

Hypoglycemic Events in Diabetic Patients under Non-insulin Regimens During Ramadan: A Frequentist Network Meta-Analysis

Salah Eddine O. Kacimi¹⁺, MD, Mahnoor Sukaina²⁺, MBBS, Anas Elgenidy³⁺, MBBS, Ramadan Abdelmoez Farahat⁴, MBBS, Huzaifa A. Cheema⁵, MBBS, Amira Y. Benmelouka⁶, MD, Dina M. Awad⁷, MD; Hadj Ahmed Belaoui⁸, PhD, Moustafa K.E Abdelli¹, MD, Anisse Tidjane⁹, MD, Nabil Smain Mesli^{1,10}, MD, Jaffer Shah^{11*}, MD, Mounir Ould Setti¹², MD, Ahmed M. Afifi¹³, MBBS, Sherief Ghozy^{14,15}, MD & the Ramadan Diabetes Research Group (RDRG) Collaborators[#]

⁺ Co-first authors

¹ Faculty of Medicine, Abou-Bekr Belkaid University of Tlemcen, Tlemcen, Algeria

² Faculty of Medicine, Karachi Medical and Dental College, Karachi, Pakistan

³ Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt

⁴ Faculty of Medicine, Kafrelsheikh University, Kafrelsheikh, Egypt

⁵ Department of Medicine, King Edward Medical University, Lahore, Pakistan

⁶ Faculty of Medicine, University of Algiers, Algiers, Algeria

⁷ Alexandria Faculty of Medicine, Alexandria University, Alexandria, Egypt

⁸ Laboratoire de Biologie des Systèmes Microbiens (LBSM), Ecole Normale Supérieure de Kouba, Algiers, Algeria

⁹ Faculty of Medicine, University of Oran, Oran, Algeria

¹⁰ Department of Surgery A, University-Hospital Center (CHU) of Tlemcen, Tlemcen, Algeria

¹¹ Medical Research Center, Kateb University, Kabul, Afghanistan

¹² Institute of Public Health and Clinical Nutrition, University of Eastern Finland, Kuopio, Finland

¹³ Division of gastroenterology, Baylor College of Medicine, Texas, USA

¹⁴ Department of Radiology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA

¹⁵ Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences and Department for Continuing Education (EBHC program), Oxford University, Oxford, UK

* Corresponding authors

Ramadan Diabetes Research Group (RDRG) Collaborators (PubMed-Indexed): Hazem S. Ghaith, Mostafa Reda, Ian SOH

Corresponding author

Jaffer Shah, MD

Medical Research Center, Kateb University, Kabul, Afghanistan; Jaffer.shah@kateb.edu.af

1 **Abstract**

2 Background

3 Diabetic Muslims who choose to fast during Ramadan encounter major risks such as
4 hyperglycemia, hypoglycemia, diabetic ketoacidosis, and dehydration. Recently, newer
5 antidiabetic agents have been found to be less likely to cause hypoglycemic emergencies. This
6 meta-analysis aimed to present collective and conclusive results from major randomized
7 controlled trials (RCTs) to determine the risk of hypoglycemia among patients taking oral
8 antidiabetics during Ramadan.

9 Methods

10 We searched PubMed, Web of Science, and Google Scholar for RCTs. We performed a
11 frequentist network meta-analysis using the “netmeta” package of R software version 4.1.1 to
12 investigate the risk of developing hypoglycemia after taking oral antidiabetic drugs during
13 Ramadan.

14 Results


15 Nine RCTs with a total of 3464 patients were included in the final analysis. In the comparison of
16 all antidiabetic drug classes with sulfonylureas, SGLT-2 inhibitors were associated with the
17 lowest hypoglycemic risk (RR, 0.18; 95% CI, 0.04-0.78; P-score, 0.909), followed by GLP-1
18 agonists (RR, 0.31; 95% CI, 0.17-0.56; P-score, 0.799), and DDP-4 inhibitors (RR, 0.57; 95%
19 CI, 0.43-0.75; P-score, 0.483). When comparing individual drugs, dapagliflozin was associated
20 with the lowest hypoglycemic risk (RR, 0.18; 95% CI, 0.04-0.78; P-score, 0.874), followed by
21 lixisenatide (RR, 0.25; 95% CI, 0.09-0.71; P-score, 0.813), liraglutide (RR, 0.34; 95% CI, 0.17-
22 0.69; P-score, 0.715), and sitagliptin (RR, 0.51; 95% CI, 0.37-0.71; P-score, 0.515).

23 Conclusion

24 SGLT-2 inhibitors are associated with the least documented hypoglycemic events and adverse
25 outcomes compared with other oral hypoglycemic drugs. These findings could have considerable
26 public health and clinical implications when extrapolated to the global Muslim population with a
27 similar clinical background.

28 Keywords

29 SGLT-2 inhibitors; Ramadan fasting; Diabetic Muslims; Hypoglycemia; Non-insulin Regimen;
30 Frequentist Network Meta-Analysis



32 **Introduction**

33 Fasting is one of the basic principles of Islam, a religion that over a billion people practice.
34 Healthy Muslim adults must cease eating and drinking from sunrise to sunset during Ramadan,
35 the 9th lunar month in the Islamic calendar [1,2]. Presently, there are more than 150 million
36 Muslim diabetics globally [3], and the number of diabetics worldwide is expected to surpass 360
37 million by 2030 [2]. Glycemic control in diabetic patients is essential. This is to avoid acute
38 hyperosmolar non-ketotic coma, chronic diabetic complications such as diabetic retinopathy in
39 microvascular changes, and other macrovascular complications [1].

40 However, maintaining glycemic control may be difficult, especially for diabetic Muslims who
41 fast during the holy month of Ramadan.[4] Therein lies the major and serious complication of
42 hypoglycemia associated with fasting and oral hypoglycemic antidiabetic such as meglitinides
43 and sulfonylureas [1,5,6]. The Epidemiology of Diabetes and Ramadan (EPIDIAR)
44 demonstrated that around 78.5% of Muslim diabetic patients who fast did not refrain from
45 fasting for at least 15 days. Furthermore, an alteration in physical activity and changes in insulin
46 dosage and other oral hypoglycemic drugs were observed to increase severe hypoglycemic
47 events [7].

48 In recent times, newer antidiabetic agents have been introduced which are less likely to cause
49 hypoglycemic emergencies. Such antidiabetics include dipeptidyl peptidase-4 (DPP-4) inhibitors
50 and sodium-glucose co-transporter-2(SGLT-2) inhibitors. Crucially, the role of SGLT-2
51 inhibitors has been rarely elaborated in a network meta-analysis to show efficacy in fasting
52 diabetic patients. Currently, most studies have shown that hypoglycemia during Ramadan can be
53 curbed by shifting the therapy from insulin or other oral hypoglycemics to DPP-4 inhibitors or
54 metformin [1,5,6]. A network meta-analysis by Lee et al. showed that newer antidiabetics exhibit
55 appropriate glycemic control and lower hypoglycemic complications than sulfonylureas [8].
56 Moreover, it also highlighted that incretin-based mimetics manifest 1.5 times lesser
57 hypoglycemic events [8]. Likewise, a recent meta-analysis demonstrated that DPP-4 and
58 glucagon-like peptide (GLP-1) agonist therapy significantly improves HbA1c levels amongst
59 fasting diabetic patients during Ramadan [9]. Other studies have also shown that Ramadan-
60 focused diabetes education helps create awareness among the population, ensuring a decline in
61 HbA1c levels in fasting patients [10].

62 This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to present collective and conclusive results of
63 major randomized controlled trials (RCTs) regarding hypoglycemic events associated with
64 antidiabetic medication in the fasting population during Ramadan. Diabetic emergencies, if not
65 treated timely, can lead to fatal outcomes. Lack of awareness and standard therapy hinders
66 seeking and continuing treatment. The rationale of our study is to fill the literature gap and
67 provide the data that helps create a standardized therapy for fasting people with diabetes during
68 Ramadan.

69 **Methods**

70 This meta-analysis was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
71 Review and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) statement recommendations [11]. A systematic search
72 was done to select all the trials that correspond to the following criteria: 1) population: diabetics
73 fasting during Ramadan; 2) intervention and comparator: any non-insulin oral antidiabetic agent
74 compared with another oral agent; 3) outcome: hypoglycemic events; and 4) study design: RCTs.

75 **Literature search**

76 The search was conducted on March 2022 in the following databases: MEDLINE (via PubMed),
77 Scopus, Web of Science, and Science Direct using a search string relating to the following
78 keywords: Ramadan, diabetes, oral antidiabetic agents, and hypoglycemia.

79 There were no restrictions on language, country, gender, race, or sample size among the
80 published articles. Animal reports, reviews, letters, commentaries, conference abstracts/posters,
81 case reports, case series, and trials including diabetic patients not fasting in Ramadan were
82 excluded. Further, a manual search of reference lists of the included studies was done to retrieve
83 any relevant studies.

84 **Screening and study selection**

85 After removing duplicates, the title and abstract screening of the selected articles was performed
86 by two independent reviewers. This step was followed by a full-text screening of the selected
87 articles to verify the included population and the availability of the outcomes. When full texts
88 were not available, we contacted the authors. Disagreements were resolved by a third senior
89 researcher.

90 **Data extraction**

91 Two independent authors performed the data extraction using a pre-performed excel sheet.
92 Population demographics and data on hypoglycemic events during Ramadan were extracted.
93 Disagreements were resolved through discussion with a senior researcher to find a consensus.

94 **Risk of bias**

95 Two independent investigators evaluated the risk of bias in the included studies using the revised
96 Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool for randomized controlled trials (RoB 2.0) [12]. RoB 2.0 addresses
97 five domains: (1) bias arising from the randomization process; (2) bias due to deviations from
98 intended interventions; (3) bias due to missing outcome data; (4) bias in measurement of the
99 outcome; and (5) bias in the selection of the reported result. Each item was described as having a
100 low, high, or unclear risk of bias. Each study's overall risk of bias was described as low,
101 moderate, or high risk, based on our judgments for all the items. A senior author resolved any
102 discrepancies among reviewers by consensus.

103 **Statistical analysis**

104 We conducted the analysis using the 'netmeta' package ver. 2.1-0 ([https://cran.r-](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/netmeta/index.html)
105 [project.org/web/packages/netmeta/index.html](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/netmeta/index.html)) of R software version 4.1.1. We performed a

106 frequentist network meta-analysis to investigate the risk of developing hypoglycemia after taking
107 oral antidiabetic drugs during Ramadan. Fixed- or random-effects models were used to perform
108 the network meta-analysis based on the level of heterogeneity/inconsistency [13]. When ≥ 10
109 studies were available, we built comparison-adjusted funnel plots to examine small study effects
110 [13]. Funnel plot asymmetry was assessed with three tests (Begg–Mazumdar test, Egger's
111 regression, and Thompson–Sharp test). P values < 0.1 were considered significant [14–16].

