Relationship of baseline HbA1c, HbA1c change, and HbA1c target of <7% with Insulin Analogues in Type 2 Diabetes: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Clinical Practice</i>
Manuscript ID:	IJCP-10-10-0558.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Original Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-Nov-2010
Complete List of Authors:	Giugliano, Dario; Second University of Naples Maiorino, Maria Ida; Second University of Naples Bellastella, Giuseppe; Second University of Naples Chiodini, Paolo; Second University of Naples Esposito, Katherine; Second University of Naples
Specialty area:	

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**Relationship of baseline HbA1c, HbA1c
change, and HbA1c target of <7% with Insulin
Analogues in Type 2 Diabetes: A meta-analysis
of randomized controlled trials**

D. Giugliano¹, M. Maiorino¹, G. Bellastella¹, P. Chiodini², K. Esposito¹

¹Department of Geriatrics and Metabolic Diseases, ²Department of Medicine and Public Health,
Second University of Naples, Naples, Italy

Corresponding Author: Dario Giugliano, MD, PhD, Department of Geriatrics and Metabolic
Diseases, Second University of Naples, Piazza L. Miraglia, 80138 Naples, Italy

dario.giugliano@unina2.it

FAX ++39 081 5665054

Word count 2200; Abstract 227; 2 Tables, 3 Figures

ABSTRACT

Aim: We performed a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with insulin analogues in type 2 diabetes utilizing a least-squared regression model in order to assess the relationship between baseline HbA1c, the magnitude of HbA1c decrease, and attainment of HbA1c target of $<7\%$.

Methods: RCTs involving insulin regimens (basal, prandial, biphasic, and basal-bolus) were identified through electronic searches (MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL, and The Cochrane Library) through September 2010. We included any study arm of RCTs if they were at least 12 weeks in duration, the number of patients in any arm was more than 30, and reported the baseline HbA1c and change from baseline HbA1c.

Results: We found 87 studies, with a total of 135 arms, and 38803 patients. The weighted R^2 values for the overall analysis assessing the association between baseline HbA1c and absolute change in HbA1c or the proportion of patients at target were 0.485 ($P < 0.001$) and 0.146 ($P < 0.001$), respectively. Subanalyses of insulin regimens for the association between basal HbA1c and absolute decrease of HbA1c produced weighted R^2 which were significant for all insulin regimens, with the highest association for basal-bolus ($R^2 = 0.719$, $P < 0.001$).

Conclusions: The strong positive relationship between baseline HbA1c and the magnitude of HbA1c change we found in RCTs using insulin analogues in type 2 diabetes should be considered when assessing the clinical efficacy of insulin therapies.

228 words

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

What’s known

- A haemoglobin A1 (HbA1c) concentration of 7% or less is recommended for most patients with type 2 diabetes to minimize the risk of vascular complications.
- Insulin analogues are increasingly used in the treatment of type 2 diabetes, with the aim to offer a better replication of the pattern of endogenous secretion of insulin.
- A positive relationship between baseline HbA1c levels and the magnitude of HbA1c decrease has been found for most glucose-lowering therapies.

What’s new

- We performed a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials with insulin analogues in type 2 diabetes to assess the relationship between baseline HbA1c, the magnitude of HbA1c decrease, and attainment of HbA1c target of <7%.
- We included 87 studies with 38803 patients. We found that higher baseline HbA1c levels are associated with greater reduction in HbA1c and with a lower proportion of patients at target for the HbA1c <7%.
- These findings should be considered when assessing clinical efficacy of insulin therapies with insulin analogues derived from clinical trials.

Introduction

The efficacy of any glucose-lowering therapies is currently based upon their ability to improve blood glucose control, which generally is assessed by the absolute reduction in haemoglobin A1c (HbA1c). However, a positive relationship between baseline HbA1c levels and the magnitude of HbA1c decrease has been found for most glucose-lowering therapies, pointing to a general phenomenon not linked to any specific drug or class (1-3). These findings may have important implications as both the FAD and EMA suggest consider baseline HbA1c as an adjustment factor in the assessment of agent efficacy (4,5).

Tight glycaemic control, to maintain a HbA1c concentration of 7% or less, is recommended for most patients with type 2 diabetes to minimize the risk of vascular complications (6). Although traditionally used as a final treatment option, insulin has been recently recommended by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD) to be introduced earlier for controlling hyperglycaemia in type 2 diabetes, after lifestyle changes and metformin fail to reach and/or maintain HbA1c of less than 7% (7). Insulin analogues are increasingly used in the treatment of human diabetes, with the aim to offer a better replication of the pattern of basal and postprandial endogenous secretion of insulin (8). Conversion of the insulin market to analogues, estimated to be 40-45% in 2005, has been projected to reach saturation within 2010 (9).

In this study, we performed a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with insulin analogues in type 2 diabetes utilizing a least-squared regression model in order to assess the relationship between baseline HbA1c, the magnitude of HbA1c decrease, and attainment of HbA1c target of <7%.

METHODS

The present meta-analysis was conducted in accordance with guidelines established by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) (10). Reports of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RCTs of insulin analogues in type 2 diabetes patients were identified through systematic literature search of MEDLINE, EMBASE, The Cochrane Library, and CINAHL through September 2010. The main search concepts were type 2 diabetes, haemoglobin A1c, long-acting insulin analogues, short-acting insulin analogues, biphasic insulin analogues, glargine, detemir, neutral protamine lispro, lispro, aspart, glulisine, randomized controlled trials, clinical trials. We also reviewed reference lists of included articles, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration and European Medicines Agency Web sites for the insulin analogues, and Web sites of public registries of clinical trials (ClinicalTrials.gov and ClinicalStudyResults.org).

Study selection

We included any study arm of randomized controlled trials if: a) patients >18 years old with a diagnosis of type 2 diabetes, as defined by criteria current at the time of the trial, were included; b) different insulin regimens (basal, biphasic, prandial or basal-bolus) using insulin analogues were evaluated; and c) baseline HbA1c and change from baseline HbA1c were reported. Trials were rejected if the intervention time was < 12 weeks, or the number of patients in any arm was less than 30 patients. Clinical trials addressing patients with Type 1 diabetes were excluded. We included crossover trials with at least 12 weeks of follow-up before and after the crossover phase. The search had no language restriction; we excluded reviews, editorials, comments, letters, and abstracts. Two investigators (D.G. and K.E.) identified relevant publications and abstracted the data, and any disagreements were resolved by consensus. Data were abstracted and independently checked for accuracy prior to statistical analyses.

Insulin regimens

We considered four insulin regimens: basal insulin consisted of long-acting insulin analogues (glargine, detemir, and lispro NPL); biphasic insulin consisted of premixed insulin analogues (lispro 25/75, lispro 50/50, aspart 30/70, aspart 50/50, aspart 70/30, the numbers denote the percentage of the rapid-acting to the long-acting component, respectively); prandial insulin consisted of short-

acting insulin analogues (lispro, aspart, glulisine); and basal-bolus insulin consisted of any combination of prandial and basal insulin analogues.

Data synthesis and analyses

The proportion of patients with HbA1c <7% across the selected trials was computed as Pooled OR (POR) with 95% CI, as previously described (11). In brief, we transformed the proportion of patients with HbA1c <7% at the end of treatment into a quantity suitable for the usual fixed and random effects summaries (the Freeman-Tukey variant of the arcsine square root transformed proportion) (12). The pooled proportion is calculated as back-transformation of the weighted mean of the transformed proportions, using inverse arcsine variance weights for the fixed effects model and DerSimonian-Laird weight for the random effects model (13).

