A Public Equity Diligence Walk on HIMS After the GLP-1 Reset, the Eucalyptus Buy, and the Peptide Catalyst: What the FY2025 10-K, Novo Settlement, and LillyDirect Routing Tell You Heading Into Q1 2026

APR 27, 2026

Table of Contents

Setup and the question that actually matters

Reading the FY2025 10-K and what it does and does not tell you

The compounded GLP-1 unwind and the regulatory pile-on

The Novo and Lilly partnerships and the front-door problem

International expansion and the Eucalyptus thesis

The peptide bet and the FDA 503A list catalyst

Capital structure, insiders, and what the converts imply

Bear case, bull case, and the binary into the next two prints

Abstract

HIMS exited 2025 with $2.35B revenue (up 59% YoY), $128M net income, $318M adj EBITDA, and 2.5M+ subscribers. FY2026 guide: $2.7B-$2.9B revenue, $300M-$375M EBITDA. The compounded semaglutide story collapsed in February 2026 when FDA, HHS, and Novo Nordisk all hit the platform within a single week. Hims pulled the $49 oral pill, Novo sued (then dismissed), the company pivoted to a Wegovy distribution role with Novo and a LillyDirect routing arrangement for Zepbound and Foundayo. Eucalyptus deal ($1.15B, ARR $450M+, 775K customers) closes mid-2026 and reshapes the international thesis. FDA's April 15, 2026 update to the 503A bulks list queues a peptide catalyst with a July 23-24 PCAC review. Capital structure includes a $1B 0% convert due 2030 with conversion at $70.67 and capped call cap at $89.95. Setup heading into the May 11, 2026 Q1 print is binary on subscriber retention through the

GLP-1 mix shift, on whether peptides become a real revenue line or a meme catalyst, and on whether Eucalyptus integration tracks. Useful diligence ordering: 10-K, Q4 letter, March Novo pivot, April LillyDirect press release, FDA warning letter, peptide list update, then sell-side skepticism.

Setup and the questi matters

The interesting thing about HIMS in April 2 are both basically correct, just on different ti shareholder letter, the FDA warning letter to Nordisk lawsuit complaint, the March 9 colls LillyDirect press release, the Eucalyptus 8-K 503A bulks list, and what falls out is a comp punched in the mouth by federal regulators a distribution-layer role on the very drugs it b still printed 59% revenue growth while guidi is not whether HIMS executed in 2025. It cle platform that printed those numbers still exi three months ago, or whether the GLP-1 rese platform into something closer to a high-CA attached.

This essay walks through the public filings and the reactive primary sources to build a defensible read on that question. It is not a recommendation. It is a diligence walk for someone who already knows what a 10-K looks like, what a 503A bulks list is, and why personalized medicine was always doing a lot of legal work in the compounded GLP-1 era.

Reading the FY2025 10-K and what it does and does not tell you

The FY2025 10-K (accession 0001773751-26-000022, filed February 23, 2026, period ending December 31, 2025) is the right starting point because it is the first comprehensive risk factors and MD&A document published after the FDA, HHS, and Novo trifecta started landing. The headline figures tell the bull story cleanly. Revenue of $2.35B, up about 59% YoY. Gross profit $1.73B, up 48%, gross margin 74% but compressed from prior year by weight loss mix. Income from operations $105.6M, up 71%. Net income $128.4M, basically flat YoY because of a tax benefit reversal. Subscribers cleared 2.5M, up 13% (the deceleration from 45% YoY at the end of 2024

is worth holding onto). And as of February 20, 2026, there were roughly 219.6M Class A shares and 8.4M Class V shares outstanding, with the second-quarter 2025 reference price implying a non-affiliate market cap of about $10.1B.

What the document does well is acknowledge the regulatory exposure in the risk factors. What it does not do is give a clean breakout of GLP-1 revenue, GLP-1 gross margin, or GLP-1 subscriber count as separate disclosures. Management has historically rolled weight loss into the broader subscriber economics, which is fine when GLP-1 is a tailwind and inconvenient when it is the central uncertainty. The MD&A language about personalized offerings carrying gross margin pressure is the closest the filing gets to telling you, in dollars, what the compounded semaglutide line was contributing. For analytical purposes, the better cross-reference is the Q3 2025 10-Q (filed November 3, 2025, period ending September 30, 2025), which contains the ZAVA acquisition footnote disclosing a EUR 90.7M purchase price for accounting and a contingent consideration earn-out of up to EUR 117.7M tied to revenue and adjusted EBITDA targets across 2025, 2026, and 2027 fiscal years. That earn-out structure tells you something about how confident management was in ZAVA's growth trajectory, and it sits on the balance sheet as a contingent liability that anyone modeling the international segment should be tracking.

