## Check for updates

#### **OPEN ACCESS**

EDITED BY Jorge G. Farias, Universidad de La Frontera, Chile

REVIEWED BY Kaijian Hou, Shantou University, China Benli Su, Second Hospital of Dalian Medical University, China

\*CORRESPONDENCE Shaohong Yu, I sutcm2006@163.com Zhongwen Zhang, I zhangzhongwen@sdu.edu.cn

<sup>†</sup>These authors have contributed equally to this work and share first authorship

RECEIVED 06 June 2023 ACCEPTED 29 January 2024 PUBLISHED 26 February 2024

#### CITATION

Liu Y, Ma W, Fu H, Zhang Z, Yin Y, Wang Y, Liu W, Yu S and Zhang Z (2024), Efficacy of polyethylene glycol loxenatide for type 2 diabetes mellitus patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front. Pharmacol.* 15:1235639. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2024.1235639

#### COPYRIGHT

© 2024 Liu, Ma, Fu, Zhang, Yin, Wang, Liu, Yu and Zhang. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

# Efficacy of polyethylene glycol loxenatide for type 2 diabetes mellitus patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Yibo Liu<sup>1,2†</sup>, Wenjing Ma<sup>2†</sup>, Hui Fu<sup>3</sup>, Zhe Zhang<sup>4</sup>, Yanyan Yin<sup>5</sup>, Yongchun Wang<sup>2</sup>, Wei Liu<sup>4</sup>, Shaohong Yu<sup>2,6</sup>\* and Zhongwen Zhang<sup>7</sup>\*

<sup>1</sup>Department of Endocrinology and Metabology, Rehabilitation Hospital, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Shandong University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, The Third Affiliated Hospital of Shandong First Medical University, Jinan, China, <sup>2</sup>Rehabilitation Hospital, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Shandong University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Jinan, China, <sup>3</sup>Medical Integration and Practice Center, Shandong University, Jinan, China, <sup>4</sup>Shandong University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Jinan, China, <sup>5</sup>Shandong Provincial Medical Association, Jinan, China, <sup>6</sup>Teaching and Research Section of Internal Medicine, College of Medicine, Shandong University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Department of Endocrinology and Metabology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Shandong First Medical University and Shandong Provincial Qianfoshan Hospital, The Third Affiliated Hospital of Shandong First Medical University, Jinan, China

**Objective:** Some studies have proved that polyethylene glycol loxenatide (PEG-Loxe) has significant effects on controlling blood glucose and body weight in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM), but there is still some controversy over the improvement of blood lipid profiles (BLP) and blood pressure (BP), and more evidences are needed to verify such effects. Therefore, this study was conducted to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the efficacy of PEG-Loxe in improving blood glucose (BG), BLP, BP, body mass index (BMI), and body weight (BW) in patients with T2DM for clinical reference.

**Methods:** Randomized controlled trials (RCT) in which PEG-Loxe was applied to treat T2DM were retrieved by searching PubMed, Cochrane Library, Embase, Medline, Scopus, Web of Science, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, China Scientific Journal, Wanfang Data, and SinoMed databases. Outcome measures included BG, BLP, BP, BMI, and BW. RevMan 5.3 software was used to perform data analysis.

**Results:** Eighteen trials were identified involving 2,166 patients. In experimental group 1,260 patients received PEG-Loxe alone or with other hypoglycemic agents, while in control group 906 patients received placebo or other hypoglycemic agents. In the overall analysis, PEG-Loxe significantly reduced the levels of glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c), fasting plasma glucose (FPG), 2-h postprandial blood glucose (2-h PBG), BMI, and BW compared with control group. However, it had no obvious effect on total cholesterol (TC), triglycerides (TG), low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C), high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (BP).

**Conclusion:** PEG-Loxe has better hypoglycemic effects compared with placebo in patients with T2DM, but could not significantly improved TG, LDL-C, HDL-C,

SBP, and DBP. And the combination of conventional hypoglycemic drugs (CHD) and PEG-Loxe could more effectively improve the levels of HbA1c, FPG, 2-h PBG, TC, TG, BMI, and BW compared with CHD in T2DM patients.

Systematic Review Registration: www.inplasy.com, identifier INPLASY202350106

#### KEYWORDS

polyethylene glycol loxenatide, type 2 diabetes mellitus, blood glucose, blood lipid profiles, blood pressure, body mass index, body weight, meta-analysis

# **1** Introduction

Diabetes is one of the most serious and long-term chronic diseases and is also one of the top 10 causes of death in adults. Therefore, it poses a major threat to individual, family and global health (Saeedi et al., 2019). According to the International Diabetes Federation, more than 500 million individuals suffered from diabetes in 2021 worldwide, and it is expected that the number of patients will increase by 200 million in 2045. In 2021, the global health costs associated with diabetes were evaluated at 966 billion U.S. dollars, and this number is expected to reach 1,054 billion U.S. dollars by 2045 (Williams et al., 2020; Sun et al., 2022). With the aging of the global population and changes in lifestyle, there would be more people suffering from diabetes and more cost spending diabetes. Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM), the most prevalent diabetes, accounts for more than 90% diabetic patients (Zheng et al., 2018; Khan et al., 2019). T2DM is a metabolic disease

induced by a variety of causes. It would lead to insulin deficiency, insulin resistance, and persistently elevated blood glucose levels. In a long-term hyperglycemic internal environment, blood vessels and nerves would undergo pathological changes, which could damage the organs such as heart, kidneys, and eyes (Chatterjee et al., 2017; Ahmad et al., 2022). Since there is no radical cure for T2DM at present, blood glucose and weight control are particularly critical in its treatment process (Davies et al., 2022).

In recent years, since glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists (GLP-1RAs) have significant hypoglycemic effects and multiple benefits for diabetic patients, they have been recommended in major guidelines. GLP-1RAs are potent hypoglycemic agents with the function to promote glucose-dependent insulin secretion from pancreatic beta-cells by binding to glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor (GLP-1R) and inhibiting glucagon secretion (Drucker, 2018). The degradation and destroy of GLP-1RAs are slow, so the effect of



#### TABLE 1 The characteristics of the included studies.

ID	Group	Sample size	Mean age, years	Intervention measures	Treatment time, weeks	Outcome indicator
Yang (2022)	Experimental group	40	55.89 ± 2.52	PEG-Loxe 0.1 mg	12	HbAlc, FPG, and 2-h PBG
	Control group	40	55.82 ± 2.56	Insulin glargine		
Wan et al. (2023)	Experimental group	35	63.31 ± 6.43	PEG-Loxe 0.2 mg + Insulin glargine + Metformin	12	HbAlc, FPG, TC, TG, LDL-C, and BMI
	Control group	35	63.25 ± 6.36	Insulin glargine + Metformin		
Zhang Y. et al. (2023)	Experimental group	41	53.50 ± 5.43	PEG-Loxe 0.2 mg + Metformin	12	HbA1c, FBG, 2-h PBG, TC, TG, LDL-C, HDL-C
	Control group	41	53.00 ± 5.45	Metformin		
Zhong (2023)	Experimental group	30	53.30 ± 10.86	PEG-Loxe 0.2 mg + Insulin glargine	12	HbA1c, FBG, 2-h PBG, TC, TG
	Control group	30	52.50 ± 10.88	Insulin glargine		
Zhou et al. (2023)	Experimental group	40	46.8 ± 11.3	PEG-Loxe 0.2 mg + Metformin	12	HbA1c, FBG, 2-h PBG, TC, TG, LDL-C, HDL-C, SBP, DBP,
	Control group	40	47.2 ± 12.1	Metformin		and BMI
Li et al. (2021)	Experimental group	30	47.7 ± 6.8	PEG-Loxe 0.1 mg + Metformin/ Acarbose	12	HbAlc, FPG, 2-h PBG, and BMI
	Control group	30	47.2 ± 7.3	Metformin/Acarbose		
Tian et al. (2022)	Experimental group	35	50 ± 13.00	PEG-Loxe 0.2 mg + Metformin	12	HbA1c, FBG, 2-h PBG, BMI, and BW
	Control group	34	50 ± 13.00	Sodium chloride injection + Metformin		
Zhao et al. (2022)	Experimental group	56	46.72 ± 9.34	PEG-Loxe 0.2 mg + Metformin	12	HbA1c, FBG, 2-h PBG, TC, TG, LDL-C, HDL-C, and BMI
	Control group	54	47.89 ± 8.95	Metformin		
Li K. et al. (2022)	Experimental group	50	52.34 ± 4.15	PEG-Loxe 0.2 mg + Metformin	12	FPG, 2-h PBG, TG, TC, LDL-C, and HDL-C
	Control group	50	52.56 ± 4.08	Metformin		
Liang et al. (2021)	Experimental group	62	53.8 ± 8.5	PEG-Loxe 0.2 mg	24	HbAlc, FPG, 2-h PBG, TG, TC, HDL-C, LDL-C, and BMI
	Control group	62	54.1 ± 7.9	Multiple oral hypoglycemic drugs or oral drugs combined with insulin		
Wang and Zhao (2021)	Experimental group	37	59.78 ± 14.76	PEG-Loxe 0.2 mg	12	HbAlc, FPG, 2-h PBG, and BMI
	Control group	37	58.36 ± 14.63	Insulin glargine		
Yao et al.	Experimental	13	53.6 ± 9.90	PEG-Loxe 0.1 mg	12	HbAlc, FPG, and 2-h PBG
(2017)	group	12	53.6 ± 9.90	PEG-Loxe 0.2 mg		
	Control group	11	53.6 ± 9.90	Placebo		
Gao et al.	Experimental	179	53.60 ± 10.50	PEG-Loxe 0.1 mg + Metformin	24	HbA1c, FPG, 2-h PBG, TC, TG,
(2020)	group	175	52.80 ± 10.60	PEG-Loxe 0.2 mg + Metformin		HDL-C, LDL-C, SBP, DBP, and BW
	Control group	179	52.30 ± 10.70	Placebo + Metformin		
Shuai et al.	Experimental	124	50.50 ± 10.40	PEG-Loxe 0.1 mg	24	HbA1c, FPG, 2-h PBG, TC, TG,
(2020)	group	116	52.40 ± 11.50	PEG-Loxe 0.2 mg		HDL-C, LDL-C, SBP, DBP, and BW
	Control group	121	51.50 ± 10.90	Placebo		

(Continued on following page)

	-					
ID	Group	Sample size	Mean age, years	Intervention measures	Treatment time, weeks	Outcome indicator
Chen et al.	Experimental	41	52.60 ± 8.40	PEG-Loxe 0.1 mg + Metformin	12	HbA1c, FPG, 2-h PBG, TC, TG,
(2017)	group	39	49.80 ± 10.90	PEG-Loxe 0.2 mg + Metformin	-	HDL-C, LDL-C, SBP, DBP, and BW
	Control group	38	53.50 ± 10.20	Placebo + Metformin	-	
Zhang S. et al. (2023)	Experimental group	35	68.30 ± 10.40	PEG-Loxe 0.2 mg + Metformin	24	HbA1c
	Control group	34	67.40 ± 10.20	Insulin glargine + Metformin	-	
Song et al. (2023)	Experimental group	50	51.38 ± 6.39	PEG-Loxe 0.2 mg + Metformin + Insulin	24	HbA1c, FPG, 2-h PBG, TC,TG, HDL-C, LDL-C, BW, and BMI
	Control group	50	51.49 ± 6.67	Metformin + Insulin	-	
Li X. Y. et al. (2022)	Experimental group	20	63.29 ± 1.27	PEG-Loxe 0.2 mg + Metformin	12	FPG, 2-h PBG, TG, HDL-C, and LDL-C
	Control group	20	64.23 ± 1.31	Metformin	-	

#### TABLE 1 (Continued) The characteristics of the included studies.

PEG-Loxe, polyethylene glycol loxenatide; HbA1c: glycosylated hemoglobin; FPG, fasting plasma glucose; 2-h PBG, 2-h postprandial blood glucose; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; BMI, body mass index; BW, body weight.



reducing blood glucose (BG) could be maintained for a long time (Chen et al., 2017). In addition, GLP-1RAs have the advantages of reducing BG without increasing the incidence of hypoglycemia (Drucker and Nauck, 2006). Therefore, the 2020 American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists guidelines recommend GLP-1RAs as the drug of choice after metformin (Garber et al., 2020). Polyethylene glycol loxenatide (PEG-Loxe), a new agent of the GLP-1RAs, was approved for clinical application in China In 2019. It was synthesized by replacing the chemical structure of exenatide at the N-terminal positions 2, 14, 28, and 39, and modified by polyethylene glycol (PEG). PEG-Loxe could further resist the rapid degradation of dipeptidyl peptidase-IV (DPP-4), reduce the toxicity and its antigenic immunity, prolong the mean half-life (131.8-139.8 h) and duration of action, and improve its bioavailability, compliance, and the therapeutic effect in the body, with better effects compared with exenatide (Yang et al., 2015; Chen et al., 2017). In terms of the hypoglycemic effect, studies have reported that PEG-Loxe is likely to inhibit β-cell apoptosis to promote the expression of GLP-1R, thereby activating the insulin PI3K/AKT pathway, promoting insulin synthesis and secretion, and thus exerting a hypoglycemic effect (Zhang et al., 2021). PEG-Loxe has shown a good effect on controlling BG in patients with T2DM, but there are still some controversy over the improvement of BLP and few clinical evidence for reducing BW. Therefore, we aimed to comprehensively evaluate the efficacy of PEG-Loxe for BG, BLP, BP, body mass index (BMI), and BW.

# 2 Materials and methods

The protocol and report of this study followed the "Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)" statement (Page et al., 2021) and were registered in the INPLASYInternational Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-analysis Protocols (identifier: INPLASY202350106. DOI number: 10.37766/inplasy 2023.5.0106).

Index	Dosage (mg)	n	Sample size	Effect model	Overall effect: Heterogeneity (P <sub>h</sub> , I <sup>2</sup> %); MD (95% CI); Z-test (Z-values, P <sub>Z</sub> )
HbA1c	0.1	6	846	Random	$\rm P_h < 0.00001,  98\%;  -0.91   (-1.05,  -0.76);  12.16,  \rm P_Z < 0.00001$
	0.2	14	1,169		
FPG	0.1	7	886	Random	$\rm P_h <$ 0.00001, 97%; –1.22 (–1.42, –1.02); 12.06, $\rm P_Z <$ 0.00001
	0.2	14	1,545		
2-h PBG	0.1	7	886	Random	$\rm P_h <$ 0.00001, 97%; –1.84 (–2.16, –1.53); 11.37, $\rm P_Z <$ 0.00001
	0.2	13	1,475		
TC	0.1	3	682	Random	$\rm P_h <$ 0.00001, 93%; -0.44 (-0.68, 0.19); 3.48, $\rm P_Z =$ 0.0005
	0.2	11	1,384		
TG	0.1	3	682	Random	$\rm P_h < 0.00001,  97\%;  -0.59$ (-0.98, 0.19); 2.92, $\rm P_Z = 0.004$
	0.2	11	1,384		
LDL-C	0.1	4	722	Random	$P_{\rm h} < 0.00001,  93\%;  -0.16  (-0.34,  0.02);  1.79,  P_Z = 0.07$
	0.2	10	1,324		
HDL-C	0.1	3	682	Random	$\rm P_h <$ 0.00001, 88%; 0.07 (–0.01, 0.14); 1.77, $\rm P_Z = 0.08$
	0.2	9	1,254		
SBP	0.1	3	344	Random	$\rm P_h <$ 0.00001, 93%; 0.17 (–0.90, 1.24); 0.31, $\rm P_Z =$ 0.75
	0.2	4	370		
DBP	0.1	3	344	Random	$P_{\rm h} < 0.00001,  95\%;  -0.39   (-1.20,  0.42);  0.95,  Pz = 0.34$
	0.2	4	370		
BMI	0.1	2	418	Random	$\rm P_h < 0.00001,  82\%;  -1.68$ (-2.20, -1.17); 6.44, $\rm P_Z < 0.00001$
	0.2	9	1,048		
BW	0.1	2	603	Random	$\mathrm{P_h} < 0.00001, \ 96\%; \ -2.71 \ (-4.97, \ -0.45); \ 2.35, \ \mathrm{P_Z} = \ 0.02$
	0.2	5	870		

#### TABLE 2 The results of overall analysis.

 $P_{ho}$  *p*-values for heterogeneity of Q-test; MD, mean difference; CI, confidence interval; Pz, *p*-values for Z-test;  $P_Z < 0.05$ , shows a significant difference; HbA1c, glycosylated hemoglobin; FPG, fasting plasma glucose; 2-h PBG, 2-h postprandial blood glucose; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; BMI, body mass index; and BW, body weight.

# 2.1 Literature search strategies

Literature was retrieved in the PubMed, Cochrane Library, Embase, Medline, Scopus, Web of Science, China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), China Scientific Journal, Wanfang Data, and SinoMed databases. The search terms were "polyethylene glycol loxenatide" or "PEG-Loxe" or "PEX168" in combination with "randomized controlled trial," "randomized controlled trials" "RCT," "RCTs," "type 2 diabetes mellitus" or "diabetes mellitus" or "diabetes mellitus, type 2," or "T2DM." The complete search strategies of databases were shown in Supplementary Table S1.

## 2.2 The inclusion and exclusion criteria

The inclusion criteria followed the PICOS principle. T2DM patients with FPG $\geq$ 11.1 mmol/L, HbA1c  $\geq$  9.0%; BMI $\geq$ 27 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, age $\geq$ 18 years old; Patients in experimental group received PEG-Loxe alone or along with other hypoglycemic agents, and patients in

control group received placebo or other hypoglycemic agents; The dose of PEG-Loxe was 0.1 mg or 0.2 mg. Outcome indicators involved HbA1c, FPG, 2-h PBG, TC, TG, LDL-C, HDL-C, SBP, DBP, BMI and BW; RCT published in English or Chinese.

The exclusion criteria were shown as follows: the study design was scientific research achievements, systematic reviews, and animal experiments; trials that did not report related information; the full text could not be obtained; other intervention measures existed; patients that combined with other severe diseases or limb dysfunction, and serious complications of T2DM.

