

Effect of sodium-dependent glucose transporter inhibitors on glycated hemoglobin A1c after 24 weeks in patients with diabetes mellitus

A systematic review and meta-analysis

Mao-Bing Chen, MD^{a,*}, Hua Wang, MD^b, Qi-Han Zheng, MD^a, Hua-Lan Xu, MD^b, Wei-Yan Cui, MD^b

Abstract

Background: To evaluate dapagliflozin, canagliflozin, empagliflozin, ertugliflozin, and sotagliflozin according to their effect on the glycated hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) level in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus.

Methods: The Web of Science, PubMed, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, and Clinical Trials databases were electronically searched to collect randomized controlled trials of patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus through June 2020. Two researchers independently screened and evaluated the obtained studies and extracted the outcome indexes. RevMan 5.3 software was used to perform the meta-analysis and to create plots.

Results: Finally, 27 studies were selected and included in this study. The meta-analysis results showed that sodium-dependent glucose transporter (SGLT) inhibitors significantly reduced the HbA1c level in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. However, these results were highly heterogeneous, so we conducted a subgroup analysis. The results of the subgroup analysis suggested that by dividing populations into different subgroups, the heterogeneity of each group could be reduced.

Conclusions: SGLT inhibitors had a good effect on the HbA1c level in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus, but there might be differences in the efficacy of SGLT inhibitors in different populations. It is hoped that more studies will be conducted to evaluate the efficacy and safety of SGLT inhibitors in different populations.

Registration Number: CRD42020185025.

Abbreviations: CANA = canagliflozin, CI = confidence interval, DAPA = dapagliflozin, EMPA = empagliflozin, ERTU = ertugliflozin, HbA1c = glycated hemoglobin A1c, MD = mean difference, PROSPERO = International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews, RCTs = randomized controlled trials, SGLT = sodium-dependent glucose transporter, SOTA = sotagliflozin, T2DM = type 2 diabetes mellitus.

Keywords: type 2 diabetes mellitus, meta-analysis, sodium-glucose transporter 1, sodium-glucose transporter 2

Editor: Arthur Sargun.

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

^a Emergency Department, ^bICU Department, Wujin People's Hospital Affiliated with Jiangsu University and Wujin Clinical College of Xuzhou Medical University, Changzhou, Jiangsu, P. R. China.

* Correspondence: Mao-Bing Chen, Emergency Department, Wujin People's Hospital Affiliated with Jiangsu University and Wujin Clinical College of Xuzhou Medical University, Changzhou, Jiangsu, P. R. China (e-mail: 554118854@qq.com).

Copyright © 2021 the Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial License 4.0 (CCBY-NC), where it is permissible to download, share, remix, transform, and buildup the work provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be used commercially without permission from the journal.

How to cite this article: Chen MB, Wang H, Zheng QH, Xu HL, Cui WY. Effect of sodium-dependent glucose transporter inhibitors on glycated hemoglobin A1c after 24weeks in patients with diabetes mellitus: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Medicine 2021;100:1(e24101).

Received: 25 September 2020 / Received in final form: 17 November 2020 / Accepted: 8 December 2020

http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MD.000000000024101

1. Introduction

Diabetes mellitus, commonly known as diabetes, is a group of metabolic disorders characterized by prolonged hyperglycemia. Symptoms of diabetes, including type 1 diabetes mellitus and type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM), usually include frequent urination, thirst, and increased appetite.^[1,2] T2DM begins with insulin resistance, a condition in which cells cannot respond normally to insulin. As the disease progresses, insulin deficiency may also occur. The most common cause is a combination of overweight and insufficient exercise.^[3] Without being well controlled, these conditions can lead to serious complications.^[4] In 2019, there were approximately 463 million people with diabetes worldwide, close to 9% of adults.^[5] In that year, 4.2 million people died of diabetes, the seventh leading cause of death in the world.^[6]

The formation of glycated hemoglobin suggests the presence of excessive sugar in the bloodstream, indicating the possibility of diabetes. There are different subfractions of glycated hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c), which are easy to detect and have recently received more attention from researchers.^[7,8] HbA1c is measured primarily to determine the 3-month average blood sugar level. Three months is the lifespan of a red blood cell. A persistently elevated level of HbA1c increases the risk of vascular

complications, such as coronary disease, heart attack, stroke, heart failure, kidney failure, blindness, erectile dysfunction, neuropathy, gangrene, gastroparesis, and short-term complications of surgery such as poor wound healing.^[9,10]

There are many types of hypoglycaemic drugs, among which sodium-dependent glucose transporter (SGLT) inhibitors are the focus of current research because they have a unique hypoglycemic mechanism and can remove glucose from the blood.^[7,8] SGLT inhibitors are mainly divided into SGLT-2 inhibitors and dual SGLT-1/2 inhibitors. Specific drugs include dapagliflozin (DAPA), canagliflozin (CANA), empagliflozin (EMPA), ertugliflozin (ERTU), and sotagliflozin (SOTA).^[9,10] SGLT inhibitors are commonly used as second-line hypoglycemic agents in clinical practice.^[11]

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effects of these SGLT inhibitors on HbA1c and to perform a variety of subgroup analyses to evaluate their effects in different populations, thereby providing a basis for the clinical selection of drugs.

2. Methods

2.1. Design and registration

A meta-analysis was conducted to evaluate the effect of SGLT inhibitors on the HbA1c level in patients with T2DM. This protocol was registered in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO), registration number: CRD42020185025 (https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO). No ethics approval was required because this study used data that were already in the public domain.^[11]

2.2. Study selection

2.2.1. Study type. The quantitative analysis of this study included data from randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

2.2.2. Study subjects. The subjects of this study were patients with T2DM, with no restrictions on age, weight, basic HbA1c, drug background, etc. However, patients with serious underlying acute and chronic diseases or heart and kidney failure were excluded.

2.2.3. Intervention measures. First, the targets of this study were SGLT inhibitors; currently, there are 5 major SGLT inhibitors, DAPA, CANA, EMPA, ERTU, and SOTA. Due to their different doses, there were 10 different interventions. Second, the placebo control groups were also included in this network meta-analysis.

The purpose of this study was to compare the efficacy of individual medications, and studies on the efficacy and safety of medication combinations were not included in this study.

This study did not exclude patients based on background medications. If the dose of background medications did not change during the course of treatment, the study was still included in this meta-analysis.

2.2.4. Outcome indicators. The final outcome index included in the quantitative analysis was the HbA1c level at week 24 (± 2 weeks).

Through a previous review of the literature, we found that after approximately 12 weeks of oral treatment with SGLT inhibitors, the HbA1c level of patients reached a low point and could be maintained at that level thereafter. Therefore, we included all studies with HbA1c data for week 24. **2.2.5.** Exclusion criteria. Studies with data that could not be extracted or utilized, studies based on animal experiments, and literature reviews were excluded.

2.3. Data sources and searches

We searched publications through June 2020 using the following databases: Web of Science, PubMed, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, and Clinical Trials. We searched in English as a retrieval strategy. However, we did not limit the retrieved results by language. With the help of translation software (Google Translate), we could read literature in other languages. The search terms included "SGLT," "diabetes," and "mellitus." Figure 1 shows an example of the search in the PubMed database.

2.4. Study screening, data extraction and assessment of the risk of bias

Data were collected independently by 2 researchers. The unqualified studies were eliminated, and the qualified studies were screened out after reading the title, abstract, and full text. Then, the research data were extracted and checked, and disagreements were resolved by discussion or a decision made by the author. The extracted data included the following:

- basic information of the study, including title, author, and year of publication;
- (2) characteristics of the included study, consisting of study duration, sample size of test group and control group, and intervention measures;
- (3) outcome indicators and data included;
- (4) collection of risk assessment elements of bias.

The risk of bias in the included studies was assessed using the RCT bias risk assessment tool recommended in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (5.1.0).^[12]

2.5. Statistical analysis

RevMan 5.3 software was used for the meta-analysis. The continuous variables are expressed as the mean difference (MD) as effect indicators, and the estimated value and 95% confidence interval (CI) were included as effect analysis statistics. A heterogeneity test was conducted with the results of each study. A fixed-effects model was used for analysis if there was no statistical heterogeneity in the results ($I^2 \leq 50\%$). The sources of heterogeneity were analyzed if $I^2 > 50\%$. After excluding the influence of obvious clinical heterogeneity, a random-effects model was used for analysis. The significance level was set at $\alpha = 0.05$.

3. Results

3.1. Included studies and patients

Through database searches, we retrieved a total of 7657 studies. Finally, 27 studies^[13–39] were selected and included. No grey literature was included in this study. The specific flow diagram is shown in Figure 1. Through data collation for the included studies, a total of 14,074 patients were enrolled. In each study, the characteristics of patients in the groups were similar.



Figure 1. PubMed database retrieval strategy and PRISMA flow diagram.

3.2. Characteristics of the included studies and quality assessment

All included studies were RCTs. The basic characteristics and quality assessment of the studies are presented in Table 1.

3.3. Meta-analysis results

3.3.1. *HbA1c.* Twenty-seven studies reported comparisons of the HbA1c level, including 11 articles on DAPA, 6 articles on EMPA, 4 articles on ERTU, 6 articles on CANA, and 0 articles on SOTA (Fig. 2, Table 2).

A random-effects model was adopted, and the HbA1c level in the DAPA group was lower than that in the placebo group: 5 mg DAPA group: $I^2 = 22\%$ [MD=-0.50, 95% CI (-0.63, -0.38), P < .00001]; 10 mg DAPA group: $I^2 = 60\%$ [MD=-0.61, 95% CI (-0.72, -0.51), P < .00001].

A random-effects model was adopted, and the HbA1c level in the EMPA group was lower than that in the placebo group: 10 mg EMPA group: $I^2 = 83\%$ [MD=-0.68, 95% CI (-0.84, -0.51), P < .0001]; 25 mg EMPA group: $I^2 = 68\%$ [MD=-0.67, 95% CI (-0.80, -0.54), P < .00001].

A random-effects model was adopted, and the HbA1c level in the ERTU group was lower than that in the placebo group: 5 mg ERTU group: $I^2 = 64\%$ [MD=-0.71, 95% CI (-0.85, -0.56), P < .00001]; 15 mg ERTU group: $I^2 = 25\%$ [MD=-0.80, 95% CI (-0.91, -0.70), P < .00001].

A random-effects model was adopted, and the HbA1c level in the CANA group was lower than that in the placebo group: 100 mg CANA group: $I^2 = 44\%$ [MD = -0.71, 95% CI (-0.82, -0.56), P < .00001]; 300 mg CANA group: $I^2 = 70\%$ [MD = -0.88, 95% CI (-1.03, -0.72), P < .00001].

