UNIVERSITY^{OF} BIRMINGHAM University of Birmingham Research at Birmingham

Prognostic models for predicting remission of diabetes following bariatric surgery

Singh, Pushpa; Adderley, Nicola; Hazlehurst, Jonathan; Price, Malcolm; Tahrani, Abd; Nirantharakumar, Krishnarajah; Bellary, Srikanth

DOI: 10.2337/dc21-0166

License: None: All rights reserved

Document Version Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Singh, P, Adderley, N, Hazlehurst, J, Price, M, Tahrani, A, Nirantharakumar, K & Bellary, S 2021, 'Prognostic models for predicting remission of diabetes following bariatric surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis', *Diabetes Care*, vol. 44, no. 11, pp. 2626-2641. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc21-0166

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an author-created, uncopyedited electronic version of an article accepted for publication in Diabetes Care. The American Diabetes Association (ADA), publisher of Diabetes Care, is not responsible for any errors or omissions in this version of the manuscript or any version derived from it by third parties. The definitive publisher-authenticated version will be available in a future issue of Diabetes Care in print and online at http://care.diabetesjournals.org.

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

•Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.

•Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.

•User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?) •Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.





Figure 1: PRISMA flowchart

(b) Performance of DiaRem based on Follow up

Paper id						ES (95% CI)	% Weight
ſ				ł			
Original, 2013 (16)						0.79 (0.73, 0.86)	5.83
Modified ABCD, 2015 (44)						0.79 (0.69, 0.90)	3.37
Lee, 2015(46)		÷		<u> </u>		0.72 (0.61, 0.83)	3.25
_ee, 2016 (48)					-	0.82 (0.76, 0.87)	6.69
Lee, 2017 (49)			+			0.74 (0.65, 0.83)	4.30
Lee, 2017 (49)				. →	_	0.85 (0.81, 0.88)	8.33
Raj. 2017 (53)				- !		0.61 (0.45, 0.77)	1.80
Seki, 2018 (54)		-			-	0.75 (0.63, 0.87)	3.04
Shen, 2018 (55)				+		0.82 (0.78, 0.87)	7.14
Ahuja, 2018 (57)				•	_	0.79 (0.69, 0.88)	3.89
Almalki 1, 2018 (58)				+++		0.83 (0.78, 0.90)	6.25
Almalki 2, 2018 (58)				i		0.85 (0.80, 0.90)	6.77
Kam, 2019 (62)						0.74 (0.67, 0.79)	6.05
Lee, 2020 (64)						0.82 (0.72, 0.92)	3.60
MDR, 2020 (38)		-	+	- 1		0.67 (0.57, 0.77)	3.69
Umemura et al. 2020(39)						0.81 (0.69, 0.93)	3.00
Subtotal (I-squared = 56.0%, p =	0.003)			\sim	_	0.79 (0.76, 0.82)	76.99
with estimated predictive interval	/			1		. (0.70, 0.88)	
1 0				i i			
>1				1			
LeeMH, 2015 (45)						0.73 (0.62, 0.84)	3.19
Lee, 2017 (49)					•	0.87 (0.80, 0.93)	5.61
Chen, 2018 (59)			•	1	_	0.74 (0.60, 0.88)	2.32
Chen, 2018 (59)						0.85 (0.80, 0.90)	6.97
Kam, 2019 (62)			+			0.75 (0.67, 0.82)	4.93
Subtotal (I-squared = 60.7%, p =	0.038)	9 <u>7</u>		$\langle \rangle$		- 0.80 (0.74, 0.86)	23.01
with estimated predictive interval	1.1			1		. (0.62, 0.99)	
				i i		A second second	
Overall (I-squared = 55.2%, p = 0	0.001)			->	-	0.80 (0.77, 0.82)	100.00
with estimated predictive interval	***************			Ī		. (0.71, 0.88)	
NOTE: Weights are from random	effects analysi	s					
.4	.5	.6	.7	.8	.9	1	