In 32 trials (39 arms and 5559 patients), which qualified for inclusion/exclusion criteria, the proportion of patients with HbA1c <7% at the end of treatment was not reported. We used the available information from the 55 trials (96 arms and 33244 patients) that reported the proportion of patients with HbA1c <7% for developing an algorithm for the estimate of the proportion of patients with HbA1c <7% (p) starting from the mean value of HbA1c reported at the end of treatment. The algorithm was a linear regression model relating the logit of the success rate ($\log(p/(1-p))$) with the HbA1c at the end of the treatment. Following there is the resulting equation to predict the logit of the success rate: $\log(p/1-p) = 11.68167 - 164.3119 \times \text{HbA1c-end}$. This equation explained the 88% of the variability between studies, and just little deviance between observed and predicted success rates were reported. The success rate (p) was then given by simple mathematical transformations.

The relationships between baseline HbA1c and change from baseline HbA1c, and between baseline HbA1c and attainment of the HbA1c target of <7% were analyzed by a weighted least-squared regression model using the S-PLUS 6.1 for Windows (Insightful Corp., Seattle, WA, USA), and sas version 9.2 for Windows (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA). The weight was computed as the inverse of the variance.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The following subanalyses also were conducted: 1) trial arms with basal insulin (57 arms with 21615 patients assessing the long-acting insulin analogues glargine, detemir, and lispro NPL); 2) trial arms with biphasic insulin (49 arms with 11624 patients assessing the premixed insulin analogues lispro 25/75, lispro 50/50, aspart 30/70, aspart 50/50, aspart 70/30); 3) trial arms with prandial insulin (13 arms with 2597 patients assessing the short-acting insulin analogues lispro, aspart, and glulisine); and 4) trial arms with basal-bolus insulin (16 arms with 2967 patients assessing any combination of prandial and basal insulin analogues).

Publication bias in these meta-analyses was assessed by funnel plot analyses, which revealed symmetrical relationships around mean change in HbA1c (data not shown).

RESULTS

The process of selecting the RCTs utilized in the final analyses from the 2700 citations originally identified is described in Fig. 1. We found 87 studies (14-100), with a total of 135 arms, that satisfied the inclusion/exclusion criteria. Most trials were multinational and sponsored by industry. All studies were randomized controlled trials (Table 1): among these, most were parallel group and 8 were crossover. All studies were of open-label design except one. Trial duration ranged from 12 to 134 weeks. The trials enrolled a total of 38803 patients (range, 41 to 2493 patients per arm); baseline HbA1c ranged from 7.2% to 10.6%.

The baseline HbA1c level, the decrement of HbA1c after treatment, and the proportion of patients at target with HbA1c <7% for the overall population and for each specific insulin regimen are reported in Table 2. Also reported in Table 2 are the relation between basal HbA1c and the decrement of HbA1c, and between basal HbA1c and proportion of patients at target. The median HbA1c level ranged from 8.35% with basal-bolus insulin to 9.1% with biphasic insulin; the decrement of HbA1c ranged from a median value of 1.32% with basal insulin to 1.4% with biphasic or prandial insulin; and the proportion of patients at target ranged from 35% with biphasic insulin to 51% with basal-bolus insulin.

The weighted $a R^2$ values for the overall analysis assessing the association between baseline HbA1c and absolute change in HbA1c (Fig 1) or the proportion of patients at target (Fig 2) were 0.485 ($P < 0.001$) and 0.146 ($P < 0.001$), respectively.

Subanalyses of different insulin regimens were also carried out (Table 2). Subanalyses of insulin regimens for the association between basal HbA1c and absolute decrease of HbA1c produced weighted R^2 which were significant for all insulin regimens, with the highest association for basal-bolus (0.719, $P < 0.001$). On the contrary, subanalysis of insulin regimens for the association between basal HbA1c and proportion of patients at target produced weighted R^2 which were significant for basal (0.195, $P < 0.001$) and biphasic insulin (0.076, $P = 0.037$), but not significant for prandial (0.127, $P = 0.126$) or basal-bolus insulin (0.000, $P = 0.526$).

DISCUSSION

The current meta-analysis demonstrates that higher baseline HbA1c levels are associated with greater reduction in HbA1c in clinical trials using different insulin regimens with insulin analogues in type 2 diabetes. Moreover, higher baseline HbA1c levels are also associated with a lower proportion of patients at target for the HbA1c $< 7\%$. This last negative association, however, was of lesser significance and not present for all the insulin regimens. To our knowledge, this is the first comprehensive analysis assessing the association between baseline HbA1c level and two HbA1c outcomes, namely the decrease of HbA1c and the proportion of patients at HbA1c target, currently adopted in clinical trials for evaluating the efficacy of insulin analogues in type 2 diabetes.

Recruitment to a clinical trial can produce a clinically useful improvement in glycaemic control, especially in those with relatively poor control at study outset (101). This finding well describes the positive relationship between baseline HbA1c levels and the magnitude of HbA1c change. The weighted R^2 values for the analysis assessing the association between baseline HbA1c and absolute change in HbA1c in the all 135 arms was highly significant (0.485, $P < 0.001$), and of greater

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

magnitude that that previously reported for other glucose-lowering therapies (1-3), which ranged from $R^2 = 0.18$ (1) to $R^2 = 0.31$ (2). The difference between our results and those reported earlier for other noninsulin, glucose-lowering therapies may be due to greater biological potency of insulin, which remains the most effective of diabetes medications in lowering glycaemia. Insulin can, when used in adequate doses, decrease any level of elevated HbA1c to, or close to, the therapeutic goal. Unlike the other blood glucose-lowering medications, there is no maximum dose of insulin beyond which a therapeutic effect will not occur (7). Although it may appear obvious that the closer the baseline HbA1c is to the target, the higher the probability to reach the target, we found evidence for a mild association between baseline HbA1c level and attainment of the target in all 135 arms ($R^2 = 0.146$).

This study has limitations. Many trials were of low methodological quality, but this is expected when the double-blind masking is not possible as for insulin trials. Moreover, about 15% of the included arms (21/135) reported the effect of therapies for period greater than 26 weeks, which makes unclear whether the HbA1c outcomes can be replicated during longer treatments. Finally, the influence of a publication bias cannot be entirely excluded as studies with positive results are more likely to be published, resulting in an overestimate of the benefit of insulin analogues on HbA1c reduction. This study has also strengths as it was restricted to RCTs that met predetermined methodological criteria: it focused on the effect of insulin regimens with insulin analogues which may be clinical relevant given the increasing number of patients with type 2 diabetes that are using insulin, either alone or in combination with oral antidiabetic drugs (102); it was conducted using weighted data from prospective cohort studies; lastly, the high number of RCTs included (87 RCTs with 135 arms) and the huge number of patients investigated (38 803), makes unlikely the possibility that even missed (non published) data may alter the associations herein reported.

In conclusion, our analysis of 38 804 patients with type 2 diabetes using insulin analogues demonstrate a strong positive relationship between baseline HbA1c and the magnitude of HbA1c

change, and a smaller one between baseline HbA1c and the proportion of patients at the HbA1c target of <7%. The findings herein reported should be considered when assessing clinical efficacy of insulin therapies with insulin analogues derived from clinical trials. Future trials should consider and correct for these variables (starting HbA1c value and HbA1c decrease) in the interpretation of data.