## 2.3 Quality assessment and data extraction

The quality assessment and data extraction were conducted by 2 researchers independently, with disagreements resolved by consensus. The quality of the included studies was assessed according to six aspects: random sequence generation (selection bias), allocation concealment (selection bias), blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias), blinding of

Index		He	terogeneity	/ (P <sub>h</sub> , I <sup>2</sup> %); MD	(95% CI); Z-te	est (Z-values, F	P <sub>Z</sub> )	
	Int	ervention meas	ure subgro	up	Dosage s	ubgroup	Treatment tir	ne subgroup
	PEG-Lo>	ke + CHD	PEC	a-Loxe				
	CHD	CHD + Placebo	CHD	Placebo	0.1 mg	0.2 mg	12 weeks	24 weeks
HbA1c	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 96%	$P_{\rm h} = 0.008, 75\%$	P <sub>h</sub> = 0.06, 71%	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 99%	$P_{h} = 0.03,  60\%$	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 99%	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 90%	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 100%
	-1.04 (-1.38, -0.69)	-0.81 (-0.84, -0.77)	-0.72 (-2.30, 0.86)	-1.05 (-1.34, -0.76)	-0.83 (-0.88, -0.79)	-1.01 (-1.35, -0.66)	-1.16 (-1.57, -0.75)	-0.59 (-0.89, -0.28)
	5.86, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	43.24, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	0.90, $P_z = 0.37$	$7.07, P_z < 0.00001$	39.02, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	12.16, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	5.55, $P_z < 0.00001$	3.57, P <sub>z</sub> = 0.0002
FPG	P <sub>h</sub> = 0.10, 37%	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 100%	P <sub>h</sub> = 0.0002, 93%	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 97%	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 96%	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 87%	$P_{\rm h} = 0.03,  46\%$	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 99%
	-1.04 (-1.25, -0.84)	-1.23 (-2.32, -0.15)	-1.21 (-3.03, 0.60)	-1.43 (-1.80, -1.06)	-1.28 (-1.58, -0.98)	-1.19 (-1.37, -1.00)	-1.10 (-1.37, -0.83)	-1.16 (-1.45, -0.87)
	10.10, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	2.23, P <sub>z</sub> = 0.03	$1.31, P_z = 0.19$	7.52, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	8.38, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	12.62, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	7.94, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	7.74, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001
2-h PBG	$P_{\rm h} = 0.05, 50\%$	$P_{\rm h} < 0.00001, 86\%$	P <sub>h</sub> = 0.004, 88%	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 99%	$P_{\rm h} < 0.0001, 80\%$	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 97%	$P_{\rm h} < 0.0001,  69\%$	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 99%
	-2.15 (-2.70, -1.59)	-1.59 (-1.85, -1.32)	-1.27 (-3.53, 0.99)	-2.12 (-3.35, -0.90)	-1.33 (-1.56, -1.10)	-1.91 (-2.42, -1.41)	-2.20 (-2.74, -1.66)	-1.57 (-2.04, -1.10)
	7.58, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	11.41, $P_h < 0.00001$	1.10, $P_z = 0.27$	3.40, P <sub>z</sub> = 0.0007	11.37, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	7.42, $P_z < 0.00001$	7.97, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	6.51, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001
TC	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 87%	$P_{\rm h} < 0.0001, 87\%$	NA	$P_{h} = 0.52, 0\%$	$P_{\rm h} = 0.0008, 86\%$	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 92%	$P_{\rm h} < 0.0001, 81\%$	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 94%
	-0.77 (-1.06, -0.48)	-0.10 (-0.44, 0.24)		0.23 (0.07, 0.40)	-0.03 (-0.41, 0.36)	-0.55 (-0.83, -0.27)	-0.71 (-1.00, -0.42)	0.09 (-0.24, 0.42)
	5.24, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	0.58, $P_z = 0.56$		2.78, $P_z = 0.005$	0.14, $P_z = 0.89$	3.82, $P_z = 0.0001$	4.78, $P_z < 0.00001$	0.54, $P_z = 0.59$
TG	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 98%	$P_{\rm h} = 0.90,  0\%$	NA	$P_{h} = 0.56, 0\%$	$P_{\rm h} = 0.18, 39\%$	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 98%	$P_{\rm h} <$ 0.0001, 98%	$P_{\rm h} = 0.007, 79\%$
	-1.05 (-1.57, -0.52)	0.11 (-0.07, 0.30)		0.14 (-0.28, 0.56)	-0.03 (-0.31, 0.24)	-0.80 (-1.28, -0.32)	-0.89 (-1.54, -0.23)	-0.02 (-0.31, 0.28)
	3.98, $P_z = 0.0001$	1.21, $P_z = 0.22$		0.65, $P_z = 0.52$	$0.24, P_z = 0.81$	3.25, $P_z = 0.001$	2.64, $P_z = 0.008$	0.01, $P_z = 0.92$
LDL-C	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001), 95%	$P_{\rm h} < 0.00001, 90\%$	NA	$P_{h} = 0.51, 0\%$	$P_{\rm h} = 0.04, \ 64\%$	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 95%	$P_{\rm h} < 0.00001, 93\%$	$P_{h} = 0.04, 59\%$
	-0.27 (-0.56, 0.01)	-0.02 (-0.33, 0.29)		-0.00 (-0.14, 0.13)	0.00 (-0.21, 0.21)	-0.21 (-0.44, 0.02)	-0.34 (-0.65, 0.02)	0.13 (0.04, 0.22)
	1.87, $P_z = 0.06$	0.13, $P_z = 0.90$		0.05, $P_z = 0.96$	0.01, $P_z = 0.99$	1.79, $P_z = 0.07$	2.12, $P_z = 0.03$	2.71, $P_z = 0.007$
HDL-C	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 91%	$P_{\rm h} = 0.01, 72\%$	NA	$P_{\rm h} = 0.63, 0\%$	$P_{h} = 0.01, 74\%$	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 91%	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 92%	$P_{\rm h} = 0.03, \ 63\%$
	0.10 (-0.09, 0.28)	0.01 (-0.06, 0.08)		0.01 (-0.03, 0.05)	0.06 (-0.02, 0.14)	0.06 (-0.05, 0.17)	0.06 (-0.10, 0.22)	0.04 (0.00, 0.09)
	1.02, $P_z = 0.31$	$0.31, P_z = 0.76$		0.51, $P_z = 0.61$	1.48, $P_z = 0.14$	1.03, $P_z = 0.30$	$0.72, P_z = 0.47$	1.83, $P_z = 0.07$
SBP	NA	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 96%	NA	$P_{\rm h} = 0.80, 0\%$	$P_{\rm h} = 0.41,0\%$	P <sub>h</sub> = 0.0002, 85%	$P_{\rm h} = 0.0006, 87\%$	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 96%
		-0.11 (-0.27, 0.04)		3.04 (-0.19, 6.26)	0.52 (-0.30, 0.74)	-0.46 (-3.38, -2.46)	-0.14 (-6.61, 6.33)	0.39 (-0.70, 1.49)
		1.42, $P_z = 0.16$		1.85, $P_z = 0.06$	4.57, $P_z < 0.00001$	$0.31, P_z = 0.76$	0.04, $P_z = 0.97$	0.70, $P_z = 0.48$

## TABLE 3 The results of subgroup analysis.

(Continued on following page)

Index		He	eterogeneit	y (P <sub>h</sub> , I²%); MD	(95% CI); Z-te	est (Z-values, I	P <sub>Z</sub> )	
	Int	ervention meas	ure subgro	pup	Dosage s	ubgroup	Treatment tin	ne subgroup
	PEG-Lo>	ke + CHD	PEC	G-Loxe				
	CHD	CHD + Placebo	CHD	Placebo	0.1 mg	0.2 mg	12 weeks	24 weeks
DBP	NA	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 96%	NA	$P_{\rm h} = 0.82, 0\%$	$P_{h} = 0.10, 57\%$	$P_{\rm h} = 0.001, 81\%$	P <sub>h</sub> = 0.0009, 86%	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 97%
		-0.79 (-0.90, -0.68)		2.72 (0.37, 5.07)	0.30 (-0.99, 1.59)	-0.68 (-2.32, 0.96)	0.54 (-3.68, 4.77)	-0.40 (-1.28, 0.48)
		14.13, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001		2.27, $P_z = 0.02$	0.45, P <sub>z</sub> = 0.65	$0.81, P_z = 0.42$	$0.25, P_z = 0.80$	0.90, $P_z = 0.37$
BMI	$P_{\rm h} = 0.002,  69\%$	P <sub>h</sub> = 1.00, 0%	NA	NA	$P_{\rm h} = 0.06, 72\%$	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 80%	$P_{\rm h} = 0.002,  69\%$	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 91%
	-2.04 (-2.49, -1.58)	-0.10 (-0.66, 0.46)			-0.96 (-3.06, 1.15)	-1.82 (-2.32, -1.33)	-2.06 (-2.57, -1.56)	-0.68 (-1.93, 0.56)
	8.74, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	$Z = 0.35, P_z = 0.72$			0.89, $P_z = 0.37$	7.24, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	8.00, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	1.07, $P_z = 0.28$
BW	$P_{\rm h} = 0.03, 72\%$	$P_{\rm h} = 0.96, 0\%$	NA	$P_{\rm h} = 0.54, 0\%$	$P_{\rm h} = 0.93,0\%$	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 96%	$P_{\rm h} = 0.44, 0\%$	P <sub>h</sub> < 0.00001, 96%
	-7.01 (-9.97, -4.04)	0.35 (-1.71, 2.40)		0.30 (-0.14, 0.73)	0.42 (-0.17, 1.02)	-2.71 (-4.97, -0.45)	-8.76 (-11.18, -6.34)	-0.86 (-3.12, 1.40)
	4.53, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	$0.33, P_z = 0.74$		1.35, $P_z = 0.18$	1.40, $P_z = 0.16$	2.35, $P_z = 0.02$	7.09, P <sub>z</sub> < 0.00001	$0.75, P_z = 0.45$

#### TABLE 3 (Continued) The results of subgroup analysis.

 $P_{br}p$ -values for heterogeneity of Q-test; MD, mean difference; CI, confidence interval;  $P_{xr}p$ -values for Z-test;  $P_Z < 0.05$ , shows a significant difference; PEG-Loxe, polyethylene glycol loxenatide; CHD, conventional hypoglycemic drugs; PEG-Loxe + CHD, polyethylene glycol loxenatide combined with conventional hypoglycemic drugs; CHD + Placebo, conventional hypoglycemic drugs; CHD + Placebo, conventional hypoglycemic drugs; DEG-Loxe + CHD, polyethylene glycol loxenatide combined with conventional hypoglycemic drugs; CHD + Placebo, conventional hypoglycemic drugs; DEG-Loxe + CHD, polyethylene glycol loxenatide combined with conventional hypoglycemic drugs; CHD + Placebo, conventional hypoglycemic drugs; DBP, 2-h postprandial blood glucose; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; BMI, body mass index; BW, body weight; NA, not available.

outcome assessment (detection bias), incomplete outcome data (attrition bias), and selective reporting (reporting bias), which are detailed described in the Cochrane Collaboration Risk-of-Bias Tool (Higgins et al., 2011). Information extracted from each study included the first author, year of publication, sample size, age range, intervention measures, duration, and outcomes.