												Literature qua	ality score			
No.	First author	Year	Trials No.	Country	Background	Duration of treatment	Group-1	Group-2	Group-3	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of participants and personnel	Blinding of outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other bias
	Bailey, C. J.	2010	NCT00528879	ЯN	MET	24 wk	DAPA 5 mg	DAPA 10 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk
2	Bailey, C. J.	2012	I	ЧK	Diet and Exercise	24 wk	DAPA 5mg	PLA		low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear
n	Bode, Bruce	2013	NCT01106651	SN	Unlimited	26 wk	CANA 100 mg	CANA 300 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear
4	Bolinder, J.	2014	NCT00855166	Sweden	MET	24 wk	DAPA 10 mg	PLA		low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear
2	Dagogo-Jack, S.	2018	NCT02036515	SN	MET and SITA	24 wk	ERTU 5 mg	ERTU 15 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear
9	Ferrannini, E.	2010	NCT00528372	Italy	Diet and Exercise	24 wk	DAPA 5 mg	DAPA 10 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear	low risk	unclear
7	Forst, T.	2014	NCT01106690	Germany	MET and pioglitazone	26 wk,	CANA 100 mg	CANA 300 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear
80	Haering, Hans-Ulrich	2014	NCT01159600	Germany	Diet and Exercise	24 wk	EMPA 10mg	EMPA 25 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear
6	Jabbour, Serge A.	2018	NCT00984867	SN	SITA and/or MET	24 wk	DAPA 10 mg	PLA		low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear	low risk	unclear
10	Ji, L	2019	NCT02630706	China	MET	26 wk	ERTU 5 mg	ERTU 15 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear
÷	Kadowaki, T.	2017	NCT02354235	Japan	Teneligliptin	24 wk	CANA 100 mg	PLA		low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear
12	Kawamori, R.	2018	NCT02453555	Japan	linagliptin	24 wk	DAPA 10 mg	PLA		low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear	low risk	unclear
13	Kovacs, C. S.	2015	NCT01210001	Canada	MET	24 wk	EMPA 10 mg	EMPA 25 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear	low risk	unclear
14	Mathieu, C.	2015	NCT01646320	Romania	MET and Saxagliptin	24 wk	DAPA 10 mg	PLA		low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear	low risk	unclear
15	Matthaei, S.	2015	NCT01392677	Germany	MET and SUL	24 wk	DAPA 10 mg	PLA		low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear	low risk	unclear
16	Neal, B.	2015	NCT01032629	Australia	Insulin	24 wk	CANA 100 mg	CANA 300 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear	low risk	unclear
17	Romera, I.	2016	I	Spain	MET or SUL and so on.	24 wk	EMPA 10 mg	EMPA 25 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear	low risk	unclear
18	Rosenstock, J.	2018	NCT02033889	SN	MET	26 wk	ERTU 5 mg	ERTU 15 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear
19	Rosenstock, J.	2012	NCT00683878	SN	Pioglitazone	24 wk	DAPA 5 mg	DAPA 10 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear	low risk	unclear
20	Softeland, E.	2017	NCT01734785	Norway	Linagliptin and MET	24 wk	EMPA 10 mg	EMPA 25 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear
21	Stenlof, K.	2013	NCT01081834	Sweden	Diet and Exercise	26 wk	CANA 100 mg	CANA 300 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear
22	Strojek, K.	2011	NCT00680745	Poland	Glimepiride	24 wk	DAPA 5 mg	DAPA 10 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear
23	Terra, S. G.	2017	NCT01958671.	SN	Diet and Exercise	26 wk	ERTU 5 mg	ERTU 15 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear	low risk	unclear
24	Wilding, J. P.	2013	NCT01106625	ЧK	MET and SUL	24 wk	CANA 100 mg	CANA 300 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear
25	Yang, W.	2016	NCT01095666	China	MET	24 wk	DAPA 5 mg	DAPA 10 mg	PLA	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear	unclear
26	Yang, W.	2018	NCT02096705	China	Insulin with or without oral	24 wK	DAPA 10 mg	PLA		low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear	unclear
27	Roden, M.	2013	NCT01177813	Germany	antihyperglycemic drugs Diet and Exercise	24 wk	EMPA 10 mg	EMPA 25 mg		low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	low risk	unclear
CANA	= canagliflozin, DAPA	= dapagli	iflozin, EMPA = er	mpagliflozin.												

Basic information and bias risk assessments of the studies.

Table 1

| or Subgroup Me
low dose | | | | |
 | | can pure ence | Mean Difference | The second s

 | |
 | | | | -
 | a sector sector of | memorenee | Medit | |
|---|--|---|--|--
--|---|--|--
--
--
--	---	--
--	---	--
ow dose	ean SD	Total
 | Veight IV, | Random, 95% Cl | IV, Random, 95% CI | Study or Subgroup

 | Mean | SD
 | Total | Mean | SD | Total
 | Weight | IV, Random, 95% CI | IV, Rand | lom, 95% Cl |
| and the second se | and store | | e suite | | 1.00
 | and the second | and a second second | | 1.1.1 Low dose

 | | | | |
 | | |
 | | | | |
| , C. J.2010 | -0.7 0.86 | 137 | -0.3 | 3.83 | 137
 | 25.1% - | 0.40 [-0.60, -0.20] | | *Haering, Hans-Ulrich2014

 | -0.7 | 0.78
 | 217 | -0.13 | 0.78 | 207
 | 18.1% | -0.57 [-0.72, -0.42] | - | |
| C.J.2012 -0 | 0.82 1.01 | 68 | 0.02 | 2.99 | 68
 | 11.3% | 0.84 [-1.18, -0.50] | | *Kawamori R 2018

 | -0.92 | 1.08
 | 182 | 0.2 | 0.96 | 93
 | 14.3% | -1.121-1.37 -0.871 | | |
| inini, E 2010 -0. | 1.77 0.94 | 64 | -0.23 | 188 | 15
 | 13.4% - | 0.54 [-0.84, -0.24] | | *Voyace C 8 2015

 | -0.61 | 0.0
 | 165 | .0.01 | 0.0 | 165
 | 16.4% | 0.601.079 .0.411 | | |
| ISTOCK, J. 2012 -0. | 182 1 | 141 | -0.45 | | 139
 | 20.1% | 0.37 [-0.60, -0.14] | | Portes 1 2013

 | 0.74 | 0.0
 | 007 | 0.14 | 0.0 | 607
 | 10.00 | 0.00 [0.76, 0.40] | - | |
| K K 2011 -0. | 0.03 1.1 | 142 | -0.13 | | 145
 | 17.8% | 0.50[-0.75, -0.25] | | Hoden, M.2013

 | -0.71 | 0.8
 | 007 | -0.14 | 0.8 | 231
 | 19.9% | -0.57 [-0.00, -0.40] | | |
| -0. | 1.02 1.4 | 600 | -0.23 | 1.4 | 700 1
 | 00.0% | 0.59 -0.91, -0.27 | • | "Romera, 1.2016

 | -1.18 | 1.1
 | 186 | -0.81 | 1.1 | 188
 | 15.3% | -0.37 [-0.59, -0.15] | | |
| anonate Tault - 0.01 C | NF- 0.42 | din 6 | P = 0.27 | 8- 22 |
 | 00.01 | read or and or sail | | "Softeland, E 2017

 | -0.89 | 0.7
 | 86 | 0.01 | 0.7 | 90
 | 16.0% | -0.90[-1.11, -0.69] | | |
| yenergil effect 7 = 9.04 | A /P = 0.00 | 0011 | | |
 | | | | Subtotal (95% CI)

 | |
 | 1443 | | | 1340
 | 100.0% | -0.68 [-0.84, -0.51] | • | |
| or Overall elleve 2 = 0.04 | 400.00 | 0017 | | |
 | | | | Heterogeneity Tau ² = 0.03: 0

 | Chi#= 28 | 83. df=
 | 5 (P « | 0.0001) | F=8 | 3%
 | | | | |
| high dose | | | | |
 | | | | Test for overall effect 7 = 7.9

 | 1 (P < 0.0 | (10001)
 | | | |
 | | | | |
| C. J.2010 -0 | 0.84 0.83 | 135 | -0.3 | 1.83 | 137
 | 10.8% | 0 54 1-0 74 -0 341 | |

 | |
 | | | |
 | | | | |
| ter, J.2014 -0 | 0.31 0.65 | 89 | 0.03 | 0.62 | 91
 | 11.3% - | 0.34 [-0.53, -0.15] | | 1 1 3 High dates

 | |
 | | | |
 | | | | |
| nini E 2010 -0 | 89 0.92 | 70 | -0.23 | 88 | 75
 | 7.4% - | 0 66 1-0 95 -0 371 | | 1.1.2 High dose

 | |
 | | | |
 | | | | |
| ur, Serge A 2018 | 0.5 0.77 | 223 | 0 | 0.77 | 224
 | 13.1% - | 0.50 [-0.64, -0.36] | | Haering, Hans-Ulrich2014

 | -0.77 | 0.78
 | 213 | -0.13 | 0.78 | 207
 | 21.8% | -0.64 [-0.79, -0.49] | - | |
| HU, C.2015 -0 | .82 0.87 | 160 | -0.1 | 0.9 | 160
 | 10.9% - | 0.72 [-0.91, -0.53] | | Kovacs, C. S.2015

 | -0.7 | 0.9
 | 168 | -0.01 | 0.9 | 165
 | 18.2% | -0.69 [-0.88, -0.50] | | |
| ei, S.2015 -0 | 0.86 0.74 | 108 | -0.17 | 0.77 | 108
 | 10.6% - | 0.69 [-0.89, -0.49] | | Roden, M 2013

 | -0.75 | 0.8
 | 597 | -0.14 | 0.8 | 597
 | 26.7% | -0.61 -0.70, -0.521 | | |
| nstock, J.2012 -0 | 0.97 1 | 140 | -0.45 | 1 | 139
 | 9.3% - | 0.52 [-0.75, -0.29] | | Romera 12016

 | -1 27 | 11
 | 189 | -0.81 | 11 | 188
 | 16.1% | -0 46 1-0 68 -0 241 | | |
| k, K.2011 -0 | 0.82 1.1 | 151 | -0.13 | 1.1 | 145
 | 8.8% - | 0.69 [-0.94, -0.44] | | Coffeiand E 2017

 | .0.05 | 0.7
 | 00 | 0.01 | 0.7 | 00
 | 17 2% | 0.061116.076 | | |
| W.2016 -0 | 0.85 1.4 | 152 | -0.23 | 1.4 | 145
 | 6.7% - | 0.62 [-0.94, -0.30] | | Subtetet (OEV CD

 | -0.95 | 0.1
 | 1367 | 0.01 | 0.1 | 1317
 | 100.00 | 0.00 1.10, 0.70 | | |
| W.2018 -0 | 0.87 0.8 | 139 | 0.03 | 0.8 | 133
 | 11.1% | 0.90 [-1.09, -0.71] | | Subtotal (95% CI)

 | 1.1 | 100
 | 1257 | | | 1247
 | 100.0% | -0.67 [-0.80, -0.54] | • | |
| | | 1367 | | 1 | 357 1
 | 100.0% -0 | 0.61 [-0.72, -0.51] | • | Heterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0.01; C

 | Chi#= 12 | 56, df =
 | 4 (P= | 0.01), P | = 68% | 6
 | | | | |
| stal (95% CI) | | 2 AT - C | (P = 0.0) |)7); I*= | 60%
 | | | | Test for overall effect Z = 10.

