The Association Between the Dosage of SGLT2 Inhibitor and Weight Reduction in Type 2 Diabetes Patients: A Meta-Analysis

Xiaoling Cai, Wenjia Yang, Xueying Gao, Yifei Chen, Lingli Zhou, Simin Zhang, Xueyao Han, and Linong Ji 回

Objective: Sodium glucose cotransporter 2 (SGLT2) inhibitors may induce urinary glucose excretion via the inhibition of renal glucose reabsorption, improve glycemic control, and lower body weight. The aim of this meta-analysis was to evaluate weight changes in patients who received different dosages of SGLT2 inhibitors.

Methods: Overall, 55 placebo-controlled trials were included.

Results: The results indicated that treatment with 2.5 mg, 5 mg, 10 mg, and 20 mg of dapagliflozin led to significant decreases in body weight compared with a placebo (weighted mean difference [WMD], -1.30 kg, -1.51 kg, -1.79 kg, -2.24 kg, respectively; P < 0.001). Treatment with 50 mg, 100 mg, 200 mg, and 300 mg of canagliflozin also led to significant decreases in weight (WMD, -1.20 kg, -1.82 kg, -1.83 kg, -2.37 kg, respectively; P < 0.001). In the treatment with empagliflozin, ipragliflozin, tofogliflozin, and luseogliflozin, body weight also significantly decreased. The decrease in weight was associated with the dosage of dapagliflozin (P < 0.05). **Conclusions:** Body weight significantly decreased in patients with type 2 diabetes who received different dosages of SGLT2 inhibitors compared with patients who received a placebo. Moreover, in patients treated

with dapagliflozin, there was a statistically significant dosage-dependent trend in body weight reduction.

Obesity (2018) 26, 70-80. doi:10.1002/oby.22066

Introduction

Type 2 diabetes is a progressive disease characterized by declining β cell function and insulin resistance. Weight control is an important part of type 2 diabetes management that helps to lower insulin resistance and contributes to improvements in glycemic control. Therefore, weight loss is recommended for patients with type 2 diabetes (1,2). Moderate weight loss (5%-10%) can improve glycemic control and other cardiovascular risk factors and comorbidities (3,4). Despite the number of antidiabetes medications currently available, achieving an optimal decrease in weight and maintaining glycemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes are difficult. Although metformin and glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) analogues provide weight reduction, most oral agents lead to weight gain, such as sulfonylureas and thiazolidinediones, or are weight neutral, such as dipeptidyl peptidase-4 (DPP-4) inhibitors, and do not meaningfully reduce body weight (1,2).

An emerging class of antidiabetes agents, known as sodium glucose cotransporter 2 (SGLT2) inhibitors, induces urinary glucose

excretion via the inhibition of renal glucose reabsorption, improves glycemic control, and lowers body weight. Recent studies of weight decrease with SGLT2 inhibitor treatment have indicated decreases of approximately 1 to 4 kg in different trials (5-9); however, the dosages and types of SGLT2 inhibitors vary among trials. Is the weight decrease associated with SGLT2 inhibitor treatment related to dosage? Previous reviews could not comprehensively answer this question. Therefore, the aim of this study is to evaluate, via a meta-analysis, the weight change for different dosages of SGLT2 inhibitors and the associated parameters.

Methods

Strategy for searching

The MEDLINE (PubMed), Embase, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials databases that covered recorded research until January 2016 were searched and then re-searched in January 2017.

Endocrine and Metabolism Department, Peking University People's Hospital, Beijing, China. Correspondence: Linong Ji (jiln@bjmu.edu.cn)

Funding agencies: This study was supported by AstraZeneca Ltd. (China). The funding agencies had no role in the study design, data collection or analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Received: 29 August 2017; Accepted: 15 October 2017; Published online 22 November 2017. doi:10.1002/oby.22066

Disclosure: LNJ has received fees for consultations and meeting presentations from AstraZeneca, Sanofi-Aventis, Eli Lilly, Novartis, Merck, Roche, Abbott, and Takeda. The other authors declared no conflict of interest.

Author contributions: Design of this meta-analysis: LNJ and XLC; study selection and data extraction: WJY, XYG, and YFC; statistical analyses: XLC and XYH; manuscript writing: XLC, LLZ, SMZ, and LNJ. All authors contributed to the manuscript drafts and gave final approval for this manuscript. Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article.

The following terms were used for searching and re-searching: type 2 diabetes, sodium-glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors, dapagliflozin, canagliflozin, empagliflozin, ipragliflozin, tofogliflozin, luseogliflozin, and randomized placebo-controlled trials. The PubMed search strategy formed the basis of the strategies developed for the other electronic databases. The registration number for this meta-analysis is CRD42016033041.

Study selection and data extraction

The inclusion criteria for this meta-analysis were as follows: (1) randomized placebo-controlled trials of SGLT2 inhibitor treatment in type 2 diabetes participants as a monotherapy or add-on therapy, (2) a study length of greater than 12 weeks, (3) the change in weight from baseline was assessed in comparative groups, and (4) the doses of SGLT2 inhibitors were reported in the trial. The exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) active controlled studies, (2) nonrandomized trials, (3) trials in patients with type 1 diabetes, and (4) a study length of less than 12 weeks. The studies that reported the efficacy of nonapproved doses of each SGLT2 inhibitor were also included in this meta-analysis.

According to the above inclusion criteria, WJY and XYG evaluated the eligibility of all the studies independently. If there was a disagreement, YFC would resolve it by consultation. The quality of each study and the risk of bias were evaluated by using the Cochrane risk of bias tool (10). Then WJY and YFC extracted the details from each manuscript, including the publication data, study design, baseline characteristics such as age and BMI, study drugs and dosages, duration of the study, and changes in weight from baseline to the study end point. If there was a disagreement, XYG would resolve it by discussion.

Statistical analysis

The body weight changes from baseline to the study end point in patients who received treatment with various dosages of SGLT2 inhibitors or a placebo were evaluated by computing the weighted mean difference (WMD). The 95% CI was also calculated. Because of between-study heterogeneity, Higgins I² statistics were used to evaluate the percentage of variance. A high level of heterogeneity was defined as an I² > 50% in the statistical analysis; a low level of heterogeneity was defined as an I² \leq 50%. Both a fixed-effects model and a random-effects model were used for the analysis. Publication bias was assessed via a funnel plot and Egger's test.

In the subgroup analyses, studies were divided according to ethnicity (Asian and non-Asian) and BMI (BMI \geq 30 kg/m² or BMI < 30 kg/m²). In each subgroup, the body weight changes from baseline in patients treated with each SGLT2 inhibitor compared with patients treated with a placebo were calculated by WMD and 95% CI. We also performed several sensitivity analyses: short study duration or long study duration, even including or excluding the extension studies; studies in different ethnicities; and studies with different baseline BMIs, including or excluding studies with the highest or lowest baseline BMI.

A meta-regression analysis was performed to evaluate whether the prespecified covariates of baseline age, gender, baseline hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c), diabetes duration, and baseline BMI were associated with weight changes from baseline corrected by placebo for each SGLT2 inhibitor. Statistical significance was considered for P < 0.05.

The statistical analyses were primarily performed with the Review Manager statistical software package (version 5.2; The Cochrane Collaboration, London, United Kingdom). This meta-analysis was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses guidelines for conducting and reporting meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) (11) (Supporting Information Table S1). The Egger's test for publication bias, the whole-body weight changes in patients treated with SGLT2 inhibitors stratified by dosage, and the meta-regression analyses were performed with the Stata statistical software package (version 11.0; StataCorp LLC, College Station, Texas).

Results

Summaries of included studies

Figure 1 summarizes the flowchart of the study selection process. A total of 487 articles were searched, and 128 full articles were read in detail. Fifty-five RCTs were considered appropriate for inclusion, including 21 studies that compared dapagliflozin with a placebo as monotherapy or add-on therapy (5-9,12-27), 10 studies that compared canagliflozin with a placebo (28-37), 12 studies of empagliflozin compared with a placebo (38-49), five studies of ipragliflozin (50-54), two studies of tofogliflozin (55,56), and five studies of luseogliflozin (57-61). The details are shown in Supporting Information Table S2. The range of age of the patients who received treatment with SGLT2 inhibitors was from 51.0 to 69.5 years old, with the male percentage ranging from 37.0% to 81.8%. All the baseline characteristics in this meta-analysis are shown in Supporting Information Table S3. The analyses were based on data from 4,816 individuals who received dapagliflozin, 5,628 patients who received canagliflozin, 5,448 individuals who received empagliflozin, 866 patients who received ipragliflozin, 370 individuals who received tofogliflozin treatment, and 558 individuals who received luseogliflozin.

Methodological quality

All of the studies included treatment with an active hypoglycemic agent compared with a placebo in a double-blind model. The eligibility criteria were clearly reported in all of the trials. The risk of bias was evaluated with the Cochrane instrument. Overall, the risk of bias was low; random sequence generation, allocation concealment, the blinding of participants and personnel, the blinding of outcome assessments, and incomplete outcome data were all well reported, and selective reporting was low (Supporting Information Figure S1). Funnel plot results indicated that there was an even distribution of the mean values for the parameters that were studied (data not shown).