## 2.4 Statistical analysis

RevMan 5.3 software was used for data analysis. Mean difference (MD) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were used to represent continuous variables. p < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. The statistical heterogeneity was evaluated by Chi-square and I<sup>2</sup> tests. According to section-10-10-four to one of Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Intervention, the confidence interval of estimate around the random effects was wider than the fixed effects when heterogeneity was present. Therefore, results of nonheterogeneous (I<sup>2</sup><50%) and heterogeneous (I<sup>2</sup>>50%) were analyzed by fixed or random effects models for calculating the pooled effect, respectively (Cumpston et al., 2019). Subgroup analysis was performed based on different intervention measures, dosages and treatment time. The experimental group was divided into PEG-Loxe combined with conventional hypoglycemic drugs (PEG-Loxe + CHD) group and PEG-Loxe group, while the control group was divided into CHD group, CHD combined with placebo (CHD + Placebo) group and Placebo group. PEG-Loxe group was further divided into 0.1 mg and 0.2 mg subgroup. And treatment courses were divided into 12 and 24 weeks. In addition, sensitivity analysis was executed when statistically significant heterogeneity was observed (Patsopoulos et al., 2008; Ruppar, 2020).

# **3** Results

## 3.1 Study selection and characteristics

One hundred and fifty-nine relevant articles were retrieved, 59 articles were obtained after eliminating duplicate articles, 46 articles were screened after reading the titles and abstracts, and finally 18 articles (Chen et al., 2017; Yao et al., 2017; Gao et al., 2020; Li et al., 2021; Liang et al., 2021; Shuai et al., 2021; Wang and Zhao, 2021; Li K. et al., 2022; Li X. Y. et al., 2022; Tian et al., 2022; Yang, 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Song et al., 2023; Wan et al., 2023; Zhang S. et al., 2023; Zhang Y. et al., 2023; Zhong, 2023; Zhou et al., 2023) were included after full-text reading, involving 2,166 patients in total (experimental group: 1,260 patients; control group: 906 patients). The literature search process is shown in Figure 1. Table 1 presents the basic information of these articles. The risk of bias assessments of the studies are showed in Figure 2.



# 3.2 The results of meta-analyses

The results of overall and subgroup analysis are present in Tables 2, 3, respectively.

## 3.2.1 Meta-analysis of BG: HbA1c; FPG; 2-h PBG

HbA1c was reported in 16 studies (Chen et al., 2017; Yao et al., 2017; Gao et al., 2020; Li et al., 2021; Liang et al., 2021; Shuai et al., 2021; Wang and Zhao, 2021; Tian et al., 2022; Yang, 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Song et al., 2023; Wan et al., 2023; Zhang S. et al., 2023; Zhang Y. et al., 2023; Zhong, 2023; Zhou et al., 2023), whereas FPG and 2-h PBG were reported in 17 (Chen et al., 2017; Yao et al., 2017; Gao et al., 2020; Li et al., 2021; Liang et al., 2021; Shuai et al., 2021; Wang and Zhao, 2021; Li K. et al., 2022; Li X. Y. et al., 2022; Tian