For Peer Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. Bloomgarden ZT, Dodis R, Viscoli CM, Holmboe ES, Inzucchi SE. Lower baseline glycemia reduces apparent oral agent glucose-lowering efficacy: a meta-regression analysis. *Diabetes Care* 2006; **29**: 2137–2139.
2. DeFronzo RA, Stonehouse AH, Han J, Wintle ME. Relationship of baseline HbA1c and efficacy of current glucose-lowering therapies: a meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *Diabetic Medicine* 2010; **27**: 309-317.
3. Sherifali D, Nerenberg K, Pullenayegum E, Cheng JE, Gerstein HC. The effect of oral antidiabetic agents on glycated hemoglobin levels: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care* 2010; **33**: 1859-1864.
4. Food and Drug Administration. Draft guidance for industry diabetes mellitus: developing drugs and therapeutic biologics for treatment and prevention. 2008. Available at <http://www.fda.gov/cder/guidance/7630dft.pdf> Last accessed 16 September 2010.
5. The European Agency for the Evaluation of Medicinal Products, Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products (CPMP). Note for guidance on clinical investigation of medicinal products in the treatment of diabetes mellitus. 2002. Available at <http://www.emea.europa.eu/pdfs/human/ewp/108000en.pdf> Last accessed 16 September 2010
6. Skyler JS, Bergenstal R, Bonow RO, et al. Intensive glycemic control and the prevention of cardiovascular events: implications of the ACCORD, ADVANCE, and VA Diabetes trials: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association and a scientific statement of the American College of Cardiology Foundation and the American Heart Association *Circulation*. 2009;**119**:351-357.

- 1
2
3 7. Nathan DM, Buse JB, Davidson MB, et al. Management of hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes:
4
5 A consensus algorithm for the initiation and adjustment of therapy: A consensus statement
6
7 from the American Diabetes Association and the European Association for the Study of
8
9 Diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2009;**32**:193-203.
- 10
11
12 8. Hirsch IB. Insulin analogues. *N Engl J Med*. 2005;352(2):174-183.
- 13
14
15 9. Hauber A, Gale EAM. The market in diabetes. *Diabetologia* 2006;**49**:247-252.
- 16
17
18 10. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic
19
20 reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and
21
22 elaboration. *Ann Intern Med*. 2009;**151**:W-65–W-94.
- 23
24
25 11. Giugliano D, Maiorino M, Bellastella G, Chiodini P, Esposito K. Treatment regimens with
26
27 insulin analogues and haemoglobin A1c target of <7% in type 2 diabetes: A systematic
28
29 review. *Diab Res Clin Pract* (2010), doi:10.1016/j.diabres.2010.08.006
- 30
31
32 12. Stuart A, Ord JK. Kendall's Advanced Theory of Statistics (6th edition). London: Edward
33
34 Arnold 1994.
- 35
36
37 13. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Controlled Clinical Trials*
38
39 1986;**7**:177-88.
- 40
41
42 14. Riddle MC, Rosenstock J, Gerich J. Insulin Glargine 4002 Study Investigators. The treat-to-
43
44 target trial: randomized addition of glargine or human NPH insulin to oral therapy of type 2
45
46 diabetic patients. *Diabetes Care*. 2003;**26**:3080-3086.
- 47
48
49 15. Malone JK, Kerr LF, Campaigne BN, Sachson RA, Holcombe JH. Lispro Mixture-Glargine
50
51 Study Group. Combined therapy with insulin lispro Mix 75/25 plus metformin or insulin
52
53 glargine plus metformin: a 16-week, randomized, open-label, crossover study in patients with
54
55 type 2 diabetes beginning insulin therapy. *Clin Ther*. 2004;**26**:2034-2044.
- 56
57
58
59
60

16. Raskin P, Allen E, Hollander P, et al; INITIATE Study Group. Initiating insulin therapy in type 2 diabetes: a comparison of biphasic and basal insulin analogs. *Diabetes Care* 2005;**28**:260-265.
17. Heine RJ, Van Gaal LF, Johns D, Mihm MJ, Widel MH, Brodows RG; GWAA Study Group. Exenatide versus insulin glargine in patients with suboptimally controlled type 2 diabetes: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2005;**143**:559-569.
18. Janka HU, Plewe G, Riddle MC, Kliebe-Frisch C, Schweitzer MA, Yki-Järvinen H. Comparison of basal insulin added to oral agents versus twice-daily premixed insulin as initial insulin therapy for type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2005;**28**:254-259.
19. Malone JK, Bai S, Campaigne BN, Reviriego J, Augendre-Ferrante B. Twice-daily pre-mixed insulin rather than basal insulin therapy alone results in better overall glycaemic control in patients with Type 2 diabetes. *Diabet Med* 2005;**22**:374-381.
20. Davies M, Storms F, Shutler S, Bianchi-Biscay M, Gomis R, for the Atlantis Study Group. Improvement of glycemic control in subjects with poorly controlled type 2 diabetes. Comparison of two treatment algorithms using insulin glargine. *Diabetes Care* 2005;**28**:1282-1288.
21. Kann PH, Wascher T, Zackova V, et al; Starting insulin therapy in type 2 diabetes: twice-daily biphasic insulin Aspart 30 plus metformin versus once-daily insulin glargine plus glimepiride. *Exp Clin Endocrinol Diabetes* 2006;**114**:527-532.
22. Jacober SJ, Scism-Bacon JL, Zagar AJ. A comparison of intensive mixture therapy with basal insulin therapy in insulin-naïve patients with type 2 diabetes receiving oral antidiabetes agents. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2006;**8**:448-455.
23. Kazda C, Hülstrunk H, Helsing K, Langer F, Forst T, Hanefeld M. Prandial insulin substitution with insulin lispro or insulin lispro mid mixture vs. basal therapy with insulin

- glargine: a randomized controlled trial in patients with type 2 diabetes beginning insulin therapy. *J Diabetes Complications* 2006;**20**:145-152.
24. Kennedy L, Herman WH, Strange P, Harris A; GOAL A1C Team. Impact of active versus usual algorithmic titration of basal insulin and point-of-care versus laboratory measurement of HbA1c on glycemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes: the Glycemic Optimization with Algorithms and Labs at Point of Care (GOAL A1C) trial. *Diabetes Care* 2006;**29**:1-8.
25. Hermansen K, Davies M, Derezinski T, Martinez Ravn G, Clauson P, Home P. A 26-week, randomized, parallel, treat-to-target trial comparing insulin detemir with NPH insulin as add-on therapy to oral glucose-lowering drugs in insulin-naïve people with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2006;**29**:1269-1274.
26. Rosenstock J, Sugimoto D, Strange P, Stewart JA, Soltes-Rak E, Dailey G. Triple therapy in type 2 diabetes: insulin glargine or rosiglitazone added to combination therapy of sulfonylurea plus metformin in insulin-naïve patients. *Diabetes Care* 2006;**29**:554-559.
27. Gerstein HC, Yale JF, Harris SB, Issa M, Stewart JA, Dempsey E. A randomized trial of adding insulin glargine vs. avoidance of insulin in people with Type 2 diabetes on either no oral glucose-lowering agents or submaximal doses of metformin and/or sulphonylureas. The Canadian INSIGHT (Implementing New Strategies with Insulin Glargine for Hyperglycaemia Treatment) Study. *Diabet Med* 2006;**23**:736-742.
28. Standl E, Maxeiner S, Raptis S; HOE901/4009 Study Group. Once-daily insulin glargine administration in the morning compared to bedtime in combination with morning glimepiride in patients with type 2 diabetes: an assessment of treatment flexibility. *Horm Metab Res* 2006;**38**:172-177.
29. Holman RR, Thorne KI, Farmer AJ, et al; 4-T Study Group. Addition of biphasic, prandial, or basal insulin to oral therapy in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2007;**357**:1716-1730.