 | 18 (P < 0 | 00001
 |) | | |
 | | | | |
| tal (95% Cl)
ogeneity: Tau [#] = 0.02; C
ir overail effect Z = 11.3
Forest plot co | hi [#] = 22.61
34 (P < 0.0
omparin; | g the | efficacy | on H | bAlc
 | between | DAPA and PLA. | -1 -0.5 0 0.5 T
Favours DAPA Favours PLA | B Forest plot c

 | rompari | ng the
 | e effic | acy on | НЬ/ | Alc be
 | etween | EMPA and PLA. | -1 -0.5
Favours EMP/ | 0 0.5 1
A Favours PLA |
| rat (95% C)
ogeneity: Tau* = 0.02; C
ir overail effect Z = 11.3
Forest plot co | chi ² = 22.68
34 (P < 0.0
omparin;
ER | g the
TU | efficacy | on H | bAlc
 | between | DAPA and PLA.
Mean Difference | A Contraction of the second se | B Forest plot c

 | compari
CAN/ | ng the | e effic
 | PLA | Hb. | Alc be | Me
 | EMPA and PLA. | -1 -0.5
Favours EMP/
Mean Diffe | 0 0.5 1
A Favours PLA |
| ar (95% Cl)
genetic, Tau" = 0.02; C
r overall effect Z = 11.3
Forest plot co
udy or Subgroup | chi ² = 22.64
34 (P < 0.0
omparin;
ER
Mean | g the
TU
SD Te | efficacy | on H
PLA | bAlc
Tota
 | between
al Weight | DAPA and PLA.
Mean Difference
IV, Random, 95% CI | -1 -0.5 0 0.5
Favours DAPA Favours PLA
Mean Difference
IV, Bandem 95% CI | B Forest plot of Study of Sabarooun M

 | compari
CAN/
Mean Si | ing the
 | e effic | PLA
PLA | Hb. | Alc be
 | etween
Me
ght IV, I | EMPA and PLA.
an Difference
Random, 95% Cl | -1 -0.5
Favours EMP/
Mean Diffe
IV. Random. | 0 0.5 1
A Favours PLA |
| at (95% Cl)
genety: Tauf = 0.02; C
roverall effect Z = 11.5
Forest plot co
ady or Subgroup
1.1 Low dose | chi ² = 22.64
34 (P < 0.0
omparin;
ER
Mean | g the
TU
SD Te | efficacy
tal Mea | on H | bAlc
 | between
1 Weight | —
DAPA and PLA.
Mean Difference
IV, Random, 95% CI | -1 -05 0 0.5 T
Favours DAPA Favours PLA
Mean Difference
N, Bandem, 95% Cl | B Forest plot of
Study or Subgroup M
1.1.1 Low dose
"Porte Ever 2013

 | CANJ
CANJ
Mean SI | ing the
 | e effic | PLA
PLA
n SD | Hb. | Alc be
 | Me
ght IV.1 | EMPA and PLA.
an Difference
Random, 95% CI | -1 -0.5
Favours EMP/
Mean Diffe | 0 0.5
A Favours PLA
rence
95% Cl |
| ar (95% CI)
geneity: Tau# = 0.02; C
roverall effect Z = 11.
Forest plot co
netv or Subgroup
.1 Low dose
agogo-Jack, S 2018 | chi# = 22.64
34 (P < 0.0
omparin;
ER
Mean
-0.82 | g the
TU
SD Te
0.9 | efficacy
Ital Mea | on H | bAlc
Tota
 | between
al Weight
3 22.6% | DAPA and PLA.
Mean Difference
N. Random, <u>95% CI</u>
-0.82 [±1.02, -0.62] | -1 -05 0 05 1
Favours DAPA Favours PLA
Mean Difference
N. Bandem, 95% Cl | B Forest plot of
Study or Subgroup M
1.1.1 Low dose
*Bode, Bruce2013
*Forest 7.0014

 | CAN/
CAN/
Mean SI
-0.6 | ng the
 | e effic | PLA
PLA
n SD
13 0.97 | Tota | Alc be
 | Me
ght IV.1
2% -0 | EMPA and PLA.
an Difference
Random, 95% CI
.57 [-0.75, -0.39]
83.10.84 -0.421 | -1 -0.5
Favours EMP/
Mean Diffe | 0 0.5 1
A Favours PLA
rence
95% Cl |
| at (95% Cl)
genety: Tay = 0.02; C
roverall effect Z = 11.
Forest plot co
udy or Subgroup
1.1 Low dose
agogo-Jack, S 2018
(2 2019 | chi*= 22.60
34 (P < 0.0
omparin;
ER
Mean
-0.82
-1 0 | g the
TU
SD Te
0.9 | efficacy
tal Mea
156
170 -0 | on H
PLA
n St
0 0.9
2 0.66 | bAlc
Tota
15
16
 | between
al Weight
3 22.6%
7 28.8% | | -1 -05 0 05 1
Farours DAPA Farours PLA
Mean Difference
N. Randem 555 Cl | B Forest plot of
Study of Subgroup M
1.1.1.0w dose
"Book Brue2013
"Fort, T 2014 4
"Sadowaki 7.0017 4

 | CAN/
CAN/
Iean SI
-0.6
0.89 0.
0.97 0.8 | ng the
 | e effic
d Mea
1 -0.0
3 -0.3
0 -0 | PLA
PLA
n SD
13 0.97
16 0.8 | Hb. | Alc be
 | Me
Me
ght N.J
2% -0
0% -0
7% -0 | EMPA and PLA.
an Difference
Random, 95% CI
57 [-0.75, -0.39]
.63 [-0.84, -0.42]
.87 L+1 15, -0.59] | -1 -0.5
Favours EMP)
Mean Diffe | 0 0.5 1
A Favours PLA
rence
95% Cl |
| at (95% CI)
genetit: Tat#= 0.02; C
roverail effect Z = 11.1
Forest plot co
htv or Subaroup
1.1 Low dose
apogo-Jack, S 2018
1.2 019
seensbock, J 2018 | :hi*= 22.64
34 (P ≤ 0.0
omparin;
ER
Mean
-0.82
-1 0
-0.7 | g the
TU
SD Te
0.9 | efficacy
tal Mea
56
70 -0
107 -0 | on H
PLA
n SI
2 0.66
2 0.5 | bAlc
Tota
15
16
20
 | between
al Weight
3 22.6%
7 28.8%
9 25.3% | DAPA and PLA.
Mean Difference
N. Random. 95% CI
-0.82 [+1.02, -0.62]
-0.80 [-0.84, -0.66]
-0.50 [-0.67, -0.33] | -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1
Favours DAPA Favours PLA
Mean Difference
M. Bandem, 95% CI | B Forest plot of
Study or Solutions II
1.1.1 Low dose
"Sole, Bure2013
"fort, 12014
"tadowski, 12017
"test, B.2015

 | CAN/
Iean SI
-0.6
0.89 0.
0.97 0.8 | ng the
D Tota
1 24
8 11
4 7
9 69
 | e effic
<u>Mes</u>
1 -0.0
3 -0.2
0 -0
2 0.0 | PLA
PLA
n SD
13 0.97
16 0.8
1 0.84
13 0.9 | Hb.
Tota
23
111
69 | Alche
al Wei
7 19.
5 16.
8 10.
0 30.
 | Me
ght N.1
2% -0
0% -0
7% -0
6% -0 | EMPA and PLA.
an Difference
Random, 95% CI
57 [-0.75, -0.39]
.63 [-0.64, -0.42]
.87 [-1.15, -0.59]
.65 [-0.74, -0.56] | -1 -0.5
Favours EMP/
Mean Diffe | 0 0.5 1
A Favours PLA
rence
95% CI |
| at (95% C)
geneby: Tau' = 0.02, C
r overall effect Z = 11.
Forest plot co
univ of Subbroup
L.1 Low dose
apgo-Jack, S 2018
L, 2019
osenstock, J 2018
errs, S, G 2017 | -0.82
-0.7
-0.82
-0.8
-0.8
-0.8
-0.8
-0.8
-0.8
-0.8
-0.8 | g the
TU
SD Te
0.9
1.66
0.9
1.83 | efficacy
tal Mea
56
70 -0
107 -0
56 -0.0 | on H
PLA
n SE
2 0.66
2 0.59
9 0.5 | bAlc
Tota
15
16
20
15
15
 | between
al Weight
3 22.6%
7 28.8%
9 25.3%
3 23.3% | DAPA and PLA.
Mean Difference
N. Random, 95% CI
-0.82 [-1.02, -0.62]
-0.50 [-0.67, -0.33]
-0.71 [-0.90, -0.52] | -1 -0.5 0 0.5 F
Favours DAPA Favours PLA
Mean Difference
N. Random, 55% Cl | B Forest plot c
Study or Subgroup M
1.1.1.0m dese
*Fore, funce2013
*Fore, 12014
*Fore, 12014
*

 | CAN/
Iean SI
-0.6
0.89 0.
0.97 0.8
0.62 0.
0.77 1. | ing the
D Tota
1 24
8 11
4 7
9 69
2 19 | e effic
d Mea
1 -0.0
3 -0.2
0 -0
2 0.0
5 0.1
 | PLA
n SD
13 0.97
16 0.8
1 0.84
1 0.84
1 0.94
1 0.94
1 0.94 | Hb.
Tota
23
111
69
19 | al Web
7 19.
5 16.
8 10.
0 30.
2 13. | Me
<u>att N.</u>
2% -0
0% -0
7% -0
6% -0
3% -0
 | EMPA and PLA.
an Difference
Random, 95% CI
57 [-0.75, -0.39]
63 [-0.84, -0.42]
87 [-1.15, -0.59]
65 [-0.74, -0.56]
91 [-1.15, -0.67] | -1 -0.5
Favours EMP)
Mean Diffe | 0 0.5 1
A Favours PLA
rence
95% CI |
| ar (1955 G)
genety: Tau'e 0.02, C
r overall effect Z = 11.1
Forest plot co
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://wwww.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://wwww.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://wwww.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/
http://www.com/ | -0.82
-0.82
-0.8 0 | g the
TU
SD Te
0.9
1.83 | efficacy
tal Mea
56
70 -0
107 -0
56 -0.0
89 | on H
PLA
0 0.9
2 0.66
2 0.5
9 0.9 | bAlc
Tota
15
16
20
15
68
 | between
al Weight
3 22.6%
9 25.3%
9 25.3%
2 100.0% | | -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1
Favours DAPA Favours PLA
Mean Difference
K/ Bandem, 95% CI | B Forest plot of
Study or Solutions
1.1.1 Level dose
"Sole, Brue 2013
"Graft, 2014
"Gadowakt, 7.017
"Beauco, K.2013
"Beauco, K.2013
"B

 | CAN/
fean SI
-0.6
0.89 0.
0.97 0.8
0.62 0.
0.77 1.
0.85 1. | 1 24
0 Tota
1 24
8 11
4 77
9 69
2 19
3 15 | e effic
<u>d Mea</u>
1 -0.0
3 -0.2
0 -0
2 0.0
5 0.1
7 0.0
 | PLA
n SD
3 0.97
6 0.8
1 0.84
3 0.9
4 1.2
1 1.3 | Hb.
Tota
23
11
69
19 | Alche
al Web
7 19.
5 16.
8 10.
0 30.
2 13.
6 10. | Me
att N.1
2% -0
0% -0
7% -0
6% -0
3% -0
3% -0
2% -0
 | EMPA and PLA.
an Difference
Bandom, 95% CI
57 [-0.75, -0.39]
63 [-0.84, -0.42]
87 [-1.15, -0.59]
65 [-0.74, -0.56]
91 [-1.15, -0.57]
89 [-1.15, -0.57] | Hean Diffe | 0 0.5 1
A Favours PLA
rence
95% CI |
| at (95% C)
genety, Tai * 0.02, C
or overail effect Z = 11.
Forest plot co
univ or Subaroup
1.1 Low dose
hapopo-lack, S. 2018
L, 2019
Dosenstock, J. 2018
eras, 8. 6. 2017
abrotal (95% C)
tetrogenety, Tai * 0.0 | -0.82
-0.82
-0.82
-0.80
-0.7
-0.8 0
001: Chi ^a = 6 | g the
TU
SD To
0.9
1.66
0.9
1.83 | efficacy
tal Mea
56
56 -0.0
89
= 3 (P = 0 | on H
PLA
0 0.9
2 0.66
2 0.5
9 0.9 | bAlc
Tota
15
16
20
15
68
= 64%
 | between
4 Weight
3 22.6%
7 28.8%
9 25.3%
3 23.3%
2 100.0% | DAPA and PLA.
Mean Difference
N. Random, 95% CI
-0.82 [-1.02, -0.62]
-0.80 [-0.67, -0.33]
-0.50 [-0.67, -0.33]
-0.51 [-0.90, -0.52]
-0.71 [-0.85, -0.56] | -1 -05 0 05 F
Favours DAPA Favours PLA
Mean Difference
NV, Random, 95% CI | Study of Subgroup M 1.1.1.0m dese ************************************

