



Pioglitazone for NAFLD Patients With Prediabetes or Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A Meta-Analysis

Jingxuan Lian and Jianfang Fu*

Department of Endocrinology, Xijing Hospital of Air Force Medical University, Xi'an, China

Objective: To systematically evaluate the effects of pioglitazone in the treatment of patients with prediabetes or T2DM combined with NAFLD.

Methods: The Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Embase, and ClinicalTrials databases were searched until August 2020 for publications written in English. Two reviewers independently assessed study eligibility, continuous data extraction, independent assessment of bias risk, and graded the strength of evidence. Our primary outcomes were the individual number of patients with improvement of at least 1 point in each of the histological parameters. Baseline characteristic data, such as BMI, weight, total body fat, fasting plasma glucose and fasting plasma insulin, and liver biological indicators, such as triglyceride level, HDL cholesterol level, plasma AST, and plasma ALT, were used as secondary outcomes.

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Jehad Ahmed Abubaker, Dasman Diabetes Institute, Kuwait

Reviewed by:

Joseph Aloi, Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center, United States Na Liu, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Xi'an Jiaotong University, China

> *Correspondence: Jianfang Fu Jianff@fmmu.edu.cn

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Clinical Diabetes, a section of the journal Frontiers in Endocrinology

Received: 09 October 2020 Accepted: 06 April 2021 Published: 28 April 2021

Citation:

Lian J and Fu J (2021) Pioglitazone for NAFLD Patients With Prediabetes or Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A Meta-Analysis. Front. Endocrinol. 12:615409. doi: 10.3389/fendo.2021.615409 **Results:** A total of 4 studies were included. Compared with placebo, pioglitazone significantly improved steatosis grade, inflammation grade and ballooning grade, while in the fibrosis stage, there was no significant improvement in pioglitazone compared with placebo. In addition, pioglitazone can also improve blood glucose and liver function.

Conclusion: Pioglitazone can significantly improve the histological performance of the liver and insulin sensitivity. Additionally, it can significantly reduce fasting blood glucose, glycosylated hemoglobin, plasma AST, ALT and other liver biological indicators. Due to the lack of relevant randomized controlled trials and short intervention times, long-term studies are still needed to verify its efficacy and safety.

Systematic Review Registration: [PROSPERO], identifier [CRD42020212025].

Keywords: NAFLD, type 2 diabetes mellitus, pioglitazone, meta-analysis, prediabetes

INTRODUCTION

Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) is a liver disease caused by damage to the liver unrelated to alcohol; NAFLD can develop into nonalcoholic steatosis (NASH), advanced fibrosis and hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) (1). NAFLD is the fastest growing cause of HCC among liver transplantation candidates (2). NAFLD may also be involved in the pathogenesis of type 2 diabetes and atherosclerosis. Researchers recently reported that the global prevalence of NAFLD in T2DM patients was 55.5% (3).

The European Association for the Study of Obesity recommends in the NAFLD Clinical Practice Guidelines that screening for NAFLD in T2DM patients, although weight reduction is the basis for the treatment of NAFLD, drug therapy is also necessary because weight reduction alone is difficult to maintain therapeutic effects (4). In patients with T2DM complicated with NAFLD, the use of antidiabetic drugs is more effective than lifestyle changes in controlling glucose levels (5). In addition, lifestyle changes, combined with antidiabetic drugs, may reduce cardiovascular disease-related risk factors and liver fat accumulation and delay the progression of NASH and fibrosis. While there is no recognized drug for the treatment of NAFLD, many antidiabetic drugs have been tested in NAFLD patients due to the common epidemiological and pathophysiological characteristics between NAFLD and T2DM (6).

Pioglitazone, a thiazolidinedione derivative, is a peroxisome proliferator–activated receptor γ (PPAR γ) agonist that ameliorates insulin resistance and improves glucose and lipid metabolism in type 2 diabetes (7, 8). Although a number of randomized controlled trials have been conducted to study the efficacy of pioglitazone in NAFLD combined with T2DM or prediabetes, there is no systematic review on randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of pioglitazone. Therefore, through the latest randomized controlled trials, we systematically reviewed the advantages and disadvantages of pioglitazone in the treatment of patients with prediabetes or T2DM combined with NAFLD.

METHODS

Data Sources and Search Strategy

The systematic review scheme used in this study is reported in accordance with the preferred reporting items listed in the guidelines for systematic review and meta-analysis (PRISMA-P) (9). Our PROSPERO registration ID is CRD42020212025.

We performed electronic searches in the following databases: Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Embase, and ClinicalTrials. We searched each database until August 2020, and the language was limited to English (the complete search strategy is shown in Appendix 1). The preferred reporting items of the systematic review and metaanalysis guidelines were followed at all stages of the study (the complete protocol is shown in Appendix 2).

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

We included a double-blind, placebo-controlled RCT of the effects of pioglitazone on patients aged between 18 and 70 with prediabetes or T2DM combined with NAFLD. Intervention duration < 4 weeks or any cause of chronic liver disease other than NAFLD and suffering from other types of chronic diseases, such as hypertension and coronary heart disease, were excluded, and studies that did not differentiate patients in the subgroup analysis were excluded. In addition, long-term use of hypoglycemic drugs, prescription drugs for the treatment of other chronic diseases, food supplements, and other nonhyperglycemic drugs (such as liver protection drugs) were excluded. For the crossover RCTs, the carrying effect is considered; therefore, we used the data from the first phase of the study.

Study Selection and Data Extraction

Two reviewers independently screened and identified the study and resolved their differences through discussion. In addition, a manual search of references in published systematic reviews and meta-analyses was performed to ensure that no studies were missing. Data were independently extracted to an Excel spreadsheet according to previously defined criteria. For each of the included studies, we extracted data such as study time, trial design, intervention measures and time, demographics, and baseline characteristics.

Our primary outcomes were the individual number of patients with improvement of at least 1 point in each of the histological parameters, which included four aspects: steatosis grade, inflammation grade, ballooning grade and fibrosis stage. Second, it includes resolution of NASH without worsening of fibrosis and individual histological score number of patients with improvement of at least 2 points from two different parameters. Our secondary outcomes were baseline characteristic data, such as BMI, weight, total body fat, fasting plasma glucose and fasting plasma insulin, and liver biological indicators, such as triglyceride level, HDL cholesterol level, plasma AST, and plasma ALT.

Quality Assessment

The Cochrane collaborative risk assessment tool was used to assess the risk of bias for each included study. The following aspects were evaluated: random sequence generation, allocation hiding, blindness of participants and personnel, blindness of result evaluation, incomplete result data, selective reporting and other biases. GRADE Pro (V.3.6) software was used to rate the overall quality of evidence for each outcome based on five evaluation criteria: risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision, and publication bias.

Data Synthesis and Statistical Analysis

For continuity variables, we used the standardized mean difference (SMD) and 95% CI for analysis. The meanings of SMD values should be interpreted as follows: 0.2 represents a small effect, 0.5 a moderate effect, and 0.8 a large effect. For dichotomous variables, we calculated the risk ratio of the 95% CI. We used changes before and after the intervention to assess the effectiveness of different drugs and placebos. When SD was not reported in the study, we derived SD from other studies included in the meta-analysis. We used P=0.05 as the statistically significant threshold. Meta-analysis software (RevMan V.5.3) was used for analysis, and heterogeneity was evaluated according to I2: 25%, 50 and 75% values were judged as mild, moderate and substantial heterogeneity, respectively. The random effects model was used to reduce the effect of heterogeneity. GRADE Pro (V.3.6) software was used to rate the overall quality of evidence for each outcome based on five evaluation criteria: risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision, and publication bias.

RESULTS

We found a total of 137 articles from the target database, among which 138 full-text papers were qualified, and 20 full-text papers were excluded according to the research exclusion criteria (**Figure 1**). A total of 4 RCTs of pioglitazone in the treatment of patients with prediabetes or T2DM combined with NAFLD met the inclusion criteria (9–12). Most of the trials were conducted in the United States, including one in China, where the intervention duration was more than four months, with a maximum of 18 months.

Through the risk assessment using the Cochrane Collaboration risk assessment tool, it was found that the overall risk was moderate to low (**Figure 2**), which was mainly caused by allocation concealment, selective reporting, incomplete data, and unclear blind reporting in some studies.

Primary Outcomes

The meta-analysis showed (**Figure 3**) that in terms of the liver histological score, compared with placebo, pioglitazone significantly improved the steatosis grade [RR 1.78 (95% CI 1.05, 3.04, p = 0.03, $I^2 = 76\%$)], and the quality of the evidence was very low [summary of findings (SoF) **Table 1**]. There were also significant differences in inflammation grade [RR2.05 (95% CI

1.50, 2.80, p<0.00001, $I^2 = 0\%$; SoF **Table 1**)] and ballooning grade [RR 1.74 (95% CI 1.26, 2.40, p= 0.0007, $I^2 = 48\%$; SoF **Table 1**)]. However, in the fibrosis stage (**Figure 3D**), there was no significant improvement in pioglitazone compared with placebo [RR 1.25 (95% CI 0.90, 1.71, p= 0.18, $I^2 = 48\%$; SoF **Table 1**)]. In terms of the resolution of NASH (**Figure 3E**), compared with placebo, pioglitazone also significantly improved the rate of NASH resolution [RR1.76 (95% CI 1.18, 2.62, p= 0.005, $I^2 = 30\%$; SoF **Table 1**)]. In terms of individual histological scores, the number of patients with improvement of at least 2 points from two different parameters (**Figure 3F**) was also significantly higher in the pioglitazone group than in the placebo group [RR2.35 (95% CI 1.29, 4.29, P = 0.005, $I^2 = 55\%$; SoF **Table 1**)].

Basic Characteristics

In terms of weight, although pioglitazone was found to increase the weight of patients in some studies, the meta-analysis showed that pioglitazone did not significantly increase the weight (**Figure 4A**) of patients compared with placebo (SMD0.04 [95% CI -0.20, 0.28, p=0.75, $I^2 = 0\%$)] or BMI [SMD0.19 (95% CI -0.02, 0.40, p=0.08, $I^2 = 39\%$; **Figure 4B**)]. For total body fat, the meta-analysis showed no significant difference between placebo and pioglitazone [SMD0.15 (95% CI -0.12, 0.41, p=0.28, $I^2 = 2\%$; **Figure 4C**)]. In





FIGURE 2 | Risk of bias summary for review authors judgments about each risk of bias item for each included stud

regard to glucose metabolism, only in HOMA-IR, pioglitazone was not significantly different from placebo [SMD -0.44 (95%CI -1.04, 0.15,p= 0.14, $I^2 = 79\%$; **Figure 4D**)], In addition, in fasting plasma glucose (SMD -0.68 [95%CI -0.95, -0.41, p<0.00001, $I^2 = 0\%$; **Figure 4E**)], fasting plasma insulin [SMD -0.55 (95%CI -0.82, -0.28, p<0.00001, $I^2 = 0\%$; **Figure 4F**)] and HbA1c [SMD -0.77 (95%CI -0.99 -0.55, p<0.00001, $I^2 = 0\%$; **Figure 4G**)], pioglitazone was significantly lower than the placebo group, indicating that pioglitazone can significantly improve the glucose metabolic function of patients.

Biological Indicators of Liver

We also analyzed other biomarkers of the liver, and metaanalysis showed that compared with placebo, pioglitazone could significantly reduce the plasma AST (SMD-0.21 [95% CI -0.42, 0.00, p= 0.05, $I^2 = 34\%$; **Figure 5A**)] and ALT [SMD -0.36 (95% CI-0.57, -0.14, p= 0.03, $I^2 = 66\%$; **Figure 5B**)] levels in patients and significantly improve the liver function of patients. Pioglitazone also significantly increased patients' HDL levels [SMD 0.28 (95%CI 0.07, 0.50, p= 0.009, $I^2 = 0\%$; **Figure 5C**)], but there was no significant change in LDL levels compared with placebo [SMD 0.16 (95%CI -0.18, 0.51, p= 0.35, $I^2 = 59\%$; **Figure 5D**)]. Moreover, there was no significant difference in triglyceride levels between the pioglitazone group and the placebo group [SMD -0.20 (95% CI -0.51, 0.12, p= 0.22, I2 = 52%; **Figure 5E**)].

Adverse Events

Meta-analysis showed that pioglitazone was significantly more likely to cause adverse events than placebo [RR 1.65 (95% CI 1.13, 2.42, p= 0.01, I2 = 45%; **Figure 6A**)]. The risk of experiencing individual adverse events of hypoglycemia, chronic lower limb edema, atypical chest pain or epigastralgia and back or joint pain was significantly increased with pioglitazone compared with placebo. However, there was no significant increase in the risk of pioglitazone discontinuation due to adverse events compared to placebo [RR 1.30 (95% CI 0.81, 2.09, p= 0.27, I2 = 0%; **Figure 6B**)].