30. Robbins DC, Beisswenger PJ, Ceriello A, et al; Mealtime 50/50 basal + prandial insulin analogue mixture with a basal insulin analogue, both plus metformin, in the achievement of target HbA1c and pre- and postprandial blood glucose levels in patients with type 2 diabetes: a multinational, 24-week, randomized, open-label, parallel-group comparison. *Clin Ther* 2007;**29**:2349-2364.

31. Barnett AH, Burger J, Johns D, et al; Tolerability and efficacy of exenatide and titrated insulin glargine in adult patients with type 2 diabetes previously uncontrolled with metformin or a sulfonylurea: a multinational, randomized, open-label, two-period, crossover noninferiority trial. *Clin Ther* 2007;**29**:2333-2348.

32. Esposito K, Ciotola M, Maiorino MI, et al; Addition of neutral protamine lispro insulin or insulin glargine to oral type 2 diabetes regimens for patients with suboptimal glycemic control: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2008;**149**:531-539.

33. Bretzel RG, Nuber U, Landgraf W, Owens DR, Bradley C, Linn T. Once-daily basal insulin glargine versus thrice-daily prandial insulin lispro in people with type 2 diabetes on oral hypoglycaemic agents (APOLLO): an open randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2008;**371**:1073-1084.

34. Rosenstock J, Davies M, Home PD, Larsen J, Koenen C, Schernthaner G. A randomised, 52-week, treat-to-target trial comparing insulin detemir with insulin glargine when administered as add-on to glucose-lowering drugs in insulin-naive people with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetologia* 2008;**51**:408-416.

35. Buse JB, Wolffenbuttel BH, Herman WH, et al; DURAbility of basal versus lispro mix 75/25 insulin efficacy (DURABLE) trial 24-week results: safety and efficacy of insulin lispro mix 75/25 versus insulin glargine added to oral antihyperglycemic drugs in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2009;**32**:1007-1013.

36. Raz I, Wilson PW, Strojek K, et al; Effects of prandial versus fasting glycemia on cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes: the HEART2D trial. *Diabetes Care* 2009;**32**:381-386.
37. Russell-Jones D, Vaag A, Schmitz O, et al; Liraglutide Effect and Action in Diabetes 5 (LEAD-5) met+SU Study Group. Liraglutide vs insulin glargine and placebo in combination with metformin and sulfonylurea therapy in type 2 diabetes mellitus (LEAD-5 met+SU): a randomised controlled trial. *Diabetologia*. 2009;**52**:2046-2055.
38. Blicklé JF, Hancu N, Piletic M, et al; Insulin glargine provides greater improvements in glycaemic control vs. intensifying lifestyle management for people with type 2 diabetes treated with OADs and 7-8% A1c levels. The TULIP study. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2009;**11**:379-386.
39. Blonde L, Merilainen M, Karwe V, Raskin P; TITRATE Study Group. Patient-directed titration for achieving glycaemic goals using a once-daily basal insulin analogue: an assessment of two different fasting plasma glucose targets - the TITRATE study. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2009;**11**:623-631.
40. Rosenstock J, Eliaschewitz FG, Heilmann CR, Muchmore DB, Hayes RP, Belin RM. Comparison of prandial AIR inhaled insulin alone to intensified insulin glargine alone and to AIR insulin plus intensified insulin glargine in patients with type 2 diabetes previously treated with once-daily insulin glargine. *Diabetes Technol Ther*. 2009;**11**(Suppl 2):S63-73.
41. Strojek K, Bebakar WM, Khutsoane DT, et al; Once-daily initiation with biphasic insulin aspart 30 versus insulin glargine in patients with type 2 diabetes inadequately controlled with oral drugs: an open-label, multinational RCT. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2009;**25**:2887-2894.
42. Fogelfeld L, Dharmalingam M, Robling K, Jones C, Swanson D, Jacober S. A Randomized, treat-to-target trial comparing insulin lispro protamine suspension and insulin detemir in insulin-naïve patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetic Med* 2010;**27**:181-188.

43. Heise T, Mathieu C, Hey-Hadavi J, Strack T, Lawrence D. Glycemic control with preprandial versus basal insulin in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus poorly controlled by oral antidiabetes agents. *Diabetes Technol Ther*. 2010 ;**12**:135-41.
44. Kalra S, Plata-Que T, Kumar D, Mumtaz M, Søndergaard F, Kozlovski P, Bebakar WM. Initiation with once-daily BIAsp 30 results in superior outcome compared to insulin glargine in Asians with type 2 diabetes inadequately controlled by oral anti-diabetic drugs. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2010;**88**:282-8.
45. Swinnen SG, Dain MP, Aronson R, Davies M, Gerstein HC, Pfeiffer AF, Snoek FJ, Devries JH, Hoekstra JB, Holleman F. A 24-week, randomized, treat-to-target trial comparing initiation of insulin glargine once-daily with insulin detemir twice-daily in patients with type 2 diabetes inadequately controlled on oral glucose-lowering drugs. *Diabetes Care* 2010;**33**:1176-1178.
46. Diamant M, Van Gaal L, Stranks S, Northrup J, Cao D, Taylor K, Trautmann M. Once weekly exenatide compared with insulin glargine titrated to target in patients with type 2 diabetes (DURATION-3): an open-label randomised trial. *Lancet* 2010;**375**:2234-2243.
47. Strojek K, Shi C, Carey MA, Jacober SJ. Addition of insulin lispro protamine suspension or insulin glargine to oral type 2 diabetes regimens: a randomized trial. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2010;**12**:916-22
48. Yki-Järvinen H, Dressler A, Ziemer M, and HOE 901/300s Study Group Less nocturnal hypoglycemia and better post-dinner glucose control with bedtime insulin glargine compared with bedtime NPH insulin during insulin combination therapy in type 2 diabetes. HOE 901/3002 Study Group. *Diabetes Care* 2000;**23**:1130-1136.
49. Rosenstock J, Schwartz SL, Clark CM, Jr, Park GD, Donley DW, Edwards MB. Basal Insulin Therapy in Type 2 Diabetes: 28-week comparison of insulin glargine (HOE 901) and NPH insulin *Diabetes Care* 2001; **24**:631-636.

50. Massi Benedetti M, Humburg E, Dressler A, et al: A one-years, randomised, multicentre trial comparing insulin glargine with NPH insulin in combination with oral agents in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Horm Metab Res* 2003;**35**:189-196.
51. Fritsche A, Schweitzer MA, Häring HU: 4001 Study Group. Glimepiride combined with morning insulin glargine, bedtime neutral protamine hagedorn insulin, or bedtime insulin glargine in patients with type 2 diabetes. A randomized, controlled trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2003;**138**:952-959.
52. Eliaschewitz FG, Calvo C, Valbuena H, et al. Therapy in type 2 diabetes: insulin glargine vs. NPH insulin both in combination with glimepiride. *Arch Med Res* 2006;**37**:495-501.
53. Philis-Tsimikas A, Charpentier G, Clauson P, et al. Comparison of once-daily insulin detemir with NPH insulin added to a regimen of oral antidiabetic drugs in poorly controlled type 2 diabetes. *Clin Ther* 2006;**28**:1569-1581.
54. Yki-Järvinen H, Kauppinen-Mäkelin R, Tiikkainen M, et al. Insulin glargine or NPH combined with metformin in type 2 diabetes: the LANMET study. *Diabetologia* 2006;**49**:442-451.
55. Yki-Järvinen H, Juurinen L, Alvarsson M, et al. Initiate insulin by aggressive titration and education (INITIATE): a randomized study to compare initiation of insulin combination therapy in type 2 diabetic patients individually and in groups. *Diabetes Care*. 2007;**30**:1364-1369.
56. Pan CY, Sinnassamy P, Chung KD, et al: LEAD Study Investigators Group. Insulin glargine versus NPH insulin therapy in Asian type 2 diabetes patients. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2007;**76**:111-118.
57. Bunck MC, Diamant M, Cornér A, et al. One-year treatment with exenatide improves β -cell function, compared with insulin glargine, in metformin-treated type 2 diabetic patients: A randomized, controlled trial. *Diabetes Care* 2009; **32**:762-768.