112 **Results**

113 **Description of Eligible Trials**

114 After screening, nine studies were selected for final analysis [17–25] (**Fig. 1**). Five studies were
115 multi-centric and conducted in several countries while the rest were conducted in the UK,
116 Lebanon, Malaysia, India, and Malaysia. All included studies were RCTs with double arm
117 comparisons with sulfonylureas (**Fig. 2**). The total number of patients was 3464, with 1743 in the
118 sulfonylurea treated group (mean age=53.6), and 1721 (mean age=53.9) in the intervention
119 group. The intervention group included patients treated with the following drugs: sitagliptin,
120 liraglutide, vildagliptin, lixisenatide and basal insulin, repaglinide, and dapagliflozin plus
121 metformin. The mean BMIs for the intervention and sulfonylurea treated groups were 29.7 and
122 29.4, respectively (**Tab. 1**).

123 **Results of the Outcomes in NMA**

124 **Hypoglycemia risk**

125 Among the diabetic patients, the network of treatment comparisons for hypoglycemia was
126 reported in nine studies [17–25]. The sulfonylurea was the well-connected group directly linked
127 to all other treatments. In the comparison of all antidiabetic drug classes with sulfonylureas,
128 SGLT-2 inhibitors were associated with the lowest hypoglycemic risk (RR, 0.18; 95% CI, 0.04-
129 0.78; P-score, 0.909), followed by GLP-1 agonists (RR, 0.31; 95% CI, 0.17-0.56; P-score,
130 0.799), and DDP-4 inhibitors (RR, 0.57; 95% CI, 0.43-0.75; P-score, 0.483). Compared with
131 each other, SGLT-2 inhibitors, GLP-1 agonists, DDP-4 inhibitors, and meglitinide did not reveal
132 a statistically significant difference (**Fig. 3**).

133 Dapagliflozin was associated with the lowest hypoglycemic risk (RR, 0.18; 95% CI, 0.04-0.78;
134 P-score, 0.874), followed by lixisenatide (RR, 0.25; 95% CI, 0.09-0.71; P-score, 0.813),
135 liraglutide (RR, 0.34; 95% CI, 0.17-0.69; P-score, 0.715), and sitagliptin (RR, 0.51; 95% CI,
136 0.37-0.71; P-score, 0.515). Ranking of the risk of hypoglycemia using p-score revealed
137 dapagliflozin as the best, and sulfonylureas as the worst among treatments (P-score, 0.093).
138 Compared with each other, dapagliflozin, lixisenatide, liraglutide, sitagliptin, vildagliptin, and
139 repaglinide did not reveal a statistically significant difference (**Fig. 4**).

140 **Adverse effects**

141 Comparing all treatments with sulfonylureas, there were almost no statistically significant
142 differences regarding the relative risk of having any adverse event (**Fig. 5**). However, ranking the

143 risk of any adverse events using P-scores revealed sulfonylurea as the best (P-score, 0.59), with
144 fewer adverse events, and GLP-1 agonists as the worst among treatments (P-score, 0.38). There
145 was no statistically significant difference between the drug classes compared to each other.

146 **Risk of Bias of Included Studies**

147 The quality of included studies ranged from moderate to high quality according to the Cochrane
148 Collaboration's tool for assessing the risk of bias 2 (RoB 2).

149 Regarding the randomization process, four studies were of low risk of bias [17,19,21,22], while
150 five studies [18,20,23–25] were judged to have some concerns due to the lack of blinding
151 patients and the study personnel.

152 All included trials had a low risk of bias in terms of deviations from the intended interventions,
153 the missing outcome data, the measurement outcome bias, and the selection of the reported
154 results bias. The detailed risk of bias domains by study ID, are reported in the supplement.

155 **Sensitivity Analyses**

156 We compared the individual drugs of the sulfonylurea class with other antidiabetic drugs. The
157 network of treatment comparisons for hypoglycemia consisted of eight individual nodes.
158 Gliclazide was the well-connected group and directly linked to all other treatments.

159 In the comparison of all individual drugs with glibenclamide, liraglutide was associated with the
160 lowest hypoglycemic risk (RR, 0.12; 95% CI, 0.03-0.49; P-score, 0.92), followed by lixisenatide
161 (RR, 0.15; 95% CI, 0.04-0.62; P-score, 0.88), sitagliptin (RR, 0.43; 95% CI, 0.21-0.87; P-score,
162 0.60), vildagliptin (RR, 0.43; 95% CI, 0.12-1.48; P-score,0.57), gliclazide (RR, 0.61; 95% CI,
163 0.29-1.25; P-score, 0.40), glimepiride (RR, 0.74; 95% CI, 0.39-1.42; P-score,0.28), and
164 repaglinide (RR, 0.95; 95% CI, 0.27-3.10; P-score, 0.23; **Fig. 6**). Ranking of the risk of any
165 adverse events using p-score revealed liraglutide as the best, being with fewer hypoglycemic
166 events, and glibenclamide as the worst among treatments (P-score, 0.117).

167 **Among incretins mimetics**, Liraglutide was better than lixisenatide, but there was no
168 statistically significant difference regarding hypoglycemic events. Liraglutide and lixisenatide
169 were better than **sulfonylureas** (gliclazide and glimepiride, glibenclamide), with statistically
170 significant differences. Both Liraglutide and lixisenatide were better than **repaglinide**, but
171 Liraglutide showed a statistically significant difference compared with repaglinide but not
172 lixisenatide. Finally, Liraglutide and lixisenatide were better than **DPP-4 inhibitors** (sitagliptin,
173 vildagliptin) with no statistically significant difference.