(d) Performance of DiaRem based on HbA1c cutoff

Original, 2013 (16) 0.79 (0.73, 0.66) 5.33 Modified ABCD, 2015 (44) 0.81 (0.71, 0.91) 0.81 (0.71, 0.91) .ee, 2016 (48) 0.77 (0.68, 0.87) 3.21 .ee, 2016 (48) 0.82 (0.77, 0.87) 6.71 .ee, 2017 (49) 0.81 (0.77, 0.87) 6.71 Sek, 2018 (54) 0.85 (0.77, 0.87) 6.71 Sek, 2018 (54) 0.85 (0.77, 0.87) 6.71 Sumalki 2, 2019 (52) 0.85 (0.78, 0.94) 3.63 Subtotal (I-squared = 28, 1%, p = 0.169) 0.85 (0.78, 0.94) 3.63 Wid fied ABCD, 2015 (44) 0.79 (0.69, 0.80) 2.74 .ee, 2020 (5(4) 0.79 (0.69, 0.80) 2.74 Subtotal (I-squared = 28, 1%, p = 0.169) 0.79 (0.69, 0.80) 2.74 .ee, 2020 (5(4) 0.79 (0.69, 0.80) 2.74 .ee, 20215 (46) 0.79 (0.69, 0.80) 2.74 .ee, 2016 (48) 0.79 (0.69, 0.80) 2.74 .ee, 2016 (48) 0.79 (0.69, 0.80) 2.42 .shi, 2018 (55) 0.79 (0.69, 0.80) 2.43 .shi, 2018 (56) 0.79 (0.69, 0.80) 2.43 .shi, 2018 (56) 0.79 (0.69, 0.88) 2.43	Paper d	ES (95% CI)	% Weight
Modified ABCD, 2015 (44) Lee, 2015 (45) Lee, 2015 (45) Lee, 2017 (49) Lee, 2017 (49) Lee, 2017 (49) Lee, 2017 (49) Seki, 2018 (54) Almaki 1, 2018 (53) Almaki 2, 2018 (54) Almaki 2, 2015 (44) Lee, 2020 (64) Subtotal (I-squared = 28.1%, p = 0.169) Modified ABCD, 2015 (44) Lee, 2015 (45) Almaki 2, 2015 (45) Lee, 2016 (48) Raj, 2017 (53) Shen, 2018 (55) Ahuja, 2018 (55) Ahuja, 2018 (56) Chen, 2018 (56) Chen, 2018 (55) Ahuja, 2018 (55) Ahuja, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (56) Chen, 2018 (56)	6	1	
Lee, 2015(46) Lee, 2015(45) Lee, 2017 (49) Lee, 2017 (49) Lee, 2017 (49) Seki, 2018 (54) Almalki 1, 2018 (55) Almalki 2, 2018 (56) Almalki 2, 2018 (54) Almalki 2, 2018 (56) Almalki 2, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (59) Chen, 2018 (59) Chen	Original, 2013 (16)	0.79 (0.73, 0.86)	5.33
Lee MH, 2015 (45) Lee 2017 (49) Lee, 2018 (58) Almalki 2, 2018 (58) Almalki 2, 2018 (58) Almalki 2, 2018 (58) Lee, 2019 (48) Raj, 2017 (53) Shen, 2018 (55) Ahuja, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (59) Chen, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (59) Chen, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (59) Chen, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (59) Chen, 2020 (39) Chen,	Modified ABCD, 2015 (44)	• 0.77 (0.68, 0.87)	3.21
Lee, 2016 (48) Lee, 2017 (49) Lee, 2017 (49) Lee, 2017 (49) Seki, 2018 (54) Almalki 1, 2018 (56) Almalki 2, 2018 (54) Almalki 2, 2015 (45) Lee, 2016 (48) Almalki 2, 2015 (45) Lee, 2016 (48) Almalki 2, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (59) Chen, 2018 (59) Chen	Lee, 2015(46)	0.81 (0.71, 0.91)	3.07
Lee, 2017 (49) Lee, 2017 (49) Lee, 2017 (49) Lee, 2017 (49) Lee, 2017 (49) Lee, 2017 (49) Lee, 2018 (54) Almalki 2, 2018 (56) Almalki 2, 2018 (56) Almalki 2, 2018 (56) Almalki 2, 2018 (56) Subtotal (L-squared = 28.1%, p = 0.169) with estimated predictive interval 5.5 Modified ABCD, 2015 (44) Lee, 2015 (46) Lee, 2015 (46) Lee, 2015 (46) Lee, 2015 (46) Lee, 2015 (46) Lee, 2016 (48) Raj, 2017 (53) Shen, 2018 (55) Alhuja, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (59) Alhuja, 2018 (59) A	LeeMH, 2015 (45)	0.76 (0.69, 0.84)	4.28
Lee, 2017 (49) Seki, 2018 (54) Anmalki 2, 2018 (55) Anmalki 2, 2018 (56) Anmalki 2, 2018 (56) Anmalki 2, 2018 (56) Anmalki 2, 2018 (58) Anmalki 2, 2018 (58) Anmalki 2, 2018 (58) Subtotal (-squared = 28.1%, p = 0.169) with estimated predictive interval 5.5 Modified ABCD, 2015 (44) Lee, 2020 (54) Shen, 2018 (55) Anualki 2, 2018 (55) Anualki 2, 2018 (56) Chen, 2018 (59) Chen, 2020 Chen, 2020 Ch	Lee, 2016 (48)	0.82 (0.77, 0.87)	6.71
Seki 2018 (54) Almalki 2, 2018 (56) Almalki 2, 2018 (56) Almalki 2, 2018 (56) Almalki 2, 2018 (56) Almalki 2, 2018 (56) Subtotal (-squared = 54, 1%, p = 0.169) with estimated predