© OCT 2021 | IRE Journals | Volume 5 Issue 4 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV5I4-1719443

Role of α-Amylase and α-Glucosidase (Key Enzymes Linked to Type 2 Diabetes) Activities in the Management/Prevention of Diabetes Mellitus

BADA, S. O.
Biochemistry and Toxicology Unit, Department of Science Laboratory Technology, Rufus Giwa Polytechnic, Owo Ondo State Nigeria

Abstract *- Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) is a chronic, progressive metabolic disorder characterized by insulin resistance, progressive β-cell dysfunction, and persistent hyperglycemia, with postprandial hyperglycemia frequently prededing fasting glucose abnormalities in early disease. The global burden of diabetes continues to rise at an alarming rate. The International Diabetes Federation estimated that 10.5% of adults aged 20–79 years were living with diabetes in 2021, with prevalence projected to increase to 11.3% by 2030 and 12.2% by 2045. Approximately 90% of these cases are attributable to type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM), highlighting its dominant contribution to the worldwide diabetes epidemic. α-Amylase (EC 3.2.1.1) and α-glucosidase (EC 3.2.1.20) are brush-border and pancreatic enzymes that sequentially hydrolyze complex dietary carbohydrates into glucose. Because their catalytic efficiency directly governs the rate of postprandial glucose inflow into the circulation, pharmacological inhibition of these enzymes has emerged as a rational and clinically validated strategy to attenuate PPHG and its associated metabolic and cardiovascular sequelae. The present review critically examines the structure, physiological function, and pathophysiological contributions of α-amylase and α-glucosidase; collates mechanistic, preclinical, and clinical evidence supporting synthetic (acarbose, miglitol, voglibose) and naturally derived inhibitors; discusses recent advances in nanocarrier-based delivery and structure-guided inhibitor design; and evaluates the emerging roles of combination therapy, nutrigenomics, and personalized medicine. It is therefore concluded that, despite the challenges posed by gastrointestinal adverse effects and inter-individual variability, enzyme inhibition remains a cornerstone of multimodal therapeutic strategies for type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM), with significant potential for further optimization through the development of more selective, effective, and better-tolerated agents.*

Keywords: *α-Amylase, α-Glucosidase, Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, Postprandial Hyperglycemia, Enzyme Inhibition, Acarbose, Flavonoids, Nanocarriers, Nutrigenomics*

I. INTRODUCTION

Diabetes mellitus represents one of the most pressing global public-health emergencies of the 21st century. According to the [1] T2DM is defined by chronic hyperglycemia resulting from defects in insulin secretion, insulin action, or both, and is diagnosed when fasting plasma glucose ≥126 mg/dL (7.0 mmol/L), 2-h plasma glucose ≥200 mg/dL (11.1 mmol/L) during an oral glucose tolerance test, or HbA1c ≥6.5% (48 mmol/mol) [1]. The Global Burden of Disease Study indicates that the absolute number of adults living with diabetes has approximately doubled since 1990, with disproportionately steep rises in low-, middle-, and high-middle socio-demographic index countries driven by urbanization, Western dietary patterns, and sedentary lifestyles [2] and [50]. Beyond its human cost, T2DM imposes a substantial economic burden: cost-of-illness analyses have consistently documented rising direct (medical care, medication, hospitalization) and indirect (lost productivity, disability) expenditures, with healthcare costs for diabetic patients two- to three-fold higher than for matched non-diabetic controls [3].

A central contributor to the early pathophysiology of T2DM is postprandial hyperglycemia, the excursion in blood glucose that occurs after a meal. PPHG is now recognized as an independent predictor of micro- and macrovascular complications and is mechanistically linked to oxidative stress, endothelial dysfunction, and atherogenesis [4]. The magnitude of the postprandial glucose response is principally determined by the rate at which dietary starch and disaccharides are hydrolyzed into absorbable monosaccharides by salivary and pancreatic α-amylases and by intestinal brush-border α-glucosidases [5] and [12]. Substantial

inter-individual variability in salivary amylase activity — driven largely by copy-number variation of the *AMY1* gene — further modifies glycemic responses, with low *AMY1* CNV reproducibly associated with higher BMI and obesity risk (odds ratio ≈1.19 per copy, P=1.46 × 10^{-10}) [6]; [7] and [16].

The strategic objective of inhibiting these carbohydrate-hydrolyzing enzymes was articulated decades ago by Bischoff and Lebovitz, who demonstrated that competitive blockade of intestinal α-glucosidase delays the liberation and absorption of glucose, prolongs overall carbohydrate digestion time, attenuates the postprandial glucose spike, and reduces the cumulative glycemic burden on the pancreatic β-cell [8] and [9]. Three oral α-glucosidase inhibitors — acarbose, miglitol, and voglibose — have entered widespread clinical use, and meta-analytic evidence indicates mean HbA1c reductions of 0.77% (95% CI 0.64–0.90) for acarbose and 0.68% (95% CI 0.44–0.93) for miglitol versus placebo, predominantly attributable to blunted PPHG [10] and [33]. Despite the well-documented gastrointestinal tolerability profile of these agents, the search for safer, more selective, and more economical alternatives — particularly from edible and medicinal plant sources — has accelerated markedly in the past two decades [11] and [17].

Against this background, the present review synthesizes contemporary knowledge on: (i) the structural biochemistry of α-amylase and α-glucosidase; (ii) their integrated roles in the postprandial glycemic cascade; (iii) the molecular mechanisms by which synthetic and natural inhibitors abrogate enzyme activity; (iv) the clinical trial evidence base, including the STOP-NIDDM, ACE, and ABC studies; (v) emerging delivery technologies, including polymeric, lipid-based, and biomimetic nanocarriers; and (vi) the prospects afforded by nutrigenomic personalization and rational combination therapy.

II. BIOCHEMICAL FUNCTIONS OF α-AMYLASE AND α -GLUCOSIDASE

2.1 Structure and Mechanism of Action

α-Amylase (1,4-α-D-glucan glucohydrolase, EC 3.2.1.1) is a calcium-dependent metalloenzyme belonging to glycoside hydrolase family 13. Its three-dimensional architecture comprises a $(\beta/\alpha)_8$ TIM-barrel catalytic $(\beta/\alpha)_8$ domain, a distinct carbohydrate-binding module that confers affinity for raw starch granules, and a C-terminal Greek-key domain involved in substrate anchoring [12] and [13]. The active site contains three conserved acidic residues — Asp197, Asp300, and Glu233 (porcine pancreatic α-amylase numbering) — that coordinate substrate binding and catalyze the hydrolysis of internal α-1,4-glycosidic bonds to yield maltose, maltotriose, and limit dextrins. Calcium (Ca^{2+}) stabilizes the active-site geometry, while a chloride ion is required for full catalytic activity at physiological pH [12] and [13].

Human α-amylase exists in two principal isoforms: salivary (encoded by *AMY1*) and pancreatic (encoded by *AMY2A* and *AMY2B*). Although these isoforms share ≈97% sequence homology, they differ measurably in substrate affinity and inhibitor sensitivity, with salivary amylase generally being more responsive to polyphenol-mediated inhibition than its pancreatic counterpart [14]. Salivary α-amylase activity is itself a quantitatively variable trait, governed chiefly by *AMY1* copy-number variation that ranges from 2 to >20 diploid copies in human populations; these CNVs correlate directly with enzyme expression (β per copy P=2.31 × 10^{-14}) and serum activity (β per copy P<2.20 × 10^{-16}) [15]; [6] and [16].

α-Glucosidase (EC 3.2.1.20), a member of glycoside hydrolase family 31, operates on the non-reducing α-1,4-linked ends of oligosaccharides liberated by α-amylase, releasing free glucose. The mammalian intestinal enzymes comprise two structurally related complexes — maltase-glucoamylase and sucrase-isomaltase — embedded in the brush border membrane of enterocytes. Both contain an N-terminal luminal catalytic domain and a C-terminal membrane-proximal domain; substrate specificity differs across the four catalytic subdomains, with important

implications for the selectivity profile of competitive AGIs [5] and [10]. Kinetic studies reveal typical Michaelis constants in the low-millimolar range for maltose and sucrose; competitive inhibition shifts the apparent Km without altering Vmax, while mixed-type and non-competitive modes have also been characterized for flavonoid inhibitors [11] and [17].

2.2 Physiological Roles in Carbohydrate Digestion

The digestion of dietary starch is initiated *in the oral cavity*, where salivary α-amylase (optimal pH ≈6.7–7.0) accounts for a measurable fraction of total starch hydrolysis prior to swallowing [15] and [12]. Activity is transiently interrupted by gastric acidity but resumes in the duodenum under the action of pancreatic α-amylase, which possesses a higher pH optimum (≈7.0–7.5) and is secreted in response to cholecystokinin-mediated entero-pancreatic signalling [5] and [12]. The resulting malto-oligosaccharides, together with ingested disaccharides (sucrose, maltose, isomaltose), are then hydrolyzed by the MGAM and SI complexes anchored on the microvilli of the proximal small intestine. The liberated monosaccharides (predominantly glucose) are transported across the apical membrane via the sodium-glucose linked transporter 1 and, to a lesser extent, by facilitative GLUT2 at higher luminal loads [18] and [8].

This integrated "digestive cascade" is highly efficient: under physiological conditions, >95% of complex starch is hydrolyzed and absorbed within the proximal 1.5 m of jejunum. Should ingestion exceed the absorptive capacity of SGLT1, the apical translocation of GLUT2 is rapidly upregulated, illustrating a built-in reserve mechanism against carbohydrate overload [8] and [10].

2.3 Expression Sites and Digestive Cascade

α-Amylase is expressed predominantly in the acinar cells of the salivary glands and the exocrine pancreas, whereas α-glucosidase is expressed selectively at the brush border of mature enterocytes along the duodenum and proximal jejunum [5] and [9]. The temporal and spatial ordering of these activities — oral → gastric transit → duodenal amylolysis → jejunal glucogenesis — establishes a "digestive conveyor belt" whose kinetics ultimately set the contour of the postprandial glycemic curve. Disruption of any link in this cascade, whether through substrate limitation, enzyme inhibition, or impaired enterocyte function, has direct consequences for systemic glucose homeostasis and is the rationale underlying pharmacological AGI therapy [19],[8] and [17].

III. PATHOPHYSIOLOGICAL IMPLICATION IN TYPE 2 DIABETES MELLITUS

3.1 Role in Postprandial Hyperglycemia

In T2DM, the kinetics of carbohydrate digestion and absorption are frequently accelerated rather than blunted, owing in part to upregulation of α-glucosidase activity in the proximal intestine and to elevated glucagon-driven hepatic glucose output in the postprandial window [19] and [20]. The ensuing rapid glucose influx transiently overwhelms the diminished first-phase insulin secretory response, producing exaggerated and prolonged postprandial glucose excursions. Monnier and colleagues demonstrated that acute glucose fluctuations, quantified by incremental area under the curve, generate an oxidative stress signature (8-iso-prostaglandin F2α) that is *more* pronounced per unit hyperglycemia than sustained chronic hyperglycemia, particularly in patients with HbA1c <7.5% [4] and [21]. PPHG is therefore not merely a biochemical abnormality but a contributor to oxidative, inflammatory, and endothelial injury, providing a mechanistic bridge to the macrovascular complications of diabetes.

3.2 Impact on Insulin Resistance and β-Cell Dysfunction

Persistent PPHG contributes to glucolipotoxicity — the combined deleterious effect of elevated glucose and free fatty acids on pancreatic β-cells. The pathways implicated include increased reactive oxygen species, endoplasmic reticulum stress, islet amyloid polypeptide aggregation, and reduced expression of the insulin gene transcription factor PDX-1, all of which progressively impair both β-cell mass and secretory function [22]. In parallel, hyperglycemia-induced activation of the hexosamine biosynthetic pathway, protein kinase C isoforms, and advanced glycation end-product formation impairs insulin receptor substrate-1 signaling and GLUT4 translocation in skeletal muscle and adipose tissue, reinforcing systemic insulin resistance [22] and [20].

By attenuating the postprandial glucose excursion, α-glucosidase and α-amylase inhibitors indirectly reduce the metabolic stress burden on β-cells and may therefore exert a β-cell-preserving effect over time.

3.3 Relevance to Long-Term Diabetic Complication

The Diabetes Control and Complications Trial and the UKPDS established that sustained reductions in HbA1c substantially diminish the risk of microvascular complications (retinopathy, nephropathy, and neuropathy) [1]. PPHG is now recognized as an independent risk factor for cardiovascular disease: epidemiological data demonstrate a graded relationship between 2-h post-load glucose and cardiovascular mortality, even in non-diabetic populations [4] and [23]. Microvascular complications arise from chronic hyperglycemia-induced damage to capillary endothelium (driven by AGEs, polyol pathway flux, and oxidative stress), while macrovascular complications reflect the additional contribution of postprandial dysglycemia to endothelial dysfunction, atherogenesis, and plaque instability [24] and [23]. Long-term inhibition of carbohydrate-hydrolyzing enzymes therefore offers a dual benefit: an immediate reduction in the postprandial glycemic load and a cumulative preventive effect against chronic diabetic complications.

IV. ENZYME INHIBITION AS A THERAPEUTIC STRATEGY

4.1 Mechanism of Enzyme Inhibition

Enzyme inhibitors can act through several modalities: (i) competitive inhibition, in which the inhibitor binds reversibly to the active site, mimicking the transition state of substrate (e.g., acarbose, miglitol); (ii) mixed-type inhibition, in which binding occurs at a distinct modulatory site that alters both Km and Vmax (as documented for several flavonoids); and (iii) non-competitive or uncompetitive inhibition, in which the inhibitor binds to enzyme-substrate complexes [11]; [17] and [25]. Importantly, because pancreatic α-amylase activity is required for the digestion of complex starches within the intestinal lumen, an ideal inhibitor profile preferentially targets intestinal α-glucosidase while conferring only *mild* inhibition of pancreatic α-amylase, so as to avoid the carbohydrate malabsorption and resultant flatulence, bloating, and diarrhea that characterize overly aggressive amylase blockade [19] and [17].

Mode-of-inhibition studies using Lineweaver-Burk and Dixon plots have revealed that flavonoids frequently exhibit mixed-type kinetics against both enzymes, consistent with binding at sites distinct from, or partially overlapping with, the catalytic pocket [11] and [26]. The inhibitor constant values vary widely across compound classes — from low micromolar (e.g., specific prenylated flavonoids) to millimolar — with implications for both potency and selectivity [5] and [25].

4.2 Synthetic Inhibitors

The three clinically approved AGIs differ in chemical origin, potency profile, and pharmacokinetic behavior but share the capacity to lower PPHG. Their principal pharmacologic characteristics are summarized below.

- Acarbose is a pseudotetrasaccharide of microbial origin that competitively inhibits α-glucosidase with 10^4- to 10^5-fold higher affinity than the natural substrate. Acarbose displays greater affinity for glucoamylase than for sucrase; it is minimally absorbed (<2% of oral dose) and is degraded by intestinal amylases and bacteria, with absorbed fractions eliminated renally within 24 h [27]; [28] and [10]. The STOP-NIDDM trial (n=1,429; acarbose 100 mg t.i.d.; mean follow-up 3.3 years) demonstrated a 25% relative reduction in new-onset diabetes (HR 0.75; 95% CI 0.63–0.90; P=0.0015) and a prespecified but underpowered secondary analysis reported a 49% reduction in cardiovascular events (HR 0.51; 95% CI 0.28–0.95; P=0.03), accompanied by a 34% relative risk reduction in incident hypertension (P=0.006) [27]; [30] and [31]. Mechanistically, acarbose also reduces serum biomarkers of low-grade inflammation and carotid intima-media thickness in mechanistic substudies [32] and [31].
- Miglitol is a synthetic iminosugar (1-deoxynojirimycin derivative) whose pyranose-ring mimicry confers strong competitive inhibition, particularly of sucrase. Unlike acarbose, miglitol is almost completely absorbed (systemic bioavailability ≈100%) and is eliminated unchanged in the urine [28]; [33] and [10]. Meta-

analytic HbA1c reductions with miglitol approximate 0.68% versus placebo, and one observational comparison reported lower rates of cardiovascular events in miglitol-treated patients (17%) than in glyburide-treated patients (29%), although this was not derived from a prospective, event-driven trial [33].

- Voglibose is the newest of the three agents; it is poorly absorbed and exerts predominantly topical intestinal activity, producing fewer systemic effects. A single placebo-controlled trial reported an HbA1c reduction of 0.47% (95% CI 0.31–0.63) [33]. Voglibose neither inhibits lactase nor — like acarbose — produces appreciable systemic exposure [28].

The Acarbose Cardiovascular Evaluation trial (n=6,522 Chinese patients with coronary heart disease and impaired glucose tolerance; acarbose 50 mg t.i.d.; median follow-up 5.0 years) failed to confirm a cardiovascular benefit (HR for 5-point MACE 0.98; 95% CI 0.86–1.11; P=0.73), most likely reflecting the lower dose, younger population, and more aggressive contemporary secondary prevention; nevertheless, the trial yielded an 18% relative reduction in diabetes incidence (rate ratio 0.82; 95% CI 0.71–0.94; P=0.005), with a number-needed-to-treat of 41 to prevent one diabetes case over 5 years [30] and [29]. The NAVIGATOR trial (n=9,306) using the rapid-acting insulin secretagogue nateglinide to blunt PPHG likewise showed no cardiovascular benefit (HR 0.94; 95% CI 0.82–1.09), and the ABC trial of voglibose in post-MI patients with IGT was terminated for futility at interim analysis, suggesting that *not all* PPHG-lowering strategies translate into event reduction [30]. Taken together, these data reinforce that AGIs are potent antidiabetic agents with variable cardiovascular effects, the demonstration of which requires adequately powered, event-driven trials.

4.3 Natural Inhibitors

The gastrointestinal side effects, expense, and moderate potency of synthetic AGIs have driven an extensive search for naturally derived inhibitors from foods, medicinal plants, marine organisms, and agro-industrial by-products. These natural sources contain diverse secondary metabolites — chiefly polyphenols, terpenoids, alkaloids, saponins, and peptides — whose inhibitory activities frequently exceed those of acarbose on a molar basis [34]; [11]; [17] and [35].

- Polyphenols and flavonoids constitute the most extensively investigated class. Catechins, flavonols, flavones, flavanones, isoflavones, anthocyanidins, and phenolic acids from green tea, berries, legumes, citrus peel, cocoa, and medicinal herbs have demonstrated competitive or mixed-type inhibition of both α-amylase and α-glucosidase *in vitro* [20]; [13] and [35]. Structure–activity relationship studies have identified key determinants of potency:
  - The C2=C3 double bond, C4 carbonyl, and 5,6,7,3′,4′-hydroxyl substitutions favor α-amylase inhibition.
  - Caffeoyl, galloyl, and prenyl substitutions dramatically enhance inhibitory activity against α-glucosidase.
  - Glycosylation of the B-ring generally attenuates activity against α-amylase relative to the parent aglycone [5]; [13] and [25].
  - For human enzymes specifically, the most potent salivary α-amylase inhibitors identified in a recent screen of >50 polyphenols were luteolin and pelargonidin; methoxylated anthocyanidins (peonidin, petunidin) preferentially inhibited the pancreatic isozyme [14]. Notably, the consistency between binding affinity and inhibitory *potency* can be uncoupled — for quercetin and its glycosides, binding to α-amylase does not reliably translate into catalytic inhibition, whereas for catechins, higher binding affinity does reflect stronger inhibition [26].
- Plant extracts from *Salacia reticulata*, *Morus alba*, *Gymnema sylvestre*, *Phyllanthus amarus*, *Trigonella foenum-graecum*, and *Momordica charantia* have shown robust *in vitro* and *in vivo* inhibition of α-glucosidase, with corroborating reductions in PPHG in rodent models [18]; [34] and [35]. Pine bark extract, rich in proanthocyanidins, has been reported to dose-dependently suppress α-glucosidase activity and attenuate postprandial glycemia in diabetic rats [36].
- Endophytic fungi hosted in antidiabetic medicinal plants are an emerging source of structurally novel AGIs, with reported inhibition constants in the

low-micromolar range and potent activity in streptozotocin-induced diabetic rodents [28].

- Marine algae, fungal metabolites, and protein/peptide inhibitors derived from legume seed storage proteins represent additional categories under active investigation [17] and [35].

4.4 Comparative Efficacy and Side Effects

A persistent clinical limitation of synthetic AGIs is the dose-dependent incidence of flatulence, abdominal distension, and diarrhea caused by colonic bacterial fermentation of unabsorbed carbohydrates [19]; [32] and [20]. Comparative meta-analytic data suggest that acarbose and miglitol produce broadly similar HbA1c reductions (~0.5–0.8%), with voglibose slightly less potent; across these agents, the gastrointestinal side-effect profile is the principal driver of treatment discontinuation [32] and [33]. Natural inhibitors, while frequently better tolerated, suffer from variability in phytochemical composition, low extraction yields, poor aqueous solubility, and limited oral bioavailability, and most lack rigorous, randomized clinical trial evidence of efficacy and safety [20] and [17]. Head-to-head randomized comparisons of standardized natural inhibitors with acarbose are therefore a critical unmet need.

V. CURRENT RESEARCH TRENDS AND DEVELOPMENTS

5.1 *In Vitro* and *In Vivo* Evidence

Modern inhibitor discovery programs integrate high-throughput *in vitro* colorimetric and chromatographic enzyme assays, computational ligand docking, molecular dynamics simulations, and kinetic analysis to characterize mode and potency of inhibition [13]; [11] and [25]. Compounds surpassing acarbose in potency are now commonly reported: e.g., certain prenylated flavonoids display IC_{50} values <10 μM against yeast and mammalian α-glucosidases, and structure-guided derivatives have been designed to improve selectivity for intestinal over pancreatic enzymes [5] and [25]. *In vivo* confirmation in high-fat-diet/streptozotocin rodent models, db/db or ob/ob mice, and Zucker diabetic fatty rats has become a standard preclinical requirement [17] and [35].