174 **Among DPP-4 inhibitors**, Sitagliptin was better than vildagliptin, with no statistically
175 significant difference between them regarding the hypoglycemic events. Sitagliptin and
176 vildagliptin were better than **sulfonylureas drugs** (Gliclazide and glimepiride, glibenclamide),
177 with a statistically significant difference only between Sitagliptin and glibenclamide. Sitagliptin
178 and vildagliptin were better than **repaglinide** with no statistically significant difference between
179 them.

180 **Among sulfonylureas**, Gliclazide was better than glimepiride, and glibenclamide with no
181 statistically significant difference between them regarding the hypoglycemic events. Both
182 Gliclazide and glimepiride were better than **repaglinide**, on the other hand, repaglinide is better
183 than glibenclamide. However, there was no statistically significant difference between them
184 regarding the hypoglycemic events (**Fig. 6**).

185

186 **Discussion**

187 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first network meta-analysis of all newer oral
188 hypoglycemic agents explicating hypoglycemic events in fasting diabetic patients during
189 Ramadan. We found that SGLT-2 inhibitors are associated with the least documented
190 hypoglycemic events and adverse outcomes followed by GLP-1 agonists, DPP-4 inhibitors,
191 meglitinide and sulfonylureas. A recent meta-analysis by Gad et al. advocates the treatment
192 efficacy of SGLT-2 inhibitors in Ramadan with fewer major adverse events [26]. Other meta-
193 analyses by Shiju et al. and Loh et al. promote treatment with vildagliptin in high-risk patients,
194 especially the elderly [27,28].

195 Original studies reporting that vildagliptin is associated with lesser hypoglycemic events during
196 Ramadan coincide with our results [21,29,30]. However, when comparing both classes,
197 vildagliptin has slighter lower efficacy as compared to sitagliptin, but non-significant better
198 results than sulfonylureas. Gad et al. elucidated similar outcomes that favor the efficacy of
199 SGLT-2 inhibitors, GLP-1 agonists, and DPP-4 inhibitors; however, the study does not ascertain
200 the efficiency of newer oral hypoglycemic in the hierarchy of least hypoglycemic
201 events.[9]Furthermore, the meta-analysis by Gad et al. approves both lixisenatide and liraglutide
202 for fasting diabetic patients in Ramadan like our study. Similarly, a meta-analysis by Gray et al.
203 presented the clinical efficacy of liraglutide [31]. We demonstrate that lixisenatide shows better
204 efficacy than liraglutide; however, both lower risk of symptomatic hypoglycemia compared with
205 sulfonylureas.

206 We acknowledge the statement by Gray et al. that the majority of trials and observational studies
207 favor the treatment efficacy of DPP-4 inhibitors over sulfonylureas in fasting T2D patients [31].
208 Our meta-analysis shows the possible efficacy of SGLT-2 inhibitors over GLP-1 agonists and the
209 aforementioned drugs over DPP-4 inhibitors, although all these drug classes are advantageous in
210 preventing hypoglycemic events in fasting diabetics. However, like Gray et al. we recommend
211 that in the future, more studies should evaluate and compare SGLT-2 inhibitors, GLP-1 agonists,
212 and DPP-4 inhibitors in terms of efficacy, effectiveness, primary and secondary outcomes, and
213 safety outcomes. A study by Lee et al. showed that DPP-4 inhibitors can reduce the occurrence
214 of hypoglycemic events in people who fast during Ramadan when compared to sulfonylureas [8].
215 However, it was inconclusive regarding meglitinides due to the lack of relevant data on people
216 observing fasting. The study by Mbanya et al. compared sulfonylureas and found gliclazide to be
217 the better choice of drug as compared with glimepiride which is better when compared to
218 metformin [32]. On the contrary, the observation study by Bonakdaran and Khajeh-Dalouie

219 concluded that sulfonylureas have a significantly higher incidence of hypoglycemic events as
220 compared to metformin [33]. The LIRA-Ramadan study by Azar et al. concluded that using
221 liraglutide can have significantly better outcomes and lesser complications, including
222 hypoglycemic events, compared with sulfonylureas [23]. Similarly, our study shows that GLP-1
223 agonists have better outcomes when compared with DPP-4 inhibitors, meglitinides, and
224 sulfonylureas. John et al. discussed that SGLT-2 inhibitors provide lesser risk or severity of
225 hypoglycemia in patients living in warm climate conditions [34]. The majority of Muslims live
226 in warm climatic conditions, and therefore fasting in Ramadan has better results when people are
227 using SGLT-2 inhibitors and may reduce the risk of hypoglycemia.

228 Currently, amidst the COVID-19 pandemic, Tootie et al. discussed that SGLT-2 inhibitors be
229 avoided due to the heightened risk of diabetic ketoacidosis (DKA) and dehydration as COVID-
230 19 infection may cause compromised immunity [35]. Hassanein et al., in their CRATOS study,
231 concluded that SGLT-2 inhibitors are a safer option for people fasting in Ramadan as they have a
232 lower incidence of hypoglycemic events [36]. However, they still have the risk of volume
233 depletion due to osmotic diuresis, especially in the elderly group of patients [37].

234 We recommend using newer technology, non-invasive devices over the regular finger prick
235 glucometers to monitor glucose levels throughout the day in fasting diabetics, which will aid in
236 prick-free testing without voiding the fast and help recognize the best possible management
237 regimen of diabetic drugs for individuals with different co-morbidities [38]. These devices can
238 read glucose levels 24 hours a day and keep-up the track for up to two weeks.

239 **Strengths and Limitations**

240 We presented a network meta-analysis of associations of different newer oral hypoglycemic
241 drugs with the extent of hypoglycemia and adverse events from multicenter studies in different
242 races and populations. Several limitations we observed include only hypoglycemic events as our
243 outcome and not changes in HbA1c, weight loss, and changes in systolic and diastolic blood
244 pressures. Moreover, we presented general adverse events and did not specify the most to least
245 common adverse events associated with each drug class. We specified different drugs in each
246 class, but we were only able to evaluate the efficacy of dapagliflozin in the class of SGLT-2
247 inhibitors. Another limitation that needs to be pointed out is the scarcity of studies on this topic
248 with only nine trials matching our selection criteria.

249 **OTHER INFORMATION**

250 *Financial support*

251 This work is not supported by any third party.

252 *Conflict of interest*

253 The authors of this work have no competing interests to declare.

254 *Availability of data, code, and other materials*

255 Data of this study are available upon reasonable request from the corresponding author.

256 **References**

- 257 [1] Abdessadek M, Khabbal Y, Magoul R, Marmouzi I, Ajdi F. Follow-up of glycemic index
258 before and after Ramadan fasting in type 2 diabetes patients under antidiabetic
259 medications. *Ann Pharm Françaises* 2019;77:374–81.
260 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pharma.2019.04.003>.
- 261 [2] Mudher Mikhael E. Effectiveness and Safety of Newer Antidiabetic Medications for
262 Ramadan Fasting Diabetic Patients. *J Diabetes Res* 2016;2016:6962574.
263 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/6962574>.
- 264 [3] Diabetes and Ramadan n.d. [https://idf.org/our-activities/education/diabetes-and-](https://idf.org/our-activities/education/diabetes-and-ramadan.html)
265 [ramadan.html](https://idf.org/our-activities/education/diabetes-and-ramadan.html) (accessed May 27, 2022).
- 266 [4] Almalki MH, Alshahrani F. Options for Controlling Type 2 Diabetes during Ramadan .
267 *Front Endocrinol* 2016;7.
- 268 [5] Aziz KM. Fasting during Ramadan: efficacy, safety, and patient acceptability of
269 vildagliptin in diabetic patients. *Diabetes Metab Syndr Obes* 2015;8:207–11.
270 <https://doi.org/10.2147/DMSO.S54683>.
- 271 [6] Loh HH, Kamaruddin NA. Treatment Options for Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus
272 during the Fasting Month of Ramadan. *Ann Acad Med Singapore* 2020;49:468–76.
- 273 [7] Salti I, Bénard E, Detournay B, Bianchi-Biscay M, Le Brigand C, Voinet C, et al. A
274 population-based study of diabetes and its characteristics during the fasting month of
275 Ramadan in 13 countries: results of the epidemiology of diabetes and Ramadan 1422/2001
276 (EPIDIAR) study. *Diabetes Care* 2004;27:2306–11.
277 <https://doi.org/10.2337/diacare.27.10.2306>.

- 278 [8] Lee SWH, Lee JY, Tan CSS, Wong CP. Strategies to Make Ramadan Fasting Safer in
279 Type 2 Diabetics: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-analysis of Randomized
280 Controlled Trials and Observational Studies. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2016;95.
- 281 [9] Gad H, Hayat T, Al-Muhannadi H, Malik BR, Mussleman P, Malik RA. Efficacy and
282 safety of the newer oral hypoglycemic agents in patients with T2DM during Ramadan: A
283 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2021;172:108562.
284 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2020.108562>.
- 285 [10] Gad H, Al-Muhannadi H, Purra H, Mussleman P, Malik RA. The effect of Ramadan
286 focused education on patients with type 2 diabetes: A systematic review and meta-
287 analysis. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2020;162:108122.
288 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2020.108122>.
- 289 [11] Page MJ, Moher D, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. PRISMA
290 2020 explanation and elaboration: updated guidance and exemplars for reporting
291 systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n160. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n160>.
- 292 [12] Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a
293 revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2019;366:14898.
294 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.14898>.
- 295 [13] Salanti G, Del Giovane C, Chaimani A, Caldwell DM, Higgins JPT. Evaluating the
296 Quality of Evidence from a Network Meta-Analysis. *PLoS One* 2014;9:e99682.
- 297 [14] Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating Characteristics of a Rank Correlation Test for
298 Publication Bias. *Biometrics* 1994;50:1088. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2533446>.
- 299 [15] Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple,
300 graphical test. *BMJ* 1997;315:629–34. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629>.
- 301 [16] Thompson SG, Sharp SJ. Explaining heterogeneity in meta-analysis: a comparison of
302 methods. *Stat Med* 1999;18:2693–708. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0258\(19991030\)18:20<2693::AID-SIM235>3.0.CO;2-V](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0258(19991030)18:20<2693::AID-SIM235>3.0.CO;2-V).
- 303
304 [17] Wan Seman WJ, Kori N, Rajoo S, Othman H, Mohd Noor N, Wahab NA, et al. Switching
305 from sulphonylurea to a sodium-glucose cotransporter2 inhibitor in the fasting month of
306 Ramadan is associated with a reduction in hypoglycaemia. *Diabetes, Obes Metab*