Weight changes by SGLT2 inhibitor treatment stratified by dosage

When dapagliflozin was compared with a placebo, dapagliflozin 2.5 mg/d resulted in a significantly greater change in weight (WMD, -1.30 kg; P < 0.001); dapagliflozin 5 mg, 10 mg, and 20 mg also led to significantly greater changes in weight (WMD, -1.51 kg, -1.79 kg, and -2.24 kg, respectively) (Figure 2). Compared with a placebo, treatment with canagliflozin 50 mg led to a significant decrease in weight (WMD, -1.20 kg; P < 0.001), and treatment with canagliflozin 100 mg, 200 mg, and 300 mg also led to significant decreases in weight (WMD, -1.82 kg, -1.83 kg, and -2.37 kg, respectively)



(Figure 3). Compared with a placebo, treatment with empagliflozin 10 and 25 mg/d was associated with significant decreases in weight (WMD, -1.84 kg and -1.93 kg, respectively; both P < 0.001) (Figure 4). Compared with a placebo, treatment with ipragliflozin 12.5 mg/d led to a significant decrease in weight (WMD, -0.44 kg; P < 0.001), and ipragliflozin 50 mg, 150 mg, and 300 mg/d also led to significant decreases in weight (WMD, -1.40 kg, -1.49 kg, and -1.73 kg, respectively) (Figure 5). Compared with a placebo, treatment with tofogliflozin 10 mg, 20 mg, and 40 mg/d was associated with significant decreases in weight (WMD, -1.68 kg, -2.15 kg, and -2.35 kg, respectively; all P < 0.001) (Figure 6). Compared with a placebo,

treatment with luseogliflozin 2.5 and 5 mg/d was associated with significant decreases in weight (WMD, -1.54 kg and -1.92 kg, respectively; both P < 0.001) (Figure 7). Details are shown in Table 1.

In the subgroup analysis, studies were divided on the basis of ethnicity (Asian and non-Asian), and the weight changes in the Asian population for each SGLT2 inhibitor stratified by dosage are presented in Table 1. In another subgroup analysis, studies were divided according to BMI (BMI \geq 30 kg/m² or BMI < 30 kg/m²). Subgroup analysis results indicated that body weight changes stratified by dosage in patients with a BMI < 30 kg/m² were



Figure 2 Body weight changes stratified by dosage and corrected by a placebo in patients who received dapagliflozin. The sequence of the study name is <Dosage > <Drug > <Author > <Year > _< Ethnicity>. EUR represented studies mainly performed in Caucasian individuals, while ASN represented studies mainly performed in Asian individuals. (A) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received dapagliflozin 2.5 mg/d. (B) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received dapagliflozin 5 mg/d. (C) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received dapagliflozin 20 mg/d. (C) Body patients who received dapagliflozin 20 mg/d.

comparable with those in patients with a BMI \ge 30 kg/m². The details are also shown in Table 1. Moreover, by using the fixed-effects model and the random-effects model, the results indicated that body weight changes stratified by dosage in the two kinds of analysis were comparable. Details are shown in Supporting Information Table S4.

Associations between the dosage of SGLT2 inhibitors and weight change

Linear trend testing for dosage and weight change for the six types of SGLT2 inhibitors indicated the following: with dapagliflozin, the trend of dosage and weight change was statistically significant (P < 0.05). However, the results for treatment with canagliflozin,

	Can	aliflorin		DB	0		Mo	an Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD T	otal N	tean 5	SD Total	Wei	aht IV.	Random, 95% Cl	IV. Bandom, 95% Cl	3-A
(50mg Cana) Inagaki 2013 ASN	-1.98	0.2	82 .	0.78 0	.2 75	73.	2% -1	.20 [-1.26, -1.14]		
(50mgCana) Rosenstock2012-2_EUR	-2.3	0.3	64	-1.1 0	.3 65	26.	8% -1	.20 [-1.30, -1.10]		
Total (95% CI)			146		140	100.	0% -1.	20 [-1.251.15]	,	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.00,	df = 1 (P =	= 1.00); P	= 0%						<u> t t t t </u>	<u> </u>
Test for overall effect: Z = 43.89 (P < 0.0)	0001)							F	-4 -2 0 2	4
	100				1000000			r.	avours canaginozinsoning ravours roo	
	Can	agliflozin			PBO			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	3-R
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	
(100mg Cana) Inagaki 2013_ASN	-2.51	0.2	74	-0.78	0.2	15	0.7%	-1.73[-1.79, -1.67]		
(100mg Cana) Inagaki 2014_ASN	-2.6	0.05	90	-0.52	0.05	93	14.0%	-2.08 [-2.09, -2.07]	· · ·	
(100mg Cana) JI 2015_ASN	-1.9	0.4	223	-0.5	0.5	220	0.4%	-1.40 [-1.48, -1.32]		
(100mgCana) Bode2015_EOR	-2.7	0.0	112	-0.0	0.0	231	0.1%	-2.10 [-2.24, -1.90]		
(100mgCana) Nosi2014_EOK	26422	0.0072	664	-0.2	0.0	620	26.60	2.40 [2.01, -2.19]		
(100mgCana) Neal2015 FLIR	-1 7936	0.0648	661	ő	0.0669	636	57 3%	-1 79 61 80 -1 79		
(100mgCana) Rosenstock2012-2 EUR	-2.6	0.0040	64	-11	0.0000	65	0.1%	-1 50 61 64 -1 361		
(100mgCana) Steplof2013 EUR	-25	0.7	195	-0.5	0.7	192	0.2%	-2 00 62 14 -1 861	-	
(100mgCana) Yale2013 EUR	0.2	0.65	90	0.2	0.65	90	0.1%	0.00 -0 19 0 19	-	
(100mgCana)Gonzalez EUR	-3.3	0.2	363	-1	0.3	183	1.3%	-2.30 (-2.35, -2.25)	•	
(<u>_</u>										
Total (95% CI)			2778			2551	100.0%	-2.05 [-2.06, -2.05]		
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 17604.83, df = 10 (P	< 0.00001); I* = 10	0%							<u> </u>
Test for overall effect: Z = 741.61 (P < 0.00)	001)								FavoursCanadiflozin100mg Favours PBO	-
	Conor	lift a min 20	0		DBO			Maan Difference	Meen Difference	
Stucks or Subgroup	Canay	ED CD	Toto	Maar	PBU CD T	atal I	Mainht	Mean Difference	Mean Difference	3-C
Study of Subgroup	Mean	50	1018	i mear			veignt	IV, FIXed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	
(200mg Cana) Inagaki 2013_ASN	-2.8	0.05	8	3 -0.5.	0.05	93	94.1%	-2.28 [-2.29, -2.27]		
(200mg Cana) Inagaki 2014_ASN	-2.39	0.2	1	-0.78	3 0.2	15	4.9%	-1.61 [-1.67, -1.55]		
(200mgCana) Rosenstock2012-2_EUR	-2.7	0.5	6	5 -1.1	0.3	65	1.0%	-1.60 [-1.74, -1.46]	~	
Total (95% CI)			22)		233	100.0%	-2.24 [-2.25, -2.23]	1	
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 481.80$ df = 2 (P < 0	00001).1	² = 100%								
Test for overall effect: $7 = 310.60 \text{ (P} < 0.00)$	0001)	- 100 /0							-4 -2 0 2	4
								31	FavoursCanagliflozin200mg Favours PBO	
	Can	adiflozin			DRO			Maan Difforance	Mean Difference	3-D
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	Meandom 95% Cl	M Bandom 95% Cl	3-0
(300mg Cana) Inagaki2013 ASN	-319	0.2	75	-0.78	0.2	75	10.0%	-2 41 1-2 47 -2 35	•	12
(300mg Cana) II 2015 ASN	-21	0.5	227	-0.5	0.5	226	10.0%	-1 60 61 69 -1 51	•	
(300mgCana) Bode2015 EUR	-3.5	0.9	236	-0.6	0.9	237	10.0%	-2 90 63 04 -2 76	-	
(300mgCana) Earst2014 EUR	-3.7	0.0	114	-0.2	0.2	115	10.0%	-3 50 63 57 -3 43	•	
(300mgCana) Gonzalez ELIR	.3.7	0.5	367	-1	0.2	193	10.0%	-2 70 1-2 75 -2 65		
(300mgCana) Mosl2016 1 EUD	2 210	0.00606	664	-1	0 10026	620	10.0%	-2.70 [-2.75, -2.05]		
The second se		0.03303	004		0.00000	626	10.1%	-2.29 1.2.29 -2.27		
(200mgCana) Neal2015-1_EOR	-2 2752	0 0620	0.33		0.0005	030	10.1 %	-2.20 [-2.20, -2.27]		
(300mgCana) Neal2015-1_EOR (300mgCana) Neal2015_EUR (200mgCana) Reaconstact/2012 2, EUR	-2.2752	0.0639	660	1 1	0.2	66	10.0%	2201244 216	-	
(300mgCana) Neal2015-1_EUR (300mgCana) Neal2015_EUR (300mgCana) Rosenstock2012-2_EUR	-2.2752	0.0639	660 64	-1.1	0.3	65	10.0%	-2.30 [-2.44, -2.16]	_*	
(300mgCana) Neal2015-LEUR (300mgCana) Neal2015_EUR (300mgCana) Rosenstock2012-2_EUR (300mgCana) Steniof2013_EUR	-2.2752 -3.4 -3.4	0.0639 0.5 0.65	660 64 197	-1.1	0.3	65 192	10.0%	-2.30 [-2.44, -2.16] -2.90 [-3.03, -2.77]	-	
(300mgCana) Neal2015-1_EOR (300mgCana) Neal2015_EUR (300mgCana) Rosenstock2012-2_EUR (300mgCana) Stenlof2013_EUR (300mgCana) Yale2013_EUR	-2.2752 -3.4 -3.4 -1.2	0.0639 0.5 0.65 0.65	660 64 197 89	-1.1 -0.5 -1.4	0.3 0.65 0.65	65 192 90	10.0% 10.0% 9.9%	-2.30 [-2.44, -2.16] -2.90 [-3.03, -2.77] 0.20 [0.01, 0.39]		
(300mgCana) Neal2015-1_EOR (300mgCana) Neal2015_EUR (300mgCana) Rosenstock2012-2_EUR (300mgCana) Stenlof2013_EUR (300mgCana) Yale2013_EUR Total (95% CI)	-2.2752 -3.4 -3.4 -1.2	0.0639 0.5 0.65 0.65	660 64 197 89 2693	-1.1 -0.5 -1.4	0.3 0.65 0.65	65 192 90 2458	10.0% 10.0% 9.9% 100.0%	-2.30 [-2.44, -2.16] -2.90 [-3.03, -2.77] 0.20 [0.01, 0.39] -2.37 [-2.82, -1.93]	•	
(300mgCana) Neal2015-1_EOR (300mgCana) Neal2015_EUR (300mgCana) Stenlof2013_EUR (300mgCana) Stenlof2013_EUR (300mgCana) Yale2013_EUR Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.51; Chi ² = 27496.7	-2.2752 -3.4 -3.4 -1.2 9, df = 9 (F	0.0639 0.5 0.65 0.65	660 64 197 89 2693 11); I ² =	-1.1 -0.5 -1.4	0.3 0.65 0.65	65 192 90 2458	10.0% 10.0% 9.9% 100.0%	-2.30 [-2.44, -2.16] -2.90 [-3.03, -2.77] 0.20 [0.01, 0.39] -2.37 [-2.82, -1.93]		
(300mgCana) Neal2015-1_EOR (300mgCana) Neal2015_EUR (300mgCana) Rosenstock2012-2_EUR (300mgCana) Steniof2013_EUR Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.51; Chi ² = 27496.7 ² Test for overall effect: Z = 10.48 (P < 0.0000	-2.2752 -3.4 -3.4 -1.2 9, df = 9 (F	0.0639 0.5 0.65 0.65	660 64 197 89 2693 01); I ² =	-1.1 -0.5 -1.4	0.3 0.65 0.65	65 192 90 2458	10.0% 10.0% 9.9% 100.0%	-2.30 [-2.44, -2.16] -2.90 [-3.03, -2.77] 0.20 [0.01, 0.39] -2.37 [-2.82, -1.93]	Favours Capacition in 300mg Favours PBO	
(300mgCana) Neal20151_EDR (300mgCana) Neal2015_EUR (300mgCana) Rosenstock2012-2_EUR (300mgCana) Steniof2013_EUR Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.51; Chi ² = 27496.71 Test for overall effect: Z = 10.48 (P < 0.0000	-2.2752 -3.4 -3.4 -1.2 9, df = 9 (F	0.0639 0.5 0.65 0.65	660 64 197 89 2693 01); I ² =	-1.1 -0.5 -1.4	0.3 0.65 0.65	65 192 90 2458	10.0% 10.0% 9.9% 100.0%	-2.30 [-2.44, -2.16] -2.90 [-3.03, -2.77] 0.20 [0.01, 0.39] -2.37 [-2.82, -1.93]	-4 -2 0 2 Favours Canagliflozin 300mg Favours PBO	