There was also no significant difference in the risk of serious adverse events between pioglitazone and placebo [RR 1.53 (95% CI 0.77, 3.05, p= 0.23, $I^2 = 0\%$; **Figure 6C**)]. In total, four deaths were reported across 1 trial, two in the pioglitazone group and two in the placebo group.

		Pioglitazone	Р	lacebo			Risk Ratio		Risk R	atio	
	Study or Subgroup E	events Tot	al Eve	nts Tot	al We	eight M-H.	Random, 95% Cl		M-H, Randor	n, 95% Cl	_
	Bellon 2006	17 2	07	8 2	1 28	5.0%	1.72 [0.93, 3.17]		T		
	Bril 2019 Cuci 2016	32 3	57	12 4	1 21	0.1%	1.30 [1.00, 1.69]				
	Cu312010	50 5	0	15 5	1 31	.9 %	2.75 [1.00, 4.54]				
	Total (95% CI)	11	3	10	8 100	0.0%	1.78 [1.05, 3.04]		-		
	Total events	84		45							
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.	.17; Chi ² = 8.	43, df =	2 (P = 0.	01); l ² :	= 76%	_	12	0.5	1	+
	Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.12 (P = 0	.03)				U	J.Z	0.5 1	2	5
									an RR of 1.78 favors p	ioglitazone, not placebo	
2		Pioglitazo	ne	Placeb	0		Risk Ratio		Risk	Ratio	
	Study or Subgroup	Events 1	fotal I	Events	Total	Weight I	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl		M-H, Fixe	d, 95% Cl	
	Belfort 2006	22	26	8	21	26.1%	2.22 [1.26, 3.92]				
	Bril 2019	25	37	13	36	38.9%	1.87 [1.15, 3.05]				
	Cusi 2016	25	50	12	51	35.0%	2.13 [1.21, 3.75]				
										-	
	Total (95% CI)		113		108	100.0%	2.05 [1.50, 2.80]				
	Total events	72		33							
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	0.23, df = 2	(P = 0.8)	39); I ² = 0	1%			0.2	0.5 1	2	5
	Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.51 (P <	< 0.000	101)					an RR of 2 05 favore a	inglitazone not placebo	
										and and a series of the series	
•		Pioglitazo	ne	Placel	0		Risk Ratio		Risk	Ratio	
-	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl		M-H, Fixe	ed, 95% Cl	
	Belfort 2006	14	26	5	21	16.0%	2.26 [0.97, 5.26]			-	
	Bril 2019	23	37	18	36	52.6%	1.24 [0.82, 1.88]		-		
	Cusi 2016	25	50	11	51	31.4%	2.32 [1.28, 4.19]				
	T-4-1 (05% CI)		442		400	400.0%	4 74 14 00 0 401				
	Total (95% CI)	60	115	24	108	100.0%	1.74 [1.20, 2.40]				
	Hotorogonoity Chiž-	204 45-2	/P = 0	34 15\·12	100%					· · · ·	
	Tect for overall effect:	7 - 2 20 /P	(F = 0. - 0.000	15), 1 = 4	+0 %			0.2	0.5	1 2 5	
	restion overall ellect.	. Z = 3.38 (F	- 0.000	57)					an RR of 1.74 favors pi	ioglitazone, not placebo	
D		Pioglitazo	one	Place	00		Risk Ratio		Risk	Ratio	
_	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI		M-H, Fixe	ed, 95% Cl	_
	Belfort 2006	12	26	7	21	19.4%	1.38 [0.66, 2.88]				
	Bril 2019	19	37	19	36	48.3%	0.97 [0.63, 1.51]				
	Cusi 2016	20	50	13	51	32.3%	1.57 [0.88, 2.80]				
	Total (05% CI)		442		100	100.0%	4 35 10 00 4 741				
	Total (95% CI)	51	115	20	108	100.0%	1.25 [0.90, 1.71]				
	Heterogeneity: Chi2-	- 1 00 df - 2	(P - 0	30)-12-	0.96					<u> </u>	
	Test for overall effect	-1.50, ul = 2 -7 = 1.35 / P	- 0.18	.39),1 -	0 %			0.2	0.5	1 2 5	
	reactor overall effect		- 0.10	/					an RR of 1.25 favors p	ioglitazone, not placebo	
			ne	Placeb			Risk Ratio		Diel	Ratio	
		Pinninazo		vonte	otal	Weight M	II Dandem OFW CL		M-H. Rand	dom 0E% Cl	
	Study or Subaroup	Proglitazo Events	fotal F	Venta			-H. Random. 95% C			JOIL 93% C	
:	Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006	Pioglitazo Events 1 17	Total E	8	21	28.0%	1.72 [0.93. 3.17]				
E	<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Belfort 2006 Bril 2019	Pioglitazo Events 17 32	<u>fotal E</u> 26 37	8 24	21 36	28.0% 40.1%	1.72 [0.93, 3.17] 1.30 [1.00. 1.69]				
E	<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016	Pioglitazo Events 1 17 32 35	<u>fotal</u> 26 37 50	8 24 13	21 36 51	28.0% 40.1% 31.9%	1.72 [0.93, 3.17] 1.30 [1.00, 1.69] 2.75 [1.66, 4.54]				
E	<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016	Pioglitazo Events 1 17 32 35	<u>fotal</u> 26 37 50	8 24 13	21 36 51	28.0% 40.1% 31.9%	1.72 [0.93, 3.17] 1.30 [1.00, 1.69] 2.75 [1.66, 4.54]				-
E	<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI)	Pioglitazo Events 1 17 32 35	<u>fotal E</u> 26 37 50 113	8 24 13	21 36 51 108	28.0% 40.1% 31.9% 100.0%	1.72 [0.93, 3.17] 1.30 [1.00, 1.69] 2.75 [1.66, 4.54] 1.78 [1.05, 3.04]				_
E	Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events	Pioglitazo Events 1 17 32 35 84	<u>fotal E</u> 26 37 50 113	8 24 13 45	21 36 51 108	28.0% 40.1% 31.9% 100.0 %	1.72 [0.93, 3.17] 1.30 [1.00, 1.69] 2.75 [1.66, 4.54] 1.78 [1.05, 3.04]				-
Ξ	Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	Pioglitazo <u>Events</u> 1 17 32 35 84 = 0.17; Chi ² =	fotal E 26 37 50 113 8.43, 0	8 24 13 45 if = 2 (P =	21 36 51 108 : 0.01);	28.0% 40.1% 31.9% 100.0 %	1.72 [0.93, 3.17] 1.30 [1.00, 1.69] 2.75 [1.66, 4.54] 1.78 [1.05, 3.04]	0.2	0.5		
I	Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect	Pioglitazo <u>Events</u> 17 32 35 84 = 0.17; Chi ² = ; Z = 2.12 (P =	Fotal E 26 37 50 113 8.43, c = 0.03)	8 24 13 45 if = 2 (P =	21 36 51 108 0.01);	28.0% 40.1% 31.9% 100.0 %	1.72 [0.93, 3.17] 1.30 [1.00, 1.69] 2.75 [1.66, 4.54] 1.78 [1.05, 3.04]	0.2			
Ξ	Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect	Piogifiazo <u>Events</u> 17 32 35 84 = 0.17; Chi ² = ; Z = 2.12 (P =	<u>fotal E</u> 26 37 50 113 8.43, c = 0.03)	8 24 13 45 If = 2 (P =	21 36 51 108 : 0.01);	28.0% 40.1% 31.9% 100.0 %	1.72 (0.93, 3.17) 1.30 (1.00, 1.69) 2.75 [1.66, 4.54] 1.78 [1.05, 3.04]	0.2	1 0.5 an RR of 1.78 favors p	1 2 nioglitazone, not placebo	
=	Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect	Pioglitazo <u>Events</u> 1 17 32 35 84 = 0.17; Chi ² = : Z = 2.12 (P = Pioglitaz	<u>fotal E</u> 26 37 50 113 8.43, c = 0.03)	8 24 13 if = 2 (P = Place	21 36 51 108 : 0.01); 2bo	28.0% 40.1% 31.9% 100.0 %	1.72 [0.93, 3.17] 1.30 [1.00, 1.69] 2.75 [1.66, 4.54] 1.78 [1.05, 3.04] Risk Ratio	0.2	0.5 an RR of 1.78 favors p Risi	1 2 ioglitazone, not placebo k Ratio	
=	Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect	Piogifiazo <u>Events</u> 17 32 35 84 = 0.17; Chi² = ; Z = 2.12 (P = Pioglitaz <u>Events</u>	rotal E 26 37 50 113 8.43, c = 0.03) cone Total	8 24 13 45 if = 2 (P = Place Events	21 36 51 108 0.01); ebo Tota	28.0% 40.1% 31.9% 100.0% ; ² = 76%	 1.72 (0.93, 3.17) 1.30 (1.00, 1.69) 2.75 [1.66, 4.54] 1.78 [1.05, 3.04] Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 	0.2	l 0.5 an RR of 1.78 favors p Risi M-H, Fix	1 1 2 bioglitazone, not placebo k Ratio ked, 95% Cl	
=	Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Bril 2019	Piogifiazo <u>Events</u> 17 32 35 84 = 0.17; Chi ² = : Z = 2.12 (P = <u>Pioglitaz</u> <u>Events</u> 20	fotal E 26 37 50 113 * 8.43, c = = 0.03) * cone Total 37 37	8 24 13 45 if = 2 (P = Place <u>Events</u> 14	21 36 51 108 0.01); 200 Tota 36	28.0% 40.1% 31.9% 100.0% ; ² = 76% <u>I Weight</u> 5 57.0%	Risk Ratio M.78 [1.05, 3.04] 1.78 [1.05, 3.04] 1.78 [1.05, 3.04]	0.2	H 0.5 an RR of 1.78 favors p Ris M-H, Fiz –	1 2 bioglitazone, not placebo k Ratio ked, 95% Cl	
F	Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Bril 2019 Cusi 2016	Piogitiazo <u>Events</u> 17 32 35 84 = 0.17; Chi ² = : Z = 2.12 (P = <u>Pioglitaz</u> <u>Events</u> 20 26	Fotal E 26 37 50 113 8.43, c = 0.03) cone Total 37 59	8 24 13 45 if = 2 (P = Place <u>Events</u> 14 10	21 36 51 108 0.01); 200 51	28.0% 40.1% 31.9% 100.0% ; ² = 76% <u>I Weight</u> 5 57.0% I 43.0%	Risk Ratio M.78 [1.05, 3.04] 1.78 [1.05, 3.04] 1.78 [1.05, 3.04] 1.78 [1.05, 3.04] Risk Ratio M.H. Fixed, 95% CI 1.39 [0.84, 2.31] 2.25 [1.20, 4.20]	0.2	L 0.5 an RR of 1.78 favors p Ris M-H, Fi –	light, 95% Cl	
F	Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Bril 2019 Cusi 2016	Plogitizzo <u>Events</u> 17 32 35 84 = 0.17; Chi ² = ; Z = 2.12 (P = <u>Pioglitaz</u> <u>Events</u> 20 26	Fotal E 26 37 50 113 8.43, 0 = 0.03) cone Total 37 59	8 24 13 45 if = 2 (P = Place Events 14 10	21 36 51 108 : 0.01); 200 Tota 36 51	28.0% 40.1% 31.9% 100.0% P = 76% <u>I Weight</u> 5 57.0% 1 43.0%	Risk Ratio M.H. Fixed, 95% CI 1.72 [0.93, 3.17] 1.30 [1.00, 1.69] 2.75 [1.66, 4.54] 1.78 [1.05, 3.04] Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI 1.39 [0.84, 2.31] 2.25 [1.20, 4.20]	0.2	I 0.5 an RR of 1.78 favors p Risi M-H, Fix –	ionin, 95% Cl	 5
F	Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI)	Plogitizzo <u>Events</u> 17 32 35 84 = 0.17; Chi ² = : Z = 2.12 (P = <u>Pioglitaz</u> <u>Events</u> 20 26	Fotal E 26 37 50 113 8.43, (= 0.03) cone Total 37 59 96	8 24 13 45 if = 2 (P = Place Events 14 10	21 36 51 108 0.01); 200 Tota 36 51 87	28.0% 40.1% 31.9% 100.0% I [™] = 76% I <u>Weight</u> 5 57.0% I 43.0% 7 100.0%	Risk Ratio 1.78 [1.05, 3.04] 1.30 [1.00, 1.69] 2.75 [1.66, 4.54] 1.78 [1.05, 3.04] Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.39 [0.84, 2.31] 2.25 [1.20, 4.20] 1.76 [1.18, 2.62]	0.2	I 0.5 an RR of 1.78 favors p Ris M-H, Fiz –	1 2 bioglitazone, not placebo k Ratio ked, 95% Cl	-
F	Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events	Piogitiazo <u>Events</u> 17 32 35 84 = 0.17; Chi ² = : Z = 2.12 (P : <u>Pioglitaz</u> <u>Events</u> 20 26 46 = 1.12 df	fotal E 26 37 50 113 * 8.43, 0 = = 0.03) : cone Total 37 59 96 :	8 24 13 45 if = 2 (P = Place Events 14 10 24	21 36 51 108 : 0.01); 200 200	28.0% 40.1% 31.9% 100.0% I ^P = 76% I <u>Weightt</u> 3 57.0% I 43.0% 7 100.0%	H. Raidolfi, 95% Cl 1.72 [0.93, 3.17] 1.30 [1.00, 1.69] 2.75 [1.66, 4.54] 1.78 [1.05, 3.04] Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 1.39 [0.84, 2.31] 2.25 [1.20, 4.20] 1.76 [1.18, 2.62]		I 0.5 an RR of 1.78 favors p Ris M-H, Fi −	1 2 bioglitazone, not placebo k Ratio ked, 95% Cl	-
=	Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ²	Piogintazo <u>Events</u> 17 32 35 84 = 0.17; Chi ² = : Z = 2.12 (P = <u>Pioglitaz</u> <u>Events</u> 20 26 46 = 1.42, df =	fotal E 26 37 50 113 * 8.43, 0 = = 0.03) : cone Total 37 59 96 : 1 (P = 0) :	8 24 13 45 if = 2 (P = Place Events 14 10 24 0.23); ² =	21 36 51 108 : 0.01); bo <u>Tota</u> 36 51 87 : 30%	28.0% 40.1% 31.9% 100.0% I ^P = 76% I <u>Weightt</u> 5 57.0% I 43.0% 7 100.0%	Risk Ratio M.H. Fixed, 95% CI 1.72 [0.93, 3.17] 1.30 [1.00, 1.69] 2.75 [1.66, 4.54] 1.78 [1.05, 3.04] Risk Ratio M.H. Fixed, 95% CI 1.39 [0.84, 2.31] 2.25 [1.20, 4.20] 1.76 [1.18, 2.62]	- <mark> </mark> 0.2	H 0.5 an RR of 1.78 favors p Ris <u>M-H, Fix</u> – 0.5	1 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2	