- 2016;18:628–32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dom.12649>.
- 308 [18] Malha LP, Taan G, Zantout MS, Azar ST. Glycemic effects of vildagliptin in patients with
309 type 2 diabetes before, during and after the period of fasting in Ramadan. *Ther Adv*
310 *Endocrinol Metab* 2014;5:3–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2042018814529062>.
- 311 [19] Mafauzy M. Repaglinide versus glibenclamide treatment of Type 2 diabetes during
312 Ramadan fasting. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2002;58:45–53. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-8227(02)00104-3)
313 [8227\(02\)00104-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-8227(02)00104-3).
- 314 [20] Hassanein MM, Sahay R, Hafidh K, Djaballah K, Li H, Azar S, et al. Safety of
315 lixisenatide versus sulfonylurea added to basal insulin treatment in people with type 2
316 diabetes mellitus who elect to fast during Ramadan (LixiRam): An international,
317 randomized, open-label trial. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2019;150:331–41.
318 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2019.01.035>.
- 319 [21] Hassanein M, Abdallah K, Schweizer A. A double-blind, randomized trial, including
320 frequent patient-physician contacts and Ramadan-focused advice, assessing vildagliptin
321 and gliclazide in patients with type 2 diabetes fasting during Ramadan: The STEADFAST
322 study. *Vasc Health Risk Manag* 2014;10:319–26. <https://doi.org/10.2147/VHRM.S64038>.
- 323 [22] Brady EM, Davies MJ, Gray LJ, Saeed MA, Smith D, Hanif W, et al. A randomized
324 controlled trial comparing the GLP-1 receptor agonist liraglutide to a sulphonylurea as add
325 on to metformin in patients with established type 2 diabetes during Ramadan: the Treat 4
326 Ramadan Trial. *Diabetes, Obes Metab* 2014;16:527–36.
327 <https://doi.org/10.1111/dom.12249>.
- 328 [23] Azar ST, Echtay A, Wan Bebakar WM, Al Araj S, Berrah A, Omar M, et al. Efficacy and
329 safety of liraglutide compared to sulphonylurea during Ramadan in patients
330 with type 2 diabetes (LIRAMADAN): a randomized trial. *Diabetes, Obes*
331 *Metab* 2016;18:1025–33. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dom.12733>.
- 332 [24] Aravind SR, Ismail SB, Balamurugan R, Gupta JB, Wadhwa T, Loh SM, et al.
333 Hypoglycemia in patients with type 2 diabetes from India and Malaysia treated with
334 sitagliptin or a sulfonylurea during Ramadan: a randomized, pragmatic study. *Curr Med*
335 *Res Opin* 2012;28:1289–96. <https://doi.org/10.1185/03007995.2012.707119>.
- 336 [25] Al Sifri S, Basiounny A, Echtay A, Al Omari M, Harman Boehm I, Kaddaha G, et al.

- 337 The incidence of hypoglycaemia in Muslim patients with type 2 diabetes treated with
338 sitagliptin or a sulphonylurea during Ramadan: a randomised trial. *Int J Clin Pract*
339 2011;65:1132–40. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-1241.2011.02797.x>.
- 340 [26] Gad H, Al-Nassr N, Mohammed I, Khan A, MacDonald R, Mussleman P, et al. Effect of
341 Ramadan fasting in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus treated with sodium-glucose
342 cotransporter 2 inhibitors: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Diabetes Investig*
343 2022;13:822–9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jdi.13741>.
- 344 [27] Shiju R, Akhil A, Thankachan S, Tuomilehto J, Al Arouj M, Bennakhi A. Safety
345 Assessment of Glucose-Lowering Drugs and Importance of Structured Education during
346 Ramadan: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Diabetes Res* 2022;2022:3846253.
347 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/3846253>.
- 348 [28] Loh HH, Yee A, Loh HS, Sukor N, Kamaruddin NA. Comparative studies of dipeptidyl
349 peptidase 4 inhibitor vs sulphonylurea among Muslim Type 2 diabetes patients who fast
350 in the month of Ramadan: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Prim Care Diabetes*
351 2016;10:210–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcd.2015.09.001>.
- 352 [29] Halimi S, Levy M, Huet D, Quéré S, Dejager S. Experience with Vildagliptin in Type 2
353 Diabetic Patients Fasting During Ramadan in France: Insights from the VERDI Study.
354 *Diabetes Ther Res Treat Educ Diabetes Relat Disord* 2013;4:385–98.
355 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13300-013-0038-7>.
- 356 [30] Hassanein M, Hanif W, Malik W, Kamal A, Geransar P, Lister N, et al. Comparison of the
357 dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitor vildagliptin and the sulphonylurea gliclazide in
358 combination with metformin, in Muslim patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus fasting
359 during Ramadan: results of the VECTOR study. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2011;27:1367–74.
360 <https://doi.org/10.1185/03007995.2011.579951>.
- 361 [31] Gray LJ, Dales J, Brady EM, Khunti K, Hanif W, Davies MJ. Safety and effectiveness of
362 non-insulin glucose-lowering agents in the treatment of people with type 2 diabetes who
363 observe Ramadan: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Obes Metab*
364 2015;17:639–48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dom.12462>.
- 365 [32] Mbanya JC, Al-Sifri S, Abdel-Rahim A, Satman I. Incidence of hypoglycemia in patients
366 with type 2 diabetes treated with gliclazide versus DPP-4 inhibitors during Ramadan: A

