induced dyslipidemia and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *Sci Total Environ* 2019;653:274-282.
106. Boursier J, Mueller O, Barret M, et al. The severity of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease is associated with gut dysbiosis and shift in the metabolic function of the gut microbiota. *Hepatology* 2016;63:764-75.
107. Bertin B, Dubuquoy L, Colombel JF, et al. PPAR-gamma in ulcerative colitis: a novel target for intervention. *Curr Drug Targets* 2013;14:1501-7.
108. Rousseaux C, El-Jamal N, Fumery M, et al. The 5-aminosalicylic acid antineoplastic effect in the intestine is mediated by PPARgamma. *Carcinogenesis* 2013;34:2580-6.
109. Wang Z, Koonen D, Hofker M, et al. 5-aminosalicylic acid improves lipid profile in mice fed a high-fat cholesterol diet through its dual effects on intestinal PPARgamma and PPARalpha. *PLoS One* 2018;13:e0191485.
110. Bazzi C, Sinico RA, Petrini C, et al. Low doses of drugs able to alter intestinal mucosal permeability to food antigens (5-aminosalicylic acid and sodium cromoglycate) do not reduce proteinuria in patients with IgA nephropathy: a preliminary noncontrolled trial. *Nephron* 1992;61:192-5.
111. Di Paolo MC, Merrett MN, Crotty B, et al. 5-Aminosalicylic acid inhibits the impaired epithelial barrier function induced by gamma interferon. *Gut* 1996;38:115-9.
112. Cannon AR, Akhtar S, Hammer AM, et al. Effects of Mesalamine Treatment on Gut Barrier Integrity After Burn Injury. *J Burn Care Res* 2016;37:283-92.
113. Xu J, Chen N, Wu Z, et al. 5-Aminosalicylic Acid Alters the Gut Bacterial Microbiota in Patients With Ulcerative Colitis. *Front Microbiol* 2018;9:1274.
114. Andrews CN, Griffiths TA, Kaufman J, et al. Mesalazine (5-aminosalicylic acid) alters faecal bacterial profiles, but not mucosal proteolytic activity in diarrhoea-predominant irritable bowel syndrome. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2011;34:374-83.
115. Xue L, Huang Z, Zhou X, et al. The possible effects of mesalazine on the intestinal microbiota. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2012;36:813-4.
116. Jun X, Ning C, Yang S, et al. Alteration of Fungal Microbiota After 5-ASA Treatment in UC Patients. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2019.
117. Kaiser GC, Yan F, Polk DB. Mesalamine blocks tumor necrosis factor growth inhibition and nuclear factor kappaB activation in mouse colonocytes. *Gastroenterology* 1999;116:602-9.
118. Bantel H, Berg C, Vieth M, et al. Mesalazine inhibits activation of transcription factor NF-kappaB in inflamed mucosa of patients with ulcerative colitis. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2000;95:3452-7.
119. Qu T, Wang E, Jin B, et al. 5-Aminosalicylic acid inhibits inflammatory responses by suppressing JNK and p38 activity in murine macrophages. *Immunopharmacol Immunotoxicol* 2017;39:45-53.
120. Stolfi C, Fina D, Caruso R, et al. Cyclooxygenase-2-dependent and -independent inhibition of proliferation of colon cancer cells by 5-aminosalicylic acid. *Biochem Pharmacol* 2008;75:668-76.

121. Sharon P, Ligumsky M, Rachmilewitz D, et al. Role of prostaglandins in ulcerative colitis. Enhanced production during active disease and inhibition by sulfasalazine. *Gastroenterology* 1978;75:638-40.
122. Collier HO, Francis AA, McDonald-Gibson WJ, et al. Inhibition of prostaglandin biosynthesis by sulphasalazine and its metabolites. *Prostaglandins* 1976;11:219-25.
123. Egan LJ, Mays DC, Huntoon CJ, et al. Inhibition of interleukin-1-stimulated NF-kappaB RelA/p65 phosphorylation by mesalamine is accompanied by decreased transcriptional activity. *J Biol Chem* 1999;274:26448-53.
124. Allgayer H, Kruis W. Aminosalicylates: potential antineoplastic actions in colon cancer prevention. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2002;37:125-31.
125. Bus PJ, Nagtegaal ID, Verspaget HW, et al. Mesalazine-induced apoptosis of colorectal cancer: on the verge of a new chemopreventive era? *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 1999;13:1397-402.
126. Reinacher-Schick A, Seidensticker F, Petrasch S, et al. Mesalazine changes apoptosis and proliferation in normal mucosa of patients with sporadic polyps of the large bowel. *Endoscopy* 2000;32:245-54.
127. Olaisen M, Spigset O, Flatberg A, et al. Mucosal 5-aminosalicylic acid concentration, drug formulation and mucosal microbiome in patients with quiescent ulcerative colitis. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2019;49:1301-1313.
128. Dahl JU, Gray MJ, Bazopoulou D, et al. The anti-inflammatory drug mesalamine targets bacterial polyphosphate accumulation. *Nat Microbiol* 2017;2:16267.
129. Dai L, Tang Y, Zhou W, et al. Gut Microbiota and Related Metabolites Were Disturbed in Ulcerative Colitis and Partly Restored After Mesalamine Treatment. *Front Pharmacol* 2020;11:620724.