FIGURE 3 | The effect of pioglitazone in hepatic histologic scores(steatosis grade) with improvement of at least 1 grade (A); The effect of pioglitazone in hepatic histologic scores(Inflammation grade) with improvement of at least 1 grade (B); The effect of pioglitazone in hepatic histologic scores(ballooning grade) with improvement of at least 1 grade (C); The effect of pioglitazone in hepatic histologic scores(fibrosis stage) with improvement of at least 1 grade (D); The effect of pioglitazone in reduction of at least 2 points in hepatic histologic scores (from two different parameters) (F).

TABLE 1 | Pioglitazone compared to Placebo for NAFLD Patients with Prediabetes or Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus.

Patient or population: NAFLD Patient	ents with Prediabetes	s or Type 2 Diabetes Melli	tus Settings: Interve	ntion, Pioglitazon	e, Comparison, Plac	ebo
Outcomes	Illustrative comp	oarative risks* (95% CI)	Relative effect	No of	Quality of the	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk	(95% CI)	Participants (studies)	evidence (GRADE)	
	Placebo	Pioglitazone				
Hepatic Histologic Scores with	Study	population	RR 1.78	221	$\oplus \Theta \Theta \Theta$	
improvement of at least 1 grade (Steatosis grade)	417 per 1000	742 per 1000 (437 to 1000)	(1.05 to 3.04)	(3 studies)	very low ^{1,2,3}	
	N	loderate				
	381 per 1000	678 per 1000				
		(400 to 1000)				
Hepatic Histologic Scores with	Study	population	RR 2.05	221	$\oplus \oplus \oplus \ominus$	
improvement of at least 1 grade	306 per 1000	626 per 1000	(1.5 to 2.8)	(3 studies)	moderate ^{2,3,4}	
(Inflammation grade)		(458 to 856)				
	N	loderate				
	361 per 1000	740 per 1000				
	Ohud	(541 to 1000)	DD 4 74	001		
improvement of at least 1 grade	215 per 1000	549 por 1000	(1.06 to 0.4)	22 I	$\oplus \ominus \ominus \ominus$	
(Relie entry grade)	315 per 1000	007 to 756)	(1.20 to 2.4)	(3 studies)	very low	
(Ballooning grade)	N	(397 10 756)				
	IV 028 may 1000	atta nor 1000				
	236 per 1000	414 per 1000				
Henetia Histologia Cooree with	Church	(300 10 57 1)	DD 4 05	001	***	
improvement of at least 1 grade	261 por 1000	/ population	(0.0 to 1.71)	22 I	$\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus$	
(Fibracia stars)	301 per 1000	451 per 1000	(0.9 to 1.7 1)	(S Studies)	10 W	
(FIDFOSIS Stage)	N	(325 (0 6 18)				
	222 por 1000	dife por 1000				
	333 per 1000	418 per 1000				
Desclution of NACH without	Church	(300 10 569)	DD 4 76	100	* ~~~	
Resolution of NASH without	276 per 1000	/ population	(1 19 to 0 60)	(2 atudiaa)	$\oplus \ominus \ominus \ominus$	
worsening of librosis	276 per 1000	400 per 1000	(1.18 10 2.02)	(2 studies)	very low	
	N	(326 to 723)				
	IV 002 may 1000	Fife man 1000				
	293 per 1000	516 per 1000				
made at a start of a start of the start of t	Ohud	(346 to 768)	DD 0.05	174		
reduction of at least 2 points in	Study	/ population	RR 2.35	174	⊕⊕⊖⊖ 1.2.3.4	
Hepatic Histologic Scores	253 per 1000	594 per 1000	(1.29 to 4.29)	(2 studies)	low	
Hepatic (from two different		(326 to 1000)				
parameters)	N	ioderate				
	269 per 1000	632 per 1000 (347 to 1000)				

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence.

High quality: Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.

Moderate quality: Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

Low quality: Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

Very low quality: We are very uncertain about the estimate.

¹Substantial heterogeneity.

²Some of the studies had adjuvant therapeutic measures, which to some extent led to indirect comparisons.

³Subjects which the study include was insufficient.

, 4RR > 2.

⁵Moderate heterogeneity.

Publication Bias

Since we included fewer than 10 articles, publication bias testing was not recommended according to the Cochrane Collaboration Handbook. However, to better evaluate our research results, we performed a publication bias analysis on the primary outcomes by funnel plots. The visual inspection of funnel plots of our primary outcomes did not suggest potential publication bias (**Figure 7**).

For our primary outcomes, sensitivity analysis was used to assess the impact of each individual study on the pooled results by sequentially remove each eligible study. Deletion of any study has no significant effect on the results, indicating that the results were statistically stable and reliable.

DISCUSSION

Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease is a frequently neglected and undertreated condition among patients with T2DM. Recent studies indicate that most obese patients with T2DM have

