Battle of the Incretins: Do Tirzepatide and Semaglutide Change the Cardiovascular Game in Diabetes and Obesity?

Dr. Ashutosh Mishra
MBBS, MD (Medicine), IMS BHU
Fellowship in Diabetes (DFID), CMC Vellore
DMSc (Endocrinology), University of South Wales, UK
Consultant Endocrinologist, Panacea Hospital

A Paradigm Shift in Diabetes and Obesity Management

The treatment landscape for type 2 diabetes and obesity has undergone a remarkable transformation over the past decade, driven largely by advances in incretin-based therapeutics. Among these, GLP-1 receptor agonists such as semaglutide and the novel dual GIP/GLP-1 receptor agonist tirzepatide have emerged as potent agents not only for glucose lowering but also for weight reduction and cardiovascular risk mitigation. These pharmacologic advances represent a paradigm shift from traditional glucose-centric management toward multifaceted cardiometabolic care.

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is the leading cause of mortality in individuals with diabetes and obesity. In response, regulatory agencies have mandated cardiovascular outcome trials (CVOTs) as a requirement for approval of new glucose-lowering drugs. Semaglutide and tirzepatide have both demonstrated favorable outcomes in reducing major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE) in high-risk populations. However, direct comparative data on their cardiovascular benefit have been lacking, leaving practicing clinicians to rely on indirect and sometimes conflicting evidence to guide treatment choices.

Recent real-world data and sophisticated trial emulation studies have begun filling this critical gap by simulating head-to-head comparisons in broad patient populations approaching everyday clinical practice. This review distills this emerging evidence base, clarifies the comparative cardiovascular effects of tirzepatide and semaglutide, and synthesizes mechanistic insights that help explain their clinical profiles. By focusing on cardiovascular risk reduction, weight management, safety, and practical treatment implications, this evaluation aims to inform personalized therapy decisions and optimize outcomes for patients facing the dual burdens of diabetes and obesity.

Why Cardiovascular Benefit Matters: Beyond Glycaemic Control

Cardiovascular complications remain the primary cause of death and disability in patients with type 2 diabetes and obesity. Traditionally, glycaemic control was regarded as paramount.
However, epidemiological and clinical research has steadily demonstrated that glucose lowering alone does not fully address the heightened cardiovascular risk inherent in these populations. Consequently, cardiovascular risk reduction has become an explicit therapeutic goal in diabetes management guidelines worldwide.

GLP-1 receptor agonists initially gained prominence for their powerful glucose-lowering effects, but their cardioprotective properties have elevated their status to that of essential cardiovascular medicines. Semaglutide was among the first therapies to demonstrate significant reductions in MACE, including myocardial infarction, stroke, and cardiovascular death, in dedicated outcome trials such as the SUSTAIN-6. Tirzepatide, a newer agent acting on both GIP and GLP-1 receptors, has not only surpassed expectations in glycaemic efficacy and weight loss but has also shown promising

cardiovascular benefit in the SURPASS-CVOT trial when compared with dulaglutide, another GLP-1 agonist.

The dual focus on cardiovascular outcomes and metabolic control addresses the complex pathophysiology of diabetes and obesity-related cardiovascular disease. Weight loss, improvement in insulin sensitivity, lipid profile optimization, and anti-inflammatory effects all contribute to the cardiovascular protection offered by these agents. Understanding and quantifying the comparative cardiovascular benefits of these drugs is vital for clinicians aiming to individualize treatment—minimizing cardiovascular risk while enhancing quality of life and long-term metabolic health.

The Anatomy of Real-World Comparison: Filling the Evidence Gap

While randomized controlled trials (RCTs) remain the gold standard for evaluating drug efficacy, direct head-to-head trials between tirzepatide and semaglutide for cardiovascular outcomes are still pending. This leaves an evidence gap importantly filled in part by real-world evidence (RWE) studies and trial emulation methodologies.

Real-world data leverage large administrative databases, insurance claims, and electronic health records reflecting the heterogeneous populations encountered in clinical practice—including patients often excluded from classical RCTs due to age, comorbidities, or polypharmacy. Advanced statistical techniques such as propensity score matching and instrumental variable analysis further enhance the credibility of these analyses by simulating randomized conditions.

Emulation of landmark trials such as SUSTAIN-6 and SURPASS-CVOT within RWE platforms involves replicating trial inclusion criteria, endpoints, and follow-up times to assess how these therapies perform in routine care. Such studies enable practical comparisons—evaluating major adverse cardiovascular events, mortality, and hospitalization outcomes in real populations.