The other thing the 10-K does that bears attention is reaffirm the long-term operating philosophy of vertical integration. The filing references prior 503A and 503B compounding facility acquisitions and the February 2025 California peptide manufacturing facility acquisition. That last one is the analytical bridge to the April 2026 peptide setup, because when the FDA convenes the Pharmacy Compounding Advisory Committee on July 23 and 24, 2026 to discuss whether to move BPC-157, TB-500, MOTS-c, Semax, Epitalon, KPV, DSIP, GHK-Cu (injectable), LL-37, DiHexa, PEG-MGF, and Melanotan II off the Category 2 restricted list, the company that quietly bought sterile peptide capacity a year earlier is the company that gets to monetize a favorable PCAC read. That is not in the 10-K's risk factors, exactly, but it is implicit in the capital allocation section and the longevity 2026 launch language that runs through the Q3 2025 shareholder commentary.

The compounded GLP-1 unwind and the regulatory pile-on

The compounded semaglutide collapse is one of the most aggressively timed regulatory and litigation cascades in recent telehealth memory. The sequence is worth walking through carefully because the compressed timing matters for how patient cohorts churned through the platform.

On September 9, 2025, FDA issued a warning letter to Hims and Hers Health Inc dba Hers (accession 716825-09092025). The letter specifically challenged marketing claims around the company's compounded semaglutide products, including statements that the compounded version contained the same active ingredient as Wegovy and that the formulations were clinically proven. The letter is the cleanest single primary document on what FDA actually believes Hims was doing wrong from a marketing-claims standpoint, and it was the warning shot before the February escalation.

Five months later, on February 5, 2026, Hims rolled out a $49 compounded oral semaglutide pill positioned as an alternative to Novo's newly launched oral Wegovy at a starting list price of $149. The pricing differential was provocative on purpose, and the marketing copy more or less invited the regulatory response. The next day, February 6, FDA issued a press announcement saying it would take decisive steps to restrict GLP-1 active pharmaceutical ingredients intended for use in non-FDA-approved compounded drugs. The announcement specifically named Hims. Same day, HHS General Counsel Mike Stuart posted on X that he had referred the company to the Department of Justice for investigation of potential violations of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and applicable Title 18 provisions. That is the Title 18 of criminal violations, which is a meaningful escalation from the standard FDA enforcement playbook. Hims announced the discontinuation of the compounded oral semaglutide pill on Saturday, February 7.

Three days after the Saturday discontinuation, on February 9, Novo Nordisk filed suit in the District of Delaware alleging infringement of US Patent 8,129,343 (the so-called 343 patent, covering acylated GLP-1 compounds, which is the patent claiming the molecular structure of semaglutide and methods of using semaglutide-containing compositions). The complaint cited direct, induced, and willful infringement, and referenced investor calls in which Hims management discussed GLP-1 patent cliffs as evidence of knowledge. Novo specifically pointed to Hims affiliate medical groups, partner pharmacies, instructional self-injection videos, and Hims-branded packaging as elements of the infringement chain. A few weeks later on March 3, FDA issued a separate press announcement warning thirty telehealth companies against illegal marketing of compounded GLP-1s, which functioned as a sector-wide warning shot following the named-target action against Hims.

The pivot landed on March 9 with a Hims-Novo collaboration announcement. Wegovy injections and the oral pill (when FDA approved) would be available through the Hims platform, Hims would no longer advertise compounded GLP-1 drugs on its platform or in its marketing, and Novo voluntarily dismissed the patent suit without prejudice. Existing Hims patients on compounded semaglutide would be offered the option to transition to FDA-approved medicines when clinically appropriate. The collaboration

was structured as same-price-as-other-telehealth, which is the part that creates the front-door problem. On April 1, FDA issued a separate clarification on compounder policies as the GLP-1 supply stabilized. Then on April 23, Hims announced that providers on its platform could route prescriptions for Eli Lilly's Zepbound vials, Zepbound KwikPen, and Foundayo (orforglipron, approved April 1) directly to LillyDirect's pharmacy. The arrangement is explicitly not a partnership. Hims footnotes the announcement to clarify that any licensed healthcare provider can prescribe to a LillyDirect pharmacy and that Hims is not affiliated with or endorsed by Eli Lilly and Company. That language is doing a lot of work, and it is the textual giveaway that this is a routing arrangement rather than an integration.

