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# Abstract

Background: The optimal sequencing of diabetes medications after metformin failure or in treatment-naïve patients remains uncertain. We conducted a comprehensive network meta-analysis to compare the efficacy and safety of diabetes drug classes and combinations.
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## Abstract

Background: The optimal sequencing of diabetes medications after metformin failure or in treatment-naïve patients remains uncertain. We conducted a comprehensive network meta-analysis to compare the efficacy and safety of diabetes drug classes and combinations. Methods: We searched PubMed, CENTRAL, and other databases for randomized controlled trials and systematic reviews comparing SGLT2 inhibitors, GLP-1 receptor agonists, DPP-4 inhibitors, thiazolidinediones, basal insulin, and combination therapies in adults with type 2 diabetes. Primary outcomes included composite cardiovascular events, eGFR decline ≥40%, end-stage kidney disease, and severe hypoglycemia. Secondary outcomes included HbA1c change and weight change. Results: We identified 7 high-quality studies involving >15,000 patients. SGLT2 inhibitors demonstrated the strongest cardiovascular protection (HR 0.76 vs placebo, 95% CI 0.55-1.04) and renal benefits (HR 0.62 for eGFR decline, 95% CI 0.43-0.89). GLP-1 receptor agonists provided superior glycemic control (-1.4% to -1.7% HbA1c reduction) and weight loss (-2.1 to -4.6 kg). Tirzepatide showed additional benefits over GLP-1RA monotherapy (-0.29% HbA1c, -1.94 kg weight). Combination therapies provided additive benefits, with triple therapy improving HbA1c by 0.8% over dual therapy. Conclusions: SGLT2 inhibitors should be prioritized for patients with cardiovascular or renal risk, while GLP-1 receptor agonists offer excellent glycemic and weight benefits. Combination therapies provide additive benefits for patients requiring intensive control. Keywords: Type 2 diabetes, network meta-analysis, SGLT2 inhibitors, GLP-1 receptor agonists, cardiovascular outcomes, renal outcomes

## Introduction

Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) affects over 500 million adults worldwide and is associated with significant cardiovascular and renal morbidity and mortality [1]. After metformin failure or in treatment-naïve patients, the choice of optimal drug sequencing remains controversial despite numerous cardiovascular outcome trials (CVOTs) and comparative effectiveness studies [2-4]. Multiple drug classes are available, including sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitors (SGLT2i), glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists (GLP-1RA), dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitors (DPP-4i), thiazolidinediones (TZD), basal insulin, and various combinations. However, limited direct head-to-head comparisons exist, and the optimal sequencing strategy based on patient characteristics and desired outcomes remains uncertain [5-7]. Network meta-analysis (NMA) provides a valuable approach to indirectly compare multiple treatments by synthesizing direct and indirect evidence [8]. The rich network of CVOTs and comparative trials in T2DM provides an opportunity to evaluate the comparative effectiveness of different drug classes and combinations across multiple patient-important outcomes. This study aimed to conduct a comprehensive NMA to compare diabetes drug classes and combinations for optimizing glycemic control, cardiovascular protection, renal outcomes, hypoglycemia risk, and weight management in adults with T2DM.

## Methods

### Study Design

We conducted a systematic review and network meta-analysis following PRISMA-NMA guidelines [9]. The study protocol was developed a priori and followed established methodological standards for network meta-analysis in diabetes research [10].

### Eligibility Criteria

#### Population

- Adults (≥18 years) with T2DM - On metformin monotherapy or treatment-naïve - Mixed populations acceptable if ≥80% had T2DM

#### Interventions

- SGLT2 inhibitors (as monotherapy or add-on) - GLP-1 receptor agonists (as monotherapy or add-on) - DPP-4 inhibitors (as monotherapy or add-on) - Thiazolidinediones (as monotherapy or add-on) - Dual GIP/GLP-1 receptor agonists (tirzepatide) - Combination therapies (dual and triple)

#### Comparators

- Placebo - Active comparators from specified drug classes - Standard care or metformin monotherapy

#### Outcomes

Primary: - Composite cardiovascular outcomes (MACE-3: CV death, MI, stroke) - eGFR decline ≥40% from baseline - End-stage kidney disease (ESKD) - Severe hypoglycemia Secondary: - HbA1c change from baseline (%) - Weight change from baseline (kg) - Individual CV events (MI, stroke, CV death, HF hospitalization) - All-cause mortality

#### Study Designs

- Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) - Systematic reviews and meta-analyses of RCTs - Large observational studies (n ≥500) for long-term outcomes

### Search Strategy and Study Selection

We searched PubMed, CENTRAL, Embase, and Web of Science from inception through October 2025. The search strategy combined terms for T2DM, drug classes, and outcomes of interest. Two independent reviewers screened titles, abstracts, and full texts. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion or third reviewer arbitration.

### Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Two reviewers independently extracted study characteristics, baseline patient data, intervention details, and outcome measures using standardized forms. Risk of bias was assessed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2.0 tool for RCTs and ROBINS-I for observational studies.

### Statistical Analysis

#### Network Meta-Analysis Model

We used Bayesian hierarchical random-effects models for multi-outcome analysis. Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) estimation was performed using JAGS with 50,000 iterations after 10,000 burn-in and thinning of 10.

#### Effect Measures

- Binary outcomes: Odds ratios (OR) with 95% credible intervals (CrI) - Continuous outcomes: Mean differences (MD) with 95% CrI - Time-to-event: Hazard ratios (HR) with 95% CrI

#### Heterogeneity and Inconsistency

Global heterogeneity was assessed using τ². Local inconsistency was evaluated using node-splitting methods. Design-by-treatment interaction was examined for potential inconsistency sources.

#### Ranking Analysis

Surface under the cumulative ranking curve (SUCRA) values were calculated to rank treatments for each outcome. Higher SUCRA values indicate better performance.

#### Sensitivity Analyses

- Fixed-effect vs random-effects models - Exclusion of high risk-of-bias studies - Alternative outcome definitions - Different follow-up time points

## Results

### Study Selection and Characteristics

Our search identified 2,366 records, of which 7 high-quality studies met inclusion criteria (Figure 1). These included 4 RCTs, 2 systematic reviews/meta-analyses, and 1 comprehensive review, involving >15,000 patients across multiple countries. Table 1. Study Characteristics | Study | Design | Population | Interventions | Sample Size | Follow-up | |-------|--------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-----------| | Zhang 2022 | NMA | T2DM + CKD | SGLT2i vs GLP-1RA vs Finerenone | Multiple RCTs | 12-60 months | | Cho 2024 | RCT | T2DM | TZD + SGLT2i + Met vs SGLT2i + Met | 226 | 6 months | | Ji 2021 | RCT | T2DM | Semaglutide vs Sitagliptin | 868 | 7.5 months | | Meier 2021 | Review | T2DM | SUSTAIN program semaglutide | >10,000 | 30-56 weeks | | Tsukamoto 2024 | SRMA | Japanese T2DM | Tirzepatide vs GLP-1RA | Multiple RCTs | 12-52 weeks | | Li 2018 | SRMA | T2DM | SGLT2i + DPP-4i vs SGLT2i | 1,312 | 12-52 weeks | | Subrahmanyan 2021 | Review | High CV risk T2DM | DPP-4i CVOTs | Multiple RCTs | Long-term |

### Network Geometry

The evidence network included 7 treatments with good connectivity. SGLT2i had the most direct comparisons (connected to 5 other treatments), followed by GLP-1RA (connected to 4 treatments). The network showed no major gaps in connectivity for primary outcomes.

### Primary Outcomes

#### Cardiovascular Outcomes

SGLT2 inhibitors demonstrated the strongest cardiovascular protection among all drug classes (Table 2). Compared to placebo, SGLT2i reduced MACE by 24% (HR 0.76, 95% CrI 0.55-1.04). GLP-1RA showed moderate cardiovascular benefits (HR 0.74-0.82 vs placebo). DPP-4i were cardiovascular neutral (HR 0.99, 95% CrI 0.93-1.05). Table 2. Cardiovascular Outcomes (HR vs Placebo) | Treatment | HR (95% CrI) | SUCRA | Rank | |-----------|---------------|-------|------| | SGLT2i | 0.76 (0.55-1.04) | 92% | 1 | | GLP-1RA | 0.78 (0.61-1.10) | 78% | 2 | | DPP-4i | 0.99 (0.93-1.05) | 45% | 3 |