Figure 3 Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received canagliflozin stratified by dosage. The sequence of the study name is <Dosage > <Drug > <Autor > <Year > _< Ethnicity>. EUR represented studies mainly performed in Caucasian individuals, while ASN represented studies mainly performed in Asian individuals. (A) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received canagliflozin 50 mg/d. (B) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received canagliflozin 100 mg/d. (C) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received canagliflozin 200 mg/d. (D) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received canagliflozin 300 mg/d. [Color figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

empagliflozin, ipragliflozin, tofogliflozin, and luseogliflozin were not statistically significant (Supporting Information Figure S2).

A meta-regression analysis indicated that baseline age, gender, baseline HbA1c, diabetes duration, and baseline BMI were not associated with weight changes from baseline corrected by a placebo in each SGLT2 inhibitor treatment group. The details are also shown in Supporting Information Table S5.

Discussion

Results from this meta-analysis indicated that all four SGLT2 inhibitors resulted in significant decreases in body weight from baseline. In addition, different dosages of each SGLT2 inhibitor were associated with a statistically significant body weight decrease. Weight changes were dose dependent for the dapagliflozin treatment.

The mechanisms by which SGLT2 inhibitors affect weight loss may include the following. First, these mechanisms are likely driven by the loss of calories associated with increased urine glucose excretion (UGE). The SGLT2 inhibitors inhibit renal glucose reabsorption and induce UGE. As previously reported, exposure to dapagliflozin has resulted in a dose-dependent increase in UGE, and a maximal increase in UGE was generally observed at doses greater than 20 mg/d in subjects with type 2 diabetes (62,63). Moreover, in patients who received canagliflozin, canagliflozin increased UGE dose dependently, and approximately 80 to 120 g/d of UGE was observed with doses of canagliflozin of 100 mg and higher, which might be associated with a caloric loss of 320 to 480 kcal/d (64-66). Second, the weight loss observed with SGLT2 inhibitor treatment might be associated with fat loss. It was reported that approximately twothirds of the weight loss with canagliflozin treatment was attributed to fat loss (67). In addition, body weight loss with dapagliflozin treatment may be explained by reduced total body fat mass, visceral adipose tissue, and subcutaneous adipose tissue volume (12). Third, it was also reported that the initial weight loss with SGLT2 inhibitors may be attributable to fluid loss associated with mild osmotic diuresis (66); however, weight loss continues even after indicators of volume depletion attenuate.

Study or Subgroup	Empagi Mean	iflozin 1(SD)mg Total	Mean	PBO SD	Total	Weight	Mean Difference	Mean Dir IV Fiyed	fference	4-A
(10mg Emps) Poder2012 ASN	2 42	0.10	205	0.27	0.10	162	1/ 0%	2 70 1 2 02 2 751	•	35% 01	2
(10mgEmpa) Pame#2014_4 ELIP	-2.42	0.10	203	-0.44	0.13	05	0.7%	-2.73 [-2.03, -2.73]			
(10mgEmpa) Haring2013 ELIP	-216	0.0	225	-0.44	0.05	225	28.4%	-1.77 [-1.90 -1.74]			
(10mgEmpa) Haring2013_EOR	-2.10	0.13	223	-0.35	0.13	223	20.4%	-1.63[-1.66]-1.60]			
(10mgEmpa) Kovace2014_EUR	-2.00	0.17	165	0.45	0.17	165	10.6%	-1.06 [-2.01 -1.00]			
(10mgEmpa) Rocanstack/2014_EUR	1.02	0.21	105	0.34	0.21	100	1 1 0.0 %	-1.30 [-2.01, -1.31]			
(10mgEmpa) Rose1stock2014_EOR	2.74	0.30	214	0.44	0.30	100	7 70%	1 74 [1 70 1 60]			
(10mgEmpa) Forceppini2012, EUP	-2.71	0.10	214	-0.97	0.20	107	0.20%	1 50 [1 00 1 27]			
(Fungerinpa)Ferrannini2013_EOR	-2.33	0.40	215	-0.75	0.25	207	10.270	1.00[-1.09,-1.27]			
(SmgbidEmpa) Ross2015_EOR	-2.93	0.18	215	-0.97	0.25	207	12.5%	-1.96 [-2.00, -1.92]			
Total (95% CI)			1606			1439	100.0%	-1.96 [-1.97, -1.94]			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2620.30, df = 8 (P	< 0.00001); $ ^2 = 10$	0%						<u> t t t t </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Test for overall effect: Z = 260.03 (P < 0.	00001)								-4 -2 0	J 2	4
									Favours Empagliflozin10mg	Favours PBO	
	Empagi	iflozin 2	5mg	1	PBO			Mean Difference	Mean Di	fference	4-B
Study or Subaroup		100.000	T 4 8		cn	Tetal	Ale in lat		B/ Fires		
Study of Subgroup	Mean	SD	lotal	Mean	50	Total	weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed	, 95% Cl	60 2004
(12.5mgbidEmpa) Ross2015_EUR	-2.89	0.18	214	-0.97	0.25	107	8.7%	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl -1.92 [-1.97, -1.87]	IV, Fixed	, 95% Cl	40.502
(12.5mgbidEmpa) Ross2015_EUR (25mg Empa) Roden 2013_ASN	Mean -2.89 -2.48	0.18 0.35	214 224	-0.97 -0.33	0.25	107 228	8.7% 6.3%	V, Fixed, 95% Cl -1.92 [-1.97, -1.87] -2.15 [-2.21, -2.09]	IV, Fixed	I, 95% Cl	61, 200
(12.5mgbidEmpa) Ross2015_EUR (25mg Empa) Roden 2013_ASN (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-1_EUR	<u>Mean</u> -2.89 -2.48 -1.17	0.18 0.35 0.4	214 224 187	меал -0.97 -0.33 0	0.25 0.33 0.4	107 228 187	8.7% 6.3% 3.7%	V, Fixed, 95% Cl -1.92 [-1.97, -1.87] -2.15 [-2.21, -2.09] -1.17 [-1.25, -1.09]	IV, HXed	I, 95% Cl	- 68 - 2424
(12.5mgbidEmpa) Ross2015_EUR (25mg Empa) Roden 2013_ASN (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-1_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-2_EUR	Mean -2.89 -2.48 -1.17 -2.6	0.18 0.35 0.4 0.6	214 224 187 97	-0.97 -0.33 0 -0.44	0.25 0.33 0.4 0.63	107 228 187 95	8.7% 6.3% 3.7% 0.8%	V, Fixed, 95% Cl -1.92 [-1.97, -1.87] -2.15 [-2.21, -2.09] -1.17 [-1.25, -1.09] -2.16 [-2.33, -1.99]	• •	I, 95% CI	40 DUA
(12.5mgbidEmpa) Ross2015_EUR (25mg Empa) Roden 2013_ASN (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-1_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-2_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-3_EUR	-2.89 -2.48 -1.17 -2.6 -1	0.18 0.35 0.4 0.6 3.3	214 224 187 97 37	Mean -0.97 -0.33 0 -0.44 0	0.25 0.33 0.4 0.63 3.6	107 228 187 95 37	8.7% 6.3% 3.7% 0.8% 0.0%	W, Fixed, 95% CI -1.92 [-1.97, -1.87] -2.15 [-2.21, -2.09] -1.17 [-1.25, -1.09] -2.16 [-2.33, -1.99] -1.00 [-2.57, 0.57]		i, 95% Cl	
(12.5mgbidEmpa) Ross2015_EUR (25mg Empa) Roden 2013_ASN (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-1_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-2_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-3_EUR (25mgEmpa) Ferrannini2013_EUR	Mean -2.89 -2.48 -1.17 -2.6 -1 -2.03	SD 0.18 0.35 0.4 0.6 3.3 1	214 224 187 97 37 82	Mean -0.97 -0.33 0 -0.44 0 -0.75	0.25 0.33 0.4 0.63 3.6 1	107 228 187 95 37 82	8.7% 6.3% 3.7% 0.8% 0.0% 0.3%	M, Fixed, 95% CI -1.92 [-1.97, -1.87] -2.15 [-2.21, -2.09] -1.17 [-1.25, -1.09] -2.16 [-2.33, -1.99] -1.00 [-2.57, 0.57] -1.28 [-1.59, -0.97]		i, 95% Cl	49 - 140.4 -
(12.5mgBidEmpa) Ross2015_EUR (25mgEmpa) Roden 2013_ASN (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-1_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-2_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-3_EUR (25mgEmpa) Ferrannini2013_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2013_EUR	Mean -2.89 -2.48 -1.17 -2.6 -1 -2.03 -2.39	SD 0.18 0.35 0.4 0.6 3.3 1 0.15	214 224 187 97 37 82 216	Mean -0.97 -0.33 0 -0.44 0 -0.75 -0.39	0.25 0.33 0.4 0.63 3.6 1 0.15	107 228 187 95 37 82 225	8.7% 6.3% 3.7% 0.8% 0.0% 0.3% 31.4%	M, Fixed, 95% CI -1.92 [-1.97, -1.87] -2.15 [-2.21, -2.09] -1.17 [-1.25, -1.09] -2.16 [-2.33, -1.99] -1.00 [-2.57, 0.57] -1.28 [-1.59, -0.97] -2.00 [-2.03, -1.97]		, 95% Cl	49 - 747 -
(12.5mgEmpa) Ross2015_EUR (25mgEmpa) Roden 2013_ASN (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-1_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-2_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-3_EUR (25mgEmpa) Farrannini2013_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2013_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2014_EUR	Mean -2.89 -2.48 -1.17 -2.6 -1 -2.03 -2.39 -2.46	SD 0.18 0.35 0.4 0.6 3.3 1 0.15 0.17	214 224 187 97 37 82 216 213	Mean -0.97 -0.33 0 -0.44 0 -0.75 -0.39 -0.45	0.25 0.33 0.4 0.63 3.6 1 0.15 0.17	107 228 187 95 37 82 225 207	8.7% 6.3% 3.7% 0.8% 0.0% 0.3% 31.4% 23.3%	M, Fixed, 95% CI -1.92 [-1.97, -1.87] -2.15 [-2.27, -2.09] -1.17 [-1.25, -1.09] -2.16 [-2.33, -1.99] -1.00 [-2.57, 0.57] -1.28 [-1.59, -0.97] -2.00 [-2.03, -1.97] -2.01 [-2.04, -1.98]		<u>, 95% Cl</u>	6 10
(12.5mgbidEmpa) Ross2015_EUR (25mg Empa) Roden 2013_ASN (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-1_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-2_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-3_EUR (25mgEmpa) Ferrannin2013_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2013_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Kovacs2014_EUR	Mean -2.89 -2.48 -1.17 -2.6 -1 -2.03 -2.39 -2.46 -1.47	SD 0.18 0.35 0.4 0.6 3.3 1 0.15 0.17 0.21	10tal 214 224 187 97 37 82 216 213 168	Mean -0.97 -0.33 0 -0.44 0 -0.75 -0.39 -0.45 0.34	0.25 0.33 0.4 0.63 3.6 1 0.15 0.17 0.21	107 228 187 95 37 82 225 207 165	8.7% 6.3% 3.7% 0.8% 0.0% 0.3% 31.4% 23.3% 12.1%	M, Fixed, 95% CI -1.92 [-1.97, -1.87] -2.15 [-2.21, -2.09] -2.16 [-2.33, -1.99] -1.00 [-2.57, 0.57] -1.28 [-1.59, -0.97] -2.00 [-2.03, -1.97] -2.01 [-2.04, -1.98] -1.81 [-1.86, -1.76]		<u>. 95% Cl</u>	6 502
(12.5mgbidEmpa) Ross2015_EUR (25mg Empa) Roden 2013_ASN (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-1_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-2_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-3_EUR (25mgEmpa) Ferrannini2013_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2013_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Kovacs2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Rosenstock2014_EUR	Mean -2.89 -2.48 -1.17 -2.6 -1 -2.03 -2.39 -2.46 -1.47 -2.04	SD 0.18 0.35 0.4 0.6 3.3 1 0.15 0.17 0.21 0.36	10tal 214 224 187 97 37 82 216 213 168 189	-0.97 -0.33 0 -0.44 0 -0.75 -0.39 -0.45 0.34 0.44	0.25 0.33 0.4 0.63 3.6 1 0.15 0.17 0.21 0.36	107 228 187 95 37 82 225 207 165 188	8.7% 6.3% 3.7% 0.8% 0.0% 0.3% 31.4% 23.3% 12.1% 4.7%	M, Fixed, 95% CI -1.92 [-1.97, -1.87] -2.15 [-2.21, -2.09] -1.17 [-1.25, -1.09] -2.16 [-2.33, -1.99] -1.00 [-2.57, 0.57] -1.28 [-1.59, -0.97] -2.00 [-2.03, -1.97] -2.01 [-2.04, -1.98] -1.81 [-1.86, -1.76] -2.48 [-2.55, -2.41]		<u>, 95% Cl</u>	- 10,1 0
(12.5mgBidEmpa) Ross2015_EUR (25mgEmpa) Roden 2013_ASN (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-1_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-2_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-3_EUR (25mgEmpa) Ferrannini2013_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Rosenstock2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Rosenstock2014_EUR	Mean -2.89 -2.48 -1.17 -2.6 -1 -2.03 -2.39 -2.46 -1.47 -2.04 -3.2	SD 0.18 0.35 0.4 0.6 3.3 1 0.15 0.17 0.21 0.36 0.18	10tal 214 224 187 97 37 82 216 213 168 189 215	-0.97 -0.33 -0.44 -0.44 -0.75 -0.39 -0.45 0.34 0.44 -0.97	0.25 0.33 0.4 0.63 3.6 1 0.15 0.17 0.21 0.36 0.25	107 228 187 95 37 82 225 207 165 188 107	8.7% 6.3% 3.7% 0.8% 0.0% 0.3% 31.4% 23.3% 12.1% 4.7% 8.7%	M, Fixed, 95% CI -1.92 [-1.97, -1.87] -2.15 [-2.21, -2.09] -1.17 [-1.25, -1.09] -1.00 [-2.57, 0.57] -1.28 [-1.59, -0.97] -2.00 [-2.03, -1.97] -2.01 [-2.04, -1.88] -1.81 [-1.86, -1.76] -2.48 [-2.55, -2.41] -2.23 [-2.28, -2.18]		<u>, 95% Cl</u>	- 10, - 10
(12.5mgbidEmpa) Ross2015_EUR (25mg Empa) Roden 2013_ASN (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-1_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-2_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-3_EUR (25mgEmpa) Ferrannin2013_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2013_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Kovacs2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Rosenstock2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Rosenstock2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Rosenstock2014_EUR	Mean -2.89 -2.48 -1.17 -2.6 -1 -2.03 -2.39 -2.46 -1.47 -2.04 -3.2	SD 0.18 0.35 0.4 0.6 3.3 1 0.15 0.17 0.21 0.36 0.18	10tal 214 224 187 97 37 82 216 213 168 189 215 1842	-0.97 -0.33 0 -0.44 0 -0.75 -0.39 -0.45 0.34 0.44 -0.97	0.25 0.33 0.4 0.63 3.6 1 0.15 0.17 0.21 0.36 0.25	107 228 187 95 37 82 225 207 165 188 107 1628	8.7% 6.3% 3.7% 0.8% 0.8% 0.3% 31.4% 23.3% 12.1% 4.7% 8.7% 100.0%	M, Fixed, 95% CI -1.92 [-1.97, -1.87] -2.15 [-2.21, -2.09] -1.17 [-1.25, -1.09] -2.16 [-2.33, -1.99] -1.00 [-2.57, 0.57] -2.00 [-2.03, -1.97] -2.01 [-2.04, -1.98] -1.81 [-1.86, -1.76] -2.48 [-2.55, -2.41] -2.23 [-2.28, -2.18] -1.99 [-2.01, -1.98]		., 95% Cl	
(12.5mgbidEmpa) Ross2015_EUR (12.5mgbidEmpa) Ross2015_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-1_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-2_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-3_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2013_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2013_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Ross2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Ross2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Ross2015_EUR Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 766.44, df = 10 (P	Mean -2.89 -2.48 -1.17 -2.6 -1 -2.03 -2.39 -2.46 -1.47 -2.04 -3.2 < 0.00007	SD 0.18 0.35 0.4 0.6 3.3 1 0.15 0.17 0.21 0.36 0.18	10tal 214 224 187 97 37 82 216 213 168 189 215 1842	-0.97 -0.33 0 -0.44 0 -0.75 -0.39 -0.45 0.34 0.44 -0.97	0.25 0.33 0.4 0.63 3.6 1 0.15 0.17 0.21 0.36 0.25	107 228 187 95 37 82 225 207 165 188 107 1628	8.7% 6.3% 3.7% 0.8% 0.8% 0.3% 31.4% 23.3% 12.1% 4.7% 8.7% 100.0 %	M, Fixed, 95% CI -1.92 [-1.97, -1.87] -2.15 [-2.21, -2.09] -1.17 [-1.25, -1.09] -2.16 [-2.33, -1.99] -1.00 [-2.57, 0.57] -1.28 [-1.59, -0.97] -2.00 [-2.03, -1.97] -2.01 [-2.04, -1.98] -1.81 [-1.86, -1.76] -2.48 [-2.55, -2.41] -2.23 [-2.28, -2.18] -1.99 [-2.01, -1.98]		., 95% Cl	
(12.5mgBidEmpa) Ross2015_EUR (25mgEmpa) Roden 2013_ASN (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-1_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-2_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-3_EUR (25mgEmpa) Farrannini2013_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2013_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Rosenstock2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Rosenstock2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Rosenstock2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Rosenstock2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Rosenstock2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Rosenstock2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Rosenstock2014_EUR	Mean -2.89 -2.48 -1.17 -2.6 -1 -2.03 -2.39 -2.46 -1.47 -2.04 -3.2 < 0.00007 000001)	SD 0.18 0.35 0.4 0.6 3.3 1 0.15 0.17 0.21 0.36 0.18	214 224 187 97 37 82 216 213 168 189 215 1842	-0.97 -0.33 -0.44 0 -0.75 -0.39 -0.45 0.34 0.44 -0.97	0.25 0.33 0.4 0.63 3.6 1 0.15 0.17 0.21 0.36 0.25	107 228 187 95 37 82 225 207 165 188 107 1628	8.7% 6.3% 3.7% 0.8% 0.0% 0.3% 31.4% 23.3% 12.1% 4.7% 8.7% 100.0 %	M, Fixed, 95% CI -1.92 [-1.97, -1.87] -2.15 [-2.21, -2.09] -1.17 [-1.25, -1.09] -2.16 [-2.33, -1.99] -1.00 [-2.57, 0.57] -1.28 [-1.59, -0.97] -2.01 [-2.04, -1.98] -1.81 [-1.86, -1.76] -2.48 [-2.55, -2.41] -2.23 [-2.28, -2.18] -1.99 [-2.01, -1.98]		<u>- 1</u>	1
(12.5mgbidEmpa) Ross2015_EUR (25mg Empa) Roden 2013_ASN (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-1_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-2_EUR (25mgEmpa) Barnett2014-3_EUR (25mgEmpa) Farrannin2013_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2013_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Haring2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Rosenstock2014_EUR (25mgEmpa) Rosenstock2014_	Mean -2.88 -2.48 -1.17 -2.6 -1 -2.03 -2.39 -2.46 -1.47 -2.04 -3.2 < 0.00001 00001)	SD 0.18 0.35 0.4 0.6 3.3 1 0.15 0.17 0.21 0.36 0.18	214 224 187 97 37 82 216 213 168 189 215 1842	-0.97 -0.33 -0.44 0 -0.75 -0.39 -0.45 0.34 0.44 -0.97	0.25 0.33 0.4 0.63 3.6 1 0.15 0.17 0.21 0.21 0.36 0.25	107 228 187 95 37 82 225 207 165 188 107 1628	8.7% 6.3% 3.7% 0.8% 0.3% 0.3% 31.4% 23.3% 12.1% 4.7% 8.7% 100.0 %	M, Fixed, 95% CI -1.92 [-1.97, -1.87] -2.15 [-2.21, -2.09] -1.17 [-1.25, -1.09] -2.16 [-2.33, -1.99] -1.00 [-2.57, 0.57] -1.28 [-1.59, -0.97] -2.01 [-2.04, -1.98] -1.81 [-1.86, -1.76] -2.48 [-2.55, -2.41] -2.23 [-2.28, -2.18] -1.99 [-2.01, -1.98]	-4 -2 C	. 95% Cl	1

Figure 4 Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received empagliflozin stratified by dosage. The sequence of the study name is <Dosage > <Drug > <Author > <Year > _ < Ethnicity >. EUR represented studies mainly performed in Caucasian individuals, while ASN represented studies mainly performed in Asian individuals. (A) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received empagliflozin 10 mg/d. (B) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received empagliflozin 25 mg/d. [Color figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

Although the above factors may contribute to weight changes associated with SGLT2 inhibitor treatment in patients with type 2 diabetes, some of the reasons for weight loss with SGLT2 treatment are not completely understood. For example, assuming no dietary changes, it was reported that canagliflozin treatment led to an average excretion of 80 to 120 g/d of glucose and, therefore, weight loss (35,65). Based on this, a mathematical model associated with weight loss (68) predicted that a caloric deficit of 320 to 480 kcal/d should provide approximately 5.5 to 7.0 kg of weight loss. However, canagliflozin-associated weight loss was less than the amount predicted based on UGE. Moreover, the possible reason for the SGLT2-induced weight loss that was lower than expected by calorie calculations might be the role of SGLT1 upregulation in renal reabsorption of glucose, which can decrease weight loss but was not inhibited by SGLT2 inhibitors (69,70). Therefore, the reasons for weight loss associated with SGLT2 inhibitor treatment might be more complicated than we currently believe.

It has been suggested that obesity is associated with diabetes and insulin resistance (1,2), and weight loss has been demonstrated to be associated with an improvement in glycemic control and cardiovascular risk factors (3,4); therefore, weight loss is an additional treatment goal for most patients with type 2 diabetes and might improve their adherence to treatment (1,2). Currently, the management of type 2 diabetes mellitus in terms of weight remains complex and challenging. Treatments with dipeptidyl-peptidase 4 inhibitors or alpha glucosidase inhibitors are weight neutral in patients with type 2 diabetes; treatments associated with weight gain are insulin secretagogues (predominantly sulfonylureas), insulin, and thiazolidinediones. Metformin treatment is associated with a small weight reduction, and GLP-1 agonists were associated with weight loss. SGLT2 inhibitor treatment of type 2 diabetes maintained glucose homeostasis and led to significant weight reduction and appears to be promising based on this meta-analysis. And, in fact, the use of at least empaglifozin and canagliflozin have been shown to have an impact on reducing cardiovascular risk in patients with type 2 diabetes (71,72).

According to the results of this meta-analysis, body weight decreased more with higher doses of SGLT2 inhibitors, and this result is especially significant with dapagliflozin, for which there is a statistically significant dose-dependent trend. We might hypothesize that with an increase in dosage, there might be more significant weight loss in patients treated with dapagliflozin, and it would benefit patients with type 2 diabetes and obesity. We might also hypothesize that in nondiabetic people with obesity, this kind of drug with higher dosages might be approved as a diet pill. This hypothesis is based on experience with another antidiabetes drug, liraglutide, a GLP-1 analogue with 97% homology to human GLP-1. Liraglutide was first approved for the treatment of type 2 diabetes at a dosage of approximately 0.6 to 1.8 mg once daily (73). Weight loss with liraglutide was found to be dose dependent and resulted in more than a 5% decrease in body weight at dosages up to 3.0 mg once daily in the treatment of people with obesity (74,75). Based on these

Study or Subgroup	lpraglifl Mean	ozin 12. SD	5mg Total	F Mean	BO SD T	otal V	Veiaht	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl	5-A
(12.5mg lpra) Fonseca2013 EUR	-1.5	2.8	70	-1	2.2	69	5.0%	-0.50 [-1.34, 0.34]		
(12.5mg lpra) Wilding2013 EUR	-0.92	0.63	69	-0.48	0.5	66	95.0%	-0.44 [-0.63, -0.25]		
Total (95% CI)			139			135 1	100.0%	-0.44 [-0.63, -0.26]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.0)2, df = 1 (P = 0.89); I ² = 09	8						
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.65 (P < 0.	00001)								FavoursInradiflozin12.5 Favours PBO	4
									r aroaisipraginiozirriz.o Taroaisi Do	
	Inrag	liflozin 5	Oma		PBO			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weid	iht IV. Random, 95% C	I IV. Random, 95% Cl	5-B
(50mg lpra) Fonseca 2013 EUR	-1.66	3	67	-1	2.2	69	9.	-0.66 (-1.55, 0.23	a	
(50mg lpra) Kashiwagi, 2015-2 ASN	-2.33	1.798	112	-0.63	1.679	56	18.0	0% -1.70 [-2.25, -1.15		
(50mg lpra) Kashiwagi, 2015_ASN	-1.77	11.571	118	-0.06	10.94	46	0.7	7% -1.71 [-5.50, 2.08	B]	
(50mg lpra) Wilding2013_EUR	-2.1	0.65	68	-0.48	0.5	66	36.1	1% -1.62 [-1.82, -1.42	2] 💻	
(50mg lpra)Lu2016_ASN	-2.93	0.68	87	-1.7	0.68	83	35.7	7% -1.23 [-1.43, -1.03	3] 🗮	
Total (95% CI)			452			320	100	0% -1 40 [-1 71 -1 10	•	
Heterogeneity $Tau^2 = 0.06$; $Chi^2 = 11$	12 df = 4	P = 0.03	0. F= 64	196		520	100.	-1.40[-1.71,-1.10	' <u> </u>	—
Test for overall effect: $7 = 8.90 \text{ (P} < 0.00)$	10001)	(1 - 0.05	,,, - o.	1.0					-4 -2 0 2	4
	,,								Favours Ipragliflozin50 Favours PBO	
	Ipraglif	ozin150	mg	P	30			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	1212 1024
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD To	tal W	/eight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl	5-C
(150mg lpra) Fonseca2013_EUR	-2.08	3	68	-1	2.2	69	4.7%	-1.08 [-1.96, -0.20]		
(150mg lpra) Wilding2013_EUR	-1.99	0.65	67	-0.48	0.5	66 9	35.3%	-1.51 [-1.71, -1.31]		
Total (95% CI)			135		1	135 10	00.0%	-1.49 [-1.68, -1.30]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.8	87. df = 1	(P = 0.3	5): $I^2 = 0$	%					<u>t t l l</u>	+
Test for overall effect: Z = 15.19 (P < 1	0.00001)	•							-4 -2 0 2	4
									Favours ipragilitozini 50 Favours PBO	
	[praglif]	ozin300	mg	P	30			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	E D
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD To	otal W	/eight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl	J-D
(300mg lpra) Fonseca2013_EUR	-2.67	3.2	68	-1	2.2	69	4.3%	-1.67 [-2.59, -0.75]		
(300mg lpra) Wilding2013_EUR	-2.21	0.66	72	-0.48	0.5	66 9	35.7%	-1.73 [-1.92, -1.54]		
									•	
Total (95% CI)			140		1	35 10	00.0%	-1.73 [-1.92, -1.54]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.0	$U_2, df = 1$	(P = 0.9)	J); I* = 0	%					-4 -2 0 2	4
rest for overall effect: Z = 17.80 (P < 1	0.00001)								Favours Ipragliflozin300 Favours PBO	

Figure 5 Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received ipragliflozin stratified by dosage. The sequence of the study name is <Dosage > <Drug > <Author > <Year $> _ <$ Ethnicity>. EUR represented studies mainly performed in Caucasian individuals, while ASN represented studies mainly performed in Asian individuals. (A) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received ipragliflozin 12.5 mg/d. (B) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received ipragliflozin 12.5 mg/d. (B) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received ipragliflozin 50 mg/d. (C) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received ipragliflozin 150 mg/d. (D) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received ipragliflozin 300 mg/d. [Color figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

findings, liraglutide was approved in the United States and the European Union for chronic weight management at a dose of 3.0 mg. If this postulation of weight loss with dosages of uptitrated dapagliflozin is confirmed at more than a 5% decrease in body weight, perhaps this type of antidiabetes drug can be approved to treat people with obesity without diabetes in the near future. Therefore, more trials with higher doses of dapagliflozin should be carried out to explore the promising weight decrease in people with obesity.

Although dose-dependent weight loss associated with dapagliflozin treatment was uncovered in this study, weight loss as a result of treatment with the other three SGLT2 inhibitors did not show a dose-dependent trend. According to previous RCTs, an ipragliflozin treatment study (50) suggested that dose-dependent decreases in body weight from baseline compared with the placebo at week 12 were observed, but in other studies (51-53), dose-dependent weight loss was not found. In some canagliflozin treatment studies (29,30), significant dose-related reductions in body weight from baseline were observed with canagliflozin 100 and 300 mg compared with a placebo, while in other studies (33,35,36), dose-related weight loss was not shown. In empagliflozin treatment studies (39,42,43), decreases in mean body weight did not show clear dose dependency.

In dapagliflozin treatment studies, weight loss was reported to be dose dependent (24,26) and non-dose dependent (5,8,15). Some of the results of our meta-analysis are consistent with previous RCT results, but some are different. We suggest that more clinical trials be performed to evaluate higher doses of each SGLT2 inhibitor to determine which SGLT2 treatments are actually dose dependent.

This meta-analysis compared placebo-corrected weight changes from baseline in a large sample of individuals with type 2 diabetes who underwent SGLT2 inhibitor treatment. However, as a meta-analysis, the study has several limitations. Data from separate studies were combined to determine the treatment effects on body weight. The inclusion criteria and the baseline characteristics, such as age, BMI, duration of diabetes, and ethnicity, may be different across studies, which may cause a high level of heterogeneity. We used the random-effects model for analysis when the level of heterogeneity was high and performed a sensitivity analysis. We performed several sensitivity analyses: short study duration or long study duration, including or excluding the extension studies; studies in different ethnicities; and studies in different baseline BMIs, including or excluding studies with the highest or lowest baseline BMI. Moreover, the add-on therapy studies were included or excluded. We have also

	Tofogli	flozin10	mg	F	PBO			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	6-A
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	
(10mg Tofo) Ikeda 2015_ASN	-2.235	0.48	66	-0.741	0.48	66	48.5%	-1.49 [-1.66, -1.33]		
(10mg Tofo) Kaku 2014_ASN	-2.23	0.5	57	-0.356	0.35	56	51.5%	-1.87 [-2.03, -1.72]		
Total (95% CI)			123			122	100.0%	-1.69 [-1.80, -1.58]		
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 10.65, df =	1 (P = 0.0)	001); l² :	= 91%							
Test for overall effect: Z = 29.04 (P < 0.000	101)							Eavours Tofogliflozin10mg Eavours PBO	
									Taroars rologiniczintening Taroars roo	
	Tofoglif	lozin 20	Dmg	1	PBO			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	6-B
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	
(20mg Tofo) Ikeda 2015_ASN	-2.551	0.48	64	-0.741	0.48	66	47.8%	-1.81 [-1.98, -1.64]		
(20mg Tofo) Kaku 2014_ASN	-2.851	0.5	58	-0.356	0.35	56	52.2%	-2.50 [-2.65, -2.34]		
Total (95% CI)			122			122	100.0%	-2.17 [-2.28, -2.05]	•	
Heterogeneity: Chi2 = 34.53, df =	1 (P < 0.0	00001);	² = 97%	6						
Test for overall effect: Z = 37.22 (P < 0.000	01)							-4 -2 U 2 4	
									Favours fologinio2012010g Favours FBO	
~	lotogin	lozin 40	Jmg		BO	~		Mean Difference	Mean Difference	6-C
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	lotal	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	
(40mg Tofo) Ikeda 2015_ASN	-2.824	0.48	67	-0.741	0.48	66	48.4%	-2.08 [-2.25, -1.92]		
(40mg Tofo) Kaku 2014_ASN	-2.971	0.5	58	-0.356	0.35	56	51.6%	-2.62 [-2.77, -2.46]	•	
T-1-LOFM ON			405			400	100.00	0.001.0.17 0.041		
Total (95% CI)			125			122	100.0%	-2.30 [-2.47, -2.24]	· · · · · · ·	
Heterogeneity: Chi* = 21.08, df =	1 (P < U.U	JUUUU1);	1= 95%	0					-4 -2 0 2 4	
lest for overall effect: $Z = 40.71$ (9000 > ۲	101)							Favours Tofogliflozin40mg Favours PBO	

Figure 6 Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received tofogliflozin stratified by dosage. The sequence of the study name is <Dosage > <Drug > <Autor > <Year > _ <Ethnicity>. ASN represented studies mainly performed in Asian individuals. (A) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received tofogliflozin 10 mg/d. (B) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received tofogliflozin 20 mg/d. (C) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received tofogliflozin 20 mg/d. (C) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received tofogliflozin 40 mg/d. [Color figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

made the analysis of the body weight changes in the placebo control group add on different groups of antidiabetes drugs, such as metformin, sulfonylurea, pioglitazone, insulin, etc. (Supporting Information Table S6). The sensitivity analysis indicated that there was no significant difference in the results when including or excluding the above types of studies. In addition, data on weight changes from

	Lus	eo2.5n	ng		PBO			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	7-A
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	
(2.5mg Luseo) Haneda2016_ASN	-1.29	0.4	95	-0.02	0.4	50	18.0%	-1.27 [-1.41, -1.13]	•	
(2.5mg Luseo) Seino2014-1_ASN	-2.7	0.37	79	-0.93	0.37	79	25.4%	-1.77 [-1.89, -1.65]		
(2.5mg Luseo) Seino2014-2_ASN	-2.01	0.35	61	-0.35	0.35	54	20.6%	-1.66 [-1.79, -1.53]	•	
(2.5mg Luseo) Seino2014-3_ASN	-1.31	0.36	56	0.15	0.36	57	19.2%	-1.46 [-1.59, -1.33]	•	
(2.5mg Luseo) Seino2015_ASN	-1.51	0.5	150	0	0.5	71	16.9%	-1.51 [-1.65, -1.37]	•	
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi² = 34.90, df = 4 (Test for overall effect: Z = 52.42 (P <	P < 0.00(0.00001	001); I²)	441 = 89%			311	100.0%	-1.55 [-1.61, -1.50]	-4 -2 0 2 4 Favours Luseo2.5mg Favours PBO	
	Luse	0.5mg	r.	ſ	DRO				Maan Difference	
		JUJIII	16 C		00			Mean Difference	mean Difference	70
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl	7-B
Study or Subgroup (5mg Luseo) Seino2014-2 ASN	Mean -2.08	SD 0.35	Total 61	Mean -0.35	SD 0.35	Total 54	<u>Weight</u> 50.1%	Mean Difference <u>IV, Random, 95% Cl</u> -1.73 [-1.86, -1.60]	IV, Random, 95% Cl	7-B
<u>Study or Subgroup</u> (5mg Luseo) Seino2014-2_ASN (5mg Luseo) Seino2014-3 ASN	Mean -2.08 -1.97	<u>SD</u> 0.35 0.36	<u>Total</u> 61 54	<u>Mean</u> -0.35 0.15	SD 0.35 0.36	<u>Total</u> 54 57	<u>Weight</u> 50.1% 49.9%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -1.73 [-1.86, -1.60] -2.12 [-2.25, -1.99]	IV, Random, 95% Cl	7-B

Figure 7 Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received luseogliflozin stratified by dosage. The sequence of the study name is <Dosage><Drug><Author><Year $>_<$ Ethnicity>. ASN represented studies mainly performed in Asian individuals. (A) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received luseogliflozin 2.5 mg/d. (B) Body weight changes corrected by a placebo in patients who received at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

TABLE 1 Weight	changes trom bas	seline corrected by a	placebo with different SGL	2 inhibitors and in differen	t ethnicities and different ba	aseline BMIs
SGLT2			Asian	Non-Asian	BMI < 30 kg/m ²	$BMI \ge 30kg/m^2$
inhibitors (once-daily dosing)	WMD from baseline in weight (kg)	95% CI (kg)	WMD (95%CI) (kg)	WMD (95%CI) (kg)	WMD (95% CI) (kg)	WMD (95% CI) (kg)
Dapagliflozin	*CC T	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1				1 20 / 1 67 to 0.06
د.ی III ۲.۵۳				(0,0,0,0) (0,1,0) (0,0	- 1.19 (- 1.20 (0 - 1.12) 1 60 (2 22 to 1 06)	(1.00 0) / 00 1 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 -
от с Сталование Стало	*02 F	-1./4 [0 -1.29		-1.4/ (-1./3 (0 -1.21) 1.77 / 0.05 to 1.40)	-1.09 (-2.32 [0 -1.06) 1 00 (201 to 1 60)	
20 mg	87.1— *ACC		-1.32 (-2.04 (0 -1.00)		-1.32 (-2.04 (0 -1.30) /	(00 1 - 01 00 7 - 01 00 1 - 1 00)
co my Canagliflozin	+ Z'Z	- Z' 4 3 10 - 1' 3 3				(277) - 7742 (0 - 1 - 737)
50 mg	-1.20*	-1.25 to -1.15	/	-1.20 (-1.25 to -1.15)	/	-1.20 (-1.25 to -1.15)
100 mg	-1.82*	-2.10 to -1.53	-1.74 (-2.14 to -1.34)	-1.85 (-2.26 to -1.44)	-1.74 (-2.14 to -1.34)	-1.85 (-2.26 to -1.44)
200 mg	-1.83*	-2.37 to -1.30	-1.95 (-2.60 to -1.29)	-1.60 (-1.74 to -1.46)	-1.95 (-2.60 to -1.29)	-1.60 (-1.74 to -1.46)
300 mg	-2.37*	-2.82 to -1.93	-2.01 (-2.80 to -1.21)	-2.47 (-2.97 to -1.96)	-2.01 (-2.80 to -1.21)	-2.47 (-2.97 to -1.96)
Empagliflozin						
10 mg	-1.84*	-1.98 to -1.69	-2.79 (-2.83 to -2.75)	-1.84 (-1.98 to -1.69)	-1.89 (-2.29 to -1.48)	-2.03 (-2.34 to -1.72)
25 mg	-1.93*	-2.08 to -1.77	-2.15 (-2.21 to -2.09)	-1.90 (-2.07 to -1.73)	-1.93 (-2.04 to -1.82)	-1.94 (-2.34 to -1.55)
Ipragliflozin						
12.5 mg	-0.44*	-0.63 to -0.26	/	-0.44 (-0.63 to -0.26)	/	-0.44 (-0.63 to -0.26)
50 mg	-1.40^{*}	-1.71 to -1.10	-1.35 (-1.66 to -1.04)	-1.58 (-1.77 to -1.38)	-1.35 (-1.66 to -1.04)	-1.58 (-1.77 to -1.38)
150 mg	-1.49*	-1.68 to -1.30	/	-1.49 (-1.68 to -1.30)	/	-1.49 (-1.68 to -1.30)
300 mg	-1.73*	-1.92 to -1.54	/	-1.73 (-1.92 to -1.54)	/	-1.73 (-1.92 to -1.54)
Tofogliflozin						
10 mg	-1.68*	-2.06 to -1.31	-1.68 (-2.06 to -1.31)	/	-1.87 (-2.03 to -1.72)	-1.49 (-1.66 to -1.30)
20 mg	-2.15*	-2.82 to -1.48	-2.15 (-2.82 to -1.48)	/	-2.50 (-2.65 to -2.34)	-1.81 (-1.98 to -1.64)
40 mg	-2.35*	-2.87 to -1.83	-2.35 (-2.87 to -1.83)	/	-2.62 (-2.77 to -2.46)	-2.08 (-2.25 to -1.92)
Luseogliflozin						
2.5 mg	-1.54*	-1.71 to -1.36	-1.54 (-1.71 to -1.36)	/	-1.54 (-1.71 to -1.36)	/
5 mg	-1.92*	-2.31 to -1.54	-1.92 (-2.31 to -1.54)	/	-1.92 (-2.31 to -1.54)	/
* <i>P</i> < 0.01.						

Original Article _______

baseline in each dosage group were used as the parameters in this meta-analysis, but not the pooled, patient-level data, which should be more useful to draw a conclusion. However, these data are seldom available because most trials are sponsored by industry. Therefore, we used the parameters in each trial as surrogates. Of course, another limitation might be publication bias because positive results had a greater chance of being selected for publication than negative results. We used the funnel plot assessment to minimize this limitation, but our results should be interpreted cautiously. Another limitation of this study was that when using meta-regression analysis to evaluate whether weight change caused by SGLT2 inhibitors might be affected by the baseline characteristics besides dosage, for the limited studies we collected, it may not be feasible to fit a model when the number of parameters (such as baseline age, male percent, duration of diabetes, BMI, HbA1c, etc.) to estimate is larger than the number of observations (four studies for Ipragliflozin, two studies for tofogliflozin, and five studies for luseogliflozin). Finally, we should also mention the data extraction. For example, in the Schumm-Draeger 2015 study, dapagliflozin 2.5 mg was taken twice daily, and we categorized this study in the group of dapagliflozin 5 mg/d but not twice daily. In the Ferrannini 2010 study, dapagliflozin 2.5 mg was taken in the morning in one group and in the evening in another group. It was recommended in the majority of the trials that the SGLT2 inhibitors should be taken after fasting; therefore, we did not include the group that received dapagliflozin 2.5 mg in the evening. All of the above were limitations of this meta-analysis.

In conclusion, our meta-analysis showed that a body weight decrease from baseline was significantly related to dapagliflozin, canagliflozin, empagliflozin, and ipragliflozin treatment in type 2 diabetes patients when compared with a placebo. Moreover, the weight changes were dose dependent in patients who received dapagliflozin treatment.**O**

Acknowledgments

Many thanks should be given to the people working in the Endocrinology and Metabolism Department at Peking University People's Hospital. We also thank Aiyun Song, Yunguang Li, and Xia Li at AstraZeneca Ltd. in China.

© 2017 The Obesity Society

References

- 1. American Diabetes Association. Diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:S8-S16.
- Inzucchi SE, Bergenstal RM, Buse JB; American Diabetes Association; European Association for the Study of Diabetes. Management of hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes: a patient-centered approach. Position statement of the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:1364-1379.
- Maggio CA, Pi-Sunyer FX. The prevention and treatment of obesity: application to type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 1997;20:1744-1766.
- Lavie CJ, Milani RV, Artham SM, Patel DA, Ventura HO. The obesity paradox, weight loss, and coronary disease. Am J Med 2009;122:1106-1114.
- Wilding JP, Norwood P, T'joen C, Bastien A, List JF, Fiedorek FT. A study of dapagliflozin in patients with type 2 diabetes receiving high doses of insulin plus insulin sensitizers: applicability of a novel insulin-independent treatment. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:1656-1662.
- Wilding JP, Woo V, Soler NG, et al. Long-term efficacy of dapagliflozin in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus receiving high doses of insulin: a randomized trial. Ann Intern Med 2012;156:405-415.
- 7. Bailey CJ, Gross JL, Pieters A, Bastien A, List JF. 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: 2223-2233.

- Bailey CJ, Iqbal N, T'Joen C, List JF. Dapagliflozin monotherapy in drug-naive patients with diabetes: a randomized-controlled trial of low-dose range. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2012;14:951-959.
- Bailey CJ, Morales Villegas EC, Woo V, Tang W, Ptaszynska A, List JF. Efficacy and safety of dapagliflozin monotherapy in people with type 2 diabetes: a randomized double-blind placebo-controlled 102-week trial. *Diabet Med* 2015;32: 531-541.
- Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2011;343:d5928. doi: 10.1136/ bmj.d5928
- Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. *PLoS Med* 2009;6:e1000100. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000100
- Bolinder J, Ljunggren Ö, Kullberg J, et al. Effects of dapagliflozin on body weight, total fat mass, and regional adipose tissue distribution in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus with inadequate glycemic control on metformin. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2012;97:1020-1031.
- 13. Cefalu WT, Leiter LA, de Bruin TW, Gause-Nilsson I, Sugg J, Parikh SJ. Dapagliflozin's effects on glycemia and cardiovascular risk factors in high-risk patients with type 2 diabetes: a 24-week, multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study with a 28-week extension. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1218-1227.
- Schumm-Draeger PM, Burgess L, Korányi L, Hruba V, Hamer-Maansson JE, de Bruin TW. Twice-daily dapagliflozin co-administered with metformin in type 2 diabetes: a 16-week randomized, placebo-controlled clinical trial. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2015;17:42-51.
- Ferrannini E, Ramos SJ, Salsali A, Tang W, List JF. 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: 2217-2224.
- Henry RR, Murray AV, Marmolejo MH, Hennicken D, Ptaszynska A, List JF. Dapagliflozin, metformin XR, or both: initial pharmacotherapy for type 2 diabetes, a randomised controlled trial. *Int J Clin Prac* 2012;66:446-456.
- 17. Ji L, Ma J, Li H, et al. Dapagliflozin as monotherapy in drug-naive Asian patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a randomized, blinded, prospective phase III study. *Clin Ther* 2014;36:84-100.e9.
- 18. Kaku K, Inoue S, Matsuoka O, et al. Efficacy and safety of dapagliflozin as a monotherapy for type 2 diabetes mellitus in Japanese patients with inadequate glycaemic control: a phase II multicentre, randomized, double-blind, placebocontrolled trial. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2013;15:432-440.
- Leiter LA, Cefalu WT, de Bruin TW, Gause-Nilsson I, Sugg J, Parikh SJ. Dapagliflozin added to usual care in individuals with type 2 diabetes mellitus with preexisting cardiovascular disease: a 24-week, multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebocontrolled study with a 28-week extension. J Am Geriatr Soc 2014;62:1252-1262.
- List JF, Woo V, Morales E, Tang W, Fiedorek FT. Sodium-glucose cotransport inhibition with dapagliflozin in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:650-657.
- 21. Ljunggren O, Bolinder J, Johansson L, et al. Dapagliflozin has no effect on markers of bone formation and resorption or bone mineral density in patients with inadequately controlled type 2 diabetes mellitus on metformin. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2012;14:990-999.
- Matthaei S, Bowering K, Rohwedder K, Grohl A, Parikh S. 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;38:365-372.
- Mathieu C, Ranetti AE, Li D. Randomized, double-blind, phase 3 trial of triple therapy with dapaglif lozin add-on to saxagliptin plus metformin in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:2009-2017.
- 24. Rosenstock J, Vico M, Wei L, Salsali A, List JF. 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;35:1473-1478.
- 25. Rosenstock J, Hansen L, Zee P, et al. Dual add-on therapy in type 2 diabetes poorly controlled with metformin monotherapy: a randomized double-blind trial of saxagliptin plus dapagliflozin addition versus single addition of saxagliptin or dapagliflozin to metformin. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:376-383.
- 26. Strojek K, Yoon KH, Hruba V, Elze M, Langkilde AM, Parikh S. 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;13:928-938.
- 27. Weber MA, Mansfield TA, Cain VA, Iqbal N, Parikh S, Ptaszynska A. Blood pressure and glycaemic effects of dapagliflozin versus placebo in patients with type 2 diabetes on combination antihypertensive therapy: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 study. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2016;4:211-220.
- Bode B, Stenlöf K, Harris S, et al. Long-term efficacy and safety of canagliflozin over 104 weeks in patients aged 55–80 years with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2015;17:294-303.

- 29. 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;16:467-477.
- 30. Inagaki N, Kondo K, Yoshinari T, Maruyama N, Susuta Y, Kuki H. Efficacy and safety of canagliflozin in Japanese patients with type 2 diabetes: a randomized, doubleblind, placebo-controlled, 12-week study. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2013;15:1136-1145.
- 31. Inagaki N, Kondo K, Yoshinari T, Takahashi N, Susuta Y, Kuki H. Efficacy and safety of canagliflozin monotherapy in Japanese patients with type 2 diabetes inadequately controlled with diet and exercise: a 24-week, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase III study. *Expert Opin Pharmacother* 2014;15:1501-1515.
- 32. Ji L, Han P, Liu Y, et al. Canagliflozin in Asian patients with type 2 diabetes on metformin alone or metformin in combination with sulphonylurea. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2015;17:23-31.
- 33. Lavalle-Gonzalez FJ, Januszewicz A, Davidson J, et al. Efficacy and safety of canagliflozin compared with placebo and sitagliptin in patients with type 2 diabetes on background metformin monotherapy: a randomised trial. *Diabetologia* 2013;56:2582-2592.
- 34. Neal B, Perkovic V, de Zeeuw D, et al. Efficacy and safety of canaglif lozin, an inhibitor of sodium-glucose cotransporter 2, when used in conjunction with insulin therapy in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:403-411.
- Rosenstock J, Aggarwal N, Polidori D, et al. Dose-ranging effects of canagliflozin, a sodium-glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor, as add-on to metformin in subjects with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:1232-1238.
- 36. Stenlof 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;15:372-382.
- Yale JF, Bakris G, Cariou B, et al. Efficacy and safety of canagliflozin in subjects with type 2 diabetes and chronic kidney disease. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2013;15:463-473.
- 38. Barnett AH, Mithal A, Manassie J, et al. Efficacy and safety of empagliflozin added to existing antidiabetes treatment in patients with type 2 diabetes and chronic kidney disease: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrino* 2014;2:369-384.
- 39. Ferrannini E, Seman L, Seewaldt-Becker E, Hantel S, Pinnetti S, Woerle HJ. A Phase IIb, randomized, placebo-controlled study of the SGLT2 inhibitor empagliflozin in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2013;15:721-728.
- Haering HU, Merker L, Christiansen AV, et al. Empagliflozin as add-on to metformin plus sulphonylurea in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2015;110:82-90.
- Hadjadj S, Rosenstock J, Meinicke T, Woerle HJ, Broedl UC. Initial combination of empaglif lozin and metformin in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1718-1728.
- 42. Häring HU, Merker L, Seewaldt-Becker E, et al. Empagliflozin as add-on to metformin plus sulfonylurea in patients with type 2 diabetes: a 24-week, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:3396-3404.
- 43. Häring HU, Merker L, Seewaldt-Becker E, et al. Empagliflozin as add-on to metformin in patients with type 2 diabetes: a 24-week, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:1650-1659.
- 44. Kovacs CS, Seshiah V, Swallow R, et al. Empagliflozin improves glycaemic and weight control as add-on therapy to pioglitazone or pioglitazone plus metformin in patients with type 2 diabetes: a 24-week, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2014;16:147-158.
- Merker L, Häring HU, Christiansen AV, et al. Empagliflozin as add-on to metformin in people with type 2 diabetes. *Diabet Med* 2015;32:1555-1567.
- 46. 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 Endocrino* 2013;1:208-219.
- 47. Roden M, Merker L, Christiansen AV, et al. Safety, tolerability and effects on cardiometabolic risk factors of empagliflozin monotherapy in drug-naïve patients with type 2 diabetes: a double-blind extension of a phase III randomized controlled trial. *Cardiovasc Diabetol* 2015;14:154-164.
- 48. Rosenstock J, Jelaska A, Frappin G, et al. Improved glucose control with weight loss, lower insulin doses, and no increased hypoglycemia with empagliflozin added to titrated multiple daily injections of insulin in obese inadequately controlled type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:1815-1823.
- 49. Ross S, Thamer C, Cescutti J, Meinicke T, Woerle HJ, Broedl UC. Efficacy and safety of empagliflozin twice daily versus once daily in patients with type 2 diabetes inadequately controlled on metformin: a 16-week, randomized, placebocontrolled trial. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2015;17:699-702.
- Fonseca VA, Ferrannini E, Wilding JP, et al. Active- and placebo-controlled dosefinding study to assess the efficacy, safety, and tolerability of multiple doses of ipragliflozin in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. J Diabetes Complications 2013;27:268-273.
- 51. Kashiwagi A, Takahashi H, Ishikawa H, et al. A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study on long-term efficacy and safety of ipragliflozin treatment in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus and renal impairment: results of the long-term ASP1941 safety evaluation in patients with type 2 diabetes with renal impairment (LANTERN) study. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2015;17:152-160.

- 52. Kashiwagi A, Kazuta K, Goto K, Yoshida S, Ueyama E, Utsuno A. Ipragliflozin in combination with metformin for the treatment of Japanese patients with type 2 diabetes: ILLUMINATE, a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2015;17:304-308.
- 53. Wilding JP, Ferrannini E, Fonseca VA, Wilpshaar W, Dhanjal P, Houzer A. Efficacy and safety of ipragliflozin in patients with type 2 diabetes inadequately controlled on metformin: a dose-finding study. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2013;15:403-409.
- 54. Lu CH, Min KW, Chuang LM, Kokubo S, Yoshida S, Cha BS. Efficacy, safety, and tolerability of ipragliflozin in Asian patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus and inadequate glycemic control with metformin: results of a phase 3 randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind, multicenter trial. J Diabetes Investig 2016;7:366-373.
- 55. Kaku K, Watada H, Iwamoto Y, et al. Efficacy and safety of monotherapy with the novel sodium/glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitor tofogliflozin in Japanese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a combined Phase 2 and 3 randomized, placebocontrolled, double-blind, parallel-group comparative study. *Cardiovasc Diabetol* 2014;13:65-79.
- 56. Ikeda S, Takano Y, Cynshi O, et al. A novel and selective sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitor, tofogliflozin, improves glycaemic control and lowers body weight in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2015;17:984-993.
- 57. Seino Y, Sasaki T, Fukatsu A, Ubukata M, Sakai S, Samukawa Y. Efficacy and safety of luseogliflozin as monotherapy in Japanese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 study. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2014;30:1245-1255.
- Seino Y, Sasaki T, Fukatsu A, Sakai S, Samukawa Y. Efficacy and safety of luseogliflozin monotherapy in Japanese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a 12week, randomized, placebo-controlled, phase II study. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2014;30: 1219-1230.
- 59. Seino Y, Sasaki T, Fukatsu A, Ubukata M, Sakai S, Samukawa Y. Dose-finding study of luseogliflozin in Japanese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a 12week, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase II study. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2014;30:1231-1244.
- 60. Seino Y, Inagaki N, Haneda M, et al. Efficacy and safety of luseogliflozin added to various oral antidiabetic drugs in Japanese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *J Diabetes Invest* 2015;6:443-453.
- 61. Haneda M, Seino Y, Inagaki N, et al. Influence of renal function on the 52-week efficacy and safety of the sodium glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor luseogliflozin in Japanese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Clin Ther* 2016;38:66-88.
- 62. Komoroski B, Vachharajani N, Feng Y, Li L, Kornhauser D, Pfister M. Dapagliflozin, a novel, selective SGLT2 inhibitor, improved glycemic control over 2 weeks in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2009;85:513-519.
- Komoroski B, Vachharajani N, Boulton D, et al. Dapagliflozin, a novel SGLT2 inhibitor, induces dose-dependent glucosuria in healthy subjects. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2009;85:520-526.
- 64. Devineni D, Morrow L, Hompesch M, et al. Canagliflozin improves glycaemic control over 28 days in subjects with type 2 diabetes not optimally controlled on insulin. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2012;14:539-545.
- 65. Sha S, Devineni D, Ghosh A, et al. Pharmacodynamic effects of canagliflozin, a sodium glucose co-transporter 2 inhibitor, from a randomized study in patients with type 2 diabetes. *PLoS One* 2014;9:e105638. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0105638
- 66. Sha S, Polidori D, Heise T, et al. Effect of the sodium glucose co-transporter 2 inhibitor canagliflozin on plasma volume in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2014;16:1087-1095.
- 67. Cefalu WT, Leiter LA, Yoon KH, et al. Efficacy and safety of canagliflozin versus glimepiride in patients with type 2 diabetes inadequately controlled with metformin (CANTATA-SU): 52 week results from a randomised, doubleblind, phase 3 non-inferiority trial. *Lancet* 2013;382:941-950.
- Hall KD, Sacks G, Chandramohan D, et al. Quantification of the effect of energy imbalance on bodyweight. *Lancet* 2011;378:826-837.
- 69. Wilding JP. The role of the kidneys in glucose homeostasis in type 2 diabetes: clinical implications and therapeutic significance through sodium glucose co-transporter 2 inhibitors. *Metabolism* 2014;63:1228-1237.
- Tahrani AA, Barnett AH, Bailey CJ. SGLT inhibitors in management of diabetes. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol 2013;1:140-151.
- Zinman B, Wanner C, Lachin JM, et al. Empagliflozin, cardiovascular outcomes, and mortality in type 2 diabetes. N Engl J Med 2015;373:2117-2128.
- 72. Neal B, Perkovic V, Mahaffey KW, et al. Canagliflozin and cardiovascular and renal events in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2017;377:644-657.
- 73. Blonde L, Russell-Jones D. The safety and efficacy of liraglutide with or without oral antidiabetic drug therapy in type 2 diabetes: an overview of the LEAD 1-5 studies. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2009;11:26-34.
- 74. Pi-Sunyer X, Astrup A, Fujioka K, et al. A randomized, controlled trial of 3.0 mg of liraglutide in weight management. *N Engl J Med* 2015;373:11-22.
- Davies MJ, Bergenstal R, Bode B, et al. Efficacy of liraglutide for weight loss among patients with type 2 diabetes: the SCALE diabetes randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2015;314:687-699.