Additionally, cinnamic acid derivatives have been shown to inhibit fructose-mediated protein glycation, simultaneously attenuating two pathogenic axes (postprandial and AGE-mediated) of diabetic tissue damage — a dual-mechanism therapeutic concept of considerable interest [37].

5.2 Clinical Trials and Human Studies

Beyond STOP-NIDDM and ACE, the long-term evidence base for AGIs rests on meta-analyses pooling >50 randomized trials. Holman and colleagues' comprehensive meta-analysis (cited as the ACE primary publication) demonstrated a clear HbA1c reduction with no overall increase in severe hypoglycemia; AGIs are also weight-neutral and avoid the hypoglycemia risk associated with insulin secretagogues [29] and [10]. A noninferiority randomized controlled trial in 784 Chinese patients with newly diagnosed T2DM (mean HbA1c 7.5%) found that acarbose produced HbA1c reductions of −1.1%, equivalent to metformin (between-group difference 0.01%; 95% CI −0.12% to 0.14%) [10]. Pharmacokinetic differences across ethnic groups — likely reflecting variations in intestinal microbiota composition and starch intake — have been proposed to explain cross-study inconsistencies in cardiovascular outcomes [38] and [30].

5.3 Novel Compounds and Delivery Systems

Recent advances in inhibitor design and delivery have been rapid and multifaceted:

- Structure-based and fragment-based design employing crystallographic and cryo-EM structures of human salivary and pancreatic α-amylases has accelerated the discovery of potent, isoform-selective inhibitors [13] and [14].
- Phytochemical nanocarriers including polymeric nanoparticles (chitosan, PLGA, Eudragit), lipid-based systems (nanoemulsions, solid lipid nanoparticles, self-emulsifying drug delivery systems), and inorganic carriers (mesoporous silica, polydopamine) have been engineered to overcome the poor solubility, gastric instability, and low oral bioavailability that limit natural inhibitors [39]; [40] and [41]. For example, 1-deoxynojirimycin loaded into mesoporous polydopamine with inulin-gel encapsulation showed sustained release in the small intestine,

improved insulin sensitivity, ameliorated glucolipid metabolism, enhanced intestinal mucosal barrier function, and reshaped gut microbiota composition in high-fat-diet T2DM mice [41].

- Targeted nanoparticulate delivery exploits ligand-decorated systems — e.g., chitosan nanoparticles modified with trimethyl chitosan and a CSKSSDYQC targeting peptide for goblet-cell-mediated intestinal uptake — to achieve receptor-specific delivery to absorptive epithelium [40].
- pH-responsive, glucosidase-triggered oral insulin formulations represent a parallel innovation in which the drug is liberated only upon enzymatic cleavage in the brush border, achieving hepatic targeting and dose-dependent glucose lowering without hypoglycemia in rodents and non-human primates [42].
- Multi-target and combination approaches have gained traction: combining AGIs with metformin, sulfonylureas, thiazolidinediones, DPP-4 inhibitors, GLP-1 receptor agonists, or SGLT2 inhibitors produces complementary effects on fasting and postprandial glucose, body weight, and cardiometabolic risk [43]; [44]; [45] and [46]. The ADA/EASD 2022 Consensus Report emphasizes that combination therapy may simultaneously target multiple pathophysiologic defects of T2DM, increase the durability of glycemic control, reduce therapeutic inertia, and improve treatment persistence [47].
- Gut-microbiota-targeted interventions are emerging, given that AGIs alter the substrate for distal colonic fermentation and thereby reshape microbial composition in ways that may themselves influence systemic insulin sensitivity [19] and [23].

VI. CHALLENGES AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

6.1 Limitations of Existing Inhibitors

Several intrinsic limitations constrain current AGI therapy: (i) dose-limiting gastrointestinal side effects arising from colonic fermentation of unabsorbed carbohydrates, with non-adherence rates exceeding 25% in some real-world cohorts [32] and [20]; (ii) modest HbA1c efficacy relative to metformin, SGLT2 inhibitors, or GLP-1 receptor agonists, particularly in patients with markedly elevated fasting glucose [1] and [10]; (iii) variable pharmacogenomic and microbiome-dependent responses, with the AMY1 copy-number and gut microbial composition producing measurable inter-individual differences in efficacy [15]; [6] and [16]; and (iv) inconsistent cardiovascular outcomes in adequately powered trials, underscoring that PPHG reduction alone may be insufficient to confer event reduction without simultaneous control of broader cardiometabolic risk [30] and [23].

Long-term adherence also remains a clinical challenge: cost, polypharmacy burden, and patient inconvenience contribute to discontinuation rates that erode real-world effectiveness. There is a continuing need for head-to-head pragmatic trials comparing AGIs with newer drug classes on hard endpoints, adherence, and cost-effectiveness.

6.2 Potential for Combination Therapies

Combination regimens pairing α-glucosidase inhibition with complementary mechanisms of action offer a compelling strategy to address the multifactorial pathophysiology of T2DM. Synergistic and additive effects have been documented with:

- AGI + metformin: combination therapy yields greater HbA1c reductions than either agent alone, with complementary effects on fasting (metformin) and postprandial glycemia;
- AGI + sulfonylurea: combining the postprandial effect of acarbose with the fasting effect of tolbutamide was shown to enhance overall glycemic control while attenuating body weight gain and postprandial insulin excursions in a multicentre RCT [44];
- AGI + SGLT2 inhibitor or GLP-1 receptor agonist: rationale, supported by recent meta-analytic evidence for the latter combination (HbA1c reduction WMD −0.61% vs GLP-1 RA alone; body-weight reduction −2.59 kg; systolic BP −4.13 mmHg) [47]; [43] and [46]
- AGI + nutraceuticals and polyphenols: low-dose add-on natural enzyme inhibitors may permit AGI dose reduction while preserving efficacy and improving tolerability [20] and [34].