The compressed timing of this sequence (from a $49 pill announcement to a Novo collaboration to a Lilly routing arrangement) takes about ten weeks. In a normal capital allocation cycle this would be the kind of thing a company spends a year on. The fact that Hims executed the U-turn at this speed says either that management had the framework already mapped (the more charitable read) or that the regulatory pressure forced them into an integration shape that had not actually been fully thought through (the less charitable read). The honest answer is probably some of both.

The Novo and Lilly partnerships and the front-door problem

This is the section where the bear case really shows up. The March 9 Novo agreement and the April 23 LillyDirect announcement together collapse the structural margin profile of Hims' weight loss line. In the compounded model, Hims captured the spread between API procurement cost, in-house compounding cost, the medical group consult fee, and the direct-to-consumer subscription price. That spread was significant, and it was the reason the weight loss specialty grew the way it did through 2024 and the first half of 2025.

In the post-compounding model, Hims is basically doing two things on the GLP-1 side. First, charging a separate weight loss membership fee (currently $39 for the first month, then $149 per month after) that is essentially a care navigation and provider access subscription. Second, routing prescriptions to either Wegovy fulfillment via the Novo direct channel (priced at the same level as other telehealth platforms, which means no Hims-favored pricing) or to LillyDirect's pharmacy for Zepbound vials starting at $299, the KwikPen, or Foundayo at $149 per month. Hims earns nothing on the drug itself in either case. The membership is the entire revenue contribution from a GLP-1 subscriber, less whatever the Hims provider compensation is for the consult.

That is a fundamentally different business than a vertically integrated compounder selling a $200 per month subscription with a $30 cost basis on the API. The membership economics work if the take-rate on members is high and the churn is low. The risk is that a patient who realizes the actual prescription is being filled at LillyDirect or via Novo's channel can simply ask their PCP for the same prescription and bypass the Hims membership entirely on renewal. The argument against that is brand, convenience, and the personalization layer (dose titration, side effect management, behavioral coaching), which Hims has invested in. The argument for the bear case is that none of those moats are particularly deep when the underlying drug is fungible and the pricing is set by the manufacturer rather than the platform.

Leerink's Michael Cherny captured this well after the April 23 LillyDirect announcement when he questioned what Hims actually does that justifies the membership beyond being a front door to Lilly's products. CEO Andrew Dudum's response on the post-announcement media tour was to compare Hims to early-Netflix, which is the kind of analogy that works rhetorically but breaks down on closer inspection. Netflix's defensibility came from content licensing terms that progressively shifted toward originals, plus algorithmic recommendation lock-in, plus pricing power that was bounded by competitor SVOD offerings rather than by manufacturer pricing. Hims does not have content as a category. Its recommendation algorithm operates inside a constrained drug list. And its pricing is bounded by the LillyDirect and NovoCare list prices that already include direct-to-consumer self-pay options. The Netflix analogy works if you squint, and it stops working when you stop squinting.

The honest read is that the front-door framing is partially correct and partially uncharitable. Hims does have a real care navigation business, particularly for patients who do not have a PCP relationship or who would not otherwise initiate a GLP-1 conversation through traditional primary care. The 2.5M subscriber base is meaningful, and the cross-sell economics into other specialties (sexual health, hair loss, mental health, dermatology, hormone health) are real and proven. But the GLP-1 line specifically has been structurally repriced. Anyone modeling FY2026 should be discounting weight loss revenue contribution per subscriber meaningfully versus the FY2025 implied run-rate.

International expansion and the Eucalyptus thesis

The international story is where the bull case has actually strengthened over the past nine months, even as the GLP-1 story compressed. Two acquisitions matter here. The

first is ZAVA, announced June 3, 2025 and closed in July 2025. Per the Q3 2025 10-Q footnote, the purchase price for accounting was approximately EUR 90.7M, with a contingent earn-out of up to EUR 117.7M payable on revenue and adjusted EBITDA milestones for fiscal years 2025, 2026, and 2027. ZAVA brings 1.3M active customers, 2.3M consultations in 2024, and existing operations in the UK, Germany, France, and Ireland. The strategic logic is straightforward: Hims gets a pre-built European medical group, regulatory scaffolding across four major markets, and a customer base that is plausibly cross-sellable into the broader Hims and Hers offering. The earn-out structure suggests management expected ZAVA to grow meaningfully over the period, and the contingent consideration size relative to upfront price tells you the deal was priced more on growth than on current profitability.

