

Fig. 1




Fig. 2

PH9H5 VH (SEQ ID NO:129)

EVQLLESGGGLVQPGGSLRLSCAASGFTFSSYAMSWVRQAPGKGLEWVSAISGSGGSTYADSV
KGRFTISRDN SKNTLYLQMNSLR AEDTAVYYCAKYDGIYGE LDFWGQGT LVTVSS

PH9L3 VL (SEQ ID NO:128)

EIVLTQSPATLSLSPGERATLSCRASQSVSSYLAWYQQKPGQAPRLLIYDASNRATGIPARFSG
SGSGTDFTLTISSLEPEDFAVYYCQQRRSNWPLTFGQGTKVEIK

Fig. 3




Fig. 4





Fig. 5


Food Intake in DIO mice post Compound1



TWO-way RM ANOVA, Tukey's
* $p < 0.05$ Vehicle vs. all groups
$p < 0.05$ Vehicle vs Compound1
1.0, 3.0, and 7.5nmol/kg

Fig. 6

BW change in DIO mice post Compound1



TWO-way RM ANOVA, Tukey's


* $p < 0.05$ Vehicle vs. all groups

$p < 0.05$ Vehicle vs. Compound1 1.0, 3.0, 7.5 nmol/kg and Dulaglutide

& $p < 0.05$ Vehicle vs. all Compound1 groups

Fig. 7

Food Intake in DIO mice post Compound1



$n=8$ all groups except
 $n=7$ for Compound1 3.0 nmol/kg
 and Dulaglutide

TWO-way RM ANOVA, Tukey's

* $p < 0.05$ Vehicle vs. Compound1 3.0 nmol/kg and Dulaglutide

$p < 0.05$ Vehicle vs. Compound1 1.0 nmol/kg

& $p < 0.05$ Vehicle vs. Compound1 0.3 nmol/kg

^ $p < 0.05$ Vehicle vs. Compound1 0.1 nmol/kg

Fig. 8

BW change in DIO mice post Compound1




Fig. 9

Body Weight change in DIO mice




Fig. 10




Fig. 11A




Fig. 11B




Fig. 11C




Fig. 11D




Fig. 12A




Fig. 12B




Fig. 12C




Fig. 12D