 | CAN/
Iean Si
-0.6
0.89 0.
0.97 0.8
0.62 0.
0.77 1.
0.85 1. | ng the
D Tota
1 24
8 11
4 77
9 69
2 19
3 15
146
 | e effic
d Mea
1 -0.0
3 -0.2
0 -0
2 0.0
5 0.1
7 0.0
8 | PLA
n SD
13 0.97
16 0.8
1 0.84
13 0.92
14 1.3 | Hb.
Tota
23
111
69
19
15
145 | Alc be
al Web
7 19.
5 16.
8 10.
0 30.
2 13.
6 10.
8 100.
 | Me
att N.1
2% -0
0% -0
7% -0
6% -0
3% -0
.0% -0.
.0% -0. | EMPA and PLA.
an Difference
Random. 95% Cl
57 (+ 0.75, -0.39)
63 (+ 0.84, -0.42)
87 (+ 115, -0.59)
85 (+ 0.74, -0.56)
91 (+ 1.15, -0.67)
86 (+ 1.15, -0.67)
86 (+ 1.15, -0.67) | Mean Diffe | 0 0.5 A
A Favours PLA |
| at (195% C)
genety, Tai * 0.02, C
or overail effect Z = 11.
Forest plot co
utiv or Subproup
1.1 Low dose
happo-Jack, S 2018
(L. 2019
Stoenstock, 2018
erra, S. 0.2017
aboreatios, C)
detrogenety, Tai * 0.0
stifor overail effect Z = | -0.82
-0.82
-0.82
-10
-0.7
-0.80
01; Chi [#] = 8
9.48 (P < | g the
TU
SD Te
0.9
1.66
0.9
1.83
0.0000 | efficacy
tal Mea
156
170 -0
107 -0
156 -0.0
189
= 3 (P = (
1) | on H
PLA
n SE
2 0.66
2 0.5
9 0.5
9 0.5 | bAlc
Total
15
16
20
15
68
= 64%
 | between
Weight
3 22.6%
7 28.8%
9 25.3%
3 23.3%
2 100.0% | DAPA and PLA.
Mean Difference
N. Random, 95% CI
-0.82 [+ 102, -0.62]
-0.80 [+ 0.34, -0.63]
-0.50 [+ 0.67, -0.33]
-0.71 [+ 0.90, -0.52]
-0.71 [+ 0.95, -0.56] | Hean Difference
N. Random, 95% CI | Statuty or Submoon M 5.1.1.0 we dese * * Book, Bruce 2013 * * Gook, Bruce 2013 * * Total, 7.2014 - * Total, 1.2014 - * Total, 7.2014 - * Subtotal (45%): CP - Heterogeneity, Totar = 0. Totalfor overall effect; CF

 | CANJ
-0.6
-0.6
0.99
0.62
0.62
0.77
1.
0.85
1.
0.1; Chi ^p =
= 13.07 (P | ing the
D Tota
1 24
8 11
4 7
9 69
2 19
3 15
146
8.91, d
* 0.00
 | e effic
<u>e Mes</u>
1 -0.0
3 -0.2
0 -0
2 0.0
5 0.1
7 0.0
8
f= 5 (F
001) | PLA
PLA
n SD
13 0.97
16 0.8
1 0.84
13 0.9
14 1.2
11 1.3
1 - 0.11) | Tota
233
111
699
199
155
1455
1455 | Alche
al Web
7 19.
5 16.
8 10.
0 30.
2 13.
6 10.
8 100.
8 100.
 | Me
gat IV.1
2% -0
0% -0
0% -0
6% -0
3% -0
2% -0
.0% -0. | EMPA and PLA.
an Difference
Bandom, 95% Cl
57 ±0.75, 0.39]
63 ±0.94, 0.42]
77 ±1.15, 0.59]
65 ±0.74, 0.56]
39 ±1.15, 0.67]
38 ±1.15, 0.67]
71 ±0.82, 0.60] | -1 -0.5
Favours EMP/
Meam Diffe
M. Random | 0 0.5 A
Favours PLA |
| tat (95% C)
genetity, Tat (9 = 0.02, C)
or overall effect Z = 11.
Forrest plot co
hady or <u>Subhryoup</u>
11. Low dose
Dapogo-Jack, S 2018
(1, 2.019
Strenstock, J.2019
Gran, B. C) 2017
autorial (95% C)
eterogenetity, Tau ² = 0.0
eterogenetity, Tau ² = 0.0
eterogenetity, Tau ² = 0.0 | ht#= 22.66
34 (P < 0.0
0000parin;
en
-0.82
-1 0
-0.7
-0.8 0
01; Cht#= 6
9.48 (P < | g the f | efficacy
tal Mea
56
70 -0
007 -0
56 -0.0
89
= 3 (P = (
1) | on H
PLA
n SE
0 0.5
2 0.66
2 0.6
9 0.5
9 0.5
104); P | bAlc
Tota
155
168
200
15
688
= 64%
 | between
al Weight
3 22.6%
7 28.8%
9 25.3%
3 23.3%
2 100.0% | DAPA and PLA.
Mean Difference
M. Randem, 95% CI
-0.82 [-10.2.062]
-0.80 [-0.94, -0.66]
-0.50 [-0.67, -0.32]
-0.71 [-0.85, -0.56] | -1 -05 0 05 F
Favours DAPA Favours PLA
Mean Difference
M. Bandom, 95% CI | B Forest plot of
Study or Solutions M
1.1.1.Low does
"book, blue2013
"fort, T.2014 of
"does blue2013
"fort, T.2014 of
"does blue2013
"fort, T.2014 of
"book, blue2013
"fort, T.2014 of
"book, blue2013
"book of the
Barbook of th

 | CANJ
-0.6
0.89
0.097
0.62
0.77
1.
0.85
1.
01; Chi ^a =
13.07 (P | 1 24
1 24
1 24
8 11
4 7
9 69
2 19
3 15
146
8.91, d
* 0.00 | e effic
<u>I</u> -0.0
3 -0.0
2 0.0
5 0.0
5 0.0
5 0.0
8
f= 5 (F
001)
 | PLA
n SD
13 0.97
16 0.8
1 0.84
13 0.97
14 1.2
11 1.3
1 0.11) | Tota
233
111
60
199
195
1450
(P=4 | Alche
al Web
7 19.
5 16.
8 10.
0 30.
2 13.
6 10.
8 100.
14% | Me
ght N.1
2% -0
0% -0
7% -0
6% -0
3% -0
3% -0
2% -0.
 | EMPA and PLA.
an Difference
Bandom, 955 Cl
57 (+0.75, -0.39)
63 (+0.44, -0.42)
85 (+1.15, -0.59)
65 (+0.74, -0.56)
94 (+1.15, -0.57)
98 (+1.15, -0.57)
71 (+0.82, -0.60) | Mean Diffe | ence
95% CI |
| satessis (a)
genetic Tari * 0.02, C
r overall effect Z = 11.
Forest plot co
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://www.communications.
http://wwww.communications.
http://wwww.communications.
http://wwww.communications.
http://wwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwww | -0.82
-0.82
-0.82
-1 0
-0.7
-0.8 0
01: Chi [#] = 6
9.48 (P < | g the c
TU
SD Tu
0.9
183
183
183
183
183
183
19
19
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
10 | efficacy
tal Mea
56
170 -0
007 -0
156 -0.0
89
= 3 (P = (
1)
153 | on H
PLA
n SU
2 0.66
2 0.9
9 0.9
0.04); P | bAlc
Tota
155
168
200
155
688
= 64%
 | between
d Weight
3 22.6%
7 28.8%
9 25.3%
3 23.3%
2 100.0%
3 22.2% | DAPA and PLA.
Mean Difference
N. Random. 95% CI
-0.82 [+ 0.2, -0.62]
-0.82 [+ 0.2, -0.62]
-0.82 [+ 0.2, -0.62]
-0.85 [-0.67, -0.33]
-0.71 [-0.85, -0.56]
-0.85 [+ 1.04, -0.66] | -1 -0.5 0 0.5 +
Favours DAPA Favours PLA
Mean Difference
N. Random, 95% CI | B Forest plot of
Study or Suburces M
1.1.1 Low dese
*Bode, Brux 2013
*Gart 7.2014
*Bode, Brux 2013
*Gart 7.2014
*Bode, Brux 2013
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*Bode
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

 | CAM/
dean SI
-0.6
0.089 0.
0.097 0.8
0.62 0.
0.77 1.
0.85 1.
01; Chi [#] =
= 13.07 (P | 1 24
1 24
1 24
8 11
4 7
9 69
2 19
3 15
146
8 91, d
* 0.00
 | e effic
d Mes
1 -0.0
3 -0.2
0 -0
2 0.0
5 0.0
5 0.0
5 0.0
8
f= 5 (F
001) | PLA
n SD
13 0.97
16 0.8
1 0.84
13 0.97
14 1.2
11 1.3
1 = 0.11) | Tota
233
111
69
155
1450
(P=4 | Alche
al Wei
7 19.
5 16.
8 10.
2 13.
6 10.
8 100.
4%
 | Me
ght N.1
2% -0
0% -0
7% -0
6% -0
2% -0
2% -0.
0% -0. | EMPA and PLA.
an Difference
Bandom, 95% Cl
57 ±0.75, 0.39
63 ±0.84, 0.42
67 ±1.15, 0.59
65 ±0.74, 0.56
35 ±1.15, 0.67
88 ±1.15, 0.67
88 ±1.15, 0.67
88 ±1.15, 0.67
88 ±1.15, 0.57
17 ±0.082, 0.80
20 ±0.085, 0.75 | -1 -0.5
Favours EMP/
Meam Diffe
M. Ramform | 0 0.5 1
A Favours PLA |
| La (1935) CD = 0.02, C
r overall effect Z = 11.1
Forest plot co
who or Subaroug
1.1 Low does
Japopo-Jack, S 2018
L, 2019
eterogeneth, TauF = 0.0
eterogeneth, | -0.82
-0.82
-0.8 0
01; Chi [#] = 6
-0.8 0
01; Chi [#] = 6
-0.85
-0.9 0 | g the (
TU
SD T(
188 1
183 1
1 | efficacy
tal Mea
156
170 -0
107 -0
156 -0.0
189
= 3 (P = (1)
1)
153
169 -0 | on H
PLA SI
0 0.9
2 0.66
2 0.9
9 0.9
1.04); P
0 0.9
2 0.64 | bAlc
Tota
155
168
200
156
68
68
68
155
16
155
16
155
16
155
16
155
16
155
16
155
16
155
16
155
16
155
16
155
16
155
16
155
16
155
155 | between
4 Weight
3 22.6%
7 28.8%
9 25.3%
9 25.3%
2 3.3%
2 100.0%
3 22.2%
7 34.2% | DAPA and PLA.
Mean Difference
M. Random, 95% CI
-0.82 [+1.02, -0.82]
-0.80 [-0.34, -0.64]
-0.50 [-0.67, -0.33]
-0.71 [-0.90, -0.52]
-0.71 [-0.85, -0.56]
-0.85 [+1.04, -0.66]
-0.70 [+1.04, -0.66] | -1 -05 0 05 1
Favours DAPA Favours PLA
Mean Difference
N. Random, 95h Cl
 | B Forest plot of
Study or Solonization
1.1.1.1.we down
1.1.1.1.we down
1.1.1.1.we down
1.1.1.1.we down
1.1.1.1.we down
1.1.1.1.we down
1.1.1.1.we down
1.1.1.1.we down
1.1.1.1.1.we down
1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.
 |
CANJ
-0.6
0.89
0.097
0.82
0.62
0.62
0.62
0.62
0.62
0.62
0.85
1.
0.85
1.
0.1; Chi ^p =
= 13.07 (P | ng the
D Tota
1 24
8 11
4
8 11
4
9 69
2 19
3 15
146
8.91, d
* 0.00
1 23
2 19 | e effic
d Mea
1 -0.0
3 -0.2
0 -0
2 0.0
5 0.1
5 0.1
8
f= 5 (F
001)
6 -0.0 | PLA
m SD
13 0.97
16 0.8
1 0.84
13 0.97
14 1.2
11 1.3
13 0.97
13 0.97
 | Tota
233
1111
699
199
1450
(1************************************ | Alc be
al Wei
7 19,
5 16,
8 10,
0 30,
0 30,00,000,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00,00, | Me
still V.1
2% -0
0% -0
6% -0
6% -0
3% -0
2% -0
0% -0
5% -0
5% -0 | EMPA and PLA.
an Ofference
Bandom. 95% CI
57 (+ 0.75, -0.39)
63 (+ 0.41)
87 (+ 1.5, -0.59)
65 (+ 0.74, -0.56)
91 (+ 1.5, -0.57)
91 (+ 0.82, -0.67)
71 (+ 0.82, -0.62)
70 (+ 0.88, -0.52)
 | Mean Diffe | 0 0.5 1
A Favours PLA
rence
95% CI | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| tat (usis: 0)
generity: Tail = 0.02, C
r overall effect Z = 11.1
Forest plot co
univ or Subaroum
1.1 Low dose
30000-Jack; S 2018
L, 2.019
Storentsok; J.2018
erra, 8.6.2017
abitotal (95%, 2018
Labolatal (95%, 2018)
2.2019
appop-Jack; S 2018
2.2019
appop-Jack; S 2018
2.2019 | -0.82
-0.82
-0.82
-10
-0.7
-0.80
01: Chi ^p = 6
-0.85
-0.9 0
-1 | g the (
TU
SD T(
0.9
0.9
183
183
183
183
0.0000
0.8 | efficacy
tal Mea
156
170 -0
107 -0
156 -0.0
189
107 = 0
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
1 | on H
PLA SI
0 0.0
2 0.66
2 0.9
9 0.9
0.04); P
0 0.0
2 0.66
0 0.9
0 0. | bAlc
Tota
155
168
200
1568
688
688
688
688
688
688
688 | between
al Weight
3 22.6%
7 28.8%
9 25.3%
3 23.3%
2 100.0%
3 22.2%
7 34.2%
9 25.7% | DAPA and PLA.
Mean Difference
N. Randem. 95% CI
-082[+102052]
-082[+102052]
-050[-057033]
-0.71[+0.85,-0.56]
-0.71[+0.85,-0.56]
-0.85[+1.04,-0.66]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.74,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.76[-0.84,-0.56]
-0.7 | -1 -0.5 0 0.5 +
Favours DAPA Favours PLA
Mean Difference
N. Random, 95% CI | B Forest plot of
Study or Subjector M
1.1.1 Low dese
*Bode, Brux 2013
*Fort, 7.2014
*Radowald, 7.2017
*Radowald, 7.2017 | CANJ
Mean SI
-0.6
0.89 0.
0.67 0.8
0.62 0.
0.77 1.
0.85 1.
01; Chi#=
= 13.07 (P
-0.73 0.
0.77 0.
0.73 0.
0.77 0.
0.
0.77 0.
0.77 0. | ng the
D Tota
1 24
8 11:
4 77
9 69
2 19
9 69
2 19
9 69
2 19
3 15
1466
8.91, d
**0.00
1 23
8 11. | e effic
d Mes
1 -0.0
3 -0.3
2 0.0
5 0.1
7 0.0
8
f= 5 (F
0001)
6 -0.0
0 -0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0 | PLA
PLA
PLA
SD
3 0.97
1 0.84
1 0.84
1 0.84
1 0.84
1 1.3
3 0.97
6 0.8
1 0.97
6 0.8
1 0.84
1 0.84 | 1 Hb. ⁴
1 Tota
1 23
1 11
69
1 9
1 45
1 45
1 45
1 45
1 45
1 45
1 45
1 45
1 45
1 1
1 1
1 1
1 1
1 1
1 1
1 1
1 | Alche
al Wei
7 19
5 16.
8 10.
0 30.
2 13.
6 8 100.
8 100.
4% | Me
ght N/1
2% -0
0% -0
6% -0
6% -0
3% -0
2% -0
.0% -0.
5% -0
4% -0
2% -0 | EMPA and PLA.
an Difference
Bandom. 95% CI
57 ± 075, 0.39(
37 ± 074, 0.49)
37 ± 074, 0.49(
37 ± 074, 0.49)
39 ± 1.15, 0.67]
30 ± 1.15, 0.67]
30 ± 1.15, 0.67]
70 ± 0.88, 0.52]
77 ± 0.88, 0.52]
77 ± 0.88, 0.52] | Mean Diffe | ence
95% ct |
| tat (05% C)
generit, Tat/= 0.02, C
or overall effect Z = 11.
Forest plot co
tarly cor Subaroup
1.1 Low dose
3agop-Jack, S 2018
(L, 2019
Totenstock, J 2019
Source Statenstock, J 2019
Source Statenstock, J 2019
Source Statenstock, J 2018 | -0.82
-0.84 (P < 0.0
-0.82
-0.82
-0.8 0
01: Chi ² = 6
9.48 (P <
-0.85
-0.9 0
-1 | g the
TU
SD Tr
0.9
0.66
0.9
3.38, df
0.00000
0.8
0.00000
0.8
0.00000
0.8
0.00000
0.00000
0.9
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.000000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.00000
0.000000
0.00000
0.000000
0.000000
0.000000
0.000000
0.000000
0.000000
0.0000000
0.00000000 | efficacy
tal Mea
56
70 -0
107 -0
56 -0.0
89
= 3 (P = (
1)
53
69 -0
05 -0
55
69 -0
55 -0
55
55
69 -0
55
55
56
56
56
56
56
56
56
56 | on H
PLA SE
0 0.0
2 0.66
2 0.9
9 0.9
0.04); P
0 0.0
2 0.66
2 0.66
2 0.66
2 0.66
2 0.66
0 0.9
0 0
0 0.9
0 0.9
0 0
0 0.9
0 0. | bAlc
b Tota
3 15
5 16
3 20
3 15
68
68
64%
3 15
68
20
15
68
20
15
68
20
15
68
20
15
68
20
15
15
16
20
15
15
16
15
16
15
15
16
15
15
16
15
15
16
15
16
15
16
15
15
16
15
16
15
16
15
16
15
16
15
16
15
16
15
16
15
16
15
16
15
16
15
16
15
16
15
15
16
15
16
15
15
16
15
15
16
15
15
15
15
15
16
15
15
15
15
15
15
15
15
15
15 | between
4 Weight
3 22.6%
7 28.8%
9 25.3%
3 23.3%
2 100.0%
3 22.2%
7 34.2%
9 25.7%
3 22.2% | DAPA and PLA.
Mean Difference
M. Random, 95% CI
-0.82 [-1.02, 0.62]
-0.80 [-0.94, 0.68]
-0.50 [-0.67, -0.33]
-0.71 [-0.85, -0.56]
-0.85 [-1.04, -0.66]
-0.70 [-0.84, -0.66]
-0.70 [-0.84, -0.66]
-0.85 [-1.04, -0.85]
-0.85 [-1.04, -0. | -1 -05 0 05 F
Favours DAPA Favours PLA
Mean Difference
IV, Random, 95% CI | B Forest plot or
Static or Solutions M
1.1.1. Lone dise
1.1.1. Lone dise
1.1.2. | CANU
Mean SI
-0.6
0.097 0.8
0.62 0.0
0.77 1.
0.85 1.
01; Chi [#] =
= 13.07 (P
-0.73
1.03 0.
0.77 0. | Ing the
D Tota
1 244
8 11
4 77
9 69
2 19
9 69
2 19
3 15
3 15
3 15
3 15
3 15
3 15
3 15
3 15 | e effic
a Mes
1 -0.0
3 -0.2
0 -00
5 0.0
5 0.0
5 0.0
5 0.0
5 0.0
5 0.0
6 -0.0
4 -0.2
0 0
0 0
0 0
0 0
0 0
0 0
0 0
0 | PLA
m SD
13 0.97
16 0.8
1 0.84
1 0.84
1 1 3
3 0.97
14 1.2
11 1 3
3 0.97
16 0.8
3 0.97
16 0.8
3 0.97 | Tota
233
111:
69
199
199
199
199
199
199
199
199
199 | Alche
al Wei
7 19,
5 16,
8 10,
2 13,
6 10,
2 13,
6 10,
2 13,
6 10,
7 21,
5 19,
0 27,
7 | Me
satt N.1
2% -0
0% -0
7% -0
6% -0
3% -0
2% -0
0% -0.
5% -0
4% -0
2% -0
1% -0
1% -0
5% -0
4% -0
2% -0
1% -0
1 | EXIPA and PLA.
an Difference
Eandon. 955 Cl
57 (40.75, -0.39)
637 (40.4, -0.42)
637 (41.4, -0.59)
65 (-0.74, -0.59)
65 (-0.74, -0.59)
16 (-0.64)
86 (-0.54)
77 (-0.89, -0.52)
77 (-0.89, -0.52)
77 (-0.89, -0.52)
77 (-0.89, -0.52)
77 (-0.89, -0.52)
76 (-0.89, -0.52)
77 (-0.99, -0.54)
19 (-0.89, -0.52)
77 (-0.99, -0.54)
19 (-0.89, -0.52)
77 (-0.99, -0.54)
19 (-0.99, -0.54) | Hoan Diffe | ence
95% CI |
| tat (95% C)
generity: Tat' = 0.02, C
or overall effect Z = 11.1
Forest plot co
hely or Subaroup
1.1 Lew does
Paogo-Jack, S 2018
L, 2.019
Sostenstock, J.2018
rera, S. 6.2017
adirotat (95% C)
tetrogenety, Tau'= 0.0
starfor overall effect Z =
1.2 High dose
Paogo-Jack, S 2018
L, 2.019
Sostenstock, J.2018
Hely S. 6.2017
m. 5, 6.2017 | -0.82
-0.82
-1.0
-0.7
-0.8 0
01: Chi ² = 6
9.48 (P <
-0.85
-0.9
-1.04
-1.04 1 | g the
TU
SD Tu
0.9
166
0.9
1.83
1.338, df
0.00000
0.8
1.66
0.9
1.66
0.9
1.66
0.9
1.66
0.9
1.66
0.00000 | efficacy
tal Mea
56
156
107
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
10
10 | on Hi
PLA
n St
0 0.5
2 0.66
2 0.66
2 0.69
2 0.66
2 0.5
9 0.5
1 0 | bAlc
b Tota
3 15
5 16
3 20
3 15
68
5 16
3 20
3 15
68
5 16
3 20
3 15
68
5 20
5 16
5 20
5 20 | between
al Weight
3 22.6%
7 28.8%
9 25.3%
3 23.3%
2 100.0%
3 22.2%
7 34.2%
9 25.7%
3 17.9%
3 17.9% | | Hand DEFence
N/ Bandem, 55% CI | B Forest plot of
Study or Solutions M
1.1.1.0ee does
"Solt, T.2014 -
"Cont, T.2014 -
Cont, T.2014 -
Edde, Bruce, 2013 -
Forst, T.2014 -
Forst, T.2014 -
Forst, T.2014 -
Forst, T.2014 -
Forst, T.2014 -
Steffedd, Bruce, 2013 -
Forst, T.2014 -
Forst, | CAN/
CAN/
dean SI
-0.6
0.89 0.
0.97 0.8
0.62 0.
0.97 0.8
0.77 1.
0.85 1.
01; Chi ^a =
1.307 (P
0.73 0.
1.03 0.
0.77 0.
1.03 1.
1.05 1. | ing the
D Tota
1 24
8 11
4 77
9 2 19
3 15
1466
8.91.4
4 * 0.00
1 23
8 11.
9 69
2 19
3 2 19
1 24
1 | e effic
d Mea
1 -0.0
3 -0.2
0.0
5 0.1
5 0.1
5 0.1
6 -0.0
4 -0.2
0 0.0
6 -0.0
0 -0
0 -0
0
0 -0
0
0 -0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0 | PLA SD
PLA SD
13 0.97
13 0.97
13 0.97
13 0.97
13 0.97
13 0.97
13 0.97
13 0.97
14 1.2
13 0.97
14 1.2
14 1.2
15 0.97
16 0.84
17 1.2
18 | Tota
233
1 111
699
1 155
1 155 | Alche
al Web
7 19.
5 16.
8 10.
2 13.
6 10.
2 19.
5 16.
7 19.
7 19.
5 16.
7 19.
7 19. | Me
gat IV.1
2% -0
0% -0
7% -0
6% -0
3% -0
2% -0
0% -0.
5% -0
4% -0
4% -1
5% -1
5% -1 | EMPA and PLA.
an Difference
Bandom. 95% CI
57 [-0.75, 0.39]
63 [-0.84, 0.42]
67 [-1.75, 0.39]
65 [-0.75, 0.47]
76 [-0.82, 0.67]
77 [-0.82, 0.69]
70 [-0.88, 0.71]
77 [-0.98, 0.52]
77 [-0.98, 0.71]
71 [-1.41, 0.03] | Haan Diffe | 0 0.5 1
A Favours PLA
rence
95% CI |
| Aut (95%) C)
genetic, Tail = 0.02, C
or overail effect Z = 11.1
Forest plot co
hadv or Subaroup
1.1 Low dose
3.02, Data S, 2018
(L, 2019
3.02, Data S, 2017
autotal (95%) C)
est for overail effect Z =
1.2 High docs
2007, July 4, 2018
autotal (95%) C)
estentor overail effect Z =
1.2 High docs
2007, July 4, 2018
L, 2019
Soentatot, J, 2018
autotal (95%) C)
estentor overail effect Z =
1.2 High docs
2017, July 4, 2018
autotal (95%) C)
estentor overail effect Z =
1.2 High docs
2017, July 4, 2018
autotal (95%) C) | -0.82
-1.04 (P < 0.0
-0.82
-1.0
-0.7
-0.84 (P <
-0.85
-0.9 0
-1
-1.04 1 | g the state of the | Ital Mea 156 -0.0 157 -0.0 158 -0.0 159 -3.0 153 -0.0 169 -0 152 -0.0 | on Hi
PLA SE
0 0.9
2 0.6
2 0.6
9 0.9
0.04); #
0 0.9
2 0.6
2 0.6
2 0.6
9 0.9
0 0.9 | bAlc
Tota
155
168
200
155
688
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
688
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
1668
155
155
155
155
155
155
155
15 | between
Weight
3 22.6%
7 28.8%
9 25.3%
3 23.3%
2 100.0%
3 22.2%
7 34.2%
9 25.7%
3 17.9%
2 100.0% | DAPA and PLA.
Mean Difference
N. Random, 95% CI
-0.82 [-10.2, 0.62]
-0.80 [-0.44, 0.66]
-0.50 [-0.47, 0.030, 0.52]
-0.71 [-0.84, 0.66]
-0.70 [-0.84, 0.66]
-0.70 [-0.84, 0.66]
-0.70 [-0.84, 0.66]
-0.70 [-0.84, 0.66]
-0.85 [-1.04, 0.66]
-0.70 [-0.84, 0.66]
-0.85 [-1.04, 0.66]
-0.70 [-0.84, 0.61]
-0.85 [-1.04, 0.66]
-0.85 [-1.04, 0.66]
-0.71 [-0.84, 0.61]
-0.85 [-1.04, | Head Difference | Statuty or Submout M 1.1.1.0m data 1 1.0.1.0m data 1 1.1.1.0m data 1 1.1.1.1m data 1 1.1.1.1m data 1 1.1.2.1m data <td>CAMP
CAMP
-0.6
0.89
0.07
0.85
1.0
0.85
1.0
0.73
1.03
0.77
0.
0.77
1.03
1.0
1.05
1.05
1.05
1.05
1.07
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.0000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.0000
1.000
1.000
1.0000
1</td> <td>ing the
D Tota
1 24
8 11:
4 7;
9 69,
1 23
8.91, d
* 0.00
1 23;
8.91, d
* 0.00
1 23;
9 69,
9 69,
2 19,
3 15;
146;
8.91, d
* 10, 00
1 24;
1 46;
1 24;
1 24;</td> <td>e effic
a Mes
1 -0.0
3 -0.2
0.0
5 0.0
5 0.0
8
#= 5 (F
0001)
6 -0.0
0 0.0
7 0.1
6 -0.0
0 0.0
1 -0.0
0 -0
0 -0
0
0 -0
0
0 -0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0</td> <td>PLA
PLA
m SD
13 0.97
16 0.84
13 0.97
14 1.2
11 1.3
13 0.97
16 0.83
13 0.97
16 0.83
13 0.97
14 1.2
11 1.3
13 0.97
14 1.2
15 0.11
15 0.97
16 0.83
10 9
10 9</td> <td>Tota
233
111:
699
199
199
199
199
199
199
199
199
199</td> <td>Alc be
al Web
7 19.5
5 16.0
0 30.0
2 13.6
6 10.0
4%
7 21.1
5 19.0
27.7
2 17.
6 14.
9 27.0
2 17.
6 14.
9 27.0
2 17.
9 21.0
2 19.
9 10.0
2 10.0</td> <td>Me
12% -0
0% -0
0% -0
0% -0
2% -0
2% -0
2% -0
2% -0
2% -0
5% -</td> <td>EXIPA and PLA.
an Difference
Bandom, 555; Cl
55; [4075, 0.39]
63; [4084, 0.42]
76; [415, 0.59]
65; [4074, 0.56]
76; [40, 0.67]
86; [415, 0.67]
76; [40, 0.60]
77; [40, 0.6]
70; [40, 0.52]
77; [40, 0.52]
77; [40, 0.52]
77; [40, 0.52]
77; [40, 0.52]
77; [40, 0.52]
77; [40, 0.71]
75; [40, 0.71]</td> <td>Hean Diffe</td> <td>ence
95% CI</td> | CAMP
CAMP
-0.6
0.89
0.07
0.85
1.0
0.85
1.0
0.73
1.03
0.77
0.
0.77
1.03
1.0
1.05
1.05
1.05
1.05
1.07
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.0000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.000
1.0000
1.000
1.000
1.0000
1 | ing the
D Tota
1 24
8 11:
4 7;
9 69,
1 23
8.91, d
* 0.00
1 23;
8.91, d
* 0.00
1 23;
9 69,
9 69,
2 19,
3 15;
146;
8.91, d
* 10, 00
1 24;
1 46;
1 24;
1 24; | e effic
a Mes
1 -0.0
3 -0.2
0.0
5 0.0
5 0.0
8
#= 5 (F
0001)
6 -0.0
0 0.0
7 0.1
6 -0.0
0 0.0
1 -0.0
0 -0
0 -0
0
0 -0
0
0 -0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0 | PLA
PLA
m SD
13 0.97
16 0.84
13 0.97
14 1.2
11 1.3
13 0.97
16 0.83
13 0.97
16 0.83
13 0.97
14 1.2
11 1.3
13 0.97
14 1.2
15 0.11
15 0.97
16 0.83
10 9
10 9 | Tota
233
111:
699
199
199
199
199
199
199
199
199
199 | Alc be
al Web
7 19.5
5 16.0
0 30.0
2 13.6
6 10.0
4%
7 21.1
5 19.0
27.7
2 17.
6 14.
9 27.0
2 17.
6 14.
9 27.0
2 17.
9 21.0
2 19.
9 10.0
2 10.0 | Me
12% -0
0% -0
0% -0
0% -0
2% -0
2% -0
2% -0
2% -0
2% -0
5% - | EXIPA and PLA.
an Difference
Bandom, 555; Cl
55; [4075, 0.39]
63; [4084, 0.42]
76; [415, 0.59]
65; [4074, 0.56]
76; [40, 0.67]
86; [415, 0.67]
76; [40, 0.60]
77; [40, 0.6]
70; [40, 0.52]
77; [40, 0.52]
77; [40, 0.52]
77; [40, 0.52]
77; [40, 0.52]
77; [40, 0.52]
77; [40, 0.71]
75; [40, 0.71] | Hean Diffe | ence
95% CI |