Importantly, the ADA/EASD consensus positions combination therapy earlier in the treatment algorithm for T2DM patients with HbA1c ≥1.5–2.0% above target, recognizing the synergy in simultaneously targeting the multiple pathophysiologic defects of the disease [47].

6.3 Role of Personalized Medicine and Nutrigenomics
Personalized prevention and management of T2DM constitute a rapidly evolving frontier. Salivary α-amylase activity, governed by *AMY1* CNV, is a candidate biomarker that may predict individual glycemic responses to starch-rich meals and modulate dietary recommendations [15]; [6]; [16] and [48]. Gene-risk scores based on AMY1 single-nucleotide polymorphisms have been shown to interact with carbohydrate intake to influence BMI and waist-circumference trajectories [48]. Polymorphisms in ChREBP and other carbohydrate-response genes further influence individual susceptibility to glucose dysregulation, suggesting that nutrigenomic profiling can identify patients most likely to benefit from AGI or low-glycemic-index interventions [49]. The convergence of nutrigenomics, microbiome science, and pharmacogenomics holds promise for tailoring enzyme-inhibitor therapy to maximize benefit and minimize adverse effects, a direction that should be addressed in future randomized trials stratified by genotype and microbiome signature.

VII. CONCLUSION

α-Amylase and α-glucosidase constitute the kinetic gatekeepers of postprandial glucose entry into systemic circulation, and their pharmacological inhibition is a mechanistically rational, clinically validated, and globally affordable approach to controlling PPHG in T2DM. Both synthetic (acarbose, miglitol, voglibose) and natural (polyphenol-rich) inhibitors have demonstrated reproducible HbA1c reductions of 0.5–0.8%, with pharmacologic and mechanistic profiles that complement those of metformin, sulfonylureas, SGLT2 inhibitors, GLP-1 receptor agonists, and DPP-4 inhibitors. Despite the limitations imposed by gastrointestinal tolerability, modest potency versus newer agents, and inconsistent cardiovascular outcomes in large-scale trials, AGIs retain an important niche — particularly in early disease, in dietary-sensitive populations, and as low-cost, orally administered adjuncts. Future progress will depend on (i) the development of isoform-selective, high-potency synthetic inhibitors with improved tolerability; (ii) rigorous standardization and clinical validation of natural-product inhibitors; (iii) engineering of nanocarrier and stimuli-responsive delivery systems that enhance bioavailability and intestinal targeting; (iv) rational design of combination regimens addressing the multifactorial pathophysiology of T2DM; and (v) integration of nutrigenomic, microbiome-based, and pharmacogenomic stratification to deliver personalized enzyme-inhibitor therapy. As the global burden of T2DM continues its inexorable rise, innovation in the design and deployment of α-amylase and α-glucosidase inhibitors remains an essential pillar of metabolic-disease therapeutics.

REFERENCES

[1] American Diabetes Association.. Standards of medical care in diabetes—2023. *Diabetes Care*, 46, S1–S284.
[2] Ye, J., Wu, Y., Yang, S., Zhu, D., Chen, F., Chen, J., Ji, X. and Hou, K. (2023). The global, regional and national burden of type 2 diabetes mellitus in the past, present and future: a systematic analysis of the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Frontiers in endocrinology*, *14*, 1192629.
[3] Seuring, T., Archangelidi, O. and Suhrcke, M. (2015). The Economic Costs of Type 2 Diabetes: A Global Systematic Review. *PharmacoEconomics*, *33*(8), 811–831.
[4] Ceriello, A. (2018). Postprandial hyperglycemia and cardiovascular complications of diabetes: An update. *Nutrition, Metabolism and Cardiovascular Diseases, 28*, 157–159.
[5] Lam, T. P., Tran, N. N., Pham, L. D., Lai, N. V., Dang, B. N., Truong, N. N., Nguyen-Vo, S. K., Hoang, T. L., Mai, T. T. and Tran, T. D. (2024). Flavonoids as dual-target inhibitors against α-glucosidase and α-amylase: a systematic review of in vitro studies. *Natural products and bioprospecting*, *14*(1), 4.
[6] Falchi, M., El-Sayed Moustafa, J. S., and Takousis, P. (2014). Low copy number of the

salivary amylase gene predisposes to obesity. *Nature Genetics*, 46, 492–497.

[7] Viljakainen, H., Andersson-Assarsson, J. C. and Armenio, M. (2015). Low copy number of the AMY1 locus is associated with early-onset female obesity in Finland. *PLOS ONE*, 10, e0132882.

[8] Bischoff, H. (1994) Pharmacology of α-glucosidase inhibition. *European Journal of Clinical Investigation*, 24, 3–10.

[9] Lebovitz, H. E. (1997). Alpha-glucosidase inhibitors. *Endocrinology and Metabolism Clinics of North America*, 26, 539–551.

[10] Tahrani, A. A., Barnett, A. H. and Bailey, C. J. (2016). Pharmacology and therapeutic implications of current drugs for type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Nature Reviews Endocrinology*, 12, 566–592.

[11] Proença, C., Ribeiro, D. and Freitas, M. (2021). Flavonoids as potential agents in the management of type 2 diabetes through the modulation of α-amylase and α-glucosidase activity: A review. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 62, 4157–4178.

