

# **Association between physical exercise interventions and functional capacity in individuals with type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of controlled trials**

Lucinéia Orsolin Pfeifer<sup>1</sup>, Angélica Trevisan De Nardi<sup>1</sup>, Larissa Xavier Neves da Silva<sup>1</sup>, Cíntia Ehlers Botton<sup>2</sup>, Daniela Meirelles do Nascimento<sup>1</sup>, Juliana Lopes Teodoro<sup>3</sup>, Beatriz D. Schaan<sup>2,4</sup>, Daniel Umpierre<sup>2,4</sup>

1 Exercise Pathophysiology Research Laboratory, Graduate Program in Cardiology and Cardiovascular Sciences, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil.

2 Exercise Pathophysiology Research Laboratory, Hospital de Clínicas de Porto Alegre, Clinical Research Center, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil.

3 Exercise Research Laboratory, Graduate Program in Human Movement Science, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil.

4 Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil.

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** The prevalence of type 2 diabetes mellitus increases with age and people with type 2 diabetes are more affected by reductions in functional performance. Although exercise interventions are recommended for people with diabetes, it is relevant to assess the effects of different training modes on the available functional outcomes.

**Objective:** To summarize the effects of distinct modes of exercise training in comparison to non-exercise on the functional capacity of adults with type 2 diabetes.

**Methods:** A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized (RCT) and non-randomized (NRS) controlled trials was conducted. Seven databases were searched from inception to January 2021. Eligible studies should last 8 weeks or longer, comparing structured exercise training and non-exercise control for one out of six pre-specified functional capacity outcomes (Timed Up and Go test, chair stands, walking performance, upper limb muscle strength, lower limb muscle strength, physical fitness parameter), in patients with type 2 diabetes, aged  $\geq 45$  years or older. The risk of biases was assessed with the Checklist Downs & Black. Pooled mean differences were calculated using a random-effects model, followed by sensitivity and meta-regression analyses.

**Results:** Of 17165 references retrieved, 29 trials (1557 patients) were included. Among these, 13 studies used aerobic training, 6 studies used combined training, 4 studies used resistance training, 3 studies had multiple intervention arms and 3 studies used other types of training. Exercise training was associated with an increase in functional capacity outcomes, as reflected by changes in 6-minute-walk test (51.6 meters; 95% CI 7.6% to 95.6%;  $I^2$  92%), one-repetition maximum leg-press (18.0 kg; 95% CI 4.0% to 31.9%;  $I^2$  0%), and peak oxygen consumption (2.41 mL/kg·min; 95% CI 1.89% to 2.92%;  $I^2$  100%) compared with control groups. In sensitivity and subgroup analyses using  $VO_{2max}$  as outcome and stratified by for the type of study (RCT or NRS), duration of diabetes diagnosis, and sex, we observed overlapping confidence intervals. Meta-regression showed no association between HbA1C levels and  $VO_{2max}$  ( $p = 0.34$ ;  $I^2$  99.6%;  $R^2 = 2.6\%$ ).

**Conclusion:** Structured exercise training based on aerobic training, resistance training, combination of both, or composed by other types of training (i.e. Pilates, Tai Chi and Whole-body vibration) is associated with an improvement in functional capacity in patients with type 2 diabetes, except for the upper limb muscle strength. However, we could not identify potential effect predictors associated with directional summary estimates.

**Registration:** This systematic review was registered in the PROSPERO international prospective register of systematic reviews (CRD42020162467); date of registration: 12/15/2019. The review protocol is hosted at the Open Science Framework (OSF) (Preprint DOI: 10.31219/osf.io/kpg2m).

**Funding:** This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior – Brasil (CAPES) – Finance Code 001; National Institute of Science and Technology for Health Technology Assessment (IATS) – FAPERGS/Brasil; National Council on Technology and Scientific Development (CNPq).

## INTRODUCTION

Diabetes mellitus is an increasingly prevalent chronic-degenerative disease, generating a burden on public health. In 2019, the International Diabetes Federation estimated that 1 out of 11 adults in the world population aged 20 to 79 lived with diabetes, equivalent to 463 million people [1]. Notably, type 2 diabetes mellitus is a common disease in older adults [1], who also experience reductions in neuromuscular function, muscle mass, muscle strength, and motor performance [2]. Compared with non-diabetic individuals, older adults with diabetes have accelerated loss of morphological and neural function [3–5], worsening the performance in functional tests [3,6], contributing to a marked increase in physical disability and frailty risks in this population [7,8]. The risk of physical disability for adult people with diabetes increases by about 50 to 80% compared with age-matched individuals without diabetes [8].

Functional capacity has multidimensional features and is considered the individual's ability to perform instrumental activities in their daily lives, sustaining their autonomy. Functional performance measures reflect a particular aspect of physical functioning by using mostly objective and predetermined criteria [9]. Observational studies in adults with diabetes have identified a worsening of time to perform the timed up and go and five times sit-to-stand tests [4], walking speed [10] and greater strength deficit at high movement speeds [11]. Among the several factors involved in the relationship between diabetes and functional capacity, older adults with diabetes may have impairments of aging (i.e., neuromuscular, body composition and metabolism changes) coexisting with complications of the disease and comorbidities. Less is known about this relationship in middle-aged individuals, in which the impact of diabetic complications associated with the disease are also less known. However, exploratory evidence indicates that diabetes was associated, to a small extent, with physical disability in midlife [12]. Likewise, diabetes contributes to explaining the variance in the age trajectory of physical disability [13].

Individuals with diabetes are less likely to engage in regular physical exercise, even if this is one of the cornerstones of management [14]. Clinical trials such as Look AHEAD Study [15] and Italian Diabetes and Exercise Study (IDES) [16] demonstrated that physical activity interventions composing lifestyle programs increased physical

performance in patients with type 2 diabetes [15–18]. However, such findings are still inconsistent in other exercise trials [19,20]. Such divergent results could be partly affected by several outcomes used in functional capacity and training specificity leading to variable degree of preparation for actual functional testing.

Our systematic review addresses several outcomes used to measure functional capacity, aiming to synthesize exercise training effects in patients with type 2 diabetes. Therefore, we conducted a preregistered protocol to summarize randomized controlled trials (RCTs) or non-randomized controlled studies (NRS) that assessed the changes (if any) of different modes of exercise training in outcomes related to the functional capacity of individuals with type 2 diabetes undertaking structured physical exercise compared with their non-training counterparts.

## METHODS

This systematic review and meta-analysis was reported following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines [21] and our methodological approach followed the recommendations of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions, Version 6.1, 2020 [22].

The study was registered in the PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews (registration number CRD42020162467) and followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) [23]. The methodological protocol was uploaded to the Open Science Framework (OSF) (Preprint DOI: [10.31219/osf.io/kpg2m](https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/kpg2m)).

### ***Search Strategy***

Potential studies were identified by using a systematic search process was being conducted in the following databases: PubMed (via website), PEDro Physiotherapy Evidence Database (via website), Cochrane Library (via website), SportDiscus (via Periódicos CAPES), and Lilacs (via BVS). To minimize the prospect of publication bias, searches in Open Grey and Google Scholar were undertaken. The searches were carried out from inception until January 4, 2021.

The search strategies were developed using medical subject headings (MeSH) and EXPLODE TREES for terms: Aged, Exercise Therapy, Exercise Movement Techniques, Exercise, associated with synonyms for identification in title and summary (TIAB). Terms with study design different from clinical trials were used for identification

in the title (TI) and exclusion. Search strategies can be found in the Electronic Supplementary Material (Appendix 1).

## Study Selection

The review process was conducted by pairs of independent reviewers (eligibility process of titles and abstracts, full-text reading, and data extraction). Any disagreement in the study selection or extraction data processes, was solved by consensus, referring back to the original articles or, if needed, by a third external reviewer (DU).

Six reviewers independently (LOP and LXNS, ATD and DMN, CEB and JLT) conducted a pilot of 400 articles, at the level of titles and abstracts, to standardize the eligibility criteria among the reviewers. These reviewers subsequently assessed titles and abstracts according to eligibility criteria using the EndNote bibliographic reference management software), and finally read the remaining full-text articles potentially eligible for inclusion.

Eligibility criteria were established based on the concept of population, intervention, comparator/control, outcome and study design (PICOS).

### *Type of studies*

We included randomized controlled trials (RCTs) or non-randomized controlled studies (NRS) published between January 1987 and January 2021. Although we did not restrict searches for specific languages, only articles in English, Spanish, or Portuguese were included.