Figure 2. Forest plot comparing the SGLT inhibitors versus the placebo on HbA1c. HbA1c = glycated hemoglobin A1c, SGLT = sodium-dependent glucose transporter.

3.4. Subgroup analysis

We tried to perform subgroup analysis from the following aspects (Table 3):

- (1) Drug naivety.
- (2) Duration of diabetes. We used 2 methods to establish subgroup analysis. The first method was based on whether the disease history was more than 5 years. The second method was based on even division into 2 groups according to the disease duration.
- (3) BMI. We used two methods to establish subgroup analysis. The first method was based on whether BMI was larger than 30. The second method was based on even division into 2 groups according to the BMI.
- (4) Region.

Reduced heterogeneity was found through subgroup analysis of the 10 mg EMPA, 15 mg ERTU, 100 mg CANA, and 300 mg CANA groups. Among them, the 100 mg CANA group and the

300 mg CANA group showed significant differences between the subgroups.

4. Discussion

HbA1c is mainly used to evaluate the average blood glucose level over the last 3 months, which could be used in the diagnosis of diabetes and the evaluation of blood glucose control in patients with T2DM.^[40,41] This study demonstrate that SGLT inhibitors have a significant therapeutic effect on T2DM by significantly reducing the HbA1c level.^[42,43] The studies included in this analysis were performed in Europe, America, Asia, and Oceania. The results of each study were all positive; that is, SGLT inhibitors were effective for patients with T2DM, independent of region. However, there was significant heterogeneity for each SGLT inhibitor, so we chose a random-effects model and performed a subgroup analysis to analyze the possible sources of heterogeneity.