- 367 meta-analytical approach. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2015;109:226–32.
- 368 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2015.04.030>.
- 369 [33] Bonakdaran SH, Khajeh-Dalouie M. The effects of fasting during Ramadan on glycemic
370 excursions detected by continuous glucose monitoring system (CGMS) in patients with
371 type 2 diabetes. *Med J Malaysia* 2011;66:447–50.
- 372 [34] John M, Cerdas S, Violante R, Deerochanawong C, Hassanein M, Slee A, et al. Efficacy
373 and safety of canagliflozin in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus living in hot climates.
374 *Int J Clin Pract* 2016;70:775–85. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcp.12868>.
- 375 [35] Tootee A, Esfahani EN, Larijani B. Diabetes management during Ramadan amid Covid-
376 19 pandemic. *DARU J Pharm Sci* 2020;28:795–8. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s40199-020-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40199-020-00357-6)
377 [00357-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40199-020-00357-6).
- 378 [36] Hassanein M, Echtay A, Hassoun A, Alarouj M, Afandi B, Poladian R, et al. Tolerability
379 of canagliflozin in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus fasting during Ramadan: Results
380 of the Canagliflozin in Ramadan Tolerance Observational Study (CRATOS). *Int J Clin*
381 *Pract* 2017;71. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcp.12991>.
- 382 [37] Bashier A, Khalifa AA, Abdelgadir EI, Al Saeed MA, Al Qaysi AA, Bayati MBA, et al.
383 Safety of Sodium-Glucose Cotransporter 2 Inhibitors (SGLT2-I) During the Month of
384 Ramadan in Muslim Patients with Type 2 Diabetes. *Oman Med J* 2018;33:104–10.
385 <https://doi.org/10.5001/omj.2018.21>.
- 386 [38] Tang L, Chang SJ, Chen C-J, Liu J-T. Non-Invasive Blood Glucose Monitoring
387 Technology: A Review. *Sensors (Basel)* 2020;20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s20236925>.
- 388

389 **Figures' legends**

390 **Figure 1:** The PRISMA flow diagram of the study selection process.

391 **Figure 2:** Network plots of all included studies for: i) antidiabetic drug class and symptomatic
392 hypoglycemia, ii) antidiabetic drug class and any adverse effects, iii) drug name and symptomatic
393 hypoglycemia.

394 **Figure 3:** Non-insulin antidiabetics network meta-analysis results with corresponding GRADE (grading
395 of recommendations, assessment, development, and evaluation) certainty of the evidence for symptomatic
396 hypoglycemia. Values correspond to the relative risk of having at least one symptomatic hypoglycemic
397 event when comparing columns and rows during Ramadan. Values in bold indicate a statistically
398 significant treatment effect. Values under the treatment's names correspond to the P-scores for the
399 network ranking.

400 **Figure 4:** Non-insulin antidiabetics network meta-analysis results with corresponding GRADE (grading
401 of recommendations, assessment, development, and evaluation) certainty of the evidence for symptomatic
402 hypoglycemia. Values correspond to the relative risk of having at least one symptomatic hypoglycemic
403 event when comparing columns and rows during Ramadan. Values in bold indicate a statistically
404 significant treatment effect. Values under the treatment's names correspond to the P-scores for the
405 network ranking.

406 **Figure 5:** Non-insulin antidiabetics network meta-analysis results with corresponding GRADE (grading
407 of recommendations, assessment, development, and evaluation) certainty of the evidence for any adverse
408 events. Values correspond to the relative risk of having any adverse event when comparing column and
409 row during Ramadan. Values in bold indicate a statistically significant treatment effect. Values under the
410 treatment's names correspond to the P-scores for the network ranking.

411 **Figure 6:** Network plots and sensitivity network meta-analysis results with corresponding GRADE
412 (grading of recommendations, assessment, development, and evaluation) certainty of the evidence for
413 symptomatic hypoglycemia. Values correspond to the relative risk of having at least one symptomatic
414 hypoglycemic event when comparing columns and rows during Ramadan. Values in bold indicate a
415 statistically significant treatment effect. Values under the treatment's names correspond to the P-scores for
416 the network ranking.




Figure 1 | The PRISMA flow diagram of the study selection process




Figure 2 | Network plots of all included studies for: i) antidiabetic drug class and symptomatic hypoglycemia, ii) antidiabetic drug class and any adverse effects, iii) drug name and symptomatic hypoglycemia.




Figure 3 | Non-insulin antidiabetics network meta-analysis results with corresponding GRADE (grading of recommendations, assessment, development, and evaluation) certainty of the evidence for symptomatic hypoglycemia. Values correspond to the relative risk of having at least one symptomatic hypoglycemic event when comparing columns and rows during Ramadan. Values in bold indicate a statistically significant treatment effect. Values under the treatment's names correspond to the P-scores for the network ranking


Dapagliflozin (0.874)							
0.73 (0.12 to 4.44) ⊕	Lixisenatide (0.813)						
0.53 (0.10 to 2.71) ⊕	0.73 (0.20 to 2.60) ⊕	Liraglutide (0.715)					
0.35 (0.08 to 1.58) ⊕	0.48 (0.16 to 1.46) ⊕	0.66 (0.30 to 1.45) ⊕	Sitagliptin (0.515)				
0.24 (0.05 to 1.16) ⊕⊕	0.34 (0.10 to 1.09) ⊕⊕	0.46 (0.19 to 1.12) ⊕⊕	0.70 (0.38 to 1.29) ⊕⊕⊕	Vildagliptin (0.297)			
0.20 (0.03 to 1.11) ⊕⊕	0.27 (0.07 to 1.10) ⊕⊕	0.37 (0.12 to 1.19) ⊕⊕	0.56 (0.21 to 1.49) ⊕⊕⊕	0.80 (0.28 to 2.30) ⊕⊕	Repaglinide (0.193)		
0.18 (0.04 to 0.78) ⊕⊕⊕	0.25 (0.09 to 0.71) ⊕⊕⊕	0.34 (0.17 to 0.69) ⊕⊕⊕	0.51 (0.37 to 0.71) ⊕⊕⊕⊕	0.73 (0.44 to 1.23) ⊕⊕⊕⊕	0.91 (0.36 to 2.28) ⊕⊕	Sulphonylurea (0.093)	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> High certainty Moderate certainty Low certainty Very low certainty </div>							

Figure 4 | Non-insulin antidiabetics network meta-analysis results with corresponding GRADE (grading of recommendations, assessment, development, and evaluation) certainty of the evidence for symptomatic hypoglycemia. Values correspond to the relative risk of having at least one symptomatic hypoglycemic event when comparing columns and rows during Ramadan. Values in bold indicate a statistically significant treatment effect. Values under the treatment's names correspond to the P-scores for the network ranking.