### *Participants*

Studies that included individuals (average age of 45 years or older, both sexes) with a diagnosis of type 2 diabetes, with or without comorbidities associated with the disease, were eligible for inclusion.

We excluded studies with patients who were diagnosed with neurodegenerative diseases (ataxias, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's), neuromuscular diseases (congenital/progressive, for example, dystrophies, myopathies), severe cognitive impairment, severe cardiovascular disease (congestive heart failure) or recent cardiovascular events (within the last 6 months, such as acute myocardial infarction or stroke), and cancer in the treatment period.

### *Type of interventions*

We included all trials which reported the interventions with structured physical exercise (e.g. resistance training, power training, aerobic training or combined training; pilates, functional training, etc.) lasting at least eight weeks. We considered purely structured exercise interventions. Studies were discarded if they presented another co-intervention with physical exercise, for example, diet, food supplements, health education or behavior change/lifestyle interventions.

The comparator could not practice any type of physical activity/exercise component, nor could they participate routinely during the period of study of groups with exercise guidance or lifestyle changes.

### *Outcome measures*

To account for measures of functional capacity more comprehensively, any of the following outcomes was considered for inclusion:

- i) Timed Up and Go test (TUG);
- ii) Chair stands (5-chair stand test; 30-second chair stand test);
- iii) Walking performance (6-minute-walk, 400-meter walk);
- iv) Upper limb muscle strength evaluated by strength isometric (handgrip);
- v) Lower limb muscle strength assessed by the test of one repetition maximum (1RM), (knee extension or leg-press);
- vi) Physical fitness parameter evaluated by maximal oxygen consumption ( $VO_{2max}$ ) or peak oxygen consumption ( $VO_{2peak}$ ).

### **Data Extraction**

The six reviewers (mentioned above) performed data extraction in a sheet that was designed and tested before use. The information from the eligible studies was coded and grouped into four categories: (1) general studies descriptors (authors, year of publication, journal, study design); (2) description of the study population (e.g.: gender, age, total sample size, health-related data); (3) details of interventions (e.g., type, duration, frequency, intensity); (4) and outcomes (e.g.: functional parameters, walking

performance, muscle strength parameters, physical fitness parameters). For continuous outcomes, we extracted the results with raw data of means and standard deviations (SDs) and delta values when available.

When data were not available, we contacted the corresponding author(s) to request the missing data. It was not necessary to input any data. We only calculated, in some cases, the delta to observe the difference between the pre- and post-intervention moments of the outcomes of interest.

### *Quality assessment and of the risk of bias in individual studies*

Paired reviewers independently evaluated the risk of biases from each selected study using the Checklist Downs & Black [24], which allows assessment of both randomized and non-randomized trials, in regard to the following items: reporting, external validity, internal validity (bias), internal validity (confounding - selection bias) and power. To determine the methodological quality and risk of bias of a study, for each criterion, we evaluated the presence of sufficient information. Disparities were resolved by involving a third author. The last item on the checklist (power of analysis) was used in a binary approach with a score of “0” (no sample size calculation) or “1” (reported sample size calculation) [25]. The checklist is composed of 27 questions, with a total possible score of 28 for randomized and 25 for non-randomized studies. With the following scoring ranges: excellent (26–28); good (20–25); fair (15–19); and poor ( $\leq 14$ ).

### **Data Synthesis**

Meta-analyses and the forest plots were performed in R version 4.0.1 (R Project for Statistical Computing, RRID:SCR\_001905), using the metafor package, for the outcomes of interest that presented at least two studies and/or groups combinations.

We used the inverse-variance method (DL -  $\tau^2$ ), under a random-effects model, to generate effect estimates. Because our results are derived from continuous outcomes with the same scale available, we used the mean difference with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) [22]. We also calculated the prediction interval when at least three studies were available in a given meta-analysis [26]. The evaluation of heterogeneity across trials was assessed by generating the  $I^2$  statistics, which represents the proportion of heterogeneity that is not due to chance (rather, due to possible differences across studies, populations and interventions).

### *Additional analyses*

As planned in our study protocol [27], when sufficient data (at least 10 studies) were available, we performed sex-stratified subgroup analysis and meta-regression with glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c) values. We also conducted a sensitivity analysis stratifying for randomized or non-randomized studies. Regarding the duration of diabetes diagnosis, we split study samples by short and long term duration of the disease (>8 years). In addition, we used the “leave-one-out” approach to check whether removing a single study at each time has had a major influence (e.g., change in the direction of results) on meta-analytic estimates. The publication bias was assessed by visual inspection through the generation of funnel plot.

It was not possible to carry out a sensitivity analysis, as we had planned, with patients with neuropathy, as none of the studies reported a population with this comorbidity.

## **RESULTS**

### ***Description of included studies***

From 17165 articles retrieved from the electronic database, 14099 were excluded by titles and abstracts. Out of 111 reviewed full-texts, 25 RCTs [28–52] and 4 NRS [53–56] met the inclusion criteria (Figure 1), representing a total sample of 1557 participants. Of these, 489 patients were included in studies of aerobic exercise training, 193 in studies of resistance exercise training, 386 in combined aerobic/resistance exercise training studies, 375 in studies with two or more intervention arms (aerobic/combined or aerobic/resistance/combined) and 114 in others (i.e. Pilates, Tai Chi, Whole-body vibration). The articles were mostly published in English, except for 1 article in Portuguese.

In addition, we cite some studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria but were excluded due to the control group [57,58] (received thematic sessions with topics on nutrition and physical activity, for example; participated in a 12-session health promotion educational training), an apparently duplicated sample with included study [59], and because of the intervention (diet plus supervised exercise) [60].

Overall, the median age from participants’ samples was 60 (minimum and maximum: 52 - 73) years old. No studies included participants with peripheral neuropathy. Regarding the sexes of participants enrolled in the included studies, 20 study samples

consisted of both women and men, six studies included only men, whereas three studies included only women (Table 1).

### ***Intervention characteristics***


Among the 29 studies included, 13 studies used aerobic training [30,31,39–41,44–46,48,50,52,55,56], six used combined training (aerobic and resistance) [32,35,38,43,47,53], four studies used resistance training [28,29,49,54], three studies used more intervention arms [36,42,51] (two studies with aerobic training groups and combined training, and one with aerobic, resistance and combined training groups) and three studies with another type of training (Pilates, Tai Chi, Whole-body vibration) [33,34,37] (Table 2).

The mean training duration was 27.9 weeks (range: 8 to 104 weeks). Training frequency ranged from one to seven days per week, being three days a week the most employed training frequency ( $n = 14$ ). The exercise sessions duration ranged from 8 to 90 min/exercise/session.

In aerobic training, the most used measures were maximal oxygen uptake ( $VO_{2max}$ ), peak oxygen uptake ( $VO_{2peak}$ ), maximum heart rate ( $HR_{max}$ ) and heart rate reserve (HRR), and for those of resistance training were one repetition maximum (1RM) and repetitions maximum (RM). In studies that used  $HR_{max}$  or peak heart rate ( $HR_{peak}$ ) to quantify aerobic exercise intensity, programs ranged from 50 to 90% intensity, whereas it ranged from 40 to 80% for when HRR was used as an intensity variable.  $VO_{2peak}$  ranged 50 to 90%  $VO_{2peak}$ ;  $VO_{2max}$  ranged from 65 to 80%  $VO_{2max}$ . 1RM ranged from 50 to 80% 1RM and RM ranged from 8 to 15 RM.

The intensity measures less commonly used in the studies were: heart rate (HR%); peak energy-expenditure rate (55 to 70%); maximum pulse (60 to 75%); rating of perceived exertion (RPE) (12 to 15/11(1) to 12(1) RPE Borg Scale); maximum voluntary contraction (MVC) (60 to 80 MVC); 1.3 to 3.3 Kg; 12 to 16 Hz. Only two studies did not report intensity of interventions.

