Table S2. Results of Traditional Meta-Analysis Comparing Antidiabetic Therapies Effect on HbA1c

Comparison	No. of Trials	Change in HbA1c, % WMD (95%CI)
ACA vs. PLC	2	-0.78 (-1.06, -0.50)
ALO vs. PLC	2	-0.60 (-0.76, -0.43)
ALO/PIO vs. PLC	1	-1.29 (-1.49, -1.09)
CANA vs. PLC	2	-0.67 (-0.79, -0.55)
DAPA vs. PLC	2	-0.43 (-0.55, -0.31)
EMPA vs. PLC	2	-0.64 (-0.75, -0.52)
EXEN vs. PLC	2	-0.79 (-0.86, -0.72)
GLIM vs. PLC	2	-0.95 (-1.23, -0.67)
GLIP vs. PLC	1	-0.47 (-0.74, -0.20)
LINA vs. PLC	2	-0.68 (-0.81, -0.54)
LIRA vs. PLC	1	-1.00 (-1.26, -0.75)
LIX vs. PLC	1	-0.45 (-0.69, -0.22)
MIG vs. PLC	1	-0.43 (-0.70, -0.16)
NAT vs. PLC	1	-0.44 (-0.60, -0.28)
PIO vs. PLC	1	-0.76 (-0.98, -0.54)
REP vs. PLC	1	-1.08 (-1.73, -0.43)
ROSI vs. PLC	3	-0.91 (-1.38, -0.44)[a]
SAXA vs. PLC	3	-0.50 (-0.74, -0.26)[a]
SITA vs. PLC	8	-0.67 (-0.73, -0.60)
VILDA vs. PLC	5	-0.63 (-0.83, -0.43)[a]
ACA vs. GLIB	1	0.50 (-0.13, 1.13)
ALO vs. ALO/PIO	1	0.65 (0.49, 0.81)
ALO vs. PIO	1	0.12 (-0.06, 0.30)
CANA vs. GLIM	1	-0.06 (-0.16, 0.04)
CANA vs. SITA	2	-0.05 (-0.14, 0.04)
COL vs. ROSI	1	0.30 (-0.05, 0.65)
COL vs. SITA	1	0.10 (-0.25, 0.45)
DAPA vs. GLIP	1	0.00 (-0.12, 0.12)
EMPA vs. GLIM	1	-0.07 (-0.15, 0.01)
EMPA vs. LINA	1	0.06 (-0.08, 0.20)
EMPA vs. SITA	1	-0.11 (-0.33, 0.11)
EMPA/LINA vs. EMPA	1	-0.49 (-0.61, -0.37)
EMPA/LINA vs. LINA	1	-0.43 (-0.57, -0.29)
EXEN vs. GLIM	1	-0.18 (-0.30, -0.06)
LINA vs. GLIM	1	0.21 (0.13, 0.29)
LIRA vs. GLIM	1	0.10 (-0.10, 0.30)
LIRA vs. SITA	2	-0.28 (-0.64, 0.08)
LIX vs. EXEN	1	0.17 (0.03, 0.31)
NAT vs. GLIC	1	0.16 (-0.06, 0.38)
PIO vs. ALO/PIO	1	0.53 (0.39, 0.67)
PIO vs. GLIC	1	0.02 (-0.16, 0.20)
PIO vs. GLIM	1	0.12 (-0.08, 0.32)
ROSI vs. GLIC	2	-0.01 (-0.27, 0.24)
SAX vs. GLIP	1	0.08 (-0.06, 0.18)
SAX vs. SITA	1	0.10 (-0.02, 0.22)
SITA vs. GLARG	1	0.59 (0.41, 0.77)
SITA vs. GLIM	1	0.07 (-0.05, 0.19)
SITA vs. GLIP	1	0.00 (-0.12, 0.12)
SITA vs. PIO	1	0.09 (-0.07, 0.25)
SITA vs. ROSI	2	0.09 (-0.08, 0.26)
SITA vs. VILDA	1	-0.20 (-0.53, 0.13)
VILDA vs. GLIC	1	0.04 (-0.12, 0.20)
VILDA vs. GLIM	2	0.08 (0.03, 0.14)