Sulphonylurea (0.585)			
1.00 (0.47 to 2.15) ⊕⊕⊕	SGL2 (0.555)		
0.94 (0.50 to 1.79) ⊕⊕⊕⊕	0.94 (0.35 to 2.55) ⊕⊕⊕	DDP-4 (0.485)	
0.88 (0.52 to 1.48) ⊕⊕⊕⊕	0.87 (0.35 to 2.20) ⊕⊕⊕	0.93 (0.40 to 2.12) ⊕⊕⊕	GLP-1 (0.375)

High certainty	Moderate certainty	Low certainty	Very low certainty
----------------	--------------------	---------------	--------------------

Figure 5 | Non-insulin antidiabetics network meta-analysis results with corresponding GRADE (grading of recommendations, assessment, development, and evaluation) certainty of the evidence for any adverse events. Values correspond to the relative risk of having any adverse event when comparing column and row during Ramadan. Values in bold indicate a statistically significant treatment effect. Values under the treatment's names correspond to the P-scores for the network ranking.



Liraglutide (0.923)										
0.77 (0.12 to 5.10) ⊕	Lixisenatide (0.877)									
0.27 (0.06 to 1.22) ⊕	0.35 (0.08 to 1.47) ⊕	Sitagliptin (0.603)								
0.27 (0.05 to 1.54) ⊕	0.35 (0.06 to 1.90) ⊕	1.00 (0.28 to 3.57) ⊕	Vildagliptin (0.566)							
0.19 (0.05 to 0.79) ⊕⊕⊕	0.25 (0.06 to 0.96) ⊕⊕⊕	0.71 (0.32 to 1.54) ⊕⊕	0.71 (0.26 to 1.93) ⊕⊕	Gliclazide (0.404)						
0.15 (0.04 to 0.65) ⊕⊕⊕	0.20 (0.05 to 0.74) ⊕⊕⊕	0.57 (0.30 to 1.11) ⊕⊕⊕	0.57 (0.17 to 1.91) ⊕⊕	0.81 (0.42 to 1.57) ⊕⊕	Glimepiride (0.278)					
0.13 (0.02 to 0.84) ⊕⊕	0.16 (0.03 to 1.07) ⊕⊕	0.47 (0.11 to 1.93) ⊕	0.47 (0.08 to 2.68) ⊕	0.66 (0.16 to 2.76) ⊕	0.82 (0.20 to 3.26) ⊕	Repaglinide (0.232)				
0.12 (0.03 to 0.49) ⊕⊕⊕	0.15 (0.04 to 0.62) ⊕⊕⊕	0.43 (0.21 to 0.87) ⊕⊕⊕	0.43 (0.12 to 1.48) ⊕⊕⊕	0.61 (0.29 to 1.25) ⊕⊕	0.74 (0.39 to 1.42) ⊕⊕	0.91 (0.27 to 3.10) ⊖	Glibenclamide (0.117)			

High certainty Moderate certainty Low certainty Very low certainty

Figure 6

Table 1: Basic characteristics of included articles

Study ID	Intervention name	Intervention					Sulphonylurea				
		Total, n	Sympt. HG*	Age, mean (SD)	Females (%)	BMI, mean (SD)	Total, n	Sympt. HG	Age, mean (SD)	Females (%)	BMI, mean (SD)
Al Sifri et al. 2011	Sitagliptin	507	34	55 ± 11	238 (46.9)	30.5 ± 5.7	514	68	55 ± 10	259 (50.39)	30.5 ± 5.6
Aravind et al. 2012	Sitagliptin	421	16	51.4 ± 9.9	213 (50.59)	27.4 ± 6.0	427	31	50.7 ± 10.0	233 (54.57)	27.5 ± 4.7
Azar et al. 2016	Liraglutide	171	5	54.9 ± 9.27	86 (50.3)	30.2 ± 5.37	170	16	54.0 ± 9.33	87 (51.2)	31.4 ± 5.88
Brady et al. 2013	Liraglutide plus metformin	47	12	51.5 ± 11.1	23 (48.94)	33.0 ± 7.3	52	24	52.2 ± 10.7	26 (50)	30.1 ± 4.3
Hassanein et al. 2014	Vildagliptin	279	8	54.6 ± 9.3	147 (52.7)	30.7 ± 5.0	278	19	54.3 ± 9.1	150 (54.0)	31.1 ± 5.2
Hassanein et al. 2019	Lixisenatide +basal insulin	92	3	52.6 ± 9.5	52 (56.5)	29.7 ± 5.3	92	8	54.1 ± 10.6	49 (53.3)	29.0 ± 4.3
Mafauzy et al. 2002	Repaglinide	116	8	52.7 ± 7.4	29 (25)	26.5 ± 2.5	119	9	54.5 ± 6.9	37 (31.1)	26.8 ± 3.2
Malha et al. 2014	Vildagliptin	30	19	57.0 ± 9.6	NA	29.49 ± 4.66	39	26	54.6 ± 9.2	NA	28.90 ± 4.49
Wan Seman et al. 2016	Dapagliflozin +metformin	58	4	53 ± 9.1	23 (39.7)	29.9 ± 4.84	52	15	56 ± 9.1	21 (40.4)	29.64 ± 4.44

*: Symptomatic