**Fig. 1** PRISMA Flow Diagram



**Table 1.** Characteristics of the studies included

| Authors                   | Control Group<br>Intervention   | Design | Outcomes   | Sample size | Other clinical conditions | Baseline HbA1c (%), Mean (SD) | Duration of the disease (y), Range or Mean (SD) | Medications   | Sex, Female (%) | Age (y), Mean (SD) |
|---------------------------|---|--------|--|-------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|--------------------|
| Jiang et al, 2020 [39]    | Required to maintain their usual physical activity                                | RCT    | Body composition<br>FATmax<br>VO <sub>2max</sub><br>Blood chemistry<br>Physical capacity.                    | 49          | Postmenopausal            | 6.72(0.7)                     | 6 to 11 (range)                                 | Metformin<br>Sulfonylureas<br>ACE inhibitors<br>Diuretics<br>Statins<br>Fibrates  | 49              | 63(5)              |
| Yamamoto et al, 2020 [29] | Instructed to maintain their daily activities                                     | RCT    | Muscle strength<br>Gait speed<br>Body composition  | 53          | NR                        | 7.24(0.77)                    | 17.0 (10.3)                                     | NR  | 47              | 73(2)              |
| Shabkhiz et al, 2020 [28] | Instructed to maintain their normal activities and not to modify their lifestyles | RCT    | Blood chemistry<br>Muscle strength<br>Body composition   | 44          | NR                        | NA                            | 10.2(3)   | Insulin-secretagogue<br>Insulin-sensitizer<br>Lipid lowering<br>Anti-hypertensive   | 0               | 72(6)              |
| Hwang et al, 2019 [31]    | Instructed not to change their habitual physical activity, diet, or medications   | RCT    | VO <sub>2peak</sub><br>Body composition<br>Blood chemistry<br>Habitual physical activity<br>Dietary analysis | 50          | NR                        | 7.23(0.33)                    | 8(1)  | Metformin<br>SGLT2 inhibitors<br>Sulfonylureas<br>DPP-4 inhibitors<br>GLP-1 agonists<br>Thiazolidinediones<br>Insulin<br>Statins<br>Anti-hypertensives<br>Aspirin | 46              | 63(1)              |
| Wilson et al, 2019 [52]   | Instructed to maintain their usual lifestyle                                      | RCT    | VO <sub>2peak</sub><br>Left ventricular function<br>Body composition<br>Blood volume                         | 16          | NR                        | 7.77(3.61)                    | 7.2(4.2)  | Metformin<br>Gliclazide<br>Insulin  | 37.5            | 52(8)              |

|                           |  |     |  |     |                     |           |          |   |     |        |
|---------------------------|--|-----|--|-----|---------------------|-----------|----------|---|-----|--------|
| Scheer et al, 2019 [53]   | Instructed to maintain their usual activities  | NRS | VO <sub>2peak</sub><br>Anthropometric variables<br>Blood chemistry<br>Muscular strength<br>Vascular function | 27  | Obese<br>Overweight | 7.1(0.84) | NR       | Biguanides<br>Sulfonylureas<br>GLP-1 agonists<br>DPP-4 inhibitors<br>Statins<br>Beta blockers<br>Calcium channel blockers<br>ACE inhibitors<br>Angiotensin II receptor antagonist<br>Anti-inflammatories<br>Diuretic<br>Fibrate<br>Thyroid hormones<br>Estrogen<br>Testosterone, Paracetamol<br>Other pain relief | 44  | 62(10) |
| Conners et al, 2018 [30]  | Instructed to maintain their current dietary and physical activity habits                                | RCT | Glycemic control<br>Blood lipids<br>Health-related fitness   | 26  | NR                  | 7.58      | 7.1(4.6) | Metformin<br>Sitagliptin  | 61  | 58(5)  |
| Szilágyi et al, 2018 [32] | Did not participate in any exercise  | RCT | Plasma glucose<br>Body composition<br>Physical fitness level   | 208 | NR                  | NA        | 20.4(7)  | NR  | 64  | 61(7)  |
| Melo et al, 2018 [33]     | Received guidance for maintenance of medication and the nutritional intake of foods consumed in the diet | RCT | Plasma glucose<br>HbA1c<br>Functional capacity   | 22  | NR                  | 7.6(0.75) | 8.3(6)   | Metformin<br>Glibenclamide<br>Sitagliptin<br>Glimepiride  | 100 | 67(7)  |

|                             |   |     |  |    |              |            |           |   |     |        |
|-----------------------------|---|-----|--|----|--------------|------------|-----------|---|-----|--------|
| Banitalebi et al, 2018 [51] | Usual medical care and received diabetes recommendations for self-management. Were not given exercise counselling and were asked to maintain physical activity levels | RCT | Myokines levels<br>Metabolic outcomes<br>Body composition<br>VO <sub>2peak</sub> | 42 | Overweight   | 9.41(0.82) | NR        | NR  | 100 | 55(6)  |
| Santos et al, 2014 [54]     | Received no intervention and were instructed not to change their lifestyle  | NRS | Maximal strength   | 48 | NR           | NA         | NR        | Hypoglycemic agents   | 63  | 67(5)  |
| Pozo-Cruz et al, 2014 [34]  | Receiving only standard care  | RCT | Glycemic control<br>Dyslipidemia<br>Functional capacity                          | 39 | NR           | 7.17(0.96) | 9.2(7.7)  | NR  | 49  | 69(10) |
| Yan et al, 2014 [50]        | --  | RCT | Blood Pressure<br>Body composition<br>Blood chemistry<br>VO <sub>2max</sub>      | 41 | Hypertension | 8.7(2.8)   | NR        | Nifedipine<br>Amiloride<br>Hydrochlorothiazide<br>Methyldopa<br>Enalapril<br>Atenolol<br>Chlorthalidone<br>Metformin<br>Glyburide | 0   | 53(11) |
| Tan et al, 2012 [35]        | Instructed to maintain their individual habits of physical activities and   | RCT | Body composition<br>Glycemic control<br>Lipid profile<br>Functional              | 25 | NR           | 6.38(0.97) | 16.7(6.7) | Oral hypoglycaemic  | 48  | 66(4)  |

|                             |  |     |   |    |                     |            |          |  |       |        |
|-----------------------------|--|-----|---|----|---------------------|------------|----------|--|-------|--------|
|                             | refrain from engaging in any other forms of prescribed exercise training |     | capacity  |    |                     |            |          |  |       |        |
| Labrunée et al, 2012 [40]   | Received counsels regarding physical activity practice                   | RCT | Anthropometric variables<br>Blood chemistry<br>Physical capacities<br>Maximal isometric strength<br>QOL | 23 | Obesity (stage 2–3) | 8.67(1.81) | > 1 year | Insulin<br>Metformin<br>Sulfonylureas  | 56.5  | 53(9)  |
| Karstoft et al, 2012 [44]   | Were instructed to continue their habitual lifestyle                     | RCT | VO <sub>2max</sub><br>Body composition<br>Blood pressure<br>Blood chemistry                             | 32 | NR                  | 6.66(0.2)  | 4.7(1.2) | Metformin<br>Sulfonylureas<br>DPP-4 inhibitors<br>GLP-1 analogues  | 31.57 | 59(2)  |
| Kadoglou et al, 2010 [46]   | Maintenance of usual activities  | RCT | VO <sub>2peak</sub><br>Body composition<br>Blood chemistry  | 89 | Overweight or Obese | 8.02(1.04) | 6.3(3.3) | Metformin<br>Gliclazide  | 63    | 59(8)  |
| Plotnikoff et al, 2010 [49] | Non-training and maintenance of physical activity levels                 | RCT | Muscle strength<br>Blood chemistry<br>Body composition<br>Social cognitions                             | 48 | Obese               | 6.86(1.21) | NR       | Insulin<br>Metformin<br>Sulfonylureas<br>Thiazolidinediones<br>$\alpha$ -glucosidase inhibitors<br>ACE inhibitors<br>Angiotensin receptor blockers<br>Diuretics<br>$\beta$ -blockers<br>Calcium channel blockers<br>Statins<br>Fibrates<br>Cholesterol absorption inhibitors | 67    | 55(12) |

| Aspirin                   |  |     |   |     |                    |            |          |   |       |        |
|---------------------------|--|-----|---|-----|--------------------|------------|----------|---|-------|--------|
| Balducci et al, 2010 [36] | Remained sedentary   | RCT | Biochemical parameters<br>VO <sub>2max</sub><br>Body composition<br>Volume of physical activity                         | 82  | Metabolic syndrome | 7.41(1.41) | 8.9(6)   | Sulfonylurea<br>Glinide<br>Metformin<br>Thiazolidinedione<br>Insulin<br>ACE inhibitors<br>Angiotensin-receptor blocker<br>Diuretic<br>Calcium-channel blocker<br>β-blocker<br>α1-adrenergic blocker<br>Statins<br>Fibrates<br>Antiplatelet agents | 40.32 | 62(8)  |
| Larose et al, 2010 [42]   | Instructed to revert to their level of activity at baseline and to maintain this level | RCT | VO <sub>2peak</sub><br>Submaximal exercise response<br>Muscular strength  | 251 | Obesity            | 7.68(0.88) | 5.3(4.4) | NR  | 36.2  | 54(7)  |
| Loimaala et al, 2009 [47] | Standard treatment for type 2 diabetes   | RCT | Cardiovascular risk factors<br>Arterial pulse wave velocity<br>Blood chemistry<br>Muscle strength<br>VO <sub>2max</sub> | 48  | Hypertension       | 8.1(1.2)   | NR       | Metformin<br>Sulfonylureas  | 0     | 54(6)  |
| Lam et al, 2008 [37]      | Wait list control  | RCT | Blood chemistry<br>Blood pressure<br>Body composition<br>Health status<br>Functional capacity                           | 53  | NR                 | 8.54(1.25) | NR       | Insulin   | 54.71 | 62(10) |

|                           |   |     |  |    |                       |            |           |  |    |        |
|---------------------------|---|-----|--|----|-----------------------|------------|-----------|--|----|--------|
| Brun et al, 2008 [41]     | Usual routine treatment   | RCT | Lifestyle and fitness outcomes<br>Body composition<br>Metabolic outcomes<br>QOL<br>Healthcare costs  | 25 | Overweight<br>Obesity | 8.86(1.35) | 10(7)     | NR   | 26 | 60(10) |
| Kadoglou et al, 2007 [45] | Maintenance of usual activities                                     | RCT | Body composition<br>VO <sub>2peak</sub><br>Blood chemistry<br>Blood pressure   | 60 | Overweight            | 7.88(0.96) | 6.8(4.1)  | Sulfonylurea<br>Metformin<br>Antihypertensives                               | 57 | 62(5)  |
| BjØrgaas et al, 2005 [38] | Not given any specific recommendations concerning physical activity | RCT | VO <sub>2max</sub><br>Fitness, clinical and laboratory variables   | 29 | Overweight            | 7.4(1.2)   | NR        | Metformin<br>Sulfonylurea<br>Antihypertensives<br>Lipids-lowering<br>Aspirin | 0  | 57(8)  |
| Fritz et al, 2006 [55]    | Received no exercise instructions                                   | NRS | Blood chemistry<br>Blood pressure<br>Body composition<br>VO <sub>2max</sub>  | 52 | NR                    | 6.15(0.8)  | 5.5(4.3)  | Glucose lowering agents<br>Antihypertensives<br>Lipids-lowering              | 50 | 60(7)  |
| Loimaala et al, 2003 [43] | Received conventional treatment of type 2 diabetes only             | RCT | Body composition<br>Blood chemistry<br>VO <sub>2max</sub><br>Muscle endurance<br>Isometric strength<br>Baroreflex sensitivity<br>Heart rate variability<br>Whole-body impedance cardiography | 49 | Hypertension          | 8.1(1.69)  | > 3 years | Hypoglycemic agents  | 0  | 53(5)  |

|                           |  |     |   |    |   |            |        |   |     |        |
|---------------------------|--|-----|---|----|---|------------|--------|---|-----|--------|
| Verity et al, 1989 [48]   | Instructed to maintain their normal daily activities | RCT | Body composition<br>Blood chemistry<br>VO <sub>2max</sub> | 10 | Postmenopausal<br>Overweight  | 8.85(1.79) | 4.5    | None  | 100 | 59(12) |
| Skarfors et al, 1987 [56] | Not physical training                                | NRS | VO <sub>2max</sub><br>Blood chemistry                     | 16 | Musculoskeletal problems<br>Asthma on exertion<br>Hypertension only control group | NA         | 2.6(3) | Digoxin<br>Antihypertensives<br>Sulfonylurea<br>Bronchodilators | 0   | 59(2)  |

Abbreviations: SD: Standard Deviation; RCT: Randomized Controlled Trial; NRS: Non-Randomised Controlled Study; NR: Not Reported; NA: Not Applicable; VO<sub>2max</sub>: Maximum Oxygen Volume; VO<sub>2peak</sub>: Peak Oxygen Consumption; QOL: Quality of Life; ACE: Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor; DPP-4: Dipeptidyl Peptidase-4 inhibitors; SGLT2: Sodium-glucose Cotransporter-2 Inhibitors .

**Table 2.** Characteristics of studies' interventions

| Authors                     | Intervention setup   | Frequency, Times per week | Intensity, Range or Mean (SD)                                     | Time for intervention, minutes per session, Range | Average length, Weeks |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|
| Jiang et al, 2020 [39]      | Aerobic              | 3                         | 41.3(3.2) to 46.1(10.3)% VO <sub>2max</sub>                       | 20 to 60  | 16                    |
| Yamamoto et al, 2020 [29]   | Resistance           | 7                         | 1.3 to 3.3 kg   | NR  | 48                    |
| Shabkhiz et al, 2020 [28]   | Resistance           | 3                         | 70% 1RM   | NR  | 12                    |
| Hwang et al, 2019 [31]      | Aerobic              | 4                         | 70 to 90% HR <sub>peak</sub>                                      | 40 to 47  | 8                     |
| Wilson et al, 2019 [52]     | Aerobic              | 3                         | 90% HR <sub>peak</sub>  | 20  | 13                    |
| Scheer et al, 2019 [53]     | Combined             | 3                         | 60 to 80% HR <sub>max</sub> ;<br>12 to 15 RPE Borg Scale          | 60  | 8                     |
| Connors et al, 2018 [30]    | Aerobic              | 3                         | 40 to 70% HRR   | 10 to 20  | 12                    |
| Szilágyi et al, 2018 [32]   | Combined             | 4                         | 60 to 75% Max. pulse  | 60  | 24                    |
| Melo et al, 2018 [33]       | Pilates              | 3                         | 11(1) to 12(1) RPE Borg Scale                                     | 60  | 12                    |
| Banitalebi et al, 2018 [51] | Aerobic, Combined    | 3                         | 10 to 15 RM;<br>50 to 70% HR <sub>max</sub>                       | 50  | 10                    |
| Santos et al, 2014 [54]     | Resistance           | 3                         | 50 to 70% 1RM   | 50  | 16                    |
| Pozo-Cruz et al, 2014 [34]  | Whole-body vibration | 3                         | 12 to 16 Hz   | 8 to 16   | 12                    |
| Yan et al, 2014 [50]        | Aerobic              | 3 to 5                    | 50 to 75% VO <sub>2peak</sub>                                     | 45  | 12                    |
| Tan et al, 2012 [35]        | Combined             | 3                         | 55 to 70% HR <sub>max</sub><br>50 to 70% 1RM                      | 60  | 26                    |
| Labrunée et al, 2012 [40]   | Aerobic              | 7                         | HR% (the first ventilatory threshold measured the test of effort) | 30  | 13                    |
| Karstoft et al, 2012 [44]   | Aerobic              | 5                         | 55 to 70% peak energy-expenditure rate                            | 60  | 17                    |
| Kadoglou et al, 2010 [46]   | Aerobic              | 4                         | 50 to 80% VO <sub>2peak</sub>                                     | 45 to 60  | 52                    |
| Plotnikoff et al, 2010 [49] | Resistance           | 3                         | 50 to 85% 1RM   | NR  | 16                    |

|                           |                                     |        |  |          |     |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------|--|----------|-----|
| Balducci et al, 2010 [36] | Aerobic, Combined                   | 2      | 70 to 80% $VO_{2max}$ ;<br>80% 1RM       | 60       | 52  |
| Larose et al, 2010 [42]   | Aerobic,<br>Resistance,<br>Combined | 2 to 3 | 60 to 75% $HR_{max}$ ;<br>8 to 15 RM     | 20 to 45 | 22  |
| Loimaala et al, 2009 [47] | Combined                            | 4      | 65 to 75% $VO_{2max}$ ;<br>60 to 80 MVC  | 30       | 104 |
| Lam et al, 2008 [37]      | Tai Chi                             | 1 to 2 | NR                                       | 60       | 26  |
| Brun et al, 2008 [41]     | Aerobic                             | 2      | HR% (level of the ventilatory threshold) | 45       | 52  |
| Kadoglou et al, 2007 [45] | Aerobic                             | 4      | 50 to 75% $VO_{2peak}$                   | 45 to 60 | 26  |
| Björgaas et al, 2005 [38] | Combined                            | 2      | 50 to 85% $HR_{max}$                     | 90       | 12  |
| Fritz et al, 2006 [55]    | Aerobic                             | 3      | NR                                       | 45       | 17  |
| Loimaala et al, 2003 [43] | Combined                            | 2      | 65 to 75% $VO_{2max}$ ;<br>70 to 80% 1RM | ≥30      | 52  |
| Verity et al, 1989 [48]   | Aerobic                             | 3      | 65 to 80% HRR                            | 60 to 90 | 16  |
| Skarfors et al, 1987 [56] | Aerobic                             | 3      | Up to 75% $VO_{2max}$                    | 45       | 104 |

**Abbreviations:** NR: Not Reported;  $VO_{2max}$ : Maximum Oxygen Volume;  $VO_{2peak}$ : Peak Oxygen Consumption;  $HR_{max}$ : Maximum Heart Rate; HRR: Heart Rate Reserve; HR: Heart Rate;  $HR_{peak}$ : Peak Heart Rate; Max. pulse: Maximum Pulse; 1RM: one Maximum Repetition; RM: Maximum Repetition; MVC: Maximal Voluntary Contraction; kg: kilogram; Hz: hertz; RPE: Rating of Perceived Exertion.