Recent analyses have found semaglutide to reduce the risk of myocardial infarction and stroke by approximately 18% compared to sitagliptin. Tirzepatide showed a trend toward similar risk reduction versus dulaglutide, with hazard ratios approximating parity when directly compared in RWE settings. These findings dovetail with trial data while expanding generalizability. However, limitations including residual confounding and incomplete clinical detail in claims data necessitate cautious interpretation, underscoring the need for ongoing direct RCT comparisons.

Reviewing Landmark Trials: SUSTAIN-6 and SURPASS-CVOT in Context

The SUSTAIN-6 trial was a pivotal cardiovascular outcome trial evaluating subcutaneous semaglutide versus placebo in patients with type 2 diabetes and established cardiovascular disease or high cardiovascular risk. The trial showed that semaglutide significantly reduced the composite primary endpoint of major adverse cardiovascular events (nonfatal myocardial infarction, nonfatal stroke, or cardiovascular death) with a hazard ratio of approximately 0.74, confirming GLP-1 receptor agonists' cardiovascular benefit.

SURPASS-CVOT evaluated tirzepatide compared to dulaglutide (a GLP-1 receptor agonist) focusing on MACE in patients with type 2 diabetes and high cardiovascular risk. Although the SURPASS trial was primarily powered for glycemic and weight outcomes, the cardiovascular analyses suggested non-inferiority but did not conclusively demonstrate superiority, with hazard ratios close to 1 for MACE outcomes.

These trials established the cardiometabolic efficacy of both drugs in their respective populations. However, variations in comparator arms, patient characteristics, and endpoint definitions complicate direct comparisons. Real-world emulation studies applying consistent criteria to broader populations

now offer complementary insights and allow evaluation of drug performance in real practice outside the clinical trial environment.

Summary of Recent Evidence: Real-World Impact of Tirzepatide and Semaglutide

New real-world studies analyzing US insurance claims data from 2018–2025 strategically compared semaglutide to sitagliptin and tirzepatide to dulaglutide using propensity score matching and rigorous controls. Cardiovascular endpoints included hospitalization for myocardial infarction, stroke, and all-cause mortality.

Key findings demonstrated:

- Semaglutide reduced combined MI and stroke risk by 18% compared to sitagliptin (hazard ratio [HR], 0.82).
- Tirzepatide showed a trend toward reduced all-cause mortality or major cardiovascular events versus dulaglutide (HR 0.87), though without statistical significance in some analyses.
- Direct comparison between tirzepatide and semaglutide revealed no significant difference in cardiovascular outcomes (HR 1.06).

Subgroup analyses suggested nuanced differences. Populations with established cardiovascular disease and obesity showed potential superiority of semaglutide for MACE reduction, whereas more heterogeneous cohorts sometimes favoured tirzepatide in metabolic parameters. Safety profiles were comparable, with gastrointestinal side effects predominant but manageable.

These studies support the inclusion of both agents as integral to cardiovascular risk management in diabetes and obesity, endorsing their use within guideline-based frameworks. They highlight the importance of individualizing therapy based on patient comorbidities, weight loss needs, tolerability, and preferences.

Mechanistic Overview: Dual vs. Selective Incretin Agonism

The distinct pharmacologic mechanisms of tirzepatide and semaglutide underpin their clinical effects. Tirzepatide, a dual glucose-dependent insulinotropic polypeptide (GIP) and GLP-1 receptor agonist, amplifies incretin signalling pathways, resulting in enhanced insulin secretion, reduced glucagon release, improved insulin sensitivity, and greater weight loss than GLP-1 agonists alone. Its broader receptor engagement may potentiate lipolysis and energy expenditure.

Semaglutide selectively stimulates GLP-1 receptors, exerting potent glucose-lowering, weight-loss, and cardiovascular effects well characterized in multiple CVOTs. It promotes satiety, delays gastric emptying, and modulates vascular and inflammatory pathways.

Despite tirzepatide's advantages in weight and HbA1c reduction, these have yet to translate unequivocally into superior cardiovascular outcomes, possibly because both drugs already achieve maximal GLP-1 mediated vascular benefit or due to differing trial designs and populations. Future head-to-head cardiovascular outcomes trials will clarify these mechanistic and clinical nuances.

Implications for Practice: Tailored Agent Selection

Clinical decision-making should leverage the robust cardiovascular protection offered by both agents while considering individual patient factors.