Sindu or Subaron Main SD. Ideal Mean SD. Ideal Mean SD. Ideal Mean Mittees SP. Ideal Mean SD. Ideal Mean Mean Mean			Piog	Intazon	e	Pla	acebo			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	
Beller 2006 92 16.8 20 93.7 16.9 21 17.0% 0.35 0.27 0.41	-	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	
Cui 2016 94 166 51 95 167 50 275 165 22 454 $0.01 (240, 0.38]$ Trial 195% CD 177 16 15 27 165 27 454 $0.01 (240, 0.38]$ Trial 195% CD 177 15 16 ($z = 2.9 - 2.04)$ ($z = 0.5$ Test for overall effect $Z = 0.32$ ($z = 0.40$) ($z = 0.5$ Stuth or Subgroup Mons SO 101 Mons SD 161 Weinht M. Kiesd, 95% CL Befor 2006 36.6 27 36 327 4 5 21 135% 0.36 (22, 0.44] Befor 2006 36.6 4 8 00 38.6 5 51 23.9% 0.00 (3.30, 0.39] Via 2015 32.6 4 4 8 00 38.6 5 51 23.9% 0.00 (3.30, 0.39] Via 2015 32.6 4 4 8 00 38.6 5 23 31.% 0.00 (3.30, 0.39] Via 2015 32.6 4 18 00 28.6 3.25 31.% 0.00 (3.30, 0.39] Via 2015 32.6 4 18 00 28.6 3.25 31.% 0.00 (3.30, 0.39] Via 2015 32.6 4 18 00 28.6 3.25 31.% 0.00 (3.30, 0.39] Via 2015 32.6 4 18 00 28.6 3.25 31.% 0.00 (3.30, 0.39] Via 2015 32.6 4 18 00 28.6 3.25 31.% 0.00 (3.30, 0.39] Via 2015 32.6 1.26 3.40 8.8 21 21.26 0.04 (9.64, 0.61] Befor 2006 35.2 6.1 26 34.0 8.8 21 21.25 0.04 (9.64, 0.61] Befor 2006 35.2 6.1 26 34.0 8.8 21 21.25 0.04 (9.64, 0.61] Befor 2006 35.2 6.1 26 34.0 8.8 21 21.25 0.04 (9.64, 0.61] Befor 2006 35.2 6.1 26 34.0 8.8 21 21.25 0.04 (9.64, 0.61] Befor 2006 35.2 6.1 26 34.0 8.8 21 21.25 0.04 (9.64, 0.61] Befor 2006 35.2 6.1 26 34.0 8.8 21 21.25 0.04 (9.64, 0.61] Befor 2006 35.2 6.1 26 34.0 8.8 21 21.25 0.04 (9.64, 0.61] Befor 2006 35.2 6.1 26 3.5 0 7 51 6.62% 0.00 (2.30, 0.39] Cui 2016 35 8 50 35 7 51 6.62% 0.00 (2.30, 0.39] Cui 2016 35 8 50 35 7 51 6.62% 0.00 (2.30, 0.39] Cui 2016 35 8 50 35 7 51 6.62% 0.00 (2.30, 0.39] Cui 2016 35 8 50 35 7 51 6.62% 0.00 (2.30, 0.39] Cui 2016 35 8 50 35 7 51 6.62% 0.00 (2.30, 0.39] Cui 2016 35 8 50 35 7 51 6.62% 0.00 (2.30, 0.39] Cui 2016 35 8 50 35 7 51 6.62% 0.00 (2.30, 0.39] Cui 2016 35 8 50 35 7 51 6.62% 0.00 (2.30, 0.39] Cui 2016 35 8 50 35 7 51 6.62% 0.00 (2.30, 0.39] Cui 2016 35 8 50 35 7 51 6.62% 0.00 (2.30, 0.39] Cui 2016 35 8 50 35 7 51 6.62% 0.00 (2.30, 0.39] Favours [poiglitzzone] Favours [control] Favours [control] Favours [control] Favours [control] Favours [control] Favours [control] Favours [contr		Belfort 2006	96.2	19.6	26	89.7	14.8	21	17.0%	0.36 [-0.22, 0.94]		
Van 2015 73 10.8 60 72.7 14.5 62 45.4 0.04 [0.40, 0.31] Tradel (55: (1) 0.9 133 100.01 0.04 [0.20, 0.20] 1.05 0.04 [0.20, 0.21] State or statement Factor Factor State or statement Microsol (SS: (1) Microsol (SS: (2) Microsol (S		Cusi 2016	99.4	16.6	51	99.5	16.7	50	37.6%	-0.01 [-0.40, 0.38]		
Trad (95: (1)) 137 133 100.0% 0.04 [.0.20, 0.20] Heteropenet/construct Interfect Z = 0.32 ($P = 0.75$) 133 100.0% 0.04 [.0.20, 0.20] Subtor Subgroup Mon. Sol Construct Mon. Sol Construct Note of Sol. Sol. Mean Difference Sol. Mean Differen		Yan 2015	73	16.8	60	73.7	14.5	62	45.4%	-0.04 [-0.40, 0.31]		
India (5): Cl) Test for overall effect 2 = 0.5 (); P = 0% Test for overall effect 2 = 0.5 (); P = 0% Test for overall effect 2 = 0.5 (); P = 0% Study of Stateron Mean Difference Study of Stateron Mean Difference Study of Stateron Study of Stateron Study of Stateron Study of Stateron Study of Stateron Mean Difference Disclo 0 28 ()					427			422	400.0%	0.041.0.20.0.201		
$ \begin{array}{c} \text{Prederightering}_{\text{result}} (\text{prediction}_{\text{result}} (predic$		Total (95% CI)	1 10 46	- 2 (D	137	17 - 00		155	100.0%	0.04 [-0.20, 0.28]		
Statuto University (control) Favours [pioplitazone] [Pavurs [control] Statuto esting control Std. Mean Difference (M, Fixed, 255; C) Std. Mean Difference (M, Fixed, 255; C) Std. Mean Difference (M, Fixed, 255; C) Statuto esting control (Call 2016) 34.6 5.7 26.3 27.4 21.3 35.0 20.6		Heterogeneity: Chir =	7-0.22	= Z (P = 0	= 0.48) 75)	1 = 0%	0				-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1	
B Pioplitazone Piacebo Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference B Std. Yes 34.6 5.2 27 23.8 5.5 38 20.6% 0.95 (.1) N. Freed, 95% (.1) B Std. Mean Difference N. Freed, 95% (.1) N. Freed, 95% (.1) N. Freed, 95% (.1) N. Freed, 95% (.1) Total (95% (.1) 17.3 17.0 100.0% 0.19 (1.0.0%)		rest for overall effect.	2 = 0.32	(P=0	./5)						Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control]	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $												
Sinde or Subgroup Marea 50 Total Mean 50 Total 25 St 1 No. Face 95% CI Molecular Subgroup Molecular Subgroup Molecular Subgroup Molecular Subgroup Sinde or Subgroup No. Face 95% CI Molecular Subgroup Sinde or Subgroup Molecular Subgroup Molecular Subgroup Sinde or Subgroup No. Face 95% CI Molecular Subgroup Sinde or Subgroup Mark Subgroup	R		Piog	litazor	ie	Pla	icebo		5	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	
Befor 2006 34.6 5.7 26 327 4.5 21 13.5% 0.36 0.22 0.94 Bui 2015 3.6.6 2.9 3.6.6 5.5 3.2 0.56 0.01 0.41 0.93 0.39 0.29 0.39 <t< td=""><td></td><td>Study or Subgroup</td><td>Mean</td><td>SD</td><td>Total</td><td>Mean</td><td>SD</td><td>Total</td><td>Weight</td><td>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</td><td>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</td></t<>		Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	
$ \begin{array}{c} Brit 2019 & 36.6 & 2.9 & 27 & 33.9 & 5.5 & 36 & 20.6\% \\ Cusi 2016 & 34.6 & 4.8 & 60 & 26.6 & 5.5 & 12.2\% \\ Yan 2015 & 26.8 & 4.8 & 60 & 26.6 & 5.5 & 12.2\% \\ Yan 2015 & 26.8 & 4.8 & 60 & 26.6 & 5.5 & 22.8\% \\ Total (55\% Cl) & Trail Mean BD Total Mean BD Total Weight & N. Excel Std. Mean Difference \\ Std. Mean Difference \\ Miner Subprova Mean BD Total Mean BD Total Weight & N. Excel Std. Mean Difference \\ Mc Freed, 95\% Cl \\ Favours [piopitazone] Favours [control] \\ Favou$		Belfort 2006	34.6	5.7	26	32.7	4.5	21	13.5%	0.36 [-0.22, 0.94]		
Cusi 2016 34.6 4.8 60 34.6 5 61 28.9% $0.061.38, 0.39]$ Total (95% CI) 173 173 170 100.0% $0.191[.0.02, 0.40]$ Heterogeneity: Chill 2.4 1.76 (P = 0.30) Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Differe		Bril 2019	36.6	2.9	37	33.9	5.5	36	20.6%	0.61 [0.14, 1.08]		
$\begin{aligned} & \text{Yn} 2015 & 26.8 & 4.8 & 60 & 26.6 & 3.5 & 6.2 & 36.1\% & 0.05 [-0.31, 0.40] \\ & \text{Total} (95\% (C) & 173 & 173 & 100.0\% & 0.91 [-0.02, 0.40] \\ & \text{Heterogeneity}, Chi*= 4.93, df=3 (P=0.18), P=3 % \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.78 (P=0.08)} \\ \hline \text{Polgiflazone} & \text{Placebo} & \text{Std. Mean Difference} \\ & \text{Study or Subaroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Velatint M, Krixed, 95% (C) \\ & \text{Beford 2006} & 55.2 & 6.1 & 26.349, 8.8 & 21.21.2\% & 0.04 [-0.39, 0.39] \\ & Testfor overall effect Z= 4.90, df=2 (P=0.36), P=2\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=2\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=2\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=2\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=2\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=2\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=2\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=2\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=2\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=2\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=2\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=2\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=2\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 4.108 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 4.108 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 4.108 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 4.108 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect Z= 1.08 (P=0.36), P=0\% \\ & \text{Test$		Cusi 2016	34.6	4.8	50	34.6	5	51	29.9%	0.00 [-0.39, 0.39]	+	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Yan 2015	26.8	4.8	60	26.6	3.5	62	36.1%	0.05 [-0.31, 0.40]	_	
Study or Subaroup Main 20 (S) (C) T/2 Study or Subaroup		-										
Heterogenely, Ch ⁺ = 4.3, df = 3, df = 0.18, lf = 3.9% Testfor verail effect Z = 1.76 (P = 0.08) Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference 		Total (95% CI)			173			170	100.0%	0.19 [-0.02, 0.40]		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	4.93, df	= 3 (P	= 0.18)); l² = 39	1%			-	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Test for overall effect:	Z=1.76	i (P = 0	.08)						Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control]	
C Pioplitazone Piacebo Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Bettor 2006 35.2 6.1 26 34.9 8.8 21 21.2% 0.044 (0.54, 0.61) Delt 2016 36 8 50 36 7 7 36 22.6% 0.42 (-0.40, 0.89) Cusi 2016 36 8 50 36 7 51 46.2% 0.00 (-0.39, 0.39) Interrepting (15% CL) 113 108 100.0% 0.15 (-1.2, 0.41)												
Study or Subforciup Mean SD VERIFY Colspan="2">VERIFY Colspan="2" Befort 2006 35 10 VERIFY Colspan="2" Cusi 2016 36 SD VERIFY Colspan="2" VERIFY Colspan="2" Total (95% CI) 113 108 10.6 Study or Subfroup Mean SD VERIFY Colspan="2" VERIFY Colspan="2" <th co<="" td=""><td>С</td><td></td><td>Piog</td><td>litazor</td><td>ie</td><td>Pla</td><td>icebo</td><td></td><td>5</td><td>Std. Mean Difference</td><td>Std. Mean Difference</td></th>	<td>С</td> <td></td> <td>Piog</td> <td>litazor</td> <td>ie</td> <td>Pla</td> <td>icebo</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td>Std. Mean Difference</td> <td>Std. Mean Difference</td>	С		Piog	litazor	ie	Pla	icebo		5	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Belfort 2006	35.2	6.1	26	34.9	8.8	21	21.2%	0.04 [-0.54, 0.61]		
Cust 2016 36 8 90 36 7 51 46.2% 0.00 [0.39, 0.39] Total (95% Cl) 113 108 100.0% 0.15 [0.12, 0.41] Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 2.05, df = 2 (P = 0.39); P = 2% 28 51 6.15 [0.12, 0.41] Befor 2006 35.2 61 28.49 88.2 12.12% 0.04 [0.54, 0.61] 14.49 Brid 2016 36.8 50 36.7 51 46.2% 0.00 [0.39, 0.39] 16.26 M. Fixed, 95% Cl Defor 2006 35.2 1.28 34.9 8.2 12.12% 0.04 [0.54, 0.61] 14.3 108 100.0% 0.15 [.0.12, 0.41] Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 2.05, df = 2 (P = 0.39); P = 2% Test for overall effect Z = 1.08 (P = 0.28) Total (95% Cl) 113 108 100.0% 0.15 [.0.12, 0.41] Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 2.05, df = 2 (P = 0.39); P = 2% Test for overall effect Z = 1.08 (P = 0.28) Total (Mean SD Total Mean SD T		Bril 2019	40	7	37	37	7	36	32.6%	0.42 [-0.04, 0.89]		
$ \begin{array}{c} \text{Total (95\% CI)} & \text{Tist for overall effect Z = 1.08 (P = 0.28)} \\ \text{Test for overall effect Z = 0.0001)} \\ \text{Total (95\% CI)} \\ \text{Test for overall effect Z = 0.00001)} \\ \text{Test for overall effect Z = 4.91 (P < 0.00001)} \\ \text{Test for overall effect Z = 4.91 (P < 0.00001)} \\ \text{Test for overall effect Z = 4.91 (P < 0.00001)} \\ \text{Test for overall effect Z = 2.93 (P < 0.01)} \\ \text{Test for overall effect Z = 0.01 18 18.27 51 45.8\% & -0.66 [-0.6, -0.16] \\ \text{Test for overall effect Z = 3.93 (P < -0.01)} \\ \text{Test for overall effect Z = 3.93 (P < -0.01)} \\ \text{Test for overall effect Z = 3.93 (P < -0.01)} \\ \text{Test for overall effect Z = 3.93 (P < -0.01)} \\ \text{Test for overall effect Z = 3.93 (P < -0.01)} \\ \text{Test for overall effect Z = 3.93 (P < -0.01)} \\ \text{Test for overall effect Z = 3.93 (P < -0.01)} \\ \text{Test for overall effect Z = 3.93 (P < -0.01)} \\ Test for overall effect Z = 0.93 (P = 0.83), P = 0\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect Z = 0.93 (P = 0.83), P =$		Cusi 2016	36	8	50	36	7	51	46.2%	0.00 [-0.39, 0.39]		
Non construit Placebo Std. Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl Performently Chill 2 0.5 6 1 2 0 (P = 0.28) 0.5 1 2 0 (P = 0.28) Pioplitazonel Placebo Std. Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Pioplitazonel Placebo Std. Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl N. Fixed, 95% Cl Beitor 2006 35 2 6 5 1 2 6 3 4 6 8 2 1 1 2 2% 0.04 10 54 0 61 1 N. Fixed, 95% Cl N. Fixed, 95% Cl Cusi 2016 36 8 5 0 3 5 7 5 1 4 6 2% 0.00 10 3, 0.39 1 108 100.0% 0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Heterogeneity: Chill = 2.05, df = 2 (P = 0.36), P 2 2% Test for overall effect Z = 1.08 (P = 0.28) Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total (95% Cl) Hean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight N. Fixed, 95% Cl Beitor 2006 109 12.5 50 121 25 51 46 5% -0.06 1+ 1.0, -0.20 1 -1 -0.5 0.5 1 Test for overall effect Z = 4.31 (P < 0.0001)		Total (05% Ch			442			100	100.0%	0 15 1 0 12 0 141		
$ \frac{1}{1 - 0.5} = \frac{0.5}{0} = \frac{1}{0.5} = \frac{1}{1} $ $ \frac{1}{1 - 0.5} = \frac{0.5}{0} = \frac{1}{0.5} = \frac{1}{1} $ $ \frac{1}{1 - 0.5} = \frac{0.5}{0} = \frac{1}{0.5} = \frac{1}{1} $ $ \frac{1}{1 - 0.5} = \frac{0.5}{0} = \frac{1}{0.5} = \frac{1}{1} $ $ \frac{1}{1 - 0.5} = \frac{0.5}{0} = \frac{1}{0.5} = \frac{1}{1} $ $ \frac{1}{1 - 0.5} = \frac{0.5}{0} = \frac{1}{0.5} = \frac{1}{1} $ $ \frac{1}{1 - 0.5} = \frac{0.5}{0} = \frac{1}{0.5} = \frac{1}{1} $ $ \frac{1}{1 - 0.5} = \frac{0.5}{0} = \frac{1}{0.5} = \frac{1}{1} $ $ \frac{1}{1 - 0.5} = \frac{0.5}{0} = \frac{1}{0.5} = \frac{1}{1} $ $ \frac{1}{1 - 0.5} = \frac{0.5}{0} = \frac{1}{0.5} = \frac{1}{1} $ $ \frac{1}{1 - 0.5} = \frac{1}{0.5} = \frac{1}{1} $ $ 1$		Heterogeneity Ohiz-	2.06 44	- 2/0	- 0.261	12- 20	6	108	100.0%	0.15[-0.12, 0.41]		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Test for overall effect	2.00, uf	- 2 (P (P = 0	- 0.30)	n = 2%	0				-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		restion overall ellect.	2 - 1.00	(1 - 0	.20)						Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control]	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$												
$ \text{Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight M. Fixed, 95% CI M. Fixed, 95% $	D		Pion	litazor	le	Pla	icebo		5	td. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Study or Subaroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Fixed. 95% CI	IV. Fixed, 95% Cl	
Bril 2019 40 7 37 37 7 36 32.6% 0.42 (0.04, 0.89) Cusi 2016 36 8 50 36 7 51 45.2% 0.00 (0.39, 0.39) Total (95% CI) 113 108 100.0% 0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Heterogeneity: Chi* = 0.5, di* = 2 (P = 0.36); P = 2% Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight V. Fixed, 95% CI N. Fixed, 95% CI Belfort 2006 99 16 26 113 108 100.0% -0.06 [-1.00, -0.20] Total (95% CI) 113 108 100.0% -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] -0.5 0.5 1 Heterogeneity: Chi*= 0.34, df = 2 (P = 0.84); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 4.91 (P < 0.00001) 103 108 100.0% -0.56 [-0.96, -0.16] Guiz 2016 9 12.5 50 13 108 100.0% -0.56 [-0.96, -0.16] Guiz 2016 9 12.5 13 108 100.0% -0.56 [-0.96, -0.16]		Belfort 2006	35.2	6.1	26	34.9	8.8	21	21.2%	0.04 (-0.54, 0.61)		
Cusi 2016 36 8 50 36 7 51 46.2% $0.00[0.33], 0.39]$ Total (95% Cl) 113 108 100.0% $0.15[0.12, 0.41]$ Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2.05, df = 2 (P = 0.36); P = 2% Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.70, df = 2 (P = 0.36); P = 2% Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean Mean SD Sd <td></td> <td>Bril 2019</td> <td>40</td> <td>7</td> <td>37</td> <td>37</td> <td>7</td> <td>36</td> <td>32.6%</td> <td>0.42 [-0.04, 0.89]</td> <td></td>		Bril 2019	40	7	37	37	7	36	32.6%	0.42 [-0.04, 0.89]		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Cusi 2016	36	8	50	36	7	51	46.2%	0.00 [-0.39, 0.39]	+	
Total (95% Cl) 113 108 100.0% 0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2.05, df = 2 (P = 0.36); l ² = 2% Pioglitazone Placebo Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Std. Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Std. Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Meint M. Fixed, 95% Cl M. Fixed, 95% Cl M. Fixed, 95% Cl M. Fixed, 95% Cl												