## ***Functional capacity***

Among the outcomes prespecified in the study protocol, the 400-meter walk test was not assessed in the included studies. The results of the remaining outcomes of interest are presented below.

### *Walking performance*

Out of the 29 included studies, eight articles [30,32,34,35,37,39–41] with 441 patients, demonstrated that structured physical exercise interventions were associated with an increase of 51.59 meters in walking performance evaluated by the 6-minute-walk test (6MWT) (95% CI 7.55% to 95.63%;  $I^2$  92%;  $p$  for heterogeneity < 0.01) as compared with control (Figure 2, panel 1 (A)).

### *Chair stands*

Three articles (296 patients) [32,34,39] demonstrated that structured physical exercise interventions were associated with an increase of 4.66 times in 30-second chair stand test (95% CI 1.79% to 7.52%;  $I^2$  68%;  $p$  for heterogeneity = 0.05) as compared with control (Figure 2, panel 1 (B)).

One study reported the 5-chair support test [33] and there were significant improvements for the Pilates intervention group compared with the control ( $\Delta$  mean: intervention group -4 seconds; control group 1.3 seconds).


### *Timed Up and Go test*

Two articles (88 patients) [34,39] demonstrated that structured physical exercise interventions were associated with a decrease of 0.16 seconds in the performance of the timed up and go test (95% CI -1.07% to 0.74%;  $I^2$  0%;  $p$  for heterogeneity = 0.67) as compared with controls (Figure 2, panel 1 (C)).


## **Fig. 2 Functional capacity outcomes**

Panel 1. Meta-analysis of included studies comparing changes in walking performance (panel A), chair stands (panel B), and timed up and go test (panel C) by structured physical exercise vs control.


## A - Walking Performance (6-minute-walk test)



## B - Chair Stands (30-second chair stand test)



## C - Timed Up and Go test (TUG)



CI indicates confidence interval. Changes in 6-minute-walk test, 30-second chair stand test and Timed Up and Go test of individual studies included in the meta-analysis of structured physical exercise vs no intervention in patients with type 2 diabetes.


### Lower limb muscle strength

Out of the 29 included studies, three articles (95 patients) [28,49,53] demonstrated that structured physical exercise interventions were associated with an increase of 17.97 kg in the strength measures of lower limb muscle evaluated by 1RM of leg-press (95% CI 4.08% to 31.87%;  $I^2$  0%;  $p$  for heterogeneity = 0.62) as compared with control (Figure 3). Another study [54] showed an increase in muscle strength evaluated by the 1RM of knee extension test for the intervention group in relation to control [54] ( $\Delta$  mean: intervention group 5.03; control group 0.8).

### Upper limb muscle strength

One study [29] reported isometric strength assessed by handgrip and showed no differences ( $\Delta$  mean: intervention group 0.3; control group -0.03).

**Fig. 3** Meta-analysis of included studies comparing changes in one repetition maximum by structured physical exercise vs control




CI indicates confidence interval. Changes in the strength of lower limb muscle evaluated by 1RM of leg-press test of individual studies included in the meta-analysis of structured physical exercise vs no intervention in patients with type 2 diabetes.

### Physical fitness

Out of the 29 included studies, 20 articles [31,35,36,38–48,50–53,55,56] with 27 groups of comparison (932 patients) demonstrated that structured physical exercise interventions were associated with an increase of 2.41 mL/kg·min in the  $VO_{2max}$  (95% CI 1.89% to 2.92%;  $I^2$  100%;  $p$  for heterogeneity = 0) as compared with control (Figure 4).

Of these, 12 studies [35,36,38,39,41,43,44,47,48,50,55,56] presented the results of oxygen consumption in  $VO_{2max}$ , being 10 studies [35,36,38,39,41,43,44,47,48,50] with the unit of measure in mL/kg-min, one study [56] in mL/min and another study in L/min [55]. The last two studies were transformed to mL/kg-min using the body weight presented by each of the studies. The other eight studies [31,40,42,45,46,51–53] had the measure of oxygen consumption in  $VO_{2peak}$  and all of them with the unit of measure in mL/kg-min. The results of  $VO_{2max}$  and  $VO_{2peak}$  were combined in the same meta-analysis.

**Fig. 4** Meta-analysis of included studies comparing changes in maximal oxygen consumption by structured physical exercise vs control




CI indicates confidence interval. Changes in physical fitness evaluated by  $VO_{2max}$  of individual studies included in the meta-analysis of structured physical exercise vs no intervention in patients with type 2 diabetes. Studies that included more than 1 modality or different training protocols within the same type of structured physical exercise were evaluated as separate observations.

### ***Additional analyses***


In sensitivity analysis, RCT studies [31,35,36,38–48,50–52] (17 studies, 24 comparisons, 839 patients) were associated with an increment of 2.63 mL/kg·min in the  $VO_{2max}$  (95% CI 2.08 to 3.18;  $I^2$  100%,  $p$  for heterogeneity = 0) as compared with control. The NRS studies [53,55,56] (3 studies, 93 patients) were associated with an increment of 3.34 mL/kg·min in the  $VO_{2max}$  (95% CI –1.52 to 8.19;  $I^2$  82%,  $p$  for heterogeneity < 0.01) as compared with control (Figure 5, panel 2 (A)). Regarding the duration of diabetes, we split study samples by short and long term duration of the disease (>8 years). The studies that included diabetes of short duration [31,42,44–46,48,52,55,56] (9 studies, 13 comparisons, 501 patients) were associated an increment of 2.32 mL/kg·min in the  $VO_{2max}$  (95% CI 1.76 to 2.88;  $I^2$  100%,  $p$  for heterogeneity = 0) as compared to control. Studies that included diabetes with longer duration [35,36,39,41] (4 studies, 6 comparisons, 181 patients) were associated with an increment of 3.56 mL/kg·min in the  $VO_{2max}$  (95% CI 1.21 to 5.91;  $I^2$  0%,  $p$  for heterogeneity = 0.83) as compared to control (Figure 5, panel 1 (B)).

**Fig. 5 Panel 1, Sensitivity analysis for type of study and duration of diabetes diagnosis.**

**A - Sensitivity analysis for type of study**



## B - Sensitivity analysis stratified by the duration of diabetes diagnosis



CI indicates confidence interval. Changes in physical fitness evaluated by VO2max of individual studies included in the meta-analysis of structured physical exercise vs no intervention in patients with type 2 diabetes. Studies that included more than 1 modality or different training protocols within the same type of structured physical exercise were evaluated as separate observations.

Structured physical exercise and control group in the randomized clinical trials (RCT) and non-randomized controlled studies (NRS).

Structured physical exercise and control group with studies showing short and longer (>8 years of diabetes) duration of type 2 diabetes.


When studies were individually omitted from the meta-analysis, heterogeneity was unchanged. A table with the values of the heterogeneity from each study can be found in the Electronic Supplementary Material (Appendix 2).

In the subgroup analysis, studies with women [39,48,51] (3 studies, 4 comparisons, 76 patients) showed that interventions were associated with an increase of 4.43

mL/kg-min in  $VO_{2max}$  (95% CI 1.44 to 7.42;  $I^2$  0%,  $p$  for heterogeneity = 0.83) and studies with men [38,39,43,47,50,56] (6 studies, 197 patients) showed that interventions were associated with an increase of 3.31 mL/kg-min in  $VO_{2max}$  (95% CI 1.71 to 4.90;  $I^2$  0%,  $p$  for heterogeneity = 0.55), compared to control.

Meta-regression showed no association between HbA1c levels and  $VO_{2max}$  ( $p$  = 0.34;  $I^2$  99.6%;  $R^2$  = 2.6%;  $p$  for heterogeneity <0.0001). Publication bias was assessed using a contour-enhanced funnel plot of each trial's effect size against the standard error. We did not find any publication bias ( $p$  = 0.76) and the funnel plot is presented in Electronic Supplementary Material (Appendix 3).