58. Malone JK, Beattie SD, Campaigne BN, Johnson PA, Howard AS, Milicevic Z. Therapy after single oral agent failure: adding a second oral agent or an insulin mixture? *Diabetes Res Clin Pract.* 2003;**62**:187-195.
59. Ushakova O, Sokolovskaya V, Morozova A, et al; Comparison of biphasic insulin aspart 30 given three times daily or twice daily in combination with metformin versus oral antidiabetic drugs alone in patients with poorly controlled type 2 diabetes: a 16-week, randomized, open-label, parallel-group trial conducted in russia. *Clin Ther* 2007;**29**:2374-2384.
60. Nauck MA, Duran S, Kim D, et al; A comparison of twice-daily exenatide and biphasic insulin aspart in patients with type 2 diabetes who were suboptimally controlled with sulfonylurea and metformin: a non-inferiority study. *Diabetologia* 2007;**50**:259-267.
61. Hirao K, Arai K, Yamauchi M, Takagi H, Kobayashi M; Japan Diabetes Clinical Data Management Study Group. Six-month multicentric, open-label, randomized trial of twice-daily injections of biphasic insulin aspart 30 versus multiple daily injections of insulin aspart in Japanese type 2 diabetic patients (JDDM 11). *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2008;**79**:171-176.
62. Rosenstock J, Ahmann AJ, Colon G, Scism-Bacon J, Jiang H, Martin S. Advancing insulin therapy in type 2 diabetes previously treated with glargine plus oral agents: prandial premixed (insulin lispro protamine suspension/lispro) versus basal/bolus (glargine/lispro) therapy. *Diabetes Care* 2008;**31**:20-25.
63. Yang W, Ji Q, Zhu D, et al; Biphasic insulin aspart 30 three times daily is more effective than a twice-daily regimen, without increasing hypoglycemia, in Chinese subjects with type 2 diabetes inadequately controlled on oral antidiabetes drugs. *Diabetes Care* 2008;**31**:852-856.
64. Liebl A, Prager R, Binz K, Kaiser M, Bergenstal R, Gallwitz B; PREFER Study Group. Comparison of insulin analogue regimens in people with type 2 diabetes mellitus in the PREFER Study: a randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2009;**11**:45-52.

65. Raskin P, Matfin G, Schwartz SL, et al; Addition of biphasic insulin aspart 30 to optimized metformin and pioglitazone treatment of type 2 diabetes mellitus: The ACTION Study (Achieving Control Through Insulin plus Oral ageNts). *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2009;**11**:27-32.
66. Cucinotta D, Smirnova O, Christiansen JS, et al; Three different premixed combinations of biphasic insulin aspart - comparison of the efficacy and safety in a randomized controlled clinical trial in subjects with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2009;**11**:700-708.
67. Oyer DS, Shepherd MD, Coulter FC, et al; INITIATEplus Study Group. A(1c) control in a primary care setting: self-titrating an insulin analog pre-mix (INITIATE plus trial). *Am J Med* 2009;**122**:1043-1049.
68. Rosenstock J, Lorber DL, Gnudi L, Howard CP, Bilheimer DW, Chang PC, Petrucci RE, Boss AH, Richardson PC. Prandial inhaled insulin plus basal insulin glargine versus twice daily biphasic insulin for type 2 diabetes: a multicentre randomised trial. *Lancet* 2010;**375**:2244-2253
69. Jain SM, Mao X, Escalante-Pulido M, Vorokhobina N, Lopez I, Ilag LL. Prandial-basal insulin regimens plus oral antihyperglycaemic agents to improve mealtime glycaemia: initiate and progressively advance insulin therapy in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2010;**12**:967-75
70. Roach P, Yue L, Arora V. Improved postprandial glycemic control during treatment with Humalog Mix25, a novel protamine-based insulin lispro formulation. Humalog Mix25 Study Group. *Diabetes Care* 1999;**22**:1258-1261.
71. Herz M, Sun B, Milicevic Z, et al. Comparative efficacy of preprandial or postprandial humalog@ Mix75/25 versus glyburide in patients 60 to 80 years of age with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Clin Ther* 2002;**24**:73-86.

72. Roach P, Arora V, Campaigne BN, Mattoo V, Rangwala S and The India Mix25/Mix50 Study Group. Humalog Mix50TM before carbohydrate-rich meals in type 2 diabetes mellitus *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2005;**5**:311–316.
73. Tigoviste CI, Strachinariu R, Farcasiu E, Milicevic Z, Teodirescu G. Humalog Mix 25 in patients with type 2 diabetes which do not achieve acceptable glycemic control with oral agents: results from a phase III, randomized, parallel study. *Rom J Intern Med* 2003;**41**:152-162.
74. Christiansen JS, Vaz JA, Metelko Z, Bogoev M, Dedov I. Twice daily biphasic insulin aspart improves postprandial glycaemic control more effectively than twice daily NPH insulin, with low risk of hypoglycaemia, in patients with type 2 diabetes *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2003;**5**:446–454.
75. Kilo C, Mezitisb N, Jainc R, Merseyd J, McGille J, Raskin P. Starting patients with type 2 diabetes on insulin therapy using once-daily injections of biphasic insulin aspart 70/30, biphasic human insulin 70/30, or NPH insulin in combination with metformin. *J Diabetes Complications* 2003;**17**:307-313.
76. Schernthaner G, Kopp H-P, Ristic S, Muzyka B, Peter L, Mitteregger G. Metabolic control in patients with type 2 diabetes using humalog Mix50 injected three times daily: crossover comparison with human insulin 30/70. *Horm Metab Res* 2004;**36**:188-193.
77. Niskanen L, Jensen LE, Råstam J, Nygaard-Pedersen L, Erichsen K, Vora JP. Randomized, multinational, open-label, 2-period, crossover comparison of biphasic insulin aspart 30 and biphasic insulin lispro 25 and pen devices in adult patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Clin Ther* 2004;**26**:531–540.
78. Boehm BO, Vazb JA, Brbndstedb L, Home PD. Long-term efficacy and safety of biphasic insulin aspart in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Eur J Inter Med* 2004;**15**:96–502.

79. Abrahamian H, Ludvik B, Schernthaner G, et al. Improvement of glucose tolerance in type 2 diabetic patients: traditional vs modern insulin regimens (results from the Austrian Biaspart Study). *Horm Metab Res* 2005;**37**:684-689.
80. Raz I, Stranks S, Filipczak R, et al. Efficacy and safety of biphasic insulin aspart 30 combined with pioglitazone in type 2 diabetes poorly controlled on glibenclamide (glyburide) monotherapy or combination therapy: an 18-week, randomized, open-label study. *Clin Ther* 2005;**27**:1432-1443.
81. Ligthelm R, Mouritzen U, Lynggaard H et al. Biphasic insulin aspart given thrice daily is as efficacious as a basal-bolus regimen with four daily injections. A randomised open-label parallel group four months comparison in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Exp Clin Endocrinol Diabetes* 2006;**114**:511–519.
82. Kvapil M, Swatko A, Hilberg C, Shestakova M. Biphasic insulin aspart 30 plus metformin: an effective combination in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2006;**8**:39–48.
83. Milicevic Z, Hancu N, Car N, Ivanyi T, Schwarzenhofer M, Jermendy G. Effect of two starting insulin regimens in patients with type II diabetes not controlled on a combination of oral antihyperglycemic medications. *Exp Clin Endocrinol Diabetes* 2009; **117**:223–229.
84. Lund SS, Tarnow L, Frandsen M, et al. Combining insulin with metformin or an insulin secretagogue in non-obese patients with type 2 diabetes: 12 month, randomised, double blind trial. *BMJ* 2009;**339**:b4324
85. Bastyr EJ 3rd, Stuart CA, Brodows RG, Schwartz S, Graf CJ, Zagar A, Robertson KE: Therapy focused on lowering postprandial glucose, not fasting glucose, may be superior for lowering HbA1c. IOEZ Study Group. *Diabetes Care* 2000;**23**:1236-1241.
86. Kawamori R, Iwamoto Y, Kadowaki T, et al; Effects of insulin glulisine as mono- or add-on therapy in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2009;**11**:900-909.

87. Gross JL, Nakano M, Colon-Vega G, Ortiz-Carasquillo R, Ferguson JA, Althouse S, Tobian JA, Berclaz PY, Milicevic Z. Initiation of prandial insulin therapy with AIR inhaled insulin or insulin lispro in patients with type 2 diabetes: A randomized noninferiority trial. *Diabetes Technol Ther.* 2009;**11**(Suppl 2):S27-34.
88. Anderson JH Jr, Brunelle RL, Keohane P, et al. Mealtime treatment with insulin analog improves postprandial hyperglycemia and hypoglycemia in patients with non-insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. *Arch Intern Med* 1997;**157**:1249-1255.
89. Ross SA, Zinman B, Campos RV, et al. Canadian Lispro Study Group. A comparative study of insulin lispro and human regular insulin in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus and secondary failure of oral hypoglycemic agents. *Clin Invest Med* 2001;**24**:292-298.
90. Forst T, Eriksson JW, Strotmann HJ, et al. Metabolic effects of mealtime insulin lispro in comparison to glibenclamide in early type 2 diabetes. *Exp Clin Endocrinol Diabetes* 2003;**111**:97-103.
91. Bretzel RG, Arnolds S, Medding J, Linn T. A direct efficacy and safety comparison of insulin aspart, uman soluble insulin, and human premix insulin (70/30) in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2004; **27**:1023-1027.
92. Hollander P, Cooper J, Bregnhøj J, Pedersen CB. A 52-week, multinational, open-label, parallel-group, noninferiority, treat-to-target trial comparing insulin detemir with insulin glargine in a basal-bolus regimen with mealtime insulin aspart in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Clin Ther* 2008;**30**:1976-1987.
93. Bergenstal RM, Johnson M, Powers MA, et al; Adjust to target in type 2 diabetes: comparison of a simple algorithm with carbohydrate counting for adjustment of mealtime insulin glulisine. *Diabetes Care* 2008;**31**:1305-1310.
94. Lankisch MR, Ferlinz KC, Leahy JL, Scherbaum WA; Orals Plus Apidra and LANTUS (OPAL) study group. Introducing a simplified approach to insulin therapy in type 2 diabetes:

- a comparison of two single-dose regimens of insulin glulisine plus insulin glargine and oral antidiabetic drugs. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2008;**10**:1178-1185.
95. Riddle M, Pencek R, Charenkavanich S, Lutz K, Wilhelm K, Porter L. Randomized comparison of pramlintide or mealtime insulin added to basal insulin treatment for patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2009;**32**:1577-1582.
96. Raskin P, Gylvin T, Weng W, Chaykin L. Comparison of insulin detemir and insulin glargine using a basal-bolus regimen in a randomized, controlled clinical study in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev* 2009;**25**:542-548.
97. Fritsche A, Larbig M, Owens D, Häring H-U; on behalf of the GINGER study group. Comparison between a basal-bolus and a premixed insulin regimen in individuals with type 2 diabetes- Results of the GINGER study. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2010;**12**:115-123.
98. Rašlová K, Bogoev M, Raz I, Leth G, Gall M-A, Hancu N. Insulin detemir and insulin aspart: a promising basal-bolus regimen for type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2004;**66**:193–201.
99. Haak T, Tiengo A, Draeger E, Suntum M, Waldhausl W. Lower within-subject variability of fasting blood glucose and reduced weight gain with insulin detemir compared to NPH insulin in patients with type 2 diabetes *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2005;**7**:56–64.
100. Yokoyama H, Tada J, Kamikawa F, Kanno S, Yokota Y, Kuramitsu M. Effect of conversion from bedtime NPH insulin to morning insulin glargine in type 2 diabetic patients on basal-prandial insulin therapy. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2006;**73**:35-40.
101. Gale EAM, Beattie SD, Hu J, Koivisto V, Tan MH. Recruitment to a clinical trial improves glycemic control in patients with diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2007;**30**:2989-2992.
102. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National diabetes fact sheet: general information and national estimates on diabetes in the United States, 2005. Atlanta:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;
2005.

For Peer Review Only

Legends to Figures

Figure 1. Systematic review flow diagram; n=number of trial reports.

Fig 2. Relationship between baseline HbA1c and change in HbA1c with insulin analogues in type 2 diabetes. The size of each circle in the figure represents the weighted mean in an individual arm of randomized controlled trials.

Fig 3. Relationship between baseline HbA1c and achievement of HbA1c target of <7% with insulin analogues in type 2 diabetes. The size of each circle in the figure represents the weighted mean in an individual arm of randomized controlled trials.

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Table 1. Characteristics of the Studies Included in the Systematic Review.