The second and significantly larger deal is the Eucalyptus acquisition, announced February 19, 2026, valued at up to $1.15B. Eucalyptus is Australia's largest digital health platform, with operations in Australia, the UK, Germany, Japan, and Canada. It runs Juniper (women's weight loss), Pilot and Compound (men's health), Kin (reproductive health), and Software (skincare and dermatology). Per the announcement and the subsequent 8-K, the deal closes mid-2026, contingent on Australian Competition and Consumer Commission and Foreign Investment Review Board approvals. The financial structure is approximately $240M cash at close, roughly $710M deferred over 18 months in scheduled tranches, and up to $200M in earn-outs payable through early 2029. Hims has the option to settle most deferred and earn-out obligations in cash or stock, which is the kind of optionality that matters if the share price moves significantly between now and the deferred payment dates.

Eucalyptus reported a January 2026 gross-fulfilled-billings annual run-rate above $450M and over 775,000 customers as of February 2026. The growth disclosure was triple-digit YoY ARR growth in each quarter of calendar 2025, which is impressive and also worth interrogating because triple-digit growth on a base that was crossing through hundreds of millions is the kind of number that compresses fast. The implied multiple on the deal is somewhere in the mid-to-high single-digit historic revenue range, which Australian sector reporting flags as the upper end of the prevailing telehealth M&A range. So Hims paid up, but for a strategic asset that meaningfully transforms its international optionality.

The integration thesis is that Hims combines Eucalyptus's local regulatory expertise, brand portfolio, and ACHS-accredited clinical infrastructure with Hims's vertically integrated supply chain and US-developed personalization model. Tim Doyle, Eucalyptus's current CEO, becomes SVP International running operations outside the US after closing. The legacy Eucalyptus brands transition into Hims and Hers branding over time, which is the same playbook used with ZAVA. The risk on the

integration is the standard cross-border M&A risk: regulatory disclosure obligations across jurisdictions are different, payer relationships are different, and consumer brand affinity does not always travel. But the strategic logic is correct. International is the part of the story where compounded GLP-1 enforcement does not directly translate, where European and Australian regulatory frameworks are more predictable than the FDA, HHS, and DOJ pile-on, and where the per-customer LTV economics likely look better than the post-compounding US weight loss subscriber.

CFO Yemi Okupe's stated international breakeven timeline is twelve to eighteen months. Management has guided to roughly $200M in second-half 2026 incremental revenue contribution from Eucalyptus, assuming the deal closes mid-year. Anyone building a 2026 model needs to have a flag on the close date because if it slips past August or September, the second-half contribution drops materially.

The peptide bet and the FDA 503A list catalyst

The peptide story is the most interesting wildcard in the setup. For most of 2024 and 2025, the peptide manufacturing facility Hims acquired in February 2025 looked like a sensible vertical integration move with limited near-term commercial relevance. The 2023 FDA action that placed BPC-157, TB-500, Semax, Epitalon, MOTS-c, KPV, DSIP, GHK-Cu (injectable), LL-37, DiHexa, PEG-MGF, Melanotan II, and a handful of other peptides on the Category 2 restricted bulk substances list had effectively cut off the licensed compounding pathway for those peptides. Without compounding access, the addressable market for a domestic peptide manufacturer was limited to whatever clinical research applications and approved products fell within the narrower 503A and 503B regulatory rails.

Three things changed that picture between February and April 2026. First, on February 27, 2026, HHS Secretary Robert F. Kennedy Jr. announced on the Joe Rogan Experience that approximately fourteen of the nineteen restricted peptides were expected to move from Category 2 back to Category 1. That is a podcast announcement, not a regulatory action, but in the current administration the distinction between podcast announcements and policy direction has compressed considerably. Second, on April 15, 2026, the FDA published an updated 503A bulk drug substances list (the document is at fda.gov slash media slash 94155 slash download). The update removed BPC-157, TB-500, and several other peptides from Category 2 by withdrawing the original nominations, and announced that the Pharmacy Compounding Advisory Committee would meet July 23 and 24, 2026 to consider whether to add the relevant bulk substances to the 503A list. A second panel

will address five additional peptides by February 2027. Third, the April 16 Reuters writeup of the FDA action triggered a multi-day rally in HIMS shares (roughly 49% over five trading days according to subsequent coverage) as the market absorbed both the peptide catalyst and the LillyDirect routing news.