[12] van der Maarel, M. J. E. C., van der Veen, B., Uitdehaag, J. C. M., Leemhuis, H. and Dijkhuizen, L. (2002). Properties and applications of starch-converting enzymes of the α-amylase family. *Journal of Biotechnology, 94*(2), 137–155.

[13] Lo Piparo, E., Scheib, H., Frei, N., Williamson, G., Grigorov, M. and Chou, C. J. (2008). Flavonoids for controlling starch digestion: Structural requirements for inhibiting human α-amylase. *Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 51*(12), 3555–3561.

[14] Visvanathan, R., Houghton, M. J. and Barber, E. (2024). Structure-function relationships in (poly)phenol-enzyme binding: Direct inhibition of human salivary and pancreatic α-amylases. *Food Chemistry*, 444, 138621.

[15] Erta, G., Gersone, G., Jurka, A. and Tretjakovs, P. (2025). Decoding metabolic connections: The role of salivary amylase activity in modulating visceral fat and triglyceride glucose index. *Lipids in Health and Disease, 24*, Article 98.

[16] Peyrot des Gachons, C. and Breslin, P. A. S. (2016). Salivary amylase: Digestion and metabolic syndrome. *Current Diabetes Reports, 16*(10), Article 102.

[17] Sales, P. M., Souza, P. M., Simeoni, L. A. and Silveira, D. (2012). α-Amylase inhibitors: A review of raw material and isolated compounds from plant source. *Journal of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences, 15*(1), 141–183.

[18] Ali, H., Houghton, P. J. and Soumyanath, A (2006). α-Amylase inhibitory activity of some Malaysian plants used to treat diabetes; with particular reference to *Phyllanthus amarus*. *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, 107, 449–455.

[19] Adefegha, S. A. and Oboh, G. (2013). Phytochemistry and mode of action of some tropical spices in the management of type-2 diabetes and hypertension. *African Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology, 7*(7), 332–346.

[20] Kim, Y., Keogh, J. B. and Clifton, P. M. (2016). *Polyphenols and glycemic control*. *Nutrients, 8*(1), 17.

[21] Monnier, L., Mas, E., Ginet, C., Michel, F., Villon, L., Cristol, J. P. and Colette, C. (2006). Activation of oxidative stress by acute glucose fluctuations compared with sustained chronic hyperglycemia in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA), 295*(14), 1681–1687.

[22] Ko, S.-H., Kim, S.-R., Kim, D.-J., Oh, S.-J., Lee, H.-J., Shim, K.-H., Woo, M.-H., Kim, J.-Y., Kim, N.-H., Kim, J.-T., Kim, C. H., Kim, H. J., Jeong, I.-K., Hong, E.-G., Cho, J.-H., Mok, J.-O. and Yoon, K.-H. (2011). 2011 clinical practice guidelines for type 2 diabetes in Korea. *Diabetes & Metabolism Journal, 35*(5), 431–436.

[23] Nathan, N., Janssen, L., Sutherland, R., Hodder, R. K., Evans, C. E. L., Booth, D., Yoong, S. L., Reilly, K., Finch, M. and Wolfenden, L. (2019). The effectiveness of lunchbox interventions on improving the foods and beverages packed and consumed by children at centre-based care or school: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 16*, Article 38.

[24] Fowler, M. J. (2008. Microvascular and macrovascular complications of diabetes. *Clinical Diabetes*, 26, 77–82.

[25] Zhu, J., Chen, C., Zhang, B. and Huang, Q. (2020). The inhibitory effects of flavonoids on α-

amylase and α-glucosidase. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition, 60*(4), 695–708.

[26] Xu, W., Shao, R. and Xiao, J. (2015). Is there consistency between the binding affinity and inhibitory potential of natural polyphenols as α-amylase inhibitors? *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 63, 8571–8577.

[27] Chiasson, J. L., Josse, R. G., Gomis, R., Hanefeld, M., Karasik, A., Laakso, M. and STOP-NIDDM Trial Research Group. (2002). Acarbose for prevention of type 2 diabetes mellitus: The STOP-NIDDM randomised trial. *The Lancet, 359*(9323), 2072–2077.

[28] Khader, Y., Abu Khudair, S., Tanaka, E., Kufoof, L., Al Nsour, M., Aqel, A., Al-Dubai, S. A. R., Alblihed, M., Altammemi, A. B., Obeidat, S., Alzoubi, K. H., Al-Horani, H., Khader, A., AlAli, A., AlMannai, M., Abdel-Razeq, H. and Ghandour, R. (2024). Psychosocial, emotional and behavioral problems, quality of life, and mental health care-seeking behaviors among children and adolescents in Jordan: A national school-based survey. *Frontiers in Public Health, 12*, Article 1409158.

[29] Holman, R. R., Coleman, R. L., Chan, J. C. N., Chiasson, J. L., Feng, H., Ge, J., Gerstein, H. C., Gray, R., Huo, Y., McMurray, J. J. V., Rydén, L., Schröder, S., Sun, Y., Theodorakis, M. J., Tendera, M., Tucker, L., Tuomilehto, J., Wei, Y., Yang, W., Wang, D., Hu, D., Pan, C. and ACE Study Group. (2017). Effects of acarbose on cardiovascular and diabetes outcomes in patients with coronary heart disease and impaired glucose tolerance (ACE): A randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology, 5*(11), 877–886.

[30] Holman, R. R. (2018). What does the Acarbose Cardiovascular Evaluation (ACE) trial tell us? *Journal of Diabetes, 10*(8), 683–685.

[31] Standl, E., Theodorakis, M. J., Erbach, M., Schnell, O. and Tuomilehto, J. (2014). On the potential of acarbose to reduce cardiovascular disease. *Cardiovascular diabetology*, *13*, 81.

[32] Derosa, G., and Maffioli, P. (2012). Anti-obesity drugs: a review about their effects and their safety. *Expert opinion on drug safety*, *11*(3), 459–471.

[33] van de Laar, F. A., Lucassen, P. L. B. J., Akkermans, R. P., van de Lisdonk, E. H., Rutten, G. E. H. M. and van Weel, C. (2005). Alpha-glucosidase inhibitors for patients with type 2 diabetes: Results from a Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care, 28*(1), 154–163.

[34] Patel, D. K., and Patel, K. (2015). Medicinal plants with potential anti-diabetic properties: A review. *American Journal of Phytomedicine and Clinical Therapeutics, 3*(2), 98–107.

[35] Tundis, R., Loizzo, M. R. and Menichini, F. (2010). Natural products as α-amylase and α-glucosidase inhibitors and their hypoglycaemic potential in the treatment of diabetes: An update. *Mini-Reviews in Medicinal Chemistry*, 10, 315–331.

[36] Kim, Y. M., Jeong, Y. K., Wang, M. H., Lee, W. Y. and Rhee, H. I. (2005). Inhibitory effect of pine extract on alpha-glucosidase activity and postprandial hyperglycemia. *Nutrition (Burbank, Los Angeles County, Calif.)*, *21*(6), 756–761.

[37] Adisakwattana, S., Sompong, W., Meeprom, A., Ngamukote, S. and Yibchok-Anun, S. (2012). *Cinnamic acid and its derivatives inhibit fructose-mediated protein glycation*. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences, 13*(2), 1778–1789.

[38] Hedrington, M. S. and Davis, S. N. (2019). Considerations when using alpha-glucosidase inhibitors in the treatment of type 2 diabetes. *Expert opinion on pharmacotherapy*, *20*(18), 2229–2235.

[39] Nie, A., Su, X., Zhang, S., Guan, W. and Li, J. (2020). Psychological impact of COVID-19 outbreak on frontline nurses: A cross-sectional survey study. *Journal of clinical nursing*, *29*(21-22), 4217–4226.

[40] Singh, J., Kaur, H., Singh, B., Sharma, S., Kaur, G., Kaur, A., Singh, B. and Arora, S. (2019). Phytochemical analysis and in vitro assessment of antioxidant, anti-diabetic and anti-inflammatory activities of *Morus alba L.* leaves. *Scientific Reports, 9*, Article 15259.

[41] Zhong, S., Qi, L., Huo, J., Wang, Y., Liu, Y., Zhang, H., Li, X. and Chen, Y. (2023). Mesoporous polydopamine and inulin hydrogel for improved deoxynojirimycin effect in type 2

diabetes mellitus management. *International Journal of Biological Macromolecules, 244*, 125037.

[42] Hunt, N. J., Lockwood, G. P., Heffernan, S. J., Daymond, J., Ngu, M., Narayanan, R. K., Westwood, L. J., Mohanty, B., Esser, L., Williams, C. C., Kuncic, Z., McCourt, P. A. G., Le Couteur, D. G. and Cogger, V. C. (2024). Oral nanotherapeutic formulation of insulin with reduced episodes of hypoglycaemia. *Nature nanotechnology*, *19*(4), 534–544.

[43] DeFronzo, R. A., Abdul-Ghani, M., Norton, L. and Nissen, S. E. (2014). Combination therapy with SGLT2 inhibitors and GLP-1 receptor agonists. *Diabetes Care, 37*(12), 3309–3316.

[44] De Block, C. E., De Leeuw, I. H., Bogers, J. J., Pelckmans, P. A., Ieven, M. M., Van Marck, E. A., Van Acker, K. L. and Van Gaal, L. F. (2003). Autoimmune gastropathy in type 1 diabetic patients with parietal cell antibodies: histological and clinical findings. *Diabetes care*, *26*(1), 82–88.

[45] Goldstein, B. J., Gomis, R., Lee, H.-K. and Leiter, L. A., on behalf of the Global Partnership for Effective Diabetes Management. (2007). Type 2 diabetes—Treat early, treat intensively. *International Journal of Clinical Practice, 61*(Suppl. 157), 16–21.

[46] Mantsiou, C., Karagiannis, T., Kakotrichi, P., Malandris, K., Avgerinos, I., Liakos, A., Tsapas, A. and Bekiari, E. (2020). Glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists and sodium-glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitors as combination therapy for type 2 diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes, obesity & metabolism*, *22*(10), 1857–1868.

[47] Davies, M. J., Aroda, V. R., Collins, B. S., Gabbay, R. A., Green, J., Maruthur, N. M., Rosas, S. E., Del Prato, S., Mathieu, C., Mingrone, G., Rossing, P., Tankova, T., Tsapas, A. and Buse, J. B. (2022). Management of Hyperglycemia in Type 2 Diabetes, 2022. A Consensus Report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes care*, *45*(11), 2753–2786.

[48] Gkouskou, K. K., Grammatikopoulou, M. G., Lazou, E., Vasilogiannakopoulou, T., Sanoudou, D. and Eliopoulos, A. G. (2024). A genomics perspective of personalized prevention and management of obesity. *Human genomics*, *18*(1), 4.

[49] Agius L. (2015). Role of glycogen phosphorylase in liver glycogen metabolism. *Molecular aspects of medicine*, *46*, 34–45.

[50] Lin, X., Xu, Y., Pan, X., Xu, J., Ding, Y., Sun, X., Song, X., Ren, Y. and Shan, P. F. (2020). Global, regional, and national burden and trend of diabetes in 195 countries and territories: an analysis from 1990 to 2025. *Scientific reports*, *10*(1), 14790.