Studies (author, year, reference)	No	Analogue	Lenght wk	HbA1c basal (%)	HbA1c change (%)	HbA1c <7% (%)	R vs C
Basal insulin: 44 RCTs, 57 arms							
Riddle, 2003 ¹⁴	367	Glargine	24	8.6	-1.64	58	R
Malone, 2004 ¹⁵	67	Glargine	16	8.7	-0.9	18	R
Raskin, 2005 ¹⁶	114	Glargine	24	9.8	-2.39	40	R
Heine, 2005 ¹⁷	260	Glargine	24	8.3	-1.2	48	R
Janka, 2005 ¹⁸	177	Glargine	24	8.85	-1.7	49	R
Malone, 2005 ¹⁹	97	Glargine	16	8.5	-0.36	12	R
Davies, 2005 ²⁰	2493	Glargine	24	8.9	-1.0	26	R
Davies, 2005 ²⁰	2468	Glargine	24	9.9	-1.1	30	R
Kann, 2006 ²¹	127	Glargine	24	8.9	-1.0	26	R
Jacober, 2006 ²²	59	Glargine	16	9.2	-1.86	31	R
Kazda, 2006 ²³	53	Glargine	16	8.1	-0.3	24.5	R
Kennedy, 2006 ²⁴	1491	Glargine	24	8.9	-1.4	30	R
Kennedy, 2006 ²⁴	1363	Glargine	24	8.9	-1.4	36	R
Kennedy, 2006 ²⁴	1501	Glargine	24	8.9	-1.5	38	R
Kennedy, 2006 ²⁴	1366	Glargine	24	8.9	-1.6	41	R
Hermansen, 2006 ²⁵	227	Detemir	24	8.6	-1.8	70	R
Rosenstock, 2006 ²⁶	104	Glargine	24	8.8	-1.68	48	R
Gernstein, 2006 ²⁷	206	Glargine	24	8.6	-1.6	58	R
Standl, 2006 ²⁸	308	Glargine	24	8.8	-1.62	48	R
Standl, 2006 ²⁸	316	Glargine	24	8.8	-1.6	47	R
Holman, 2007 ²⁹	234	Detemir	52	8.4	-0.8	28	R
Robbins, 2007 ³⁰	158	Glargine	24	7.8	-0.3	40	R
Barnett, 2007 ³¹	138	Glargine	16	8.9	-1.32	40	R
Esposito, 2008 ³²	55	Glargine	36	8.8	-2.0	64	R
Esposito, 2008 ³²	55	Lispro NPL	36	8.7	-1.9	62	R
Bretzel, 2008 ³³	204	Glargine	48	8.7	-1.7	57	R
Rosenstock, 2008 ³⁴	248	Detemir	52	8.6	-1.4	52	R
Rosenstock, 2008 ³⁴	259	Glargine	52	8.6	-1.5	52	R
Buse, 2009 ³⁵	1046	Glargine	24	9.0	-1.7	40	R
Raz, 2009 ³⁶	558	Glargine	134	8.3	-0.5	31	R
Russell-Jones, 2009 ³⁷	232	Glargine	24	8.2	-1.0	46	R
Bicklé, 2009 ³⁸	103	Glargine	36	7.6	-0.8	66	R
Blonde, 2009 ³⁹	121	Detemir	20	7.9	-1.1	64	R
Blonde, 2009 ³⁹	122	Detemir	20	7.9	-0.9	54	R
Rosenstock, 2009 ⁴⁰	217	Glargine	24	8.5	-0.6	15	R

1								
2								
3								
4	Strojek, 2009 ⁴¹	232	Glargine	24	8.5	-1.2	46	R
5	Fogelfeld, 2009 ⁴²	223	Lispro NPL	24	8.8	-1.5	35	R
6	Fogelfeld, 2009 ⁴²	219	Detemir	24	8.8	-1.3	31	R
7								
8	Heise, 2010 ⁴³	122	Glargine	26	8.6	-1.4	55	R
9	Kalra, 2010 ⁴⁴	79	Glargine	26	8.4	-0.8	36	R
10								
11	Swinnen, 2010 ⁴⁵	478	Glargine	24	8.7	-1.45	44	R
12	Swinnen, 2010 ⁴⁵	486	Detemir	24	8.7	-1.54	48	R
13								
14	Diamant, 2010 ⁴⁶	223	Glargine	26	8.3	-1.3	48	R
15	Strojek, 2010 ⁴⁷	235	Lispro NPL	24	8.67	-1.46	43.8	R
16	Strojek, 2010 ⁴⁷	236	Glargine	24	8.67	-1.41	41	R
17								
18	Yki-Yarvinen, 2000 ⁴⁸	213	Glargine	52	9,1	-0.44	7.5	C
19	Rosenstock, 2001 ⁴⁹	259	Glargine	28	8.6	-0.4	14.5	C
20								
21	Massi-Benedetti, 2003 ⁵⁰	235	Glargine	52	8.56	-0.46	17	C
22								
23	Fritsche, 2003 ⁵¹	236	Glargine	24	9.1	-1.3	24	C
24	Fritsche, 2003 ⁵¹	227	Glargine	24	9.1	-1.0	16.5	C
25								
26	Eliashewitz, 2006 ⁵²	231	Glargine	24	9.03	-1.38	29	C
27	Philis-Tsimikas, 2006 ⁵³	168	Detemir	20	9.1	-1.6	34,5	C
28	Philis-Tsimikas, 2006 ⁵³	170	Detemir	20	8.9	-1.5	39	C
29								
30	Yki-Jarvinen, 2006 ⁵⁴	55	Glargine	36	9.13	-2.0	49	C
31	Yki-Jarvinen, 2007 ⁵⁵	121	Glargine	24	8.7	-1.8	58.5	C
32								
33	Pan, 2007 ⁵⁶	220	Glargine	24	9.02	-1.0	18	C
34	Bunck, 2009 ⁵⁷	33	Glargine	52	7.4	-0.6	62	C
35								
36								
37	Biphasic insulin: 37 RCTs, 49 arms							
38								
39	Malone, 2003 ⁵⁸	296	Lispro 25/75	16	9.17	-1.87	40	R
40	Malone, 2004 ¹⁵	67	Lispro 25/75	16	8.7	-1.3	42	R
41	Raskin, 2005 ¹⁶	108	BIAspart 30/70	24	9.7	-1.8	66	R
42								
43	Malone, 2005 ¹⁹	97	Lispro 25/75	16	8.5	-0.96	30	R
44								
45	Kann, 2006 ²¹	128	BIAspart 30/70	24	9.2	-1.7	33	R
46	Jacober, 2006 ²²	59	Lispro50 + Lispro25	16	9.2	-2.12	44	R
47								
48	Kazda, 2006 ²³	54	Lispro 50/50	24	8.1	-1.2	59	R
49	Holman, 2007 ²⁹	235	BIAspart 30/70	52	8.4	-1.1	42	R
50								
51	Ushakova, 2007 ⁵⁹	100	BIAspart 30/70	16	10.4	-3.1	45	R
52	Ushakova, 2007 ⁵⁹	100	BIAspart 30/70	16	10.4	-2.8	42	R
53								
54	Robbins, 2007 ³⁰	157	Lispro 50/50	24	7.8	-0.7	56	R
55	Nauck, 2007 ⁶⁰	248	BIAspart 30/70	52	8.6	-0.9	24	R
56	Hirao, 2008 ⁶¹	56	BIAspart 30/70	24	10.6	-3.0	32	R
57								
58	Rosenstock, 2008 ⁶²	187	Lispro 50/50	24	8.8	-1.85	54	R
59	Yang, 2008 ⁶³	160	BIAspart 30/70	24	9.5	-2.5	51	R
60	Yang, 2008 ⁶³	161	BIAspart 30/70	24	9.5	-2.82	66	R