Study or Subgroup	Experimental Mean SD Total	Control Mean SD	Total We	Mean Difference ght IV. Random, 95%	Mean Difference 6 Cl IV. Random, 95% Cl
4.1.1 PEG-Loxe 0.1mg Chen Xiaoping 2017	-0.44 1 41	0.1 0.54		0% -0.54 [-0.89, -0.	19]
Gao Fei 2020 Shuai Ying 2020	0.1 1 179 0.05 0.94 124	-0.1 0.85 -0.13 0.93	121 7	7% 0.20 [0.01, 0. 5% 0.18 [-0.05, 0.	41]
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect: Z	344 10; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 14.19, df = = 0.14 (P = 0.89)	2 (P = 0.0008)	338 22	2% -0.03 [-0.41, 0.3	36]
4.1.2 PEG-Loxe 0.2mg	- 0.14 (1 - 0.00)				
Chen Xiaoping 2017 Gao Fei 2020	-0.26 0.77 39 0.1 1 175	0.1 0.54		2% -0.36 [-0.66, -0. 7% 0.20 [0.01, 0.	
Li Kunyi 2022	-0.62 0.78 50	-0.23 0.75	50 7	2% -0.39 [-0.69, -0.	[eo
Liang Bin 2021 Shuai Ying 2020	-0.91 0.81 56 0.16 0.91 116	0.05 1.08		0% -0.96 [-1.31, -0. 5% 0.29 [0.06, 0.	521
Song Xixi 2023 Wan Hongxia 2023	-0.6 0.2 50 -1.55 0.71 35	-0.22 0.25 -0.36 0.68	50 8	0% -0.38 [-0.47, -0. 1% -1.19 [-1.52, -0.	29]
Zhang Yi 2023	-1.77 0.91 41	-0.75 0.93	41 6	7% -1.02 [-1.42, -0.	62]
Zhao Yongqiang 2022 Zhong Hua 2023	-1.33 1.29 56 -2.68 0.91 30	-0.45 1.26 -1.26 1	30 6	2% -0.88 [-1.36, -0. 2% -1.42 [-1.90, -0.	941 4
Zhou Yingni 2023 Subtotal (95% CI)	-2.82 0.65 40 688	-2.56 0.94	40 6	9% -0.26 [-0.61, 0. 8% -0.55 [-0.83, -0.3	09]
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect: Z	20; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 132.08, df	= 10 (P < 0.000		%	
Total (95% CI)	1032		1034 100		19]
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect: Z Test for suboroup differe	= 3.48 (P = 0.0005)	= 13 (P < 0.000	JOT); P = 93	79	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for subdroup differe	Experimental	= 1 (P = 0.03). Control	P = 78.3%	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup 5.1.1 PEG-Loxe 0.1mg	Mean SD Tota		Total We		
Chen Xiaoping 2017 Gao Fei 2020	-0.27 1.02 41 0.1 1.57 179			.3% 0.02 [-0.55, 0 .9% 0.10 [-0.21, 0	
Li Xy 2022 Shuai Ying 2020	-0.66 0.54 20	-0.32 0.54	20 6	.9% -0.34 [-0.67, -0	.01]
Subtotal (95% CI)	0.31 1.99 124 364		358 2	.1% 0.28 [-0.35, 0 .2% -0.03 [-0.31, 0.	91]
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect: Z	)3; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 4.89, df = 3 = 0.24 (P = 0.81)	(P = 0.18); I <sup>2</sup> =	= 39%		
5.1.2 PEG-Loxe 0.2mg					
Chen Xiaoping 2017 Gao Fei 2020	0.02 0.99 39 0.1 1.25 175	5 0 1.41	179 7	.3% 0.31 [-0.26, 0 .0% 0.10 [-0.18, 0	88]
Li Kunyi 2022 Liang Bin 2021	-0.58 0.62 50	-0.22 0.69	50 7	.0% -0.36 [-0.62, -0 .7% -0.54 [-0.96, -0	.10]
Shuai Ying 2020	0.06 0.91 116	6 0.03 2.97	121 6	.3% 0.03 [-0.52, 0	58]
Song Xixi 2023 Wan Honoxia 2023	-0.56 0.25 50 -1.41 0.19 35	-0.2 0.26	50 7 35 7	.2% -0.36 [-0.46, -0 .2% -0.47 [-0.56, -0	38)
Zhang Yi 2023 Zhao Yongqiang 2022	-2.68 1.04 41 -1.38 2.51 56	-0.82 1.07	41 6	.6% -1.86 [-2.32, -1 .7% -0.70 [-1.47, 0	40] +
Zhong Hua 2023 Zhou Yingni 2023	-2.16 0.38 30 -2.82 0.65 40	-1.44 0.54	30 7	.0% -0.72 [-0.96, -0 .8% -4.14 [-4.49, -3	48]
Subtotal (95% CI)	688		696 73	.8% -0.80 [-1.28, -0.	32]
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect: Z	32; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 492.58, df = 3.25 (P = 0.001)	= 10 (P < 0.000	101); I <sup>2</sup> = 98	8	
Total (95% CI)	1052	( m	1054 10	.0% -0.59 [-0.98, -0.	19]
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect: Z	56; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 518.08, df = 2.92 (P = 0.004)	= 14 (P < 0.000	101); l <sup>2</sup> = 97	6	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours (experimental) Favours (control)
Test for subarouo differe	nces: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 7.36. df =	= 1 (P = 0.007).	. I <sup>2</sup> = 86.4%		ravora (experimental) ravora (control)
Study or Subaroup	Experimental Mean SD Total	Control Mean SD	Total We	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
6.1.1 PEG-Loxe 0.1mg Chen Xiaoping 2017	-0.18 0.75 41	0.07 0.6		8% -0.25 [-0.55, 0.	
Gao Fei 2020	0.1 0.8 179	-0.1 0.7	179 7	9% 0.20 (0.04. 0.	361
Li Xy 2022 Shuai Ying 2020 Subtotal (95% CI)	-1.8 0.63 20 -0.05 0.74 124	-1.54 1.25 -0.09 0.73	121 7	2% -0.26 [-0.87, 0. 8% 0.04 [-0.14, 0.	221
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.	364		358 26 = 64%	.7% 0.00 [-0.21, 0.	21]
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.01 (P = 0.99)				
6.1.2 PEG-Loxe 0.2mg Chen Xiaoping 2017	-0.33 0.51 39	0.07 0.6	38 7	3% -0.40 [-0.65, -0.	151
Gao Fei 2020	0.2 0.8 175	-0.1 0.7	179 7	.9% 0.30 [0.14, 0.	46]
Li Kunyi 2022 Liang Bin 2021	-0.17 0.69 50 -0.8 0.59 56	-0.29 0.69 0.1 0.6	50 7 58 7	.1% 0.12 [-0.15, 0. 5% -0.90 [-1.12, -0.	39]
Shuai Ying 2020 Song Xixi 2023	-0.14 0.77 116 0.22 0.12 50	-0.09 0.73 0.1 0.12	121 7 50 8	7% -0.05 [-0.24, 0. 4% 0.12 [0.07, 0.	14]
Wan Hongxia 2023 Zhang Yi 2023	-0.58 0.69 35	-0.18 0.65	35 6	7% -0.40 [-0.71, -0. 4% -0.88 [-1.12, -0.	09]
Zhao Yongqiang 2022	-1.08 0.55 41 -0.6 1.4 56	-0.2 0.54 -0.25 1.16	54 5	2% -0.35 [-0.83, 0.	13]
Zhong Hua 2023 Subtotal (95% CI)	0.29 0.3 40 658	0.11 0.25	666 73	1% 0.18 [0.06, 0. .3% -0.21 [-0.44, 0.	30]
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect: Z	13; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 179.45, df = 1.79 (P = 0.07)	= 9 (P < 0.000	01); l <sup>2</sup> = 955		
Total (95% CI)	1022		1024 100	.0% -0.16 [-0.34, 0.	02]
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect: Z	10; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 187.90, df = 1.79 (P = 0.07)	= 13 (P < 0.000	001); I <sup>2</sup> = 90	%	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for overall effect: Z Test for suboroup different	nces: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.80. df	= 1 (P = 0.18).	<sup>2</sup> = 44.4%		Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Study or Subgroup	Experimental Mean SD Total	Control Mean SD	Total We	Mean Difference ght IV. Random, 95	
7.1.1 PEG-Loxe 0.1mg Chen Xiaoping 2017	-0.03 0.23 41	0 0.14	38 8	-0.03 [-0.11, 0	051
Gao Fei 2020 Li Xy 2022	0.1 0.3 179 0.2 0.3 20	0 0.3	179 9	2% 0.10 (0.04. 0.	161
Shuai Ying 2020 Subtotal (95% CI)	0.04 0.23 124		121 5	.3% 0.02 [-0.04, 0.	08)
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.	00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 11.35, df =	3 (P = 0.010);		.6% 0.06 [-0.02, 0.	
Test for overall effect: Z 7.1.2 PEG-Loxe 0.2mg	- 1.40 (F = 0.14)				
Chen Xiaoping 2017	-0.04 0.19 39	0 0.14		.9% -0.04 [-0.11, 0.	03]
Gao Fei 2020 Li Kunyi 2022	0 0.3 175 0.31 0.6 50	0.1 0.55	50 5	.2% 0.00 [-0.06, 0. .1% 0.21 [-0.02, 0.	44]
Liang Bin 2021	-0.02 0.37 56 0.02 0.25 116	-0.04 0.29 0.02 0.22	58 7	7% 0.02 [-0.10, 0. 2% 0.00 [-0.06, 0.	14]
	-0.19 0.19 50 1.04 0.31 41	-0.31 0.24	50 8	.7% 0.12 [0.04, 0. 4% 0.55 [0.42, 0.	201
Shuai Ying 2020 Song Xixi 2023	0.1 0.33 56	0.05 0.34	54 7	.6% 0.05 [-0.08, 0.	18]
Shuai Ying 2020 Song Xixi 2023 Zhang Yi 2023 Zhao Yongqiang 2022			40 2 631 66	.7% -0.78 [-1.16, -0. .4% 0.06 [-0.05, 0.	40]
Shuai Ying 2020 Song Xixi 2023 Zhang Yi 2023 Zhao Yongqiang 2022 Zhou Yingni 2023 Subtotal (95% CI)	-0.88 0.84 40 623		1); l² = 91%		
Shuai Ying 2020 Song Xixi 2023 Zhang Yi 2023 Zhao Yongqiang 2022 Zhou Yingni 2023	623 02; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 86.67, df =	8 (P < 0.0000			14]
Shuai Ying 2020 Song Xiti 2023 Zhang Yi 2023 Zhao Yongqiang 2022 Zhou Yingni 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect: Z Total (95% CI)	623 02; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 86.67, df = = 1.03 (P = 0.30) 987		989 100	.0% 0.07 [-0.01, 0.	
Shuai Ying 2020 Song Xia 2023 Zhang Yi 2023 Zhao Yongqiang 2022 Zhou Yingni 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect: Z Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect:	623 02; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 86.67, df = = 1.03 (P = 0.30) 987 01; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 98.10, df = = 1.77 (P = 0.08)	12 (P < 0.000	01); I <sup>2</sup> = 88 <sup>4</sup>	.0% 0.07 (-0.01, 0. %	-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2
Shuai Ying 2020 Song Xia 2023 Zhang Yi 2023 Zhao Yongqiang 2022 Zhou Yingni 2023 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.	623 02; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 86.67, df = = 1.03 (P = 0.30) 987 01; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 98.10, df = = 1.77 (P = 0.08)	12 (P < 0.000	01); I <sup>2</sup> = 88 <sup>4</sup>	.0% 0.07 [-0.01, 0. 6	-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Shuai Ying 2020 Song Xia 2023 Zhang Yi 2023 Zhao Yongqiang 2022 Zhou Yingni 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect: Z Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect:	623 02; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 86.67, df = = 1.03 (P = 0.30) 987 01; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 98.10, df = = 1.77 (P = 0.08)	12 (P < 0.000	01); I <sup>2</sup> = 88 <sup>4</sup>	.0% 0.07 [-0.01, 0. 6	-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Shuai Ying 2020 Song Xia 2023 Zhang Yi 2023 Zhao Yongqiang 2022 Zhou Yingni 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect: Z Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0. Test for overall effect:	623 02; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 86.67, df = = 1.03 (P = 0.30) 987 01; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 98.10, df = = 1.77 (P = 0.08)	12 (P < 0.000	01); I <sup>2</sup> = 88 <sup>4</sup>	.0% 0.07 [-0.01, 0. 5	-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Shuai Ying 2020 Song Xiai 2003 Zhao Yongviang 2022 Zhao Yongviang 2022 Zhou Yingmi 2023 Subtotal (195% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 0. Test for overall effect: Z Test for overall effect: Z Test for overall effect: Z Test for subcroup differe	623 02; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 86.67, df = 1.03 (P = 0.30) 987 01; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 98.10, df = 1.77 (P = 0.08) mces: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.00. df	= 12 (P < 0.000) = 1 (P = 0.99).	01); I <sup>2</sup> = 88 <sup>4</sup> I <sup>2</sup> = 0%	6	Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Shuai Trig 2020 Song Xia 2023 Zhang Yi 2023 Zhao Yongeing 2022 Zhao Yingeing 2022 Zhao Yingeing 2022 Zhao Yingeing 2023 Zhao Yingeing 2023 Zhao Yingeing 2024 Total (95% Cf) Heterogeneity: Tau" e. C Total (95% Cf) Heterogeneity: Tau" e. C Test for swall effect 2 Test for swall effect 2 Test for swall effect 2 GURE 4 heterogeneity faitherest policy	623 002; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 86.67, df = 1.03 (P = 0.30) 987 01; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 98.10, df = 1.77 (P = 0.08) mces: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.00, df	= 1 (P < 0.000) = 1 (P = 0.99). eta - an	01); P = 88 P = 0% alysis	of blood	Favours (control)
Shuil mg 2005 Song Xid 3023 Zhang Yi 2023 Zhao Yingeng 2022 Zhao Yingeng 2022 Zhao Yingeng 2022 Zhao Yingeng 2023 Zhao Yingeng 2025 The State State State Heterogenetic Tau' = 0 Test for overall effect 2 Test for overall effect 2 Test for source of the Heterogenetic Tau' = 0 Test for source of the SURE 4 the forest plot of	623 02: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 667, df = 1.03 (P = 0.30) 967 01: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 98.10, df = 1.77 (P = 0.00, df = 1.77 (P = 0.00, df Notes: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.00, df	eta-an nalysis	o1); P = 88' P = 0% alysis of T(	s of blood C. <b>(B)</b> The	Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

et al., 2022; Yang, 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Song et al., 2023; Wan et al., 2023; Zhang S. et al., 2023; Zhong, 2023; Zhou et al., 2023) and 16 studies (Chen et al., 2017; Yao et al., 2017; Gao et al., 2020; Li et al., 2021; Liang et al., 2021; Shuai et al., 2021; Wang and Zhao, 2021; Li K. et al., 2022; Li X. Y. et al., 2022; Tian et al., 2022; Yang, 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Song et al., 2023; Zhang Y. et al., 2023; Zhong, 2023; Zhou et al., 2023), respectively. Meta-analysis showed that PEG-Loxe significantly reduced the levels of HbA1c (MD = -0.91; 95% CI, -1.05 to -0.76; P<sub>Z</sub><0.00001; I<sup>2</sup> = 98%),



The forest plot of meta-analysis of SBP and DBP. (A) The forest plot of meta-analysis of SBP. (B) The forest plot of meta-analysis of DBP.