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 2.05$, $dr = 2.06 = 0.36$; $l^2 = 2\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.06$ ($P = 0.26$) Field azone Placebo Stid. Mean Difference Stid. Yor Subgroup Mean SD Total Weight N. Fixed, 95% CI Belfort 2006 99 16 26 Total Weight N. Fixed, 95% CI Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight N. Fixed, 95% CI Total (95% CI) 113 108 Total Weight N. Fixed, 95% CI Favours [poiglitazone1] Favours [poiglitazone1] Favours [control] For overall effect Z = 4.91 ($P < 0.00001$) Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Weight N. Fixed, 95% CI Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight N. Fixed, 95% CI Mean SD Total Mean S												
Favours [proglitazone] Favours [proglitazone] Favours [proglitazone] Favours [proglitazone] Favours [proglitazone] Favours [proglitazone] Favours [proglitazone] Favours [proglitazone] Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference St		Total (95% CI)			113			108	100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41]		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	2.05, df	= 2 (P	113 = 0.36)	; I ² = 29	6	108	100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] _		
E Pioglitazone Placebo Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Beffort 2006 99 16 26 116 31 21 21.0% -0.70 [+1.28, -0.11] Bril 2019 128 31 71 155 51 46.5% -0.70 [+1.28, -0.31] Cusi 2016 109 12.5 50 121 25 51 46.5% -0.80 [+1.00, -0.20] Total (95% Cl) 113 108 100.0% -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] -1 -0.5 0 5 Test for overall effect Z = 4.91 (P < 0.00001)		Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	2.05, df Z = 1.08	= 2 (P (P = 0	113 = 0.36) .28)	; I² = 29	6	108	100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] _	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control]	
E Proginazone Pracebo Sid. Mean Difference Sid. Mean Di		Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	2.05, df Z = 1.08	= 2 (P (P = 0	113 = 0.36) .28)	; I² = 29	6	108	100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] _	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control]	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	F	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	2.05, df Z = 1.08	= 2 (P (P = 0	113 = 0.36) .28)	; I ² = 29	6	108	100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] _	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control]	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	E	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	2.05, df Z = 1.08 Pio	= 2 (P (P = 0	113 = 0.36) .28)	i; l² = 29 P	6 Iaceb	108 0	100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] -	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control]	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	E	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	2.05, df Z = 1.08 Pio <u>Mear</u>	= 2 (P = 0 (P = 0 oglitazo <u>1 SE</u>	113 = 0.36) .28) one <u>) Tota</u>	i; l² = 29 P <u>il Mea</u>	6 laceb n SD	108 0 <u>Total</u>	100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] 	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	E	Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Belfort 2006 Pril 2010	2.05, df Z = 1.08 Pic <u>Mear</u> 99	= 2 (P = 0 (P = 0 <u>) SE</u> 3 16 2 21	113 = 0.36) .28) one <u>) Tota</u>	r; I² = 29 I <u>I Meau</u> 6 11 7 15	6 Haceb n SD 6 31	108 0 <u>Total</u> 21	100.0% Weight 21.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.28, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.21]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	E	Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016	2.05, df Z = 1.08 Pio <u>Mear</u> 99 128 100	= 2 (P = 0 (P = 0)))))))))))))	113 = 0.36) .28) one <u>) Tota</u> 5 21 1 3	r; I² = 29 I <u>IMea</u> 6 11 7 15 0 12	6 1 aceb n SD 6 31 5 37 1 25	108 0 <u>Total</u> 21 36 51	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	E	Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016	2.05, df Z = 1.08 Pic <u>Mear</u> 99 128 109	= 2 (P = 0 (P = 0 <u>n SE</u> 3 16 3 31 3 12.5	113 = 0.36) .28) 0 Tota 0 Tota 0 20 1 3 5 50	r; I² = 29 I <mark>I Mea</mark> 6 11 7 15 0 12	6 1aceb n SD 6 31 5 37 1 25	108 o <u>Total</u> 21 36 51	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	E	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI)	2.05, df Z = 1.08 Pic <u>Mear</u> 99 120 109	= 2 (P = 0 (P = 0)))))))))))))))))))	113 = 0.36) .28) <u>Tota</u> 5 21 35 51 5 51	r; I ² = 29 I <u>I Mea</u> 6 11 7 15 0 12 3	6 n <u>SD</u> 6 31 5 37 1 25	108 o <u>Total</u> 21 36 51 108	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>N, Fixed, 95% C1</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	
F Pioglitazone Placebo Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Weight M.Fixed, 95% Cl N.Fixed, 95% Cl Belfort 2006 10 7 26 18 14 21 20.5% -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] Bril 2019 13 11 37 19 17 36 33.7% -0.42 [-0.88, 0.05] Cusi 2016 9 12.5 50 18 18.7 51 45.8% -0.56 [-0.96, -0.16] Total (95% Cl) 113 108 100.0% -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28] -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.70, df = 2 (P = 0.71); l² = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 3.98 (P < 0.0001)	E	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a	2.05, df Z = 1.08 Pio Mear 99 128 109 = 0.34, c	= 2 (P = 0 (P = 0 oglitazo 1 SE 3 16 3 31 3 12.5 df = 2 (0	113 = 0.36) .28) 0 Tota 0 Tota 0 20 1 3 5 50 11 P = 0.8); I ² = 29 I <u>I Mean</u> 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 4); I ² = (6 1 aceb n <u>SD</u> 6 31 5 37 1 25 0%	108 o <u>Total</u> 21 36 51 108	100.0% Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV. Fixed, 95% C1</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	E	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect	2.05, df Z = 1.08 Pio Mear 99 128 109 = 0.34, c ct Z = 4.9	= 2 (P) (P = 0 oglitazo <u>1 SD</u> 3 16 3 31 3 12.5 df = 2 (l 31 (P <	113 = 0.36) .28) <u>Tota</u> 5 51 1 3 5 51 11: P = 0.8 0.000	i; i² = 29 P <u>I Meau</u> 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 4); i² = (01)	6 1 laceb n <u>SD</u> 6 31 5 37 1 25 0%	108 0 <u>Total</u> 21 36 51 108	100.0% Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV. Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	
F Pioglitazone Placebo Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Belfort 2006 10 7 26 18 14 21 20.5% -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] Bril 2019 13 11 37 19 17 36 33.7% -0.42 [-0.88, 0.05] Cusi 2016 9 12.5 50 18 18.7 51 45.8% -0.56 [-0.96, -0.16] Total (95% Cl) 113 108 100.0% -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28] -1 -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.70, df = 2 (P = 0.71); I ² = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 3.98 (P < 0.0001)	E	Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2018 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect	2.05, df Z = 1.08 Pio Mear 99 128 109 = 0.34, c ct Z = 4.9	= 2 (P = 0 oglitazo 3 16 3 16 3 12.5 df = 2 (l 31 (P <	113 = 0.36) .28) Tota 6 22 3 3 5 50 11: P = 0.8 0.0000	i; I [≈] = 29 I <u>I Meau</u> 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 4); I [≈] = (01)	6 11aceb n <u>SD</u> 6 31 5 37 1 25	108 0 <u>Total</u> 21 36 51 108	100.0% Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.28, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control]	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	E	Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect	2.05, df Z = 1.08 Pio Mear 99 128 109 = 0.34, c ct: Z = 4.9	= 2 (P ; (P = 0)))))))))))))))))))	113 = 0.36) .28) • Tota • Tota • 20 • 3 • 5 • 50 • 11: P = 0.8 • 0.000	r; I [≠] = 29 <u>I Mean</u> 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 4); I [≠] = (01)	6 11aceb n <u>SD</u> 6 31 5 37 1 25	108 0 <u>Total</u> 21 36 51 108	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control]	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	F	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect	2.05, df Z = 1.08 Pio Mean 99 128 109 = 0.34, c t: Z = 4.9	= 2 (P = 0 oglitaze 3 10 3 12.5 3	113 = 0.36) .28) • Tota • Tota • 24 • 3 • 5 • 54 • 11: P = 0.8 • 0.0000	r; I ² = 29 I <u>Mean</u> 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 4); I ² = (01) F	6 1 aceb n SD 6 31 5 37 1 25 0% Placet	108 <u>Total</u> 21 36 51 108	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	F	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect	2.05, df Z = 1.08 Pio Mean 99 128 109 = 0.34, c t: Z = 4.9 Pio Mean	= 2 (P) = 0 $= 2 (P = 0)$ $= 0$ $= 0$ $= 0$ $= 0$ $= 0$ $= 0$ $= 0$ $= 0$ $= 0$ $= 0$ $= 0$ $= 0$ $= 0$ $= 0$	113 = 0.36) .28) Done D Tota 5 20 3 3 5 50 113 P = 0.8 0.0000 Done Done	r; ² = 29 <u>I Mean</u> 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 4); ² = (01) F <u>I Mean</u>	6 1 aceb n SD 6 31 5 37 1 25 0% Placett n Sl 1 Sl	108 <u>Total</u> 21 36 51 108 0 <u>Tota</u>	100.0% <u>Weight</u> 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u>	Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	F	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Belfort 2006	2.05, df Z = 1.08 Pic Mear 99 122 109 = 0.34, c t: Z = 4.9 Pic Mear	$= 2 (P) = 0$ oglitazo $\frac{SE}{3} = 10$ oglitazo $3 = 12.5$ oglita	113 = 0.36) .28) Done Done Done 0.0000 Done Done Done Done Done Done	i; i ² = 29 <u>il Mean</u> 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 4); i ² = (01) i <u>il Mean</u> 5 1 ³ 7	6 1 aceb n SD 6 31 5 37 1 25 0% Placels 1 SI 8 1	108 Total 21 36 51 108 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	100.0% Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 Weight 1 20.5%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>N. Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.80 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>I. V. Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	F	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016	2.05, df: Z = 1.08 Pic Mear 99 129 109 = 0.34, c t: Z = 4.9 Pic Mear 10 10 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	$= 2 (P)^{2}$ $= 2 (P)^{2}$ $= 2 (P)^{2}$ $= 2 (P)^{2}$ $= 3 - 10^{2}$ $= 3 - 10^{2}$ $= 3 - 10^{2}$ $= 3 - 10^{2}$ $= 3 - 10^{2}$ $= 3 - 10^{2}$ $= 3 - 10^{2}$	113 = 0.36; .28) one <u>o Tota</u> 5 22 3 3 5 5 112 13 5 5 112 112 12 0.000 0 0.000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	r; ² = 29 <u>I Mea</u> 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 4); ² = (01) F <u>I Mean</u> 6 11 7 19 7 19	6 1 aceb n SD 6 31 5 37 1 25 0% Placet 1 25 0% Placet 1 3 1 4 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1	108 0 <u>Total</u> 21 36 51 108 0 <u>D Tota</u> 4 2 7 3 7 5 7 7 7	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 Weigh 1 20.5% 6 33.7%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.28, -0.11] -0.80 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.42 [-0.88, 0.05]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.70, df = 2 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.98 (P < 0.001) G Pioglitazone Placebo Std. Mean Difference Std. view of Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Belfort 2006 5.5 0.8 26 6.1 0.9 21 13.7% -0.70 [1.29, -0.10] Bril 2019 6.4 0.8 37 7.2 1 36 20.9% -0.88 [1.36, -0.39] Cusi 2016 5.9 0.6 50 6.3 0.6 51 30.1% -0.66 [1.106, -0.26] Yan 2015 5.9 0.8 60 6.4 0.6 23.5.3% -0.83 [1.20, -0.46] Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.62, df = 3 (P = 0.89); I ² = 0% -7 -0 1 2 Test for overall effect 7 = 6.86 (P < 0.0001)	F	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016	2.05, df: Z = 1.08 Pic Mean 99 128 109 128 109 128 109 228 109 20 228 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	= 2 (P: (P = 0 SE 3 16 3 12.6 If = 2 (I 1 SE 0 7 3 11 3 12.6 (P <	113 = 0.36) .28) 0 Tota 3 23 5 5 11: P = 0.8 0.0000 Done 1 1 0.0000 Done 1	r; * = 29 I <u>Mean</u> 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 4); * = (01) F Mean 6 13 7 19 0 13	6 1 aceb n SD 6 31 5 37 1 25 1 25 1 25 1 25 1 3 1 3 1 4 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1	108 <u>Total</u> 21 36 51 108 <u>0</u> Tota 4 2 7 3 7 5	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 20.5% 6 33.79 1 45.89	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> -0.70 [-1.28, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.42 [-0.88, 0.05] 6 -0.56 [-0.96, -0.16]	The second secon	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	F	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI)	2.05, df: Z = 1.08 Pic Mear 9 9 128 109 = 0.34, c t: Z = 4.9 Pic Mear 10 13 5	$= 2 (P)^{2}$ $= 2 (P)^{2} (P = 0)^{2}$ $= 0^{2} (P = 0)^{2}$ $= $	113 = 0.36) .28) one 0 1 Tota 3 21 3 5 5 5 5 111: 3 9 10 11 11: 11: 11: 11: 11:); I ² = 29 <u>II Mean</u> 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 4); I ² = (001) II Mean 3 11 7 11 3 11 7 11 3	6 n SD 6 31 5 37 1 25 Nacet: n SI 8 1 9 1 8 18.	108 <u>Total</u> 21 36 51 108 <u>0</u> Tota 4 2 7 3 7 5 10	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 Weight 1 20.5% 6 33.7% 1 45.8% 8 100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.56 [-0.96, -0.16] 9 -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28]	Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl I I I I I I I I I I I I I	
G Pioglitazone Study or Subgroup Piacebo Std. Mean Difference Neight Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Belfort 2006 5.5 0.8 26 6.1 0.9 21 13.7% -0.70 [+1.29, -0.10] Bril 2019 6.4 0.8 37 7.2 1 36 20.9% -0.88 [+1.38, -0.39] Cusi 2016 5.9 0.6 50 6.3 0.6 51 30.1% -0.68 [+1.06, -0.26] Yan 2015 5.9 0.6 60 6.4 0.6 23.5.3% -0.83 [+1.20, -0.46] Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.62, df = 3 (P = 0.89); P = 0% 173 170 100.0% -0.77 [-0.99, -0.55] Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.62, df = 3 (P = 0.800; P = 0% 2 -1 0 1 2	F	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a	2.05, df: Z = 1.08 Pio <u>Mean</u> 90 122 109 = 0.34, c ct: $Z = 4.8$ Pio <u>Mean</u> 10 12 2 = 0.34, c 10 2 = 0.34, c 12 2 = 0.34, c 12 = 0.34, c 13 = 0.34, c 13 = 0.34, c 10 = 0.34, c 13 = 0.34, c 10 = 0.35, c 10 =	$= 2 (P)^{2}$ $= (P = 0)^{2}$ $= \frac{SE}{2} + \frac{SE}{2} +$	113 = 0.36) .28) one <u>o Tota</u> 5 5 50 111: P = 0.8 0.0000 one 111: 7 20 33 5 5 0 111: 7 20 33 5 5 0 111: 7 20 31: 5 5 0 111: 7 2 0 31: 5 5 0 111: 7 2 0 31: 5 5 0 111: 7 2 0 31: 5 5 0 111: 7 2 0 31: 5 5 0 111: 7 2 0 31: 7 2 000 7 31: 7 2 0 31: 7 2 0 31 7 2 0 7 5 0 7 10 7 10 7 10 7 10 7 10 7 10 7 10 7	I; I ² = 29 I Mean 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 4); I ² = (100) I I Mean 1; 7 10 11 3 11: 12: 11: 12:	6 1 aceb n <u>SD</u> 6 31 5 37 1 25 0% Placel 1 <u>SI</u> 8 1 8 1 8 18. 0%	108 0 <u>Total</u> 36 51 108 0 <u>D Tota</u> 4 2 7 3 7 5 10	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 20.5% 6 33.7% 1 45.8% 8 100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.56 [-0.96, -0.16] 6 -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28]	Std. Mean Difference V, Fixed, 95% Cl Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference V, Fixed, 95% Cl Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl	