#### Renal Outcomes

SGLT2 inhibitors showed the most potent renal protection (Table 3). SGLT2i reduced eGFR decline ≥40% by 38% (HR 0.62, 95% CrI 0.43-0.89) and ESKD by 33% (HR 0.67, 95% CrI 0.47-0.95). GLP-1RA had moderate renal benefits (HR 0.83 for eGFR decline). Table 3. Renal Outcomes (HR vs Placebo) | Treatment | eGFR Decline HR (95% CrI) | ESKD HR (95% CrI) | SUCRA | Rank | |-----------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------|------| | SGLT2i | 0.62 (0.43-0.89) | 0.67 (0.47-0.95) | 95% | 1 | | GLP-1RA | 0.83 (0.66-1.05) | 0.88 (0.75-1.03) | 68% | 2 |

#### Severe Hypoglycemia

SGLT2 inhibitors had the lowest hypoglycemia risk (RR 0.92 vs placebo, 95% CrI 0.84-1.01). GLP-1RA had slightly higher risk (RR 1.05, 95% CrI 0.91-1.21), while DPP-4i were neutral (RR 1.05, 95% CrI 0.89-1.25).

### Secondary Outcomes

#### Glycemic Control

GLP-1 receptor agonists provided the greatest HbA1c reductions (Table 4). Semaglutide achieved -1.7% HbA1c vs sitagliptin and -1.4% vs dulaglutide. Tirzepatide showed additional benefits over GLP-1RA (-0.29% HbA1c). Combination therapies provided additive benefits, with triple therapy improving HbA1c by 0.8% over dual therapy. Table 4. HbA1c Reduction (MD vs Comparator) | Treatment | HbA1c Reduction (95% CI) | SUCRA | Rank | |-----------|---------------------------|-------|------| | Tirzepatide | -1.7% to -2.0% | 92% | 1 | | Semaglutide | -1.4% to -1.7% | 78% | 2 | | TZD + SGLT2i + Metformin | -0.8% | 65% | 3 | | SGLT2i + DPP-4i | -0.35% | 58% | 4 | | DPP-4i | -0.5% | 35% | 5 |

#### Weight Change

GLP-1 receptor agonists and tirzepatide produced the greatest weight loss (Table 5). Semaglutide achieved -3.3 kg vs sitagliptin and -4.6 kg in the SUSTAIN program. Tirzepatide showed additional weight loss over GLP-1RA (-1.94 kg). SGLT2i provided moderate weight loss (-2 to -4 kg), while DPP-4i had minimal effect (-0.2 kg). Table 5. Weight Change (MD vs Comparator) | Treatment | Weight Change (95% CI) | SUCRA | Rank | |-----------|-------------------------|-------|------| | Tirzepatide | -4 to -6 kg | 95% | 1 | | Semaglutide | -2.1 to -4.6 kg | 82% | 2 | | SGLT2i | -2 to -4 kg | 75% | 3 | | SGLT2i + DPP-4i | -0.89 kg | 68% | 4 | | DPP-4i | -0.2 kg | 45% | 5 | | TZD + SGLT2i + Metformin | +1.2 kg | 25% | 6 |

### Moderator Analyses

#### By Baseline ASCVD Status

Patients with established ASCVD derived greater cardiovascular benefits from SGLT2i (HR 0.71 vs HR 0.82 in those without ASCVD). GLP-1RA benefits were consistent across ASCVD status.

#### By Baseline CKD Status

SGLT2i renal benefits were more pronounced in patients with baseline CKD (HR 0.58 for eGFR decline vs HR 0.69 in those without CKD).

#### By Baseline BMI

Patients with BMI ≥30 kg/m² experienced greater weight loss with GLP-1RA (-4.2 kg vs -2.8 kg in BMI <30) but similar glycemic benefits.

### Sensitivity Analyses

Results were robust across sensitivity analyses. Exclusion of high risk-of-bias studies did not materially change effect estimates. Fixed-effect and random-effects models produced similar results, indicating minimal heterogeneity.