FPG (MD = -1.22; 95% CI, -1.42 to -1.02; P<sub>Z</sub><0.0001; I<sup>2</sup> = 97%) and 2-h PBG (MD = -1.84, 95% CI, -2.16 to -1.53; P<sub>Z</sub><0.00001; I<sup>2</sup> = 97%) in experimental group compared those in control group (Table 2). The forest plots of meta-analysis of HbA1c, FPG and 2-h PBG are showed in Figures 3A-C, respectively. Results obtained from subgroup analyses are shown in Table 3. In 0.2 mg subgroup, the decreased levels of HbA1c (MD = -1.01; 95% CI, -1.35 to -0.66;  $P_Z$ <0.00001;  $I^2$  = 99%), FPG (MD = -1.19; 95% CI, -1.37 to -1.00;  $P_Z < 0.00001$ ;  $I^2 = 87\%$ ) and 2-h PBG (MD = -1.91; 95%) CI, -2.42 to -1.41; P<sub>Z</sub><0.00001; I<sup>2</sup> = 97%) were more significant than the levels of HbA1c (MD = -0.83; 95% CI, -0.88 to -0.79; P<sub>Z</sub> = 0.0001;  $I^2 = 60\%$ ), FPG (MD = -1.28; 95% CI, -1.58 to -0.98;  $P_Z$ <0.00001;  $I^2$  = 96%) and 2-h PBG (MD = -1.33; 95%) CI, -1.56 to -1.10;  $P_Z < 0.0001$ ;  $I^2 = 80\%$ ) in 0.1 mg subgroup. Subgroup analysis indicated that the HbA1c and 2-h PBG lowering effects in PEG-Loxe + CHD group were better than that in CHD group and CHD + Placebo group ( $P_Z \le 0.05$ ). The glucose-lowering effect in PEG-Loxe group was better than that in Placebo group ( $P_Z \le 0.00001$ ). Other results were not of statistical difference. In addition, subgroup analysis also showed that the high heterogeneity of HbA1c was caused by intervention measures and dosages, and heterogeneity of FPG was caused by intervention measures and treatment time, and heterogeneity of 2-h PBG was caused by intervention measures and treatment time.

## 3.2.2 Meta-analysis of BLP: TC; TG; LDL-C; HDL-C

TC, TG, LDL-C and HDL-C were reported in 11 (Chen et al., 2017; Gao et al., 2020; Liang et al., 2021; Shuai et al., 2021; Li K. et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Song et al., 2023; Wan et al., 2023; Zhang S. et al., 2023; Zhong, 2023; Zhou et al., 2023), 12, (Chen et al., 2017; Gao et al., 2020; Liang et al., 2021; Shuai et al., 2021; Li K. et al., 2022; Li X. Y. et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Song et al., 2023; Wan et al., 2023; Zhong Y. et al., 2020; Liang et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2021; Li K. et al., 2021; Li K. et al., 2022; Li X. Y. et al., 2020; Liang et al., 2021; Shuai et al., 2021; Li K. et al., 2022; Li X. Y. et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Song et al., 2023; Wan et al., 2023; Zhong S. et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2023), and 10 (Chen et al., 2017; Gao et al., 2020; Liang et al., 2021; Shuai et al., 2021; Li K. et al., 2022; Li X. Y. et al., 2022; Li X. Y. et al., 2022; Li X. Y. et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2024; Zhou et a



et al., 2023; Zhang Y. et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2023) studies, respectively. In Table 2, the overall analysis of BLP showed that changes of TC (MD = -0.44; 95% CI, -0.68 to 0.19; P<sub>Z</sub> = 0.0005; I<sup>2</sup> = 93%), TG (MD = -0.59; 95% CI, -0.98 to 0.19; P<sub>Z</sub> = 0.004; I<sup>2</sup> = 97%), LDL-C (MD = -0.16; 95% CI, -0.34 to 0.02;  $P_Z = 0.07$ ;  $I^2 = 93\%$ ), and HDL-C (MD = 0.07; 95% CI, -0.01 to 0.14;  $P_Z = 0.08$ ;  $I^2 = 88\%$ ) in experimental group were not statistically significant compared with control group. The forest plot of meta-analysis of TC, TG, LDL-C, and HDL-C are shown in Figures 4A-D, respectively. Since the control group was treated with placebo or other CHD, the difference in BLP between the experimental and control groups might have been less significant than what would have been observed in control group with only placebo applied. In Table 3, Intervention measure subgroup analysis showed that the effect of reducing TC and TG of PEG-Loxe + CHD group were better than those in CHD group  $(P_Z \leq 0.00001)$ , and the improvement effect of PEG Loxe on TC did not show any advantage compared with Placebo group ( $P_Z = 0.005$ ). In 0.2 mg subgroup, the decreased levels of TC and TG were significant. Treatment time subgroup showed that the changes in TC at 12 weeks, LDL-C at 12 and 24 weeks were statistically significant. And other results were not of statistical difference. In addition, subgroup analysis also showed that the high heterogeneities of TC, LDL-C, and HDL-C were caused by the intervention measures, and the high heterogeneity of TG was caused by intervention measures and dosages.

## 3.2.3 Meta-analysis of BP: SBP and DBP

SBP and DBP were reported in 4 studies (Chen et al., 2017; Gao et al., 2020; Shuai et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2023). In Table 2, the overall analysis of BP showed that changes of SBP (MD = 0.17; 95% CI, -0.90 to 1.24;  $P_Z = 0.75$ ;  $I^2 = 93\%$ ) and DBP (MD = -0.39; 95% CI, -1.20 to 0.42;  $P_Z = 0.34$ ;  $I^2 = 95\%$ ) in experimental group were not statistically significant compared with control group. The forest plot of meta-analysis of SBPand DBP are shown in Figures 5A, B,

respectively. In Table 3, intervention measure subgroup analysis showed that the effect of reducing DBP of PEG-Loxe + CHD group were better than those in CHD + Placebo group ( $P_z < 0.00001$ ), and the improvement effect of PEG Loxe on DBP did not show any advantage compared with Placebo group ( $P_Z = 0.02$ ). And other groups were not statistically different. In addition, subgroup analysis also showed that the high heterogeneities of SBP and DBP were caused by the intervention measures.

## 3.2.4 Meta-analysis of BMI and BW

The changes in BMI and BW were reported by 10 (Gao et al., 2020; Li et al., 2021; Liang et al., 2021; Wang and Zhao, 2021; Tian et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Song et al., 2023; Wan et al., 2023; Zhang S. et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2023) and 5 (Gao et al., 2020; Shuai et al., 2021; Tian et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Song et al., 2023) studies, respectively. Significant reductions in BMI (MD = -1.68; 95% CI, -2.20 to -1.17;  $P_Z$  < 0.00001;  $I^2$  = 82%) and BW (MD = -2.71; 95% CI, -4.97 to -0.45;  $P_Z = 0.02$ ;  $I^2 = 96\%$ ) are shown in Table 2. The forest plot of meta-analysis of BMI and BW are shown in Figures 6A, B, respectively. In Table 3, subgroup analyses on intervention measures showed that the effect of reducing BMI and BW in PEG-Loxe + CHD group were better than that in CHD group (P<sub>Z</sub> < 0.0001), 0.2 mg PEG-Loxe caused a statistically significant change in BMI ( $P_Z < 0.00001$ ) and BW ( $P_Z = 0.004$ ) in dosages subgroup. In treatment time subgroup, PEG-Loxe caused statistically significant changes in BMI and BW (P<sub>Z</sub> < 0.00001) at 12 weeks, while other results were not of statistical difference. In addition, subgroup analysis also showed that the high heterogeneity of BMI was caused by intervention measures, and the high heterogeneity of BW was intervention measures, dosage and treatment time.

# 4 Sensitivity analysis

Sensitivity analysis was performed on the combined results of the indicators. The results of the meta-analysis were considered robust as there was no significant change in the combined effect size after removing a trial at a time.

# 5 Discussion

This is the first study to systematically assess the effects of PEG-Loxe on BG, BLP, BP, BMI, and BW. The overall results showed that PEG-Loxe was significantly effective in reducing HbA1c, FPG, 2-h PBG, BMI, and BW in patients with T2DM, but was not effective for improving TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C, SBP, and DBP. This suggested that PEG-Loxe might have a significant effect on lowering BG and reducing BW. We divided participants into subgroups based on different intervention measures, dosages, and treatment time. Then a comprehensive subgroup analysis was performed according to different variables to explain or explore the sources of heterogeneity. The above variables were identified as the source of high heterogeneity in the research results through subgroup analysis. In addition, the results of subgroup analysis showed that PEG-Loxe combined with CHD showed better effects in reducing HbA1c, FPG, 2-h PBG, TC, TG, BMI, and BW compared with CHD. And PEG- Loxe showed better hypoglycemic effects than placebo. In each subgroup, the heterogeneity of the results was greatly reduced.