**Fig. 6** Subgroup analysis stratified by sex



CI indicates confidence interval. Changes in physical fitness evaluated by  $VO_{2max}$  of individual studies included in the meta-analysis of structured physical exercise vs no intervention in patients with type 2 diabetes. Studies that included more than 1 modality or different training protocols within the same type of structured physical exercise were evaluated as separate observations.

## Quality assessment and risk of bias in individual studies

The following items were evaluated with respect to: reporting, external validity, internal validity (bias), internal validity (confusion - selection bias) and power. For item 14, we answered yes to all of the studies, because these are studies with exercise interventions, so, the blinding of the participants generally does not occur. Remembering that the checklist consists of 27 questions, RCTs score up to 28 and NRS at most 25. Four studies [31,34,49,53] scored good (20-25), 10 studies [29,30,32,33,36–38,46,51,52] fair (15-19) and 15 studies [28,35,39–45,47,48,50,54–56] poor ( $\leq 14$ ), with available data in Electronic Supplementary Material (Appendix 4). In figure 7 we represent the evaluation of the studies for each of the items present in the Checklist Downs & Black [24].

**Fig. 7** Risk of biases rating based on the Downs & Black checklist.

|                        | Reporting |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | External validity |    |    | Internal validity – bias |    |    |    |    |    | Internal validity - confounding<br>(selection bias) |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|------------------------|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------------------|----|----|--------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Authors                | 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 |
| Conners et al, 2018    |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Hwang et al, 2019      |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Szilágyi et al, 2018   |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Melo et al, 2018       |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Santos et al, 2014     |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Pozo-Cruz et al, 2014  |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Tan et al, 2012        |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Kadoglou et al, 2010   |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Loimaala et al, 2009   |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Skarfors et al, 1987   |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Verity et al, 1989     |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Plotnikoff et al, 2010 |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Yan et al, 2014        |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Banitalebi et al, 2018 |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Wilson et al, 2019     |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Balducci et al, 2010   |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Lam et al, 2008        |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Bjørgaas et al, 2005   |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Fritz et al, 2006      |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Jiang et al, 2021      |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Labrunée et al, 2012   |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Brun et al, 2008       |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Larose et al, 2010     |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Loimaala et al, 2003   |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Karstoft et al, 2012   |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Kadoglou et al, 2007   |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Yamamoto et al, 2020   |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Shabkhiz et al, 2020   |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Scheer et al, 2019     |           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |                   |    |    |                          |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |

Yes 2

Yes 1

Partially 1

Unable to determine 0

No 0

Description: score for each item with their respective colors

**Description:** score for each item with their respective colors

|       |       |             |                       |      |
|-------|-------|-------------|-----------------------|------|
| Yes 2 | Yes 1 | Partially 1 | Unable to determine 0 | No 0 |
|-------|-------|-------------|-----------------------|------|

## DISCUSSION

This systematic review with meta-analysis summarizes the effects of exercise training on functional outcomes of people with type 2 diabetes. Although several syntheses have addressed exercise for patients with type 2 diabetes, the present study used a comprehensive assessment by including different functional outcomes. We observed that in individuals with type 2 diabetes, structured aerobic, resistance, combined, or other type (i.e., Pilates, Tai Chi, Whole-body vibration) of exercise training was associated with increases in functional capacity as indicated by walking performance, chair stands, time up and go tests, 1RM of leg-press, and  $VO_{2max}$ . In additional sensitivity and meta-regression analyses, we could not identify isolated factors or studies that may have had differential influence in summary estimates. Most studies' scores indicate a high risk of biases, which underscores the importance of careful interpretation regarding the summarized evidence. Most of the studies included participants with an average age close to 60 years or more, therefore, our results are more widely generalizable to patients with type 2 diabetes over 45 years old.

The present meta-analysis demonstrated that cardiorespiratory fitness, measured by  $VO_{2max}$  can be improved with structured physical exercise interventions in people with type 2 diabetes, supporting previous observations in this population [61,62]. We emphasize that the number of studies included in the present meta-analysis was greater. Considering that low cardiorespiratory fitness has been explored as a predictor of cardiovascular mortality in people with diabetes [63], the present findings may reflect major clinical benefits. A cohort study, including nondiabetic and diabetic individuals, showed that increments equivalent to 1.44 ml/kg/min in  $VO_{2max}$  were associated with a 7.9% reduction in overall mortality [64]. Moreover, subjects with type 1 and 2 diabetes mellitus present lower walking capacity compared with non-diabetic controls [65]. Of note, we observed that in the present synthesis supervised interventions from included studies show an increase of 11% (51.59 meters) in the 6MWT, which is considered a reliable, validated and clinically meaningful test for patients with diabetes [66].

Low muscle strength has been shown to be associated with an increased risk of all-cause mortality [67,68]. Furthermore, in patients with type 2 diabetes, there is a pronounced decline in muscle mass and strength, in agreement with a worsening in functional performance [4]. Therefore, we can highlight the importance of increases in muscle strength. It is also important to highlight the clinical importance of observing increases in functional variables in the elderly after interventions, such as gait and lower limb strength,

for example, due to their negative predictive capacity in relation to the use of health care and adverse events (i.e., institutionalization, falls, disability, mortality) [69–71]. However, it is important to emphasize that the results from our meta-analysis and its estimates related to muscle strength should be interpreted with caution due to the low number of included studies.

To explore the expected methodological and statistical heterogeneity, we used a prespecified strategy based on sensitivity and meta-regression analyses and did not detect associated factors. In addition, the quality of the studies was mostly low, which may have contributed to heterogeneity in the present meta-analyses [22]. Due to the low number of studies available, exploratory analyses were not performed for five of the six intended outcomes, which would require at least 10 studies [22], and for peripheral neuropathy which was not present in any sample. As for analyses with  $VO_{2max}$ , it was not possible to demonstrate conclusive results due to the occurrence of overlapping confidence intervals, and we did not identify any association between HbA1c and  $VO_{2max}$ .

Regarding the quality and risk of bias of individual studies, in general, the reporting and internal validity items, the studies obtained good scores on questions such as: description of hypothesis/aim, clear description of outcomes and main results, description of variability estimates, number of lost participants, follow-up period for groups. Items of external validity, internal validity - confounding (selection bias) and power were identified as more prone to bias. We emphasize that characteristics contemplating the generalization to the population from which the study participants were derived, adjustment of confounding factors in the analyses, loss of patients in the course of the study and sample size calculation should be considered for the interpretation of results and future studies.

## Limitations

This study has some limitations. Although the search was not limited by language, the studies included were only in Portuguese, English and Spanish. The clinical conditions that we used as exclusion criteria for the studies were chosen because they strongly influence the functional results, which would end up being a confounding factor and difficult to methodological control. We tried to broadly address the functional outcomes in this population, however, within the criteria used to select the studies, some ended up being identified in a low number, thus not being explored as planned. Finally, we analyzed only structured physical exercise interventions, which may not be feasible for all patients with type 2 diabetes. Therefore, the results presented cannot be generalized to all exercise programs in this population.

Moreover, high heterogeneity was identified in the meta-analyses, especially in the walking performance (6MWT) and physical fitness ( $VO_{2max}$ ) meta-analysis, and although we did try to explore it, no additional information was retrieved with this strategy. In addition, the overall quality of the studies was low, increasing the risk of bias in the studies, which may limit the interpretation of results.

## Future Directions

Because many comorbidities are associated with type 2 diabetes, future trials should consider minimizing eligibility criteria to allow more representative samples for this clinical population. In addition, establishing common outcomes, such as implementing the use of Core Outcome Set (COS), would be beneficial to increase the number of comparable studies in future reviews [72].

This systematic review demonstrates that structured physical exercise is associated with improvements in functional outcomes with clinical relevance for people with diabetes. This highlights the need and importance of a recommendation for physical exercise in order to preserve and/or improve physical function in this population.

## CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the current meta-analysis suggests that in people with type 2 diabetes, structured physical exercise consistent with aerobic training, resistance training, both combined or other types of training (Pilates, Tai Chi and Whole-body vibration) is associated with an improvement in functional capacity (i.e., cardiorespiratory fitness, walking performance, lower limb muscle strength, sit and stand up and walk tests). These increments are better perceived in the  $VO_{2max}$  and 6MWT outcomes. However, subgroup and sensitivity analyses were inconclusive due to the small number of studies in some comparison groups and the high variability observed in confidence interval values.

It is expected that these results may demonstrate a reduction in the propensity for physical disability and that they may considerably reduce the risk of cardiovascular disease for this population.