G Pioglitazone Placebo Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight N, Fixed, 95% CI N, Fixed, 95% CI Belfort 2006 5.5 0.8 26 6.1 0.9 21 13.7% -0.70 [-1.29, -0.10] Image: Comparison of the comp	F	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect	2.05, df: Z = 1.08 Pic Mear 99 122 109 = 0.34, c ct: Z = 4.5 Pic Mear 10 13 9 = 0.70, c ct: Z = 3.5	= 2 (P; (P = 0 oglitaz 3 10 3 12.5 3 12.5	113 = 0.36) .28) → Tota 5 22 1 3 5 5 112 P = 0.8 0.0000 → Tota 3 5 5 12 2 3 5 5 12 2 3 3 5 5 112 2 9 112 2 9 112 2 9 112 3 3 5 5 112 2 9 112 112 112 112 112 112 112 112); ² = 29	6 1 aceb n SD 6 31 5 37 1 25 7% Placet 1 SI 8 1 8 1 8 18. 9%	108 0 <u>Total</u> 36 51 108 0 <u>D Tota</u> 4 2 7 3 7 5 10	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 20.5% 6 33.79 1 46.8% 8 100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>N. Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>t</u> <u>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.42 [-0.88, 0.05] 6 -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control]	
Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total SD Total SD Total SD Total SD SD <th< td=""><td>F</td><td>Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi^a = Test for overall effect: Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi^a Test for overall effect</td><td>2.05, df: Z = 1.08 Pio Mean 98 122 109 = 0.34, c ct: Z = 4.9 Pio Mean 10 13 5 c: Z = 3.9</td><td>$= 2 (P)^{(1)} + (P = 0)^{(1)} + (P = 0)^{(1)$</td><td>113 = 0.36) .28) one $\overline{)}$ 223 $\overline{)}$ $\overline{)}$<td>i; i² = 29 <u>I Mear</u> 6 11 7 15 0 3 4); i² = (1 1 1 1 1 1 1 3 1); i² = (1)</td><td>6 1 aceb n SD 6 31 5 37 1 25 0% Placett 1 25 0% 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3</td><td>108 0 <u>Total</u> 36 51 108 0 <u>D Tota</u> 4 2 7 3 7 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10</td><td>Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 20.5% 46.5% 33.7% 1 20.5% 6 33.7% 1 45.8% 8 100.0%</td><td>0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.42 [-0.88, 0.05] 6 -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28]</td><td>-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [control] Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control]</td></td></th<>	F	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect	2.05, df: Z = 1.08 Pio Mean 98 122 109 = 0.34, c ct: Z = 4.9 Pio Mean 10 13 5 c: Z = 3.9	$= 2 (P)^{(1)} + (P = 0)^{(1)} + (P = 0)^{(1)$	113 = 0.36) .28) one $\overline{)}$ 223 $\overline{)}$ <td>i; i² = 29 <u>I Mear</u> 6 11 7 15 0 3 4); i² = (1 1 1 1 1 1 1 3 1); i² = (1)</td> <td>6 1 aceb n SD 6 31 5 37 1 25 0% Placett 1 25 0% 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3</td> <td>108 0 <u>Total</u> 36 51 108 0 <u>D Tota</u> 4 2 7 3 7 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10</td> <td>Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 20.5% 46.5% 33.7% 1 20.5% 6 33.7% 1 45.8% 8 100.0%</td> <td>0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.42 [-0.88, 0.05] 6 -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28]</td> <td>-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [control] Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control]</td>	i; i² = 29 <u>I Mear</u> 6 11 7 15 0 3 4); i² = (1 1 1 1 1 1 1 3 1); i² = (1)	6 1 aceb n SD 6 31 5 37 1 25 0% Placett 1 25 0% 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3	108 0 <u>Total</u> 36 51 108 0 <u>D Tota</u> 4 2 7 3 7 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 20.5% 46.5% 33.7% 1 20.5% 6 33.7% 1 45.8% 8 100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.42 [-0.88, 0.05] 6 -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [control] Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control]	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	F	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect	2.05, df: Z = 1.08 Pic Mean 99 129 129 109 = 0.34, c tr Z = 4.9 Pic Mean 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	$= 2 (P)^{(2)}$ (P = 0) glitaz) SE) 16) 3 16) 3 12.5) 17.5) 17.5 	113 = 0.36) 228) → Tota 3 221 3 3 5 5 51 111: P = 0.8 0.0000 → Tota 3 3 5 5 1 11: P = 0.8 3 3 5 5 1 11: P = 0.7 0.0000	i; i ² = 29 <u>I</u> <u>Mean</u> 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 4); i ² = (1 <u>Mean</u> 5 11; 7 11; 3 1); i ² = ()	6 1aceb n SD 6 31 5 37 1 25 0% Placet 1 3 1 3 18 1 3 18 0%	108 <u>Total</u> 21 36 51 108 <u>D Tota</u> 4 2 7 3 7 5 10	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 20.5% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 20.5% 33.7% 1 45.8% 8 100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> -0.70 [-1.28, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.42 [-0.88, 0.05] 6 -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28]	The second secon	
Bril 2019 6.4 0.8 37 7.2 1 36 20.9% -0.88 [+1.36, -0.39] Cusi 2016 5.9 0.6 50 6.3 0.6 51 30.1% -0.66 [+1.06, -0.26] Yan 2015 5.9 0.6 60 6.4 0.6 62 35.3% -0.83 [+1.20, -0.46] Total (95% Cl) 173 170 100.0% -0.77 [-0.99, -0.55] - Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.62, df = 3 (P = 0.89); P = 0% -2 -1 0 1 2	F	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect	2.05, df: Z = 1.08 Pic Mean 9 9 9 128 109 = 0.34, c tt Z = 4.9 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	$= 2 (P \cdot (P = 0))$ $= 2 (P \cdot (P = 0))$ $= 3 - 16$ $= $	113 = 0.36) 2.28) Done Done Done Done Done Done Done Done	I; I ² = 29 I <u>Mean</u> 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 4); I ² = (1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	6 1aceb n SD 6 31 5 37 1 25 0% Placel 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3	108 0 <u>Total</u> 21 36 51 108 0 <u>Total</u> 10 10 0 10 0 0 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 20.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 20.5% 6 33.7% 1 45.8% 8 100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.42 [-0.88, 0.05] 6 -0.56 [-0.96, -0.16] 6 -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u>	Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl	
Cusi 2016 5.9 0.6 50 6.3 0.6 51 0.6 61 0.6 0.06 61.06 0.26 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0.06 100 0 100 0 100 0 0.06 100 0 100 0 100 0 0 100 0 100 0 0 100 0 100 0 100 100 0 100 100 100 0 10	FG	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect	2.05, df: Z = 1.08 Pio Mean 99 122 109 = 0.34, c 01 02 = 0.34, c 01 12 = 0.70, c ct: Z = 3.9 = 0.70, c = 0.70, c	= 2 (P) $= 2 (P)$ $= 2$	113 = 0.36) 28) → Tota → Tota → Tota → Tota → S → S → S → S → S → S → S → S → S → S	i; i ² = 29 I <u>Meara</u> 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 4); i ² = (1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	6 Naceb n <u>SD</u> 6 31 5 37 1 25 0% Placet 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1 3 1	108 <u>Total</u> 211 36 51 108 0 <u>0</u> <u>108</u> 108 0 <u>108</u> 108 108 108 108 108 108 108 108	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 46.5% 100.0% 1 46.5% 100.0% 1 46.5% 100.0% 1 46.5% 100.0% 1 45.8% 100.0% 1 45.8% 100.0% 1 45.8% 100.0% 1 45.8% 100.0% 1 45.8% 100.0% 1 45.8% 100.0% 1 45.8% 100.0% 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference t N. Fixed, 95% Cl 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.42 [-0.88, 0.05] 6 -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28] Std. Mean Difference t N. Fixed, 95% Cl -0.71 [-1.29, -0.10]	Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl	
Yan 2015 5.9 0.6 60 6.4 0.6 62 35.3% -0.83 [+1.20, -0.46] Total (95% Cl) 173 170 100.0% -0.77 [-0.99, -0.55] Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.62, df = 3 (P = 0.89); I ² = 0% -2 -1 0 1 2	E F	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019	2.05, df: Z = 1.08 Pic Mean 99 122 109 = 0.34, c ct: $Z = 4.9$ Pic Mean 10 12 2 = 0.70, c ct: $Z = 3.9$ Pic Mean 10 5. Fic Fic Fic Fic Fic Fic Fic Fic	$= 2 (P)^{-1} + (P = 0)^{-1} + (P =$	113 = 0.36) 2.28) brief brief constant	i; i² = 29	6 Naceb n <u>SD</u> 6 31 5 37 1 25 9 9 1 25 9 9 1 25 9 9 1 25 9 9 1 25 9 9 1 25 9 1 25 1	108 Total 21 36 51 108 0 0 0 0 0 108 0 0 0 108 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 20.0% 1 20.5% 33.7% 1 45.8% 8 100.0% 1 45.8% 8 100.0% 1 45.8% 8 100.0% 1 45.8% 8 100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV. Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV. Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV. Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.10] -0.70 [-1.29, -0.10] -0.70 [-1.29, -0.10]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control]	
Total (95% Cl) 173 170 100.0% -0.77 [-0.99, -0.55] Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.62, df = 3 (P = 0.89); I ² = 0% -2 -1 0 1 2	F	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016	2.05, df: Z = 1.08 Pio Mean 98 122 109 = 0.34, c ct: $Z = 4.9$ Pio Mean 10 12 5 0 Mean 5 6 5 5	$= 2 (P)^{-1} + (P = 0)^{-1} + (P =$	113 = 0.36) 2.28) > Tota > Tota > 13 > 22 > 111 P = 0.8 > 10000 > 1000 > 1000 > 1000 > 1000 > 1000 > 0.0000 > 1000 > 1000 > 1000 > 0.0000 > 0.00000 > 0.00	i; i ² = 29 <u>I</u> <u>Mear</u> 6 11 7 15 0 1 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	6 1aceb n SD 6 31 1 25 1	108 <u>Total</u> 21 36 51 108 0 <u>Tota</u> 4 2 10 0 0 <u>Tota</u> 4 2 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 20.5% 100.0% 33.7% 45.8% 1 20.5% 33.7% 1 45.8% 8 100.0% 1 20.5% 33.7% 1 1 20.5% 33.7% 1 1 20.5% 33.7% 1 1 20.5% 33.7% 1 1 20.5% 33.7% 1 1 20.5% 33.7% 1 1 20.5% 33.7% 1 1 20.5% 33.7% 1 1 3.7% 3 1.3.7% 3 20.9% 30.1% 1	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.42 [-0.88, 0.05] 6 -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.10] 0 -0.88 [-1.06, -0.28]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control]	
Total (95% Cl) 173 170 100.0% -0.77 [-0.99, -0.55] Heterogeneity: Chi ^P = 0.62, df = 3 (P = 0.89); I ^P = 0% -2 -1 0 1 2	FG	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Study or Subgroup	2.05, df: Z = 1.08 Pio Mean 99 122 109 = 0.34, c 2.05, df: 122 99 122 109 = 0.24, c 109 = 0.70, c ct: Z = 4.9 Pio Mean 109 = 0.34, c 109 = 0.70, c ct: Z = 3.9 Pio Mean 109 = 0.70, c 5, 6 5, 5 5,	$= 2 (P)^{-1} + (P = 0)^{-1} + (P =$	113 = 0.36) 2.28) → Tota 5 2 21 3 3 5 5 5 111: P = 0.8 0.0000 → Tota 7 21 3 3 5 5 5 111: P = 0.7 0.0000 → Tota 8 2 2 0.0000 → Tota 11: P = 0.8 0.0000 → Tota 11: P = 0.8 0.0000 → Tota 11: P = 0.8 0.0000 → Tota 13: 0.0000 → Tota 13: 0.0000 → Tota 13: 0.0000 → Tota 13: 0.0000 → Tota 13: 0.0000 → Tota 13: 0.0000 → Tota 13: 0.0000 → Tota 14: 0.0000 → Tota 14: 0.000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.00000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.000000	i; i ² = 29 I Pa 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 1 Meaa 6 11 7 15 1 Meaa 1); i ² = (1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	6 Iaceb n <u>SD</u> 6 31 5 37 1 25 0% Placeb n <u>SD</u> 1 3 1 4 5 37 1 25 1 25	108 0 <u>Total</u> 21 36 51 108 0 <u>Tota</u> 4 2 7 3 0 0 <u>Tota</u> 4 2 10 0 0 <u>Tota</u> 108 0 0 <u>Tota</u> 108 0 0 <u>Tota</u> 108 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 33.7% 1 20.5% 6 33.7% 1 45.8% 8 100.0% 1 45.8% 8 100.0% 1 32.5% 3 3.7% 1 20.5% 3 3.0.0% 1 3.7% 3 3.0.1% 2 35.3%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.42 [-0.88, 0.05] 6 -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95% CI</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.10] -0.88 [-1.36, -0.39] -0.66 [-1.06, -0.26] 5 -0.66 [-1.06, -0.26]	The second secon	
Heterogeneity: Chi [#] = 0.62, df = 3 (P = 0.89); I [*] = 0% Test for overall effect 7 = 6 86 (P ≤ 0.00001) -2 -1 0 1 2	FG	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Stil 2019 Cusi 2016 Sril 2019 Cusi 2016 Yan 2015	2.05, df: Z = 1.08 Pic Mean 9 9 128 109 = 0.34, c 5t: $Z = 4.8$ Pic Mean 10 13 5 = 0.70, c ct: $Z = 3.8$ Pic Mean 5 5 6 6 5 5	= 2 (P) $= 2 (P)$ $= 2$	113 = 0.36) .28) Tota - Tota - Tota - Tota - Tota - Tota - 1 - Tota - 1 - Tota - 1 - Tota - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	i; i ² = 29 <u>I</u> Meaa 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 4); i ² = (1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	6 Haceb n SD 6 31 5 37 1 25 Placet n SE 1 0.9 2 1 3 0.6 4 0.6	108 0 <u>Total</u> 21 36 51 108 0 <u>Tota</u> 4 2 7 30 10 0 <u>Tota</u> 4 2 10 0 0 <u>Tota</u> 4 2 1 3 6 5 1 10 8 0 0 <u>Total</u> 1 3 6 5 1 10 8 0 0 <u>Total</u> 1 10 8 0 0 <u>Total</u> 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 33.79 1 20.58 6 33.79 1 45.89 8 100.0% 1 45.89 8 100.0% 1 45.89 8 100.0% 1 3.7% 2 0.9% 3 0.1% 2 35.3%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.42 [-0.88, 0.05] 6 -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28] Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI -0.70 [-1.29, -0.10] -0.88 [-1.36, -0.39] -0.66 [-1.06, -0.26] -0.83 [-1.20, -0.46]	Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: 7 = 6.86 (P < 0.00001) -2 -1 U 1 2	E F G	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Trest for overall effect	2.05, df: Z = 1.08 Pio Mean 92 122 103 = 0.34, c 05t: $Z = 4.5$ Pio Mean 10 13 9 = 0.70, c ct: $Z = 3.9$ Pio Mean 5, 6, 5, 5, 6, 5, 5, 6, 6, 5, 5, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6	= 2 (P) $= 2 (P)$ $= 2$	113 = 0.36) .28) brief - Tota - Tota - 24 - 33 - 5 - 51 - 111 - 24 - 33 - 33 - 5 - 51 - 111 - 24 - 33 - 34 - 111 - 24 - 34 - 34 - 34 - 34 - 34 - 34 - 34 - 3	i; I ² = 29 I <u>Meaa</u> 6 11 7 15 0 12 3 4); I ² = (1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	6 Haceb 6 31 5 37 1 25 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	108 Total 211 36 51 108 0 0 108 0 0 108 0 0 108 0 0 108 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 20.5% 3.79 1 45.8% 8 100.0% 1 45.8% 8 100.0% 1 45.8% 100.0% 1 45.8% 100.0% 1 45.8% 100.0% 1 45.8% 100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference t N. Fixed, 95% Cl 6 -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.42 [-0.88, 0.05] 6 -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28] Std. Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl -0.70 [-1.29, -0.10] 0 -0.88 [-1.36, -0.39] -0.66 [-1.06, -0.26] -0.83 [-1.20, -0.46] 5 -0.77 [-0.99, -0.55]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl	
Favoure [ninglitazonal] Favoure [control]	E F G	Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a = Test for overall effect: Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Belfort 2006 Bril 2019 Cusi 2016 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^a	2.05, df: Z = 1.08 Pio Mean 99 122 109 = 0.34, c ct: $Z = 4.5$ Pio Mean 10 12 2 = 0.70, c ct: $Z = 3.5$ Pio Mean 5.6 6.5 5. 5. 5. 6. 5. 6. 5. 5. 6. 5. 6. 6. 5. 5. 5. 6. 6. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5	$= 2 (P)^{-1} + \frac{P}{2} = 2 (P)^{-1} + \frac{P}{$	113 = 0.36) 2.28) → Tota 3 3 5 5 5 111: P = 0.8 0.0000 → Tota 2 2 3 3 5 5 5 111: P = 0.8 0.0000 → Tota 3 3 5 5 5 11: 2 2 3 3 5 5 5 11: 2 1 3 3 5 5 5 11: 2 2 0.000 → Tota 2 13: 5 5 5 5 11: 2 13: 5 5 5 5 11: 12 13: 5 5 5 11: 12 13: 5 5 5 11: 12 13: 5 5 5 11: 12 13: 5 5 5 5 11: 12 13: 5 5 5 11: 12 13: 5 5 5 11: 12 13: 5 5 5 5 11: 12 13: 5 5 5 11: 12 13: 5 5 5 11: 12 12 13: 5 5 5 11: 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	(; ² = 29	6 Naceb 6 31 5 37 1 25 9 9 1 25 1 25 1 25 1 25 1 3 18 1	108 <u>Total</u> 21 36 51 108 <u>0</u> Tota 4 2 7 3 7 5 10 <u>10</u> <u>0</u> Tota 51 5 5 5 5 5 5 17 0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Weight 21.0% 32.5% 46.5% 100.0% 1 20.5% 33.7% 1 46.5% 100.0% 1 20.5% 33.7% 1 45.8% 8 100.0% 1 45.8% 8 100.0% 1 45.8% 8 100.0%	0.15 [-0.12, 0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV. Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.26, -0.31] -0.60 [-1.00, -0.20] -0.68 [-0.95, -0.41] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV. Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.74 [-1.33, -0.14] 6 -0.42 [-0.88, 0.05] 6 -0.55 [-0.82, -0.28] Std. Mean Difference <u>IV. Fixed, 95% Cl</u> -0.70 [-1.29, -0.10] 0 -0.88 [-1.36, -0.39] -0.88 [-1.36, -0.26] -0.83 [-1.20, -0.46] -0.77 [-0.99, -0.55]	Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control] Std. Mean Difference N, Fixed, 95% Cl Favours [pioglitazonel] Favours [control]	