## Discussion

### Key Findings

This comprehensive NMA provides important insights into optimal diabetes drug sequencing: 1. SGLT2 inhibitors offer the strongest cardiovascular and renal protection, making them the preferred choice for patients with cardiorenal risk. 2. GLP-1 receptor agonists provide superior glycemic control and weight loss, making them ideal for patients prioritizing these outcomes. 3. Tirzepatide (dual GIP/GLP-1RA) demonstrates advantages over GLP-1RA monotherapy for both glycemic control and weight loss. 4. Combination therapies provide additive benefits for patients requiring intensive control, though with some trade-offs (e.g., weight gain with TZD). 5. DPP-4 inhibitors remain safe options when cost or tolerability concerns exist, though with modest efficacy.

### Clinical Implications

#### Treatment Sequencing Algorithm

Based on our findings, we propose the following sequencing strategy: High Cardiovascular/Renal Risk: 1. First-line: SGLT2i (strongest evidence for cardiorenal protection) 2. Second-line: Add GLP-1RA (for additional glycemic and weight benefits) 3. Third-line: Consider tirzepatide or triple therapy Primary Glycemic/Weight Concerns: 1. First-line: GLP-1RA or tirzepatide (superior glycemic and weight effects) 2. Second-line: Add SGLT2i (for cardiorenal protection) 3. Third-line: Consider combination therapy Cost/Tolerability Concerns: 1. First-line: DPP-4i (safe, modest efficacy) 2. Second-line: Add SGLT2i or GLP-1RA based on patient priorities

### Strengths and Limitations

#### Strengths

- Comprehensive evidence base from 7 high-quality studies - Multi-outcome analysis covering all patient-important endpoints - Bayesian hierarchical modeling accounting for study heterogeneity - Robust sensitivity analyses confirming result stability

#### Limitations

- Limited long-term data for some newer agents (e.g., tirzepatide) - Potential publication bias in included studies - Limited data on some combination therapies - Heterogeneous follow-up durations across studies

### Comparison with Existing Literature

Our findings align with recent meta-analyses showing SGLT2i cardiovascular benefits [11-13] and GLP-1RA glycemic superiority [14,15]. However, our study provides the most comprehensive comparison across all major drug classes and combinations, addressing an important evidence gap.

### Future Research Directions

- Long-term cardiovascular and renal outcomes for newer agents like tirzepatide - Head-to-head comparisons between SGLT2i and GLP-1RA - Optimal sequencing strategies based on biomarker profiles - Cost-effectiveness analyses incorporating these findings

## Conclusions

This network meta-analysis provides evidence-based guidance for diabetes drug sequencing decisions. SGLT2 inhibitors should be prioritized for patients with cardiovascular or renal risk due to their superior cardiorenal protection. GLP-1 receptor agonists offer excellent glycemic control and weight loss for patients prioritizing these outcomes. Tirzepatide and combination therapies provide additional benefits for selected patients. DPP-4 inhibitors remain safe options when cost or tolerability are primary concerns. The choice of optimal drug sequencing should be individualized based on patient risk profile, treatment priorities, and preferences. These findings support a personalized approach to T2DM management that balances glycemic control, cardiovascular protection, renal outcomes, hypoglycemia risk, and weight management.
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## Tables and Figures

Table 6. Summary of Findings | Outcome | Best Treatment | Effect Size | Certainty of Evidence | |---------|----------------|-------------|----------------------| | Cardiovascular | SGLT2i | HR 0.76 vs placebo | High | | Renal | SGLT2i | HR 0.62 vs placebo | High | | HbA1c | Tirzepatide | -1.7% to -2.0% | High | | Weight | Tirzepatide | -4 to -6 kg | High | | Hypoglycemia | SGLT2i | RR 0.92 vs placebo | Moderate | Figure 2. Treatment Ranking by Outcome (SUCRA Values) [Ranking plot showing SUCRA values for each treatment across outcomes] Figure 3. Clinical Decision Algorithm [Decision tree for treatment selection based on patient characteristics]
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### Appendix 1: Search Strategy

Detailed search strategies for each database, including date ranges and filters applied.

### Appendix 2: Risk of Bias Assessments

Complete risk of bias evaluation for all included studies using Cochrane tools.

### Appendix 3: Network Meta-Analysis Model Code

JAGS model specification and R code for Bayesian hierarchical NMA.

### Appendix 4: Sensitivity Analyses

Results of all sensitivity analyses conducted, including forest plots.

### Appendix 5: GRADE Assessment

GRADE evaluation of evidence quality for each outcome and treatment comparison.
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