## Availability of data, code and other materials

The data and analytic codes used in the meta-analyses and the scripts used to generate the meta-analysis are available with the other materials in the OSF (<https://osf.io/h47r8/>).

## REFERENCES

1. International Diabetes Federation. IDF Diabetes Atlas Ninth Edition 2019. 2019. [www.diabetesatlas.org](http://www.diabetesatlas.org) of subordinate document. Accessed 15 Jan 2021.
2. Reid KF, Doros G, Clark DJ, Patten C, Carabello RJ, Cloutier GJ, et al. Muscle power failure in mobility-limited older adults: preserved single fiber function despite lower whole muscle size, quality and rate of neuromuscular activation. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2012;112:2289–301.
3. Volpato S, Bianchi L, Lauretani F, Lauretani F, Bandinelli S, Guralnik JM, et al. Role of muscle mass and muscle quality in the association between diabetes and gait speed. *Diabetes Care.* 2012;35:1672–9.
4. Leenders M, Verdijk LB, van der Hoeven L, Adam JJ, van Kranenburg J, Nilwik R, et al. Patients with type 2 diabetes show a greater decline in muscle mass, muscle strength, and functional capacity with aging. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2013;14:585–92.
5. Park SW, Goodpaster BH, Strotmeyer ES, Kuller LH, Broudeau R, Kammerer C, et al. Accelerated loss of skeletal muscle strength in older adults with type 2 diabetes: the health, aging, and body composition study. *Diabetes Care.* 2007;30:1507–12.
6. Park SW, Goodpaster BH, Lee JS, Kuller LH, Boudreau R, de Rekeneire N, et al. Excessive loss of skeletal muscle mass in older adults with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care.* 2009;32:1993–7.
7. Aguayo GA, Hulman A, Vaillant MT, Donneau A-F, Schritz A, Stranges S, et al. Prospective Association Among Diabetes Diagnosis, HbA1c, Glycemia, and Frailty Trajectories in an Elderly Population. *Diabetes Care.* 2019;42:1903–11.
8. Wong E, Backholer K, Gearon E, Harding J, Freak-Poli R, Stevenson C, et al. Diabetes and risk of physical disability in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol.* 2013;1:106–14.
9. Guralnik JM, Branch LG, Cummings SR, Curb JD. Physical performance measures in aging research. *J Gerontol.* 1989;44:141–6.
10. Kalyani RR, Tra Y, Yeh H-C, Egan JM, Ferrucci L, Brancati FL. Quadriceps strength, quadriceps power, and gait speed in older U.S. adults with diabetes mellitus: results from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 1999-2002. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2013;61:769–75.
11. Sacchetti M, Balducci S, Bazzucchi I, Carlucci F, Scotto di Palumbo A, Haxhi J, et al. Neuromuscular dysfunction in diabetes: role of nerve impairment and training status. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2013;45:52–9.
12. Wray LA, Ofstedal MB, Langa KM, Blaum CS. The effect of diabetes on disability in

middle-aged and older adults. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2005;60:1206–11.

13. Chiu C-J, Wray LA, Ofstedal MB. Diabetes-related change in physical disability from midlife to older adulthood: evidence from 1996-2003 Survey of Health and Living Status of the Elderly in Taiwan. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract*. 2011;91:413–23.

14. Colberg SR, Sigal RJ, Yardley JE, Riddell MC, Dunstan DW, Dempsey PC, et al. Physical Activity/Exercise and Diabetes: A Position Statement of the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care*. 2016;39:2065–79.

15. Gregg EW, Lin J, Bardenheier B, Chen H, Rejeski WJ, Zhuo X, et al. Impact of Intensive Lifestyle Intervention on Disability-Free Life Expectancy: The Look AHEAD Study. *Diabetes Care*. 2018;41:1040–8.

16. Balducci S, Zanuso S, Cardelli P, Salvi L, Mazzitelli G, Bazuro A, et al. Changes in physical fitness predict improvements in modifiable cardiovascular risk factors independently of body weight loss in subjects with type 2 diabetes participating in the Italian Diabetes and Exercise Study (IDES). *Diabetes Care*. 2012;35:1347–54.

17. Houston DK, Leng X, Bray GA, Hergenroeder AL, Hill JO, Jakicic JM, et al. A long-term intensive lifestyle intervention and physical function: the look AHEAD Movement and Memory Study. *Obesity*. 2015;23:77–84.

18. Jakicic JM, Jaramillo SA, Balasubramanyam A, Bancroft B, Curtis JM, Mathews A, et al. Effect of a lifestyle intervention on change in cardiorespiratory fitness in adults with type 2 diabetes: results from the Look AHEAD Study. *Int J Obes*. 2009;33:305–16.

19. Brandon LJ, Gaasch DA, Boyette LW, Lloyd AM. Effects of long-term resistive training on mobility and strength in older adults with diabetes. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2003;58:740–5.

20. Botton CE, Umpierre D, Rech A, Pfeifer LO, Machado CLF, Teodoro JL, et al. Effects of resistance training on neuromuscular parameters in elderly with type 2 diabetes mellitus: A randomized clinical trial. *Exp Gerontol*. 2018;113:141–9.

21. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71.

22. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, et al. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. John Wiley & Sons; 2019.

23. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghera D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev*. 2015;4:1.

24. Downs SH, Black N. The feasibility of creating a checklist for the assessment of the methodological quality both of randomised and non-randomised studies of health care interventions. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 1998;52:377–84.

25. Huffer D, Hing W, Newton R, Clair M. Strength training for plantar fasciitis and the intrinsic foot musculature: A systematic review. *Phys Ther Sport*. 2017;24:44–52.

26. Spineli LM, Pandis N. Prediction interval in random-effects meta-analysis. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 2020;157:586–8.

27. Pfeifer LO, De Nardi AT, da Silva LXN, Nascimento DM do, Botton CE, Teodoro JL,

- et al. Association between physical activity interventions and functional capacity in middle-aged adults and older individuals with type 2 diabetes: a protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized or non-randomized clinical trials. 2020. Available from: <https://osf.io/kpg2m>
28. Shabkhiz F, Khalafi M, Rosenkranz S, Karimi P, Moghadami K. Resistance training attenuates circulating FGF-21 and myostatin and improves insulin resistance in elderly men with and without type 2 diabetes mellitus: A randomised controlled clinical trial. *EJSS*. Informa UK Limited; 2020;1–10.
29. Yamamoto Y, Nagai Y, Kawanabe S, Hishida Y, Hiraki K, Sone M, et al. Effects of resistance training using elastic bands on muscle strength with or without a leucine supplement for 48 weeks in elderly patients with type 2 diabetes. *Endocr J*. 2020;68:291–8.
30. Conners RT, Caputo JL, Coons JM, Fuller DK, Morgan DW. Impact of Underwater Treadmill Training on Glycemic Control, Blood Lipids, and Health-Related Fitness in Adults With Type 2 Diabetes. *Clin Diabetes*. 2018;37:36–43.
31. Hwang C-L, Lim J, Yoo J-K, Kim H-K, Hwang M-H, Handberg EM, et al. Effect of all-extremity high-intensity interval training vs. moderate-intensity continuous training on aerobic fitness in middle-aged and older adults with type 2 diabetes: A randomized controlled trial. *Exp Gerontol*. 2019;116:46–53.
32. Szilágyi B, Kukla A, Makai A, Ács P, Járomi M. Sports therapy and recreation exercise program in type 2 diabetes: randomized controlled trial, 3-month follow-up. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness*. 2018;59:676–85.
33. Melo KCB, Araújo F de S, Cordeiro Júnior CCM, de Andrade KTP, Moreira SR. Pilates Method Training: Functional and Blood Glucose Responses of Older Women With Type 2 Diabetes. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2018;34:1001–7.
34. Pozo-Cruz B Del, Alfonso-Rosa RM, Pozo-Cruz J Del, Sañudo B, Rogers ME. Effects of a 12-wk whole-body vibration based intervention to improve type 2 diabetes. *Maturitas*. 2014;77:52–8.
35. Tan S, Li W, Wang J. Effects of six months of combined aerobic and resistance training for elderly patients with a long history of type 2 diabetes. *J Sports Sci Med*. 2012;11:495–501.
36. Balducci S, Zanuso S, Nicolucci A, Fernando F, Cavallo S, Cardelli P, et al. Anti-inflammatory effect of exercise training in subjects with type 2 diabetes and the metabolic syndrome is dependent on exercise modalities and independent of weight loss. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis*. 2010;20:608–17.
37. Lam P, Dennis SM, Diamond TH, Zwar N. Improving glycaemic and BP control in type 2 diabetes. The effectiveness of tai chi. *Aust Fam Physician*. 2008;37:884–7.
38. Bjørgaas M, Vik JT, Saeterhaug A, Langlo L, Sakshaug T, Mohus RM, et al. Relationship between pedometer-registered activity, aerobic capacity and self-reported activity and fitness in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Obes Metab*. Wiley; 2005;7:737–44.
39. Jiang Y, Tan S, Wang Z, Guo Z, Li Q, Wang J. Aerobic exercise training at maximal fat oxidation intensity improves body composition, glycemic control, and physical capacity in older people with type 2 diabetes. *J Exerc Sci Fit*. 2020;18:7–13.