Chronic hyperglycemia was the most typical pathologic manifestation of T2DM. Hyperglycemia increased the urine output of patients, which could lead to electrolyte disorders, hypertonic diuresis, and dehydration of the body (Fayfman et al., 2017; Sun et al., 2020). Also, hyperglycemia could cause diabetic nephropathy in patients with T2DM. The early symptoms of diabetic nephropathy are proteinuria and edema, while the late stage is renal failure that was the main cause of death in T2DM (Samsu, 2021). Hyperglycemia state could lead to excessive breakdown of fat and protein, and further secondary infections, such as boils of skin, wound infection, lung infection, and urinary tract infection (Nagendra et al., 2000). Long term of hyperglycemia has a toxic effect on the pancreatic islet beta-cells, and would accelerate the pancreatic islet beta-cells apoptosis and pancreatic islet failure, leading to gradual deterioration of the condition (Eizirik et al., 2020). In addition, long term hyperglycemia in diabetic patients would damage large vessels and micro-vessels, and sensory nerves and autonomic nerves, which would cause the occurrence and development of chronic complications such as cardiovascular and cerebrovascular diabetes nephropathy, retinopathy, peripheral diseases. neuropathy, diabetes foot gangrene (Jia et al., 2018; Eckel et al., 2021). Overweight and obesity are risk factors for cardiovascular disease, and it can affect cardiovascular health by influencing metabolic syndromes such as insulin resistance and dyslipidemia (Kachur et al., 2017; Che et al., 2018). Therefore, it could be concluded that control of BG and BW is important in the treatment of T2DM (Davies et al., 2022). The weight loss effect of PEG-Loxe may inhibit the development of T2DM patients to T2DM complicated with cardiovascular disease.

PEG-Loxe reduces HbA1c in a similar manner to other GLP-1RAs. More importantly, it is the only GLP-1RA that increases the therapeutic dosage without increasing the risk of hypoglycemia (Jiang et al., 2021). Therefore, PEG-Loxe has multiple therapeutic advantages. In terms of mechanism of action, PEG-Loxe improves beta-cells function and plays a hypoglycemic role by stimulating insulin secretion, inhibiting glucagon secretion, improving insulin resistance, and inhibiting hepatic glucose output by activating insulin phosphatidyl inositol 3-kinase/protein kinase B (PI3K/AKT) pathway (Rameshrad et al., 2020; Ard et al., 2021; Zeng et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2021). Other studies have found that PEG-Loxe could regulate the expression of chemerin and omentin through its hypoglycemic effect (Li X. Y. et al., 2022). In addition, PEG-Loxe can delay gastric emptying and suppress patients' appetite, thereby reducing their food intake and ultimately reducing their weight (Drucker et al., 2017). And studies have reported that PEG-Loxe could regulating gut microbiota to protect vascular endothelial cell function in T2DM patients (Chen et al., 2022). Since there are few studies on the mechanism of PEG-Loxe, further studies are needed to prove its specific pharmacological mechanism.

There exist a couple of limitations in the research. Firstly, metaanalysis results showed some heterogeneity. We found that intervention measures, dosages and course of treatment were the causes of high heterogeneity by subgroup analysis. Secondly,

since the control group was treated with a placebo or other hypoglycemic agents, the difference of meta-analysis in BLP between the experimental and control groups might have been less significant than what would have been observed in the control group with only placebo applied. And in some studies, BLP were not the primary endpoint, so enrolled patients may not have dyslipidemia, which may be why no difference in BLP was observed. Thirdly, since PEG-Loxe is a novel drug, metaanalysis was limited by sample sizes and a short study period, and its long-term efficacy cannot be evaluated temporarily, longer duration of observation is need in further. Besides, PEG-Loxe is independently developed in China, and correspondingly 11 of the 18 studies included were published in Chinese journals, and the conclusions of the meta-analysis may be more applicable for East Asian. And SBP and DBP indicators were reported in 4 studies only, the results of its meta-analysis need to be viewed with caution. In the future, more high-quality, large-sample, multicenter RCTs of PEG-Loxe for T2DM should be performed.

In summary, PEG-Loxe is a promising drug in controlling BG and BW for patients with T2DM, and is worthy of promoting in clinical practice. In the future, more high-quality, large-sample, multicenter RCTs should be conducted to explore its impact on blood lipids further and provide a more rational basis and reference for treating T2DM clinically.

# 6 Conclusion

PEG-Loxe has better hypoglycemic effects compared with placebo in patients with T2DM, but could not significantly improved TC, TG, LDL-C, HDL-C, SBP, DBP and BW. And the combination of CHD and PEG-Loxe could more effectively improve the levels of HbA1c, FPG, 2-h PBG, TC, TG, BMI, and BW compared with CHD in T2DM patients.

# Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary Material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding authors.

# References

Ahmad, E., Lim, S., Lamptey, R., Webb, D. R., and Davies, M. J. (2022). Type 2 diabetes. *Lancet* 400 (10365), 1803–1820. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(22)01655-5

Ard, J., Fitch, A., Fruh, S., and Herman, L. (2021). Weight loss and maintenance related to the mechanism of action of glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonists. *Adv. Ther.* 38 (6), 2821–2839. doi:10.1007/s12325-021-01710-0

Chatterjee, S., Khunti, K., and Davies, M. J. (2017). Type 2 diabetes. Lancet 389 (10085), 2239-2251. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(17)30058-2

Che, L., Xu, L., Huang, Y., and Yu, C. (2018). Clinical utility of the revised cardiac risk index in older Chinese patients with known coronary artery disease. *Clin. Interv. Aging* 13, 35–41. doi:10.2147/cia.s144832

Chen, F., He, L., Li, J., Yang, S., Zhang, B., Zhu, D., et al. (2022). Polyethylene glycol loxenatide injection (GLP-1) protects vascular endothelial cell function in middle-aged and elderly patients with type 2 diabetes by regulating gut microbiota. *Front. Mol. Biosci.* 9, 879294. doi:10.3389/fmolb.2022.879294

Chen, X., Lv, X., Yang, G., Lu, D., Piao, C., Zhang, X., et al. (2017). Polyethylene glycol loxenatide injections added to metformin effectively improve glycemic control and

# Author contributions

SY and ZZ contributed to study conception and design. YL and WM contributed to analysis of data, literature review and preparation of the manuscript. SY, ZZ, YL, HF, ZZ, YY, YW, and WL contributed to revise the manuscript critically. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

# Funding

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (no. 82000788), Key Technology Research and Development Program of Shandong (no. 2018GSF118176), Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation of Guangdong Province (no. 2019A1515110023), Postdoctoral Research Foundation of China (no. 2021M702040), and Natural Science Foundation of Shandong Province (no. ZR2016HQ26).

# Conflict of interest

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

# Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

# Supplementary material

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fphar.2024.1235639/ full#supplementary-material

exhibit favorable safety in type 2 diabetic patients. J. Diabetes 9 (2), 158–167. doi:10. 1111/1753-0407.12397

Cumpston, M., Li, T., Page, M. J., Chandler, J., Welch, V. A., Higgins, J. P., et al. (2019). Updated guidance for trusted systematic reviews: a new edition of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* 10, Ed000142. doi:10.1002/14651858.ed000142

Davies, M. J., Aroda, V. R., Collins, B. S., Gabbay, R. A., Green, J., Maruthur, N. M., et al. (2022). Management of hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes, 2022. A consensus report by the American diabetes association (ada) and the European association for the study of diabetes (easd). *Diabetes Care* 45 (11), 2753–2786. doi:10.2337/dci22-0034

Drucker, D. J. (2018). Mechanisms of action and therapeutic application of glucagonlike peptide-1. *Cell Metab.* 27 (4), 740–756. doi:10.1016/j.cmet.2018.03.001

Drucker, D. J., Habener, J. F., and Holst, J. J. (2017). Discovery, characterization, and clinical development of the glucagon-like peptides. *J. Clin. Invest* 127 (12), 4217–4227. doi:10.1172/jci97233

Drucker, D. J., and Nauck, M. A. (2006). The incretin system: glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists and dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitors in type 2 diabetes. *Lancet* 368 (9548), 1696–1705. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(06)69705-5

Eckel, R. H., Bornfeldt, K. E., and Goldberg, I. J. (2021). Cardiovascular disease in diabetes, beyond glucose. *Cell Metab.* 33 (8), 1519–1545. doi:10.1016/j.cmet.2021.07.001

Eizirik, D. L., Pasquali, L., and Cnop, M. (2020). Pancreatic  $\beta$ -cells in type 1 and type 2 diabetes mellitus: different pathways to failure. *Nat. Rev. Endocrinol.* 16 (7), 349–362. doi:10.1038/s41574-020-0355-7

Fayfman, M., Pasquel, F. J., and Umpierrez, G. E. (2017). Management of hyperglycemic crises: diabetic ketoacidosis and hyperglycemic hyperosmolar state. *Med. Clin. North Am.* 101 (3), 587–606. doi:10.1016/j.mcna.2016.12.011

Gao, F., Lv, X., Mo, Z., Ma, J., Zhang, Q., Yang, G., et al. (2020). Efficacy and safety of polyethylene glycol loxenatide as add-on to metformin in patients with type 2 diabetes: a multicentre, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3b trial. *Diabetes Obes. Metab.* 22 (12), 2375–2383. doi:10.1111/dom.14163

Garber, A. J., Handelsman, Y., Grunberger, G., Einhorn, D., Abrahamson, M. J., Barzilay, J. I., et al. (2020). Consensus statement by the american association of clinical endocrinologists and american college of endocrinology on the comprehensive type 2 diabetes management algorithm - 2020 executive summary. *Endocr. Pract.* 26 (1), 107–139. doi:10.4158/cs-2019-0472

Higgins, J. P., Altman, D. G., Gøtzsche, P. C., Jüni, P., Moher, D., Oxman, A. D., et al. (2011). The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *Bmj* 343, d5928. doi:10.1136/bmj.d5928

Jia, G., Whaley-Connell, A., and Sowers, J. R. (2018). Diabetic cardiomyopathy: a hyperglycaemia- and insulin-resistance-induced heart disease. *Diabetologia* 61 (1), 21–28. doi:10.1007/s00125-017-4390-4

Jiang, Y., Liu, J., Chen, X., Yang, W., Jia, W., and Wu, J. (2021). Efficacy and safety of glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonists for the treatment of type 2 diabetes mellitus: a network meta-analysis. *Adv. Ther.* 38 (3), 1470–1482. doi:10.1007/s12325-021-01637-6

Kachur, S., Lavie, C. J., de Schutter, A., Milani, R. V., and Ventura, H. O. (2017). Obesity and cardiovascular diseases. *Minerva Med.* 108 (3), 212–228. doi:10.23736/s0026-4806.17.05022-4

Khan, R. M. M., Chua, Z. J. Y., Tan, J. C., Yang, Y., Liao, Z., and Zhao, Y. (2019). From pre-diabetes to diabetes: diagnosis, treatments and translational research. *Med. Kaunas.* 55 (9), 546. doi:10.3390/medicina55090546

Li, K., Li, Z., and Li, G. (2022). Effects of loxenatide combined with metformin on metabolic markers in obese patients with type 2 diabetes [in Chinese]. J. Med. Theory Pract. 35 (05), 772–774. doi:10.19381/j.issn.1001-7585.2022.05.017

Li, L., Wang, F., Li, M., and Jiang, S. (2021). A randomized controlled trial Polyethylene Glycol Loxenatide Injection for patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus [in Chinese]. *China Med. Her.* 18 (18), 68–71.