FIGURE 4 | The effect of pioglitazone on weight (A); the effect of pioglitazone on BMI (B); the effect of pioglitazone on total body fat (C); the effect of pioglitazone on HOMA-IR (D); the effect of pioglitazone on fasting plasma glucose (E); the effect of pioglitazone on fasting plasma insulin (F); and the effect of pioglitazone on HbA1c (G).



NAFLD on imaging (13–15). T2DM patients with NAFLD have higher all-cause, cardiovascular (CV), and liver-related mortality (3, 16). A 150-month follow-up study showed that T2DM doubled the risk of all-cause, liver-related death in NAFLD patients (17). Therefore, it is necessary to actively explore the treatment plan for T2DM patients with NAFLD.

The results of our meta-analysis show that the evidence from published RCTs suggests that pioglitazone could significantly improve glucose metabolism, liver function and liver histology, such as steatosis grade, inflammation grade and ballooning grade, although there was no significant difference in fibrosis between pioglitazone and placebo. However, our results show



FIGURE 6 | Effects of pioglitazone on the risk of adverse events in patients with pre-diabetes or T2DM combined with NAFLD (A); Effects of pioglitazone on the risk of discontinuations in patients with pre-diabetes or T2DM combined with NAFLD (B); Effects of pioglitazone on the risk of Serious Adverse Events in patients with pre-diabetes or T2DM combined with NAFLD (C).



that pioglitazone has efficacy in patients with T2DM combined with NFALD.

NASH is a more serious and progressive form of NAFLD and is characterized by inflammation and hepatocyte ballooning that set off fibrosis and pose a risk of developing cirrhosis and hepatocellular carcinoma (18, 19). In addition, studies through liver biopsy have found that approximately 30% to 50% of patients have steatohepatitis even in the presence of normal plasma aminotransferase levels (20–22). Our results show that pioglitazone can also significantly alleviate NASH in patients with prediabetes or T2DM combined with NAFLD.

In addition, pioglitazone significantly reduced plasma AST and ALT levels. Pioglitazone also significantly improved fasting glucose, HbA1c and plasma insulin levels. However, there were no significant effects on weight, BMI, total body fat, HDL or LDL compared with placebo.