70%

Model Random effect model Random effect model

Random effect model

Random effect model

_		
		Le 1
		-

CANA 300 mg VS PLA

The meta-analysis result	s of SGLT inhibitor	s versus PLA.		
Comparision	Size		Total	ŕ
DAPA 5 mg VS PLA	11	-0.5	[-0.63, -0.38]	22%
DAPA 10 mg VS PLA		-0.61	[-0.72, -0.51]	60%
EMPA 10 mg VS PLA	6	-0.68	[-0.84, -0.51]	83%
EMPA 25 mg VS PLA		-0.67	[-0.80, -0.54]	68%
ERTU 5 mg VS PLA	4	-0.71	[-0.85, -0.56]	64%
ERTU 15 mg VS PLA		-0.80	[-0.91, -0.70]	25%
CANA 100 mg VS PLA	6	-0.71	[-0.82, -0.60]	44%

-0.88

CANA = canagliflozin, DAPA = dapagliflozin, EMPA = empagliflozin, ERTU = ertugliflozin, SGLT sodium-dependent glucose transporter.

[-1.03, -0.72]

	22.2				_				n ulaudic	0					DULATION	of diabet	es		*	
Comparison	Yes		No			٩	less	than 5 years	more	than 5 years			٩	Le (ha	ss duration f of studies)	(hal	ore duration If of studies)			٩
APA 5 mg VS PLA -0.68 APA 10 mg VS PLA -0.66 MPA 10 mg VS PLA -0.66 MPA 25 mg VS PLA -0.75 RTU 5 mg VS PLA -0.71 RTU 15 mg VS PLA -0.71 RTU 15 mg VS PLA -0.91 ANN 300 mg VS PLA -1.17	$ \begin{bmatrix} -0.90, -0.45 \\ -0.37, -0.37 \\ -0.82, -0.37 \\ -0.82, -0.49 \\ -0.97, -0.53 \\ -0.53 \\ -0.53 \\ -0.52 \\ -1.17, -0.73 \\ -1.15, -0.67 \\ -1.41, -0.93 \end{bmatrix} $	-0.46 -0.61 -0.75 -0.75 -0.75 -0.71 -0.77 -0.77	F0.56, -0.32] F0.72, -0.50] F0.72, -0.50] F0.71, -0.55] F0.71, -0.55] F0.91, -0.55] F0.73, -0.59] F0.73, -0.59] F0.73, -0.59] F0.73, -0.59] F0.73, -0.59] F0.73, -0.59]	41% 0% 61% 0% 0% 0% 0%	0% 64% 83% 0% 22% 36%	.07 .75 .52 .30 .98 .98 .13 .05*	-0.65 -0.66 - - -0.95 -0.91 -1.17	[-0.83, -0.46] [-0.95, -0.37] - - [-1.17, -0.73] [-1.15, -0.67] [-1.41, -0.93]	-0.42 -0.61 - - - -0.77 -0.66	[-0.55, -0.29] [-0.72, -0.50] - - [-0.86, -0.67] [-0.73, -0.59] [-0.73, -0.59]	%0 %0 %0	0% 64% - 0% 22% 36%	.05* .75 .13 .05*	-0.58 -0.50 - -0.77 -0.81 -0.81 -0.88 -1.01	[-0.74, -0.42] [-0.58, -0.42] - [-0.88, -0.65] [-1.05, -0.57] [-1.04, -0.78] [-1.25, -0.78]	-0.71 -0.71 -0.66 -0.63 -0.63 -0.63	[-0.57, -0.28] [-0.80, -0.62] - [-0.97, -0.34] [-0.95, -0.69] [-0.26] [-0.26] [-0.26] [-0.26]	23% 0% 72% 55%	0% - 41% 0% 0% 0%	.16 .0007* .51 .93 .06
	8	IMI		-	β			BM	"			β			Re	gion			f	
Comparison than 30		More than 30				에 다. 	ess (half i studies)		More (ha of studie:	lf s)	 		٩.	Europe a Americ	and	Othe	SJa			٩
APA 5 mg VS PLA -0.59 JAPA 10 mg VS PLA -0.79	[-0.91, -0.27] [-1.06, -0.52]	-0.57 -0.58	[-0.81, -0.32] [-0.73, -0.43]	0% 54%	59% 60%	.91 .18	-0.58 -0.63	[-0.76, -0.41] [-0.76, -0.50]	-0.46 -0.55	[-0.67, -0.2([-0.80, -0.3]	6] 48% 1] 0%	% 0% 5 72%	639 % .58	-0.48 -0.57	[-0.59, -0.5 [-0.66, -0.4	37] –0.5 48] –0.7	59 [-0.91, -0.2 79 [-1.06, -0.5	27] 0% 52] 54%	34% 41%	.13
MPA 10 mg VS PLA -0.74	[-0.94, -0.54]	-0.79	[-1.11, -0.47]	80% 56%	%0	.80 85	-0.79	[-1.06, -0.53] [-0.800.58]	-0.65	[-0.82, -0.49	9] 859 01 540	%0 %		-0.61	[-0.68, -0.5	55] -1.1	2 [-1.37, -0.8	87] 25% -	%0 (÷1000.
RTU 5mg VS PLA -0.80	[-0.94, -0.66]	-0.66	[-0.77, -0.55]	%0	67%	.12	-0.65	[-0.95, -0.36]	-0.76	29.0- '06.0-1	598	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	5 15	-0.80	F-0.94, -0.6	361 –0.6	36 F-0.77, -0.	551 0%	67%	.12
RTU 15 mg VS PLA -0.70	[-0.84, -0.56]	-0.86	[-0.97, -0.74]	%0	%0	60.	-0.75	[-0.87, -0.64]	-0.86	[-0.99, -0.7]	2] 359	% 10%	% .25	-0.86	[-0.95, -0.7	74] -0.	7 [-0.84, -0.	56] 0%	%0	60.
ANA 100 mg VS PLA -0.87	[-1.15, -0.59]	-0.67	[-0.74, -0.60]	%0	44%	.18	-0.77	[-1.00, -0.53]	-0.66	[-0.75, -0.58	8] 689	%0 %	.42	-0.67	[-0.74, -0.(30] -0.8	37 [-1.15, -0.	59] 44%	%0 %	.18
ANA 300 mg VS PLA –	I	I	I	I	I	I	-0.88	[-1.18, -0.58]	-0.85	[-1.00, -0.7(0] 80	% 379	% .87	I	I	I	I	I	I	I

A total of 11 studies were included in the DAPA group, with high heterogeneity among the studies. Subgroup analysis according to the duration of diabetes could reduce the heterogeneity, with a significant difference among the subgroups. The results of the subgroup analysis of the DAPA group suggested that the heterogeneity in the DAPA group might be derived from the duration of diabetes in the included patients. This finding also suggests that patients with T2DM for different durations might react differently to DAPA.

A total of 6 studies were included in the EMPA group, with high heterogeneity among the studies. Subgroup analysis according to region could reduce the heterogeneity, with a significant difference among the subgroups. In the included studies, racial factors were usually mentioned only during the assessment of randomization, without a separate presentation of data for different race groups in the results. However, the country where the first author was located, especially according to European/American and non-European/American countries, could indirectly reflect racial differences. The results of the subgroup analysis of the EMPA group suggested that the heterogeneity in the EMPA group might be derived from the different regions of the included patients. This finding also suggests that T2DM patients from different regions might react differently to EMPA.

A total of 4 studies were included in the ERTU group, with high heterogeneity among the studies. Subgroup analysis according to drug naivety, the duration of diabetes, BMI, and region could reduce the heterogeneity significantly, but the differences among the subgroups were not statistically significant. The results of the subgroup analysis of the ERTU group suggested that the heterogeneity in the ERTU group might be derived from differences in the drug naivety, duration of diabetes, BMI, and region of the included patients. This finding also suggests that T2DM patients with differences in these factors might react differently to EMPA.

A total of 6 studies were included in the CANA group, with high heterogeneity among the studies. Subgroup analysis according to drug naivety and the duration of diabetes could significantly reduce the heterogeneity, with significant differences among the subgroups. The results of the subgroup analysis of the CANA group suggested that the heterogeneity in the CANA group might be derived from the drug naivety and duration of diabetes of the included patients. This finding also suggests that T2DM patients with differences in drug naivety and the duration of diabetes might react differently to EMPA.

The mechanism by which SGLT inhibitors control blood sugar is through SGLT. SGLT is divided into SGLT-1 and SGLT-2.^[44,45] Their mechanisms of action are similar. When the sodiumpotassium ion ATPase pump on the basolateral membrane consumes ATP, it transports 3 sodium ions to the outside and 2 potassium ions to the inside of the cell. The concentration of sodium ions in the cell decreases, and the sodium ions in the lumen tend to flow into the cell due to the difference in ion concentrations. The function of the SGLT protein is to allow glucose and sodium ions to flow into the cell together. Finally, glucose is transported to the capillaries through GLUT2^[46,47] (Fig. 3).

SGLT-1 is mainly distributed in the small intestine and kidney. In the small intestine, it can absorb glucose in the intestinal juice, and in the kidney, it is responsible for reabsorbing 10% of the glucose in the urine. SGLT-2 is mainly distributed in the kidney and is responsible for reabsorbing 90% of the glucose in the urine.^[48,49] SGLT inhibitors could act on SGLT-1 and SGLT-2. SOTA-related studies were not included in this study, so the drugs included in this study are all SGLT-2 inhibitors.^[50] SGLT-2



inhibitors achieve the goal of blood sugar control by increasing the excretion of glucose from urine.^[40,41]

The use of SGLT inhibitors is common in clinical practice, and it is considered feasible to administer SGLT inhibitors alone in patients in the early stage.^[42,43] Reducing the number of pharmacological interventions in patients with T2DM improves their quality of life.^[44,45] Long-term follow-up studies showed that the administration of SGLT2 inhibitors was associated with a reduction in the primary composite outcome composed of cardiovascular death, nonfatal myocardial infarction, and nonfatal stroke.^[46–49]

The purpose of this study was not only to verify the efficacy of SGLT inhibitors in T2DM but also to analyze the possible causes of heterogeneity. A total of 4 meta-analyses were conducted in this study, and the results of each showed significant heterogeneity. These findings indicate that the efficacy of SGLT inhibitors in different populations might be different, especially according to differences in the duration of diabetes, BMI, and region. This study only analyzed the effects of SGLT inhibitors on the HbA1c level in different populations, and whether there are differences in other effects or the safety of SGLT inhibitors in different populations remains to be determined by relevant systematic research. It is hoped that more studies will be conducted to evaluate differences in the efficacy and safety of SGLT inhibitors in different populations.

The limitations of this network meta-analysis are as follows:

- The literature on SOTA retrieved in this study did not meet the inclusion criteria; thus, the efficacy of SOTA in T2DM was not analyzed.
- (2) Subgroup analysis could not explain all the sources of heterogeneity.

5. Conclusions

SGLT inhibitors have a good effect on patients with T2DM, but there may be differences in the efficacy of SGLT inhibitors in different populations. It is hoped that more studies will be conducted to evaluate the efficacy and safety of SGLT inhibitors in different populations.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: Mao-Bing Chen, Hua-Lan Xu.