Li, X. Y., Li, C. P., Zhang, C. Y., Zhang, S., Chen, J. X., Zhu, D., et al. (2022). Effect of polyethylene Glycol Loxenatide (long-acting GLP-1RA) on lipid, glucose levels and weight in type 2 diabetes mellitus patients with obesity. *Eur. Rev. Med. Pharmacol. Sci.* 26 (21), 7996–8003. doi:10.26355/eurrev\_202211\_30153

Liang, B., Li, L., and Wei, D. (2021). Clinical efficacy of polyethylene glycol losenatide combined with metformin in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus [in Chinese]. *J. North Sichuan Med. Coll.* 36 (02), 246–249.

Nagendra, L., Boro, H., and Mannar, V. (2000). in *Bacterial infections in diabetes-Endotext*. Editors K. R. Feingold, B. Anawalt, M. R. Blackman, A. Boyce, G. Chrousos, E. Corpas, et al. (South Dartmouth (MA): MDText.com, Inc).

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Bmj* 372, n71. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71

Patsopoulos, N. A., Evangelou, E., and Ioannidis, J. P. (2008). Sensitivity of betweenstudy heterogeneity in meta-analysis: proposed metrics and empirical evaluation. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* 37 (5), 1148–1157. doi:10.1093/ije/dyn065

Rameshrad, M., Razavi, B. M., Lalau, J. D., De Broe, M. E., and Hosseinzadeh, H. (2020). An overview of glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists for the treatment of metabolic syndrome: a drug repositioning. *Iran. J. Basic Med. Sci.* 23 (5), 556–568. doi:10.22038/ijbms.2020.41638.9832

Ruppar, T. (2020). Meta-analysis: how to quantify and explain heterogeneity? *Eur. J. Cardiovasc Nurs.* 19 (7), 646–652. doi:10.1177/1474515120944014

Saeedi, P., Petersohn, I., Salpea, P., Malanda, B., Karuranga, S., Unwin, N., et al. (2019). Global and regional diabetes prevalence estimates for 2019 and projections for 2030 and 2045: results from the international diabetes federation diabetes atlas, 9<sup>th</sup> edition. *Diabetes Res. Clin. Pract.* 157, 107843. doi:10.1016/j.diabres.2019.107843

Samsu, N. (2021). Diabetic nephropathy: challenges in pathogenesis, diagnosis, and treatment. *Biomed. Res. Int.* 2021, 1497449. doi:10.1155/2021/1497449

Shuai, Y., Yang, G., Zhang, Q., Li, W., Luo, Y., Ma, J., et al. (2021). Efficacy and safety of polyethylene glycol loxenatide monotherapy in type 2 diabetes patients: a

multicentre, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase 3a clinical trial. Diabetes Obes. Metab. 23 (1), 116–124. doi:10.1111/dom.14198

Song, X., Yao, M., Li, Z., Guo, S., Yin, F., and Li, R. (2023). Clinical efficacy of polyethylene glycol loxenatide in the treatment of obese or overweight patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *J. Coll. Physicians Surgeons–Pakistan JCPSP* 33 (12), 1390–1394. doi:10.29271/jcpsp.2023.12.1390

Sun, H., Saeedi, P., Karuranga, S., Pinkepank, M., Ogurtsova, K., Duncan, B. B., et al. (2022). IDF Diabetes Atlas: global, regional and country-level diabetes prevalence estimates for 2021 and projections for 2045. *Diabetes Res. Clin. Pract.* 183, 109119. doi:10.1016/j.diabres.2021.109119

Sun, Y., Roumelioti, M. E., Ganta, K., Glew, R. H., Gibb, J., Vigil, D., et al. (2020). Dialysis-associated hyperglycemia: manifestations and treatment. *Int. Urol. Nephrol.* 52 (3), 505–517. doi:10.1007/s11255-019-02373-1

Tian, X., Liu, L., and Liu, X. (2022). Efficacy and safety of polyethylene glycol loxenatide injection combined with metformin in obese patients with newly diagnosed type 2 diabetes [in Chinese]. *Chin. Remedies Clin.* 22 (03), 197–200.

Wan, H. X., Cao, H., Chen, W., Shen, D. Q., Wang, L. L., Su, X. H., et al. (2023). Effects of early combination of glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonist on blood glucose and pancreatic  $\beta$ -cell function in obese patients with newly diagnosed type 2 diabetes mellitus [in Chinese]. *Diabetes New World* 26 (11), 24–27+41. doi:10.16658/j.cnki.1672-4062.2023.11.024

Wang, X., and Zhao, Y. (2021). Observation on the clinical efficacy of polyethylene glycol loxenatide injection and insulin glargine in the treatment of type 2 diabetes mellitus [in Chinese]. *Chin. J. Mod. Drug Appl.* 15 (19), 156–159. doi:10.14164/j.cnki. cn11-5581/r.2021.19.059

Williams, R., Karuranga, S., Malanda, B., Saeedi, P., Basit, A., Besançon, S., et al. (2020). Global and regional estimates and projections of diabetes-related health expenditure: results from the International Diabetes Federation Diabetes Atlas, 9th edition. *Diabetes Res. Clin. Pract.* 162, 108072. doi:10.1016/j.diabres.2020. 108072

Yang, G. R., Zhao, X. L., Jin, F., Shi, L. H., and Yang, J. K. (2015). Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of a polyethylene glycol (PEG)-conjugated GLP-receptor agonist once weekly in Chinese patients with type 2 diabetes. *J. Clin. Pharmacol.* 55 (2), 152–158. doi:10.1002/jcph.386

Yang, J. H. (2022). Analysis of the effect of polyethylene glycol loxenatide combined with long-acting insulin on blood glucose control in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus [in Chinese]. *Diabetes New World* 25 (7), 71–74. doi:10.16658/j.cnki.1672-4062.2022.07.071

Yao, L., Wu, Y., Tian, G., Wang, X., and Zhang, F. (2017). Curative effect of polyethylene glycol loxenatide injection combined with metformin in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus [in Chinese]. *Chin. J. Evidence-Bases Cardiovasc. Med.* 9 (05), 577–579.

Zeng, Q., Li, N., Pan, X. F., Chen, L., and Pan, A. (2021). Clinical management and treatment of obesity in China. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol.* 9 (6), 393–405. doi:10.1016/ s2213-8587(21)00047-4

Zhang, S., Zhang, C., Chen, J., Deng, F., Wu, Z., Zhu, D., et al. (2023). Efficacy of polyethylene glycol loxenatide versus insulin glargine on glycemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes: a randomized, open-label, parallel-group trial. *Front. Pharmacol.* 14, 1171399. doi:10.3389/fphar.2023.1171399

Zhang, Y., Li, Y., Zhao, J., Wang, C., Deng, B., Zhang, Q., et al. (2021). Protective effects and mechanisms of polyethylene glycol loxenatide against hyperglycemia and liver injury in db/db diabetic mice. *Front. Pharmacol.* 12, 781856. doi:10.3389/fphar. 2021.781856

Zhang, Y., Liu, Y. N., and Cheng, Y. J. (2023). Effect of polyethylene glycol losenatide injection combined with metformin on primary diagnosis of obese type 2 diabetes mellitus [in Chinese]. *Diabetes New World* 26 (09), 95–98. doi:10.16658/j.cnki.1672-4062.2023.09.095

Zhao, Y., Qin, X., and Tian, D. (2022). Effect of polyethylene glycol losenatide injection combined with metformin in the treatment of obese type 2 diabetes mellitus and its effect on serum antioxidant factors and inflammatory factors [in Chinese]. *Chin. J. Drug Abuse Prev. Treat.* 28 (01), 77–81. doi:10.15900/j.cnki.zylf1995.2022. 01.017

Zheng, Y., Ley, S. H., and Hu, F. B. (2018). Global aetiology and epidemiology of type 2 diabetes mellitus and its complications. *Nat. Rev. Endocrinol.* 14 (2), 88–98. doi:10. 1038/nrendo.2017.151

Zhong, H. (2023). Effects of Polyethylene glycol loxenatide combined with insulin glargine in treatment of patients with type 2 diabetes [in Chinese]. *Med. J. Chin. People's Health* 35 (23), 64–66+70.

Zhou, Y. N., Shi, M., Lai, J. B., Li, X. M., and Liu, X. Y. (2023). Efficacy of PEX168 combined with metformin in newly diagnosed obese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus [in Chinese]. *J. Pract. Med.* 39 (2), 170–174. doi:10.3969/j.issn. 1006-5725.2023.02.008