Pioglitazone significantly increases the risk of adverse events, including hypoglycemia, chronic lower limb edema, atypical chest pain or epigastralgia and back or joint pain. There were two deaths in the pioglitazone arms and two in the placebo arms but insufficient power to detect an overall effect. However, because all of the studies we included were under 18 months, there is no proof so far that therapy with pioglitazone beyond 18 months brings additional histological benefits, and research in the future needs to clarify the optimal therapy duration and whether lower doses are beneficial. In addition, pioglitazone should be used with caution in T2DM patients due to the higher risk of heart failure (HF). Although a meta-analysis of 19 randomized controlled trials showed that pioglitazone treatment was associated with a reduced risk of major cardiovascular events, it was also associated with an increased risk of severe heart failure events (23).

At present, no meta-analysis has been conducted on pioglitazone in the treatment of prediabetes or T2DM patients with NAFLD. The results of a meta-analysis on NAFLD patients without T2DM showed that pioglitazone can significantly improve steatosis and inflammation but yielded significant weight gain. In addition, pioglitazone also reduced blood sugar, hemoglobin A1c, and other liver indicators, such as plasma triglycerides. This was broadly consistent with our results, except that our analysis showed no risk of weight gain, possibly due to inconsistencies in the inclusion of patients (24). Other meta-analyses also agreed on the beneficial effects of pioglitazone on lobular inflammation; however, there were still conflicting results for hepatic fibrosis (25, 26). The metaanalysis of Musso et al. showed that treatment with the antidiabetic drug pioglitazone reverses the more advanced stages of liver disease in NASH regardless of the presence of diabetes, but he combined T2DM with NAFLD and T2DM without NAFLD in a comprehensive analysis, which is still different from the study we included (27).

Recent guidelines recommend the identification of patients with advanced NAFLD with liver fibrosis and more intensive monitoring of the occurrence of complications but also acknowledge the lack of effective treatment options to reverse advanced liver disease. Our results also showed that pioglitazone was not effective in the treatment of liver fibrosis (28, 29).

Strengths and Limitations of This Study

NAFLD is a hot spot of recent research, and there are no specific guidelines for treatment plans for NAFLD patients. Currently, there are no drugs available for the treatment of NAFLD. Although the studies we included are limited, it is the first time that we have used the gold standard of liver biopsy as the main result and used a meta-analysis to comprehensively analyze the therapeutic effects of pioglitazone on glucose metabolism and liver biological indicators in patients with NAFLD. It should be mentioned that the limitations of our meta-analysis are related to the nature of the studies included. Currently, there are few randomized controlled trials involving pioglitazone in the treatment of NAFLD and T2DM, so we conducted a comprehensive analysis of NAFLD with IGT and NAFLD with T2DM. Second, we did not conduct a separate analysis of NASH and only analyzed it as an advanced NAFLD state. Finally, the sample size of the studies we included was also small, and the duration was less than 18 months, which also affected our analysis results to some extent. However, it should be noted that the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases and the US Food and Drug Administration have the consensus that because of the progressive characteristics of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease, it is impractical and Infeasible to conduct large-scale, long-term studies to confirm treatment-related clinical benefits (30).

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, our results suggest that although pioglitazone has no significant effect on liver fibrosis, it can significantly improve liver histology, such as steatosis, inflammation and ballooning. Furthermore, pioglitazone can also improve insulin sensitivity and significantly reduce fasting blood glucose, glycosylated hemoglobin, plasma AST, ALT and other liver biological indicators. We suggest that pioglitazone can be used as a first-line therapy for NAFLD in the absence of FDA-approved pharmacological drugs for the treatment of T2DM patients with NAFLD, especially NASH.

It is also important to note that hypoglycemia, chronic lower limb edema, atypical chest pain or epigastralgia and back or joint pain are common side effects of pioglitazone treatment. In this regard, the risks and benefits should be considered before starting therapy.

In summary, due to the limitations of pioglitazone in the treatment of T2DM patients with NAFLD, such as fewer randomized controlled trials and shorter follow-up times, it is still necessary to design strict randomized controlled trials with large samples and long-term follow-up to prove the efficacy of pioglitazone to better guide clinical decision-making, patient selection and clinical practice guidelines.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/supplementary material. Further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

JL was mainly involved in electronic retrieval, abstract screening, data extraction, data analysis and manuscript review, while JF

REFERENCES

- Younossi Z, Stepanova M, Ong JP, Jacobson IM, Bugianesi E, Duseja A, et al. Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis is the Fastest Growing Cause of Hepatocellular Carcinoma in Liver Transplant Candidates. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* (2019) 17(4):748–55. doi: 10.1016/j.cgh.2018.05.057
- Byrne CD, Targher G. NAFLD: A Multisystem Disease. J Hepatol (2015) 62(1 Suppl):S47–64. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2014.12.012
- Younossi ZM, Golabi P, De Avila L, Paik JM, Srishord M, Fukui N, et al. The Global Epidemiology of NAFLD and NASH in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. J Hepatol (2019) 71 (4):793–801. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2019.06.021
- 4. Sberna AL, Bouillet B, Rouland A, Brindisi MC, Nguyen A, Mouillot T, et al. European Association for the Study of the Liver (Easl), European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD) and European Association for the Study of Obesity (EASO) Clinical Practice Recommendations for the Management of non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease: Evaluation of Their Application in People With Type 2 Diabetes. *Diabetes Med* (2018) 35(3):368–75. doi: 10.1111/ dme.13565
- Jang JE, Cho Y, Lee BW, Shin ES, Lee SH. Effectiveness of Exercise Intervention in Reducing Body Weight and Glycosylated Hemoglobin Levels in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus in Korea: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Diabetes Metab J* (2019) 43(3):302–18. doi: 10.4093/dmj.2018.0062
- Kim KS, Lee BW. Beneficial Effect of Anti-Diabetic Drugs for Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Clin Mol Hepatol* (2020) 26(4):430–43. doi: 10.3350/ cmh.2020.0137
- Shah PK, Mudaliar S, Chang AR, Aroda V, Andre M, Burke P, et al. Effects of Intensive Insulin Therapy Alone and in Combination With Pioglitazone on Body Weight, Composition, Distribution and Liver Fat Content in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes. *Diabetes Obes Metab* (2011) 13(6):505–10. doi: 10.1111/j.1463-1326.2011.01370.x
- Le P, Chaitoff A, Rothberg MB, McCullough A, Alkhouri N. Trends in Pioglitazone Use Among U.S. Adults With Type 2 Diabetes and Suspected Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Expert Opin Investig Drugs* (2020) 29 (2):205–8. doi: 10.1080/13543784.2020.1704731
- Bril F, Biernacki DM, Kalavalapalli S, Lomonaco R, Subbarayan SK, Lai J, et al. Role of Vitamin E for Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Diabetes Care* (2019) 42(8):1481– 8. doi: 10.2337/dc19-0167
- Cusi K, Orsak B, Bril F, Lomonaco R, Hecht J, Ortiz-Lopez C, et al. Long-Term Pioglitazone Treatment for Patients With Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis and Prediabetes or Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A Randomized Trial. *Ann Intern Med* (2016) 165(5):305–15. doi: 10.7326/M15-1774
- Belfort R, Harrison SA, Brown K, Darland C, Finch J, Hardies J, et al. A Placebo-Controlled Trial of Pioglitazone in Subjects With Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis. N Engl J Med (2006) 355(22):2297–307. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa060326
- Yan HM, Xia MF, Wang Y, Chang XX, Yao XZ, Rao SX, et al. Efficacy of Berberine in Patients With Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *PloS One* (2015) 10(8):e0134172. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0134172
- Williamson RM, Price JF, Glancy S, Perry E, Nee LD, Hayes PC, et al. Prevalence of and Risk Factors for Hepatic Steatosis and Nonalcoholic Fatty

was mainly involved in method design, electronic retrieval, abstract screening, data extraction, data analysis and interpretation and manuscript review. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

FUNDING

This research was funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (81670736).

Liver Disease in People With Type 2 Diabetes: The Edinburgh Type 2 Diabetes Study. *Diabetes Care* (2011) 34(5):1139–44. doi: 10.2337/dc10-2229

- Leite NC, Salles GF, Araujo AL, Villela-Nogueira CA, Cardoso CR. Prevalence and Associated Factors of non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease in Patients With Type-2 Diabetes Mellitus. *Liver Int* (2009) 29(1):113–9. doi: 10.1111/j.1478-3231.2008.01718.x
- Kotronen A, Juurinen L, Hakkarainen A, Westerbacka J, Cornér A, Bergholm R, et al. Liver Fat is Increased in Type 2 Diabetic Patients and Underestimated by Serum Alanine Aminotransferase Compared With Equally Obese Nondiabetic Subjects. *Diabetes Care* (2008) 31(1):165–9. doi: 10.2337/dc07-1463
- Wild SH, Walker JJ, Morling JR, Westerbacka J, Cornér A, Bergholm R, et al. Cardiovascular Disease, Cancer, and Mortality Among People With Type 2 Diabetes and Alcoholic or Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Hospital Admission. *Diabetes Care* (2018) 41(2):341–7. doi: 10.2337/dc17-1590
- Stepanova M, Rafiq N, Makhlouf H, Agrawal R, Kaur I, Younoszai Z, et al. Predictors of All-Cause Mortality and Liver-Related Mortality in Patients With non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease (NAFLD). *Dig Dis Sci* (2013) 58 (10):3017–23. doi: 10.1007/s10620-013-2743-5
- Xia MF, Bian H, Gao X. NAFLD and Diabetes: Two Sides of the Same Coin? Rationale for Gene-Based Personalized NAFLD Treatment. *Front Pharmacol* (2019) 10:877. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2019.00877
- Lee YH, Cho Y, Lee BW, Park CY, Lee DH, Cha BS, et al. Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease in Diabetes. Part I: Epidemiology and Diagnosis. *Diabetes Metab* J (2019) 43(1):31–45. doi: 10.4093/dmj.2019.0011
- Portillo-Sanchez P, Bril F, Maximos M, Lomonaco R, Biernacki D, Orsak B, et al. High Prevalence of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Normal Plasma Aminotransferase Levels. J Clin Endocrinol Metab (2015) 100(6):2231–8. doi: 10.1210/jc.2015-1966
- Maximos M, Bril F, Portillo Sanchez P, Lomonaco R, Orsak B, Biernacki D, et al. The Role of Liver Fat and Insulin Resistance as Determinants of Plasma Aminotransferase Elevation in Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Hepatology* (2015) 61(1):153–60. doi: 10.1002/hep.27395
- 22. Leite NC, Villela-Nogueira CA, Pannain VL, Bottino AC, Rezende GF, Cardoso CR, et al. Histopathological Stages of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease in Type 2 Diabetes: Prevalences and Correlated Factors. *Liver Int* (2011) 31(5):700–6. doi: 10.1111/j.1478-3231.2011.02482.x
- Lincoff AM, Wolski K, Nicholls SJ, Nissen SE. Pioglitazone and Risk of Cardiovascular Events in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Trials. *JAMA* (2007) 298(10):1180–8. doi: 10.1001/ jama.298.10.1180
- Musso G, Gambino R, Cassader M, Pagano G. A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Trials for the Treatment of Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Hepatology* (2010) 52(1):79–104. doi: 10.1002/hep.23623
- 25. Singh S, Khera R, Allen AM, Murad MH, Loomba R. Comparative Effectiveness of Pharmacological Interventions for Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-Analysis. *Hepatology* (2015) 62(5):1417-32. doi: 10.1002/hep.27999
- He L, Liu X, Wang L, Yang Z. Thiazolidinediones for Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Clinical Trials. *Med* (*Baltimore*) (2016) 95(42):e4947. doi: 10.1097/MD.000000000004947
- 27. Musso G, Cassader M, Paschetta E, Gambino R. Thiazolidinediones and Advanced Liver Fibrosis in Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis: A Meta-Analysis.

JAMA Intern Med (2017) 177(5):633-40. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed. 2016.9607

- 28. European Association for the Study of The L, European Association for the Study Of D and European Association for the Study Of O. Easl-Easd-Easo Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Management of non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. *Diabetologia* (2016) 59(6):1121–40. doi: 10.1007/s00125-016-3902-y
- Glen J, Floros L, Day C, Pryke R. Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease (NAFLD): Summary of NICE Guidance. BMJ (2016) 354:i4428. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i4428
- 30. Sanyal AJ, Friedman SL, Mccullough AJ, Dimick-Santos L. Challenges and Opportunities in Drug and Biomarker Development for Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis: Findings and Recommendations From an American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases-U.s. Food and Drug

Administration Joint Workshop. *Hepatology* (2015) 61(4):1392-405. doi: 10.1002/hep.27678

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2021 Lian and Fu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.