- Data curation: Mao-Bing Chen, Hua Wang, Qi-Han Zheng, Wei-Yan Cui.
- Methodology: Mao-Bing Chen, Hua Wang.
- Software: Mao-Bing Chen, Wei-Yan Cui.
- Supervision: Mao-Bing Chen, Qi-Han Zheng.
- Writing original draft: Mao-Bing Chen, Hua Wang, Qi-Han Zheng, Hua-Lan Xu, Wei-Yan Cui.
- Writing review & editing: Mao-Bing Chen.

References

- Cooke DW, Plotnick L. Type 1 diabetes mellitus in pediatrics. Pediatr Rev 2008;29:374–85.
- [2] Vos T, Flaxman AD, Naghavi M, et al. Years lived with disability (YLDs) for 1160 sequelae of 289 diseases and injuries 1990-2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. Lancet 2012;380:2163–96.
- [3] Picot J, Jones J, Colquitt JL, et al. The clinical effectiveness and costeffectiveness of bariatric (weight loss) surgery for obesity: a systematic review and economic evaluation. Health Technol Assess 2009;13:1-190, 215-357, iii-iv.
- [4] Kitabchi AE, Umpierrez GE, Miles JM, et al. Hyperglycemic crises in adult patients with diabetes. Diabetes Care 2009;32:1335–43.
- [5] Nair GG, Tzanakakis ES, Hebrok M. Emerging routes to the generation of functional β-cells for diabetes mellitus cell therapy. Nat Rev Endocrinol 2020;16:506–18.
- [6] Saeedi P, Salpea P, Karuranga S, et al. Mortality attributable to diabetes in 20-79 years old adults, 2019 estimates: results from the International Diabetes Federation Diabetes Atlas, 9th edition. Diabetes Res Clin Pract 2020;162:108086.
- [7] Miedema K. Standardization of HbA1c and optimal range of monitoring. Scand J Clin Lab Investig 2005;65:61–72.
- [8] Johansson KS, Sonne DP, Knop FK, et al. What is on the horizon for type 2 diabetes pharmacotherapy? – an overview of the antidiabetic drug development pipeline. Expert Opin Drug Discov 2020;15:1253–65.
- [9] Kilpatrick ES, Bloomgarden ZT, Zimmet PZ. Is haemoglobin A1c a step forward for diagnosing diabetes? BMJ 2009;339:b4432.
- [10] Handelsman Y. Rationale for the early use of sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitors in patients with type 2 diabetes. Adv Ther 2019;36:2567–86.
- [11] Sideri S, Papageorgiou SN, Eliades T. Registration in the international prospective register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO) of systematic

review protocols was associated with increased review quality. J Clin Epidemiol 2018;100:103–10.

- [12] Augusteijn H, van Aert RCM, van Assen MALM. The effect of publication bias on the Q test and assessment of heterogeneity. Psychol Methods 2019;24:116–34.
- [13] Bailey CJ, Gross JL, Pieters A, et al. Effect of dapagliflozin in patients with type 2 diabetes who have inadequate glycaemic control with metformin: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Lancet 2010;375:2223–33.
- [14] Bailey CJ, Iqbal N, T'Joen C, et al. Dapagliflozin monotherapy in drugnaïve patients with diabetes: a randomized-controlled trial of low-dose range. Diabetes Obes Metab 2012;14:951–9.
- [15] Bode B, Stenlöf K, Sullivan D, et al. Efficacy and safety of canagliflozin treatment in older subjects with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a randomized trial. Hosp Pract 2013;41:72–84.
- [16] Bolinder J, Ljunggren Ö, Johansson L, et al. Dapagliflozin maintains glycaemic control while reducing weight and body fat mass over 2 years in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus inadequately controlled on metformin. Diabetes Obes Metab 2013;16:159–69.
- [17] Dagogo-Jack S, Liu J, Eldor R, et al. Efficacy and safety of the addition of ertugliflozin in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus inadequately controlled with metformin and sitagliptin: the VERTIS SITA2 placebocontrolled randomized study. Diabetes Obes Metab 2018;20:530–40.
- [18] Ferrannini E, Ramos SJ, Salsali A, et al. Dapagliflozin monotherapy in type 2 diabetic patients with inadequate glycemic control by diet and exercise: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. Diabetes Care 2010;33:2217–24.
- [19] Forst T, Guthrie R, Goldenberg R, et al. Efficacy and safety of canagliflozin over 52 weeks in patients with type 2 diabetes on background metformin and pioglitazone. Diabetes Obes Metab 2014;16:467–77.
- [20] Häring HU, Merker L, Seewaldt-Becker E, et al. Empagliflozin as addon to metformin in patients with type 2 diabetes: a 24-week, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Diabetes Care 2014;37:1650–9.
- [21] Jabbour SA, Hardy E, Sugg J, et al. Dapagliflozin is effective as add-on therapy to sitagliptin with or without metformin: a 24-week, multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Diabetes Care 2014;37:740–50.
- [22] Ji L, Liu Y, Miao H, et al. Safety and efficacy of ertugliflozin in Asian patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus inadequately controlled with metformin monotherapy: VERTIS Asia. Diabetes Obes Metab 2019;21: 1474–82.
- [23] Kadowaki T, Inagaki N, Kondo K, et al. Efficacy and safety of canagliflozin as add-on therapy to teneligliptin in Japanese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: results of a 24-week, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Diabetes Obes Metab 2017;19: 874–82.
- [24] Kawamori R, Haneda M, Suzaki K, et al. Empagliflozin as add-on to linagliptin in a fixed-dose combination in Japanese patients with type 2 diabetes: glycaemic efficacy and safety profile in a 52-week, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. Diabetes Obes Metab 2018;20:2200–9.
- [25] Kovacs CS, Seshiah V, Merker L, et al. Empagliflozin as add-on therapy to pioglitazone with or without metformin in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. Clin Ther 2015;37:1773–88.e1.
- [26] Mathieu C, Ranetti AE, Li D, et al. Randomized, double-blind, phase 3 trial of triple therapy with dapagliflozin add-on to saxagliptin plus metformin in type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Care 2015;38:2009–17.
- [27] Matthaei S, Bowering K, Rohwedder K, et al. Dapagliflozin improves glycemic control and reduces body weight as add-on therapy to metformin plus sulfonylurea: a 24-week randomized, double-blind clinical trial. Diabetes Care 2015;38:365–72.
- [28] Neal B, Perkovic V, de Zeeuw D, et al. Efficacy and safety of canagliflozin, an inhibitor of sodium–glucose cotransporter 2, when used in conjunction with insulin therapy in patients with type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Care 2015;38:403–11.
- [29] Roden M, Weng J, Eilbracht J, et al. Empagliflozin monotherapy with sitagliptin as an active comparator in patients with type 2 diabetes: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol 2013;1:208–19.

- [30] Romera I, Ampudia-Blasco FJ, Pérez A, et al. Efficacy and safety of empagliflozin in combination with other oral hypoglycemic agents in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. Endocrinol Nutr 2016;63:519–26.
- [31] Rosenstock J, Frias J, Páll D, et al. Effect of ertugliflozin on glucose control, body weight, blood pressure and bone density in type 2 diabetes mellitus inadequately controlled on metformin monotherapy (VERTIS MET). Diabetes Obes Metab 2018;20:520–9.
- [32] Rosenstock J, Vico M, Wei L, et al. Effects of dapagliflozin, an SGLT2 inhibitor, on HbA(1c), body weight, and hypoglycemia risk in patients with type 2 diabetes inadequately controlled on pioglitazone monotherapy. Diabetes Care 2012;35:1473–8.
- [33] Søfteland E, Meier JJ, Vangen B, et al. Empagliflozin as add-on therapy in patients with type 2 diabetes inadequately controlled with linagliptin and metformin: a 24-week randomized, double-blind, parallel-group trial. Diabetes Care 2017;40:201–9.
- [34] Stenlöf K, Cefalu WT, Kim KA, et al. Efficacy and safety of canagliflozin monotherapy in subjects with type 2 diabetes mellitus inadequately controlled with diet and exercise. Diabetes Obes Metab 2013;15:372–82.
- [35] Strojek K, Yoon KH, Hruba V, et al. Effect of dapagliflozin in patients with type 2 diabetes who have inadequate glycaemic control with glimepiride: a randomized, 24-week, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Diabetes Obes Metab 2011;13:928–38.
- [36] Terra SG, Focht K, Davies M, et al. Phase III, efficacy and safety study of ertugliflozin monotherapy in people with type 2 diabetes mellitus inadequately controlled with diet and exercise alone. Diabetes Obes Metab 2017;19:721–8.
- [37] Wilding JPH, Charpentier G, Hollander P, et al. Efficacy and safety of canagliflozin in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus inadequately controlled with metformin and sulphonylurea: a randomised trial. Int J Clin Pract 2013;67:1267–82.
- [38] Yang W, Han P, Min KW, et al. Efficacy and safety of dapagliflozin in Asian patients with type 2 diabetes after metformin failure: a randomized controlled trial. J Diabetes 2016;8:796–808.
- [39] Yang W, Ma J, Li Y, et al. Dapagliflozin as add-on therapy in Asian patients with type 2 diabetes inadequately controlled on insulin with or without oral antihyperglycemic drugs: a randomized controlled trial. J Diabetes 2018;10:589–99.
- [40] Le Marois E, Bruzzo F, Reach G, et al. Comparison between a rapid glycohaemoglobin (HbA1c) immunoassay and other indices of glycaemic control. Acta Diabetol 1996;33:232–5.
- [41] Giaccari A. Sodium-glucose co-transporter inhibitors: medications that mimic fasting for cardiovascular prevention. Diabetes Obes Metab 2019;21:2211–8.
- [42] Loutradis C, Papadopoulou E, Angeloudi E, et al. The beneficial actions of SGLT-2 inhibitors beyond management of hyperglycemia. Curr Med Chem 2019;27:6682–702.
- [43] Feng M, Lv H, Xu X, et al. Efficacy and safety of dapagliflozin as monotherapy in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Medicine 2019;98:e16575.
- [44] Helmke BM, Reisser C, Idzkoe M, et al. Expression of SGLT-1 in preneoplastic and neoplastic lesions of the head and neck. Oral Oncol 2004;40:28–35.
- [45] Dobrică EC, Găman MA, Cozma MA, et al. Polypharmacy in type 2 diabetes mellitus: insights from an internal medicine department. Medicina 2019;55:436.
- [46] Chao EC. SGLT-2 inhibitors: a new mechanism for glycemic control. Clin Diabetes 2014;32:4–11.
- [47] Fitchett D, Zinman B, Wanner C, et al. Heart failure outcomes with empagliflozin in patients with type 2 diabetes at high cardiovascular risk: results of the EMPA-REG OUTCOME[®] trial. Eur Heart J 2016;37:1526–34.
- [48] Ohgaki R, Wei L, Yamada K, et al. Interaction of the sodium/glucose cotransporter (SGLT) 2 inhibitor canagliflozin with SGLT1 and SGLT2. J Pharmacol Exp Ther 2016;358:94–102.
- [49] Zou CY, Liu XK, Sang YQ, et al. Effects of SGLT2 inhibitors on cardiovascular outcomes and mortality in type 2 diabetes: a metaanalysis. Medicine 2019;98:e18245.
- [50] Chen MB, Xu RJ, Zheng QH, et al. Efficacy and safety of sotagliflozin adjuvant therapy for type 1 diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Medicine 2020;99:e20875.