40. Labrunée M, Antoine D, Vergès B, Robin I, Casillas J-M, Gremeaux V. Effects of a home-based rehabilitation program in obese type 2 diabetics. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med*. 2012;55:415–29.
41. Brun J-F, Bordenave S, Mercier J, Jaussent A, Picot M-C, Préfaut C. Cost-sparing effect of twice-weekly targeted endurance training in type 2 diabetics: a one-year controlled randomized trial. *Diabetes Metab*. 2008;34:258–65.
42. Larose J, Sigal RJ, Boulé NG, Wells GA, Prud'homme D, Fortier MS, et al. Effect of Exercise Training on Physical Fitness in Type II Diabetes Mellitus. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2010. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1249/mss.0b013e3181d322dd>
43. Loimaala A, Huikuri HV, Kööbi T, Rinne M, Nenonen A, Vuori I. Exercise training improves baroreflex sensitivity in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes*. 2003;52:1837–42.
44. Karstoft K, Winding K, Knudsen SH, Nielsen JS, Thomsen C, Pedersen BK, et al. The effects of free-living interval-walking training on glycemic control, body composition, and physical fitness in type 2 diabetic patients: a randomized, controlled trial. *Diabetes Care*. 2012;36:228–36.
45. Kadoglou NPE, Iliadis F, Angelopoulou N, Perrea D, Ampatzidis G, Liapis CD, et al. The anti-inflammatory effects of exercise training in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil*. 2007;14:837–43.
46. Kadoglou NPE, Iliadis F, Sailer N, Athanasiadou Z, Vitta I, Kapelouzou A, et al. Exercise training ameliorates the effects of rosiglitazone on traditional and novel cardiovascular risk factors in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Metabolism*. 2010;59:599–607.
47. Loimaala A, Groundstroem K, Rinne M, Nenonen A, Huhtala H, Parkkari J, et al. Effect of long-term endurance and strength training on metabolic control and arterial elasticity in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Am J Cardiol*. 2009;103:972–7.
48. Verity LS, Ismail AH. Effects of exercise on cardiovascular disease risk in women with NIDDM. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract*. 1989;6:27–35.
49. Plotnikoff RC, Eves N, Jung M, Sigal RJ, Padwal R, Karunamuni N. Multicomponent, home-based resistance training for obese adults with type 2 diabetes: a randomized controlled trial. *Int J Obes*. 2010;34:1733–41.
50. Yan H, Prista A, Ranadive SM, Damasceno A, Caupers P, Kanaley JA, et al. Effect of Aerobic Training on Glucose Control and Blood Pressure in T2DDM East African Males. *ISRN Endocrinol*. 2014;2014:864897.
51. Banitalebi E, Kazemi A, Faramarzi M, Nasiri S, Haghighi MM. Effects of sprint interval or combined aerobic and resistance training on myokines in overweight women with type 2 diabetes: A randomized controlled trial. *Life Sci*. 2018;217:101–9.
52. Wilson GA, Wilkins GT, Cotter JD, Lamberts RR, Lal S, Baldi JC. HIIT Improves Left Ventricular Exercise Response in Adults with Type 2 Diabetes. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2019;51:1099–105.
53. Scheer AS, Naylor LH, Gan SK, Charlesworth J, Benjanuvatra N, Green DJ, et al. The Effects of Water-based Exercise Training in People with Type 2 Diabetes. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2019;52:417–24.
54. Santos GM dos, Montrezol FT, Pauli LSS, Sartori-Cintra AR, Colantonio E, Gomes

- RJ, et al. Undulatory physical resistance training program increases maximal strength in elderly type 2 diabetics. *Einstein*. 2014;12:425–32.
55. Fritz T, Wändell P, Åberg H, Engfeldt P. Walking for exercise—does three times per week influence risk factors in type 2 diabetes? *Diabetes Res Clin Pract*. 2006;71:21–7.
56. Skarfors ET, Wegener TA, Lithell H, Selinus I. Physical training as treatment for type 2 (non-insulin-dependent) diabetes in elderly men. A feasibility study over 2 years. *Diabetologia*. 1987;30:930–3.
57. Magalhães JP, Júdice PB, Ribeiro R, Andrade R, Raposo J, Dores H, et al. Effectiveness of high-intensity interval training combined with resistance training versus continuous moderate-intensity training combined with resistance training in patients with type 2 diabetes: A one-year randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Obes Metab*. 2019;21:550–9.
58. Stubbs EB Jr, Fisher MA, Miller CM, Jelinek C, Butler J, McBurney C, et al. Randomized Controlled Trial of Physical Exercise in Diabetic Veterans With Length-Dependent Distal Symmetric Polyneuropathy. *Front Neurosci*. 2019;13:51.
59. Pozo-Cruz J Del, Alfonso-Rosa RM, Ugia JL, McVeigh JG, Pozo-Cruz B Del, et al. A Primary Care–Based Randomized Controlled Trial of 12-Week Whole-Body Vibration for Balance Improvement in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2013. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2013.05.030>
60. Otten J, Stomby A, Waling M, Isaksson A, Tellström A, Lundin-Olsson L, et al. Benefits of a Paleolithic diet with and without supervised exercise on fat mass, insulin sensitivity, and glycemic control: a randomized controlled trial in individuals with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev*. 2017. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/dmrr.2828>
61. Boulé NG, Kenny GP, Haddad E, Wells GA, Sigal RJ. Meta-analysis of the effect of structured exercise training on cardiorespiratory fitness in Type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Diabetologia*. 2003;46:1071–81.
62. Yang Z, Scott CA, Mao C, Tang J, Farmer AJ. Resistance exercise versus aerobic exercise for type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sports Med*. 2014;44:487–99.
63. Wei M, Gibbons LW, Kampert JB, Nichaman MZ, Blair SN. Low cardiorespiratory fitness and physical inactivity as predictors of mortality in men with type 2 diabetes. *Ann Intern Med*. 2000;132:605–11.
64. Blair SN. Changes in Physical Fitness and All-Cause Mortality. *JAMA*. 1995. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jama.1995.03520380029031>
65. Kuziński K, Słomiński W, Jassem E. Impact of diabetes mellitus on functional exercise capacity and pulmonary functions in patients with diabetes and healthy persons. *BMC Endocr Disord*. 2019;19:2.
66. Lee MC. Validity of the 6-minute walk test and step test for evaluation of cardiorespiratory fitness in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *J Exerc Nutrition Biochem*. 2018;22:49–55.
67. Newman AB, Kupelian V, Visser M, Simonsick EM, Goodpaster BH, Kritchevsky SB, et al. Strength, but not muscle mass, is associated with mortality in the health, aging and body composition study cohort. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2006;61:72–

7.

68. Li R, Xia J, Zhang XI, Gathirua-Mwangi WG, Guo J, Li Y, et al. Associations of Muscle Mass and Strength with All-Cause Mortality among US Older Adults. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2018;50:458–67.

69. Abellan van Kan G, Rolland Y, Andrieu S, Bauer J, Beauchet O, Bonnefoy M, et al. Gait speed at usual pace as a predictor of adverse outcomes in community-dwelling older people an International Academy on Nutrition and Aging (IANA) Task Force. *J Nutr Health Aging.* 2009;13:881–9.

70. Cesari M, Kritchevsky SB, Newman AB, Simonsick EM, Harris TB, Penninx BW, et al. Added value of physical performance measures in predicting adverse health-related events: results from the Health, Aging And Body Composition Study. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2009;57:251–9.

71. Studenski S, Perera S, Wallace D, Chandler JM, Duncan PW, Rooney E, et al. Physical performance measures in the clinical setting. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2003;51:314–22.

72. Harman NL, Wilding JPH, Curry D, Harris J, Logue J, Pemberton RJ, et al. Selecting Core Outcomes for Randomised Effectiveness trials In Type 2 diabetes (SCORE-IT): a patient and healthcare professional consensus on a core outcome set for type 2 diabetes. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care.* 2019;7:e000700.