Liebl, 2009 ⁶⁴	178	BIAspart 30/70	16	8.4	-1.23	50	R
Raskin, 2009 ⁶⁵	102	BIAspart 30/70	34	8.1	-1.6	76	R
Buse, 2009 ³⁵	1045	Lispro 25/75	24	9.1	-1.9	47.5	R
Cucinotta, 2009 ⁶⁶	200	BIAspart 30/70	36	8.9	-1.6	31	R
Cucinotta, 2009 ⁶⁶	201	BIAspart 50/50	36	8.9	-1.9	51	R
Cucinotta, 2009 ⁶⁶	198	BIAspart 70/30	36	8.7	-1.5	38	R
Oyer, 2009 ⁶⁷	1625	BIAspart 30/70	24	9.9	-2.4	40	R
Oyer, 2009 ⁶⁷	1624	BIAspart 30/70	24	9.9	-2.4	42	R
Oyer, 2009 ⁶⁷	1626	BIAspart 30/70	24	9.9	-2.5	42	R
Strojek, 2009 ⁴¹	225	BIAspart 30/70	24	8.5	-1.4	45	R
Rosenstock, 2010 ⁶⁸	237	BIAspart 30/70	52	8.7	-0.8	27	R
Kalra, 2010 ⁴⁴	76	BIAspart 30/70	26	8.47	-1.22	40	R
Jain, 2010 ⁶⁹	242	Lispro 50/50	36	9.5	-1.76	35	R
Roach, 1999 ⁷⁰	89	Lispro 25/75	26	9.2	-1.4	24	C
Herz, 2002 ⁷¹	72	Lispro 25/75	16	9.8	-1.16	7.5	C
Roach, 2003 ⁷²	57	Lispro50 + Lispro25	16	9.04	-0.9	15.5	C
Roach, 2003 ⁷²	59	Lispro 25/75	16	9.14	-1.0	15.5	C
Tirgoviste, 2003 ⁷³	85	Lispro 25/75	16	9.45	-1.35	10	C
Christiansen, 2003 ⁷⁴	201	BIAspart 30/70	16	8.8	-0.6	16	C
Kilo, 2003 ⁷⁵	46	BIAspart 30/70	12	9.5	-1.3	14	C
Schernthaner, 2004 ⁷⁶	40	Lispro 50/50	12	8.4	-0.8	31	C
Niskanen, 2004 ⁷⁷	133	Lispro 25/75	12	8.5	-0.5	19	C
Niskanen, 2004 ⁷⁷	133	BIAspart 30/70	12	8.5	-0.35	15	C
Boehm, 2004 ⁷⁸	58	BIAspart 30/70	24	9.45	-1.1	11.5	C
Abrahamian, 2005 ⁷⁹	89	BIAspart 30/70	24	9.8	-2.2	31	C
Raz, 2005 ⁸⁰	97	BIAspart 30/70	18	9.5	-0.5	5	C
Raz, 2005 ⁸⁰	93	BIAspart 30/70	18	9.6	-1.2	11	C
Ligthelm, 2006 ⁸¹	196	BIAspart 30, 50, 70	16	9.1	-1.3	24	C
Kvapil, 2006 ⁸²	107	BIAspart 30/70	16	9.6	-1.6	19	C
Kvapil, 2006 ⁸²	108	BIAspart 30/70	16	9.3	-1.7	31	C
Milicevic, 2009 ⁸³	68	Lispro 50+Lispro 25	24	9.7	-1.3	10.5	C
Lund, 2009 ⁸⁴	52	BIAspart 30/70	52	8.15	-1.45	65.5	C
Lund, 2009 ⁸⁴	49	BIAspart 30/70	52	8.07	-1.17	58.5	C

Prandial Insulin: 12 RCTs, 13 arms

Bastyr, 2000 ⁸⁵	41	Lispro	12	10.0	-2.3	23	R
Kazda, 2006 ²³	52	Lispro	16	8.2	-1.2	40	R
Holman, 2007 ²⁹	239	Aspart	52	8.6	-1.4	49	R
Bretzel, 2008 ³³	208	Lispro	48	8.7	-1.9	69	R
Hirao, 2008 ⁶¹	61	Lispro	24	10.6	-2.8	33	R

1								
2								
3								
4	Raz, 2009 ³⁶	557	Lispro	134	8.4	-0.7	28	R
5	Kawamori, 2009 ⁸⁶	127	Glulisine	16	9.0	-2.25	23	R
6	Kawamori, 2009 ⁸⁶	130	Glulisine	16	9.0	-2.07	52	R
7								
8	Gross, 2009 ⁸⁷	190	Lispro	24	8.2	-0.9	34	R
9	Anderson,1997 ⁸⁸	772	Lispro	26	8,7	-0.5	14	C
10								
11	Ross, 2001 ⁸⁹	70	Lispro	24	10,3	-2.3	19	C
12	Forst, 2003 ⁹⁰	75	Lispro	26	7,5	-0.3	46	C
13								
14	Bretzel, 2004 ⁹¹	75	Aspart	12	7,82	-0.9	58	C
15								
16								
17	Basal-bolus insulin: 12 RCTs, 16 arms							
18	Hollander, 2008 ⁹²	84	Glargine + Aspart	52	8.6	-1.4	36	R
19	Hollander, 2008 ⁹²	173	Detemir + Aspart	52	8.8	-1.8	37	R
20								
21	Rosenstock, 2008 ⁶²	187	Glargine + Lispro	24	8.9	-2.1	69	R
22	Bergenstal, 2008 ⁹³	136	Glargine + Glulisine	24	8.1	-1.4	73	R
23								
24	Bergenstal, 2008 ⁹³	137	Glargine + Glulisine	24	8.03	-1.5	69	R
25	Lankisch, 2008 ⁹⁴	162	Glargine + Glulisine	24	7.4	-0.4	36.5	R
26								
27	Lankisch, 2008 ⁹⁴	154	Glargine + Glulisine	24	7.3	-0.36	52	R
28	Liebl, 2009 ⁶⁴	537	Detemir + Aspart	16	8.5	-1.56	60	R
29								
30	Riddle, 2009 ⁹⁵	56	Glarg/Detem + any	24	8.3	-1.3	61	R
31	Raskin, 2009 ⁹⁶	251	Detemir + Aspart	24	8.4	-1.1	39	R
32								
33	Raskin, 2009 ⁹⁶	128	Glargine + Aspart	24	8.4	-1.4	54	R
34	Fritsche, 2009 ⁹⁷	153	Glargine + Glulisine	52	8.6	-1.3	47	R
35	Jain, 2010 ⁶⁹	242	Glargine + Lispro	36	9.3	-1.93	39	R
36								
37	Raslova 2004 ⁹⁸	195	Detemir + Aspart	22	8,11	-0.65	36	C
38								
39	Haak, 2005 ⁹⁹	341	Detemir + Aspart	26	7,9	-0.3	31	C
40	Yokohama, 2006 ¹⁰⁰	31	Glargine + Lispro	14	7,2	-0.6	70	C

HbA1c target <7%: R=reported; C=calculated

Table 2. Weighted R² for the overall population and subanalyses

Analysis	Arms (n)	Population	HbA1c Basal Median*	Δ HbA1c (%) Median*	HbA1c <7% Pooled (%)§ (95%, CI)	Weighted R ² Basal (independent) Δ HbA1c (dependent)	Weighted R ² Basal (independent) Target (dependent)
Overall	135	38803	8.7 (8.4;9.1)	-1.4 (-1.7;-0.97)	40 (30;50)	0.485 (P < 0.001)	0.146 (P < 0.001)
Basal insulin	57	21615	8.7 (8.5;8.9)	-1.32 (-1.6;-0.9)	37 (27;50)	0.178 (P < 0.001)	0.195 (P < 0.001)
Biphasic insulin	49	11624	9.1 (8.5;9.6)	-1.4 (-1.9;-1.1)	35 (29;42)	0.418 (P < 0.001)	0.076 (P = 0.037)
Prandial insulin	13	2597	8.7 (8.2;9.2)	-1.4 (-2.2;-0.8)	37.5 (28;48)	0.717 (P < 0.001)	0.127 (P = 0.126)
Basal-bolus insulin	16	2967	8.35 (7.96;8.6)	-1.35 (-1.5;-0.6)	51 (41;61)	0.719 (P < 0.001)	0.000 (P = 0.526)

*Median (interquartile range)

§Mixed effect model: estimates adjusted for the correlation within studies and heterogeneity between studies; CI = confidence interval

ΔHbA1c = decrement of HbA1c after intervention