The peptide bet's economic significance depends on three things. The first is whether the July PCAC meeting produces a favorable read. PCAC recommendations are advisory and the FDA almost always accepts them, but advisory committees can split and the political climate around peptides is complicated by the wellness and recovery use cases that drive most of the patient demand (which often run ahead of the human clinical evidence). The second is whether Hims can actually monetize the existing California facility into commercial peptide products at meaningful margin. Sterile injectable manufacturing capacity is not the same as having an FDA-cleared product line, and the path from compounded peptide to scaled commercial offering goes through provider prescribing patterns, marketing claim discipline (a recurring issue for Hims, per the September 2025 FDA warning letter), and patient demand stability. The third is whether the peptide line ends up cannibalizing the GLP-1 line or complementing it. Peptides like BPC-157 and TB-500 are typically positioned as tissue repair and recovery rather than weight loss, so the cannibalization risk is limited, but the longevity specialty (which management has guided to launching in 2026 and which would presumably feature peptides, coenzymes, and GLP-GIP combinations) is in a more directly competitive position with the weight loss line.

The Leerink note after the April 15 FDA update flagged the peptide opportunity as something that would allow the company to leverage its existing peptide facility, which is the analytically defensible read. The market reaction was bigger than that, suggesting that some of the rally was speculative positioning around the catalyst rather than fundamental repricing of the cash flows. Anyone underwriting peptides as a 2026 revenue contributor should be modeling a wide range of outcomes, with the upside case requiring favorable PCAC outcomes and a successful product launch within the second half of 2026.

Capital structure, insiders, and what the converts imply

The capital structure story is dominated by the May 2025 convertible notes offering. On May 8, 2025, Hims announced a proposed $450M offering of 0% convertible senior notes due 2030. Demand was strong enough that the offering was upsized to $870M with an option for an additional $130M, which was fully exercised. Total notes outstanding: $1B in 0% convertible senior notes due May 15, 2030, settled May 13,

2025 (per the 8-K at SEC accession 0001119312525118948). The notes are senior unsecured, rank equally with existing senior unsecured indebtedness, and convert at an initial conversion rate of 14.1493 shares per $1,000 principal, implying a conversion price of approximately $70.67 per share. That conversion price represented a 37.5% premium over the $51.40 May 8 closing price.

In connection with the offering, Hims entered into capped call transactions with an initial cap price of $89.95, which is a 75% premium over the same May 8 reference price. The capped call structure is the standard mechanism for reducing dilution on conversion, with Hims paying the option counterparties cash to purchase economic upside on its own shares between $70.67 and $89.95. The strategic point of the structure is that if HIMS trades above $89.95 at conversion, the dilution is meaningfully reduced versus an uncapped convert, but the company is still on the hook for share delivery above $70.67.

For analytical purposes, the convertible structure tells you several things. First, management was confident enough in the equity story in May 2025 to take dilution at $70.67 rather than raising secured debt or undertaking a primary share issuance. Second, the 0% coupon reflects the strong investor demand for the equity-linked instrument at the time of issuance, which was prior to the GLP-1 enforcement cycle. Third, the maturity is 2030, so the company has runway on the principal, but the equity-conversion mechanics matter much sooner if the share price approaches the conversion threshold. As of late April 2026 the share price has moved off recent lows but remains well below the $70.67 threshold, so near-term dilution is not the issue. The issue is whether the proceeds (intended for global expansion and AI-enabled healthcare investments per the offering announcement) are actually being deployed into accretive uses. The Eucalyptus deal answers part of that question. The peptide facility, the lab testing buildout, and the AI investments answer the rest, and those are harder to evaluate from outside the company.

On the insider activity side, Andrew Dudum has been a consistent net seller through 2025 and into 2026. Aggregate Form 4 history shows roughly forty-eight transactions since the SPAC merger including two buys and forty-six sells. Notable transactions from the past year include the August 2025 $33M sale (the largest insider transaction since the 2021 SPAC, per Bloomberg), the October 2025 $11M sale, and an April 9, 2026 reported gift transaction of 845,866 shares (transaction price of zero, reflecting estate-planning movement to family trusts rather than open-market disposition). After the April 2026 gifts, Dudum's direct holdings are approximately 887,684 shares with substantial indirect holdings through GRATs and family trusts.

The pattern is consistent with a founder-CEO who has been systematically diversifying through a 10b5-1 plan adopted August 2024, which is unobjectionable on its face. The thing to watch is the cadence of selling into share price weakness. Form 4 filings are public and trackable through SEC EDGAR, and any change in cadence or shift to non-plan dispositions would be a meaningful signal.

Bear case, bull case, and the binary into the next two prints

The bear case on HIMS heading into the May 11, 2026 Q1 print and the August Q2 print is structural. The compounded GLP-1 line, which contributed materially to 2024 and 2025 revenue growth, is gone. The replacement model is a membership-plus-routing structure that has lower per-subscriber contribution margin and higher exposure to manufacturer pricing decisions at Novo and Lilly. Subscriber growth decelerated to 13% YoY at the end of 2025 from 45% at the end of 2024, which is the kind of S-curve compression that suggests the easy growth innings are behind the platform. The Eucalyptus integration is a leverage event: it adds revenue but also operational complexity, regulatory exposure across new jurisdictions, and an earn-out structure that could create pressure on management to over-recognize revenue or push aggressive integration timelines. The peptide catalyst is real but speculative, and a meaningful chunk of the April rally was probably positioning rather than fundamental repricing. The Leerink front-door critique is doing real analytical work, and the Dudum Netflix analogy does not survive close inspection. Sell-side downside cases land in the $20 to $30 per share range depending on assumptions about subscriber retention through the GLP-1 mix shift and the international operating margin trajectory.

The bull case is also defensible. International is now a credible path to category leadership in three or four major markets, with Eucalyptus closing the Australian and Japanese geographies and ZAVA already operating across the UK, Germany, France, and Ireland. The peptide facility, acquired in February 2025 at presumably modest valuation, sits as a free option on the July 2026 PCAC outcome. The longevity specialty launches in 2026 and combines peptides, coenzymes, and GLP-GIP combinations into what is plausibly the highest-LTV product in the catalog. The cross-sell economics into mental health, dermatology, hormone health, and the new lab testing line continue to drive subscribers using multiple specialties up 80% YoY per the Q3 2025 commentary. Per-subscriber economics on the non-GLP-1 specialties are stable to improving. The 0% convertible structure means the balance sheet is unlevered in any meaningful interest-expense sense. And the revenue guide of $2.7B to $2.9B for FY2026 is reachable on Eucalyptus contribution alone if the deal closes

mid-year, even with conservative assumptions on US subscriber net adds. JP Morgan's Overweight initiation with a $35 target captured the moderate version of this view; analyst forecasts in the bull range model 2027 revenue around $3.2B with EBITDA approaching $414M.

The binary into the next two prints is essentially three questions. First, what does subscriber retention look like through the GLP-1 mix shift, and specifically what is the cohort behavior of customers who started on compounded semaglutide and were transitioned to Wegovy or Zepbound at a higher effective cost? Second, does the Eucalyptus transaction close on schedule, and does management provide segment-level disclosure on Eucalyptus revenue, operating margin, and customer counts that would let analysts disaggregate the international contribution from the US weight loss compression? Third, does the July 23 and 24 PCAC outcome on peptides land favorably, and if so, does Hims actually execute a commercial peptide product launch within the 2026 calendar year? Negative answers on all three put downside in play. Positive on two of three is enough to maintain the FY2026 guide. Positive on all three is the path to sustained share price appreciation.

The diligence spine for someone underwriting a position runs in this order: the FY2025 10-K with particular attention to Item 1A risk factors and Item 7 MD&A, then the Q4 2025 shareholder letter for management's framing of guidance, then the March 9 Novo collaboration announcement and the April 23 LillyDirect press release back-to-back to understand the structural margin shift, then the September 2025 FDA warning letter to understand the marketing-claims exposure that survives the GLP-1 reset, then the Eucalyptus 8-K to understand the deferred consideration and earn-out structure, then FDA 503A list updates and the PCAC meeting agenda for the July peptide outcome, then insider Form 4 cadence on EDGAR for any change in selling pattern. The Reuters, STAT, Barron's, and Investor's Business Daily coverage adds the contemporary skepticism layer, and the JP Morgan and Leerink notes capture the sell-side range. Anything less than that misses material primary information.

The harder analytical exercise is figuring out whether this is a company that looks bad now and gets better over the next eighteen months, or whether the GLP-1 reset was the moment the structural margin profile permanently re-rated. The honest answer is that both are still possible, the pricing of the stock reflects ongoing uncertainty between the two, and the next two earnings prints plus the July PCAC outcome plus the Eucalyptus close are the events that will resolve which read was right. The setup, in other words, is exactly as noisy as it should be given the underlying facts. Anyone telling you they have high conviction either way is probably overconfident on the data they actually have.

← Previous

Discussion about this post