- For patients with high cardiovascular risk or established atherosclerotic disease, semaglutide—with its longer safety track record and consistent CV benefit—may be preferred.
- Tirzepatide may be favored when profound weight loss and glycemic lowering are priorities, such as in severe obesity or difficult glycemic control.
- Side effect profiles are similar, with nausea, vomiting, and gastrointestinal discomfort common but generally transient.
- Cost, formulation preference, and patient comorbidities guide shared decision-making.
- Both agents should be integrated within broader multifactorial cardiovascular risk reduction strategies including lipid management, blood pressure control, and lifestyle interventions.

Conclusion:

The advent of incretin-based therapies, particularly semaglutide and tirzepatide, represents a watershed moment in managing type 2 diabetes and obesity, emphasizing cardiovascular protection alongside metabolic control. Both agents have consistently demonstrated significant reductions in major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE) across diverse randomized controlled trials and have extended their impact through real-world data analyses emulating trial populations.

Real-world evidence from large U.S. insurance claims databases reinforces that semaglutide and tirzepatide provide robust cardiovascular benefit consistent with their trial findings. Semaglutide shows hazard ratios (HR) around 0.82 for myocardial infarction and stroke reduction compared to sitagliptin, while tirzepatide exhibits cardiovascular event risk profiles comparable to dulaglutide and numerically similar outcomes to semaglutide when assessed directly in routine clinical practice. These findings substantiate their effectiveness beyond the controlled trial environment, offering reassurance of broad applicability for patients often excluded from trials due to comorbidities or age.

However, nuanced differences emerge in subgroup analyses and specialized cohort studies. For patients with established cardiovascular disease and obesity, some analyses report up to a 57% MACE reduction favoring semaglutide over tirzepatide. Conversely, broader or primary prevention populations sometimes show parity or slight numeric advantages with tirzepatide, particularly attributable to its superior weight loss and glycemic control. These variations highlight the critical importance of individualized therapy selection based on patient phenotype, comorbidities, and treatment goals.

Mechanistically, tirzepatide’s dual agonism of GIP and GLP-1 receptors translates into superior metabolic outcomes, including enhanced insulin sensitivity and weight reduction, yet this has yet to conclusively translate into superior cardiovascular outcomes compared to selective GLP-1 receptor activation by semaglutide. Ongoing long-term outcome trials, including the SURMOUNT series, are poised to clarify these effects further.

From a clinical standpoint, the data empower an evidence-based, patient-cantered approach. Both agents qualify as effective cardiometabolic therapies in type 2 diabetes with elevated cardiovascular risk. Tirzepatide may be prioritized when significant weight loss is a primary objective, while semaglutide’s extensive cardiovascular outcome evidence positions it as a preferred agent for patients with established cardiovascular disease or concerns over tirzepatide-specific tolerability.

In summary, the "battle of the incretins" is less about declaring a definitive winner and more about enhancing the therapeutic arsenal available to clinicians. The emerging landscape supports clinicians confidently incorporating these agents into comprehensive, individualized care strategies that engage

both metabolic and cardiovascular pathways. This dual benefit heralds a new era in diabetes and obesity management—one focused equally on extending longevity and improving quality of life through targeted, mechanism-informed therapies.

As research matures and direct comparative trials become available, finer distinctions will inform guideline updates and optimize patient outcomes further. For now, tirzepatide and semaglutide represent potent and complementary tools in combating the intertwined epidemics of diabetes, obesity, and cardiovascular disease.

This expansion builds on the data from multiple recent high-impact studies (Nature Medicine 2025, academic.oup.com 2025, cardiology-focused reports) and integrates mechanistic and clinical insights to present a nuanced, forward-looking conclusion suitable for professional publication.

References:

- Diabetes drugs semaglutide and tirzepatide show real-world heart benefits. News-Medical.net. 2025.
- Comparison of cardiovascular outcomes in patients with diabetes treated with tirzepatide or semaglutide. Academic.oup.com. 2024.
- Tirzepatide compared with semaglutide and 10-year cardiovascular risk reduction. European Heart Journal. 2025.
- Obesity update: cardiovascular risk and therapeutic innovations related to tirzepatide and semaglutide. PMC. 2025.
- Tirzepatide linked to better cardiovascular outcomes than semaglutide in MASLD patients. Cleveland Clinic. 2025.
- Semaglutide vs Tirzepatide for weight loss in adults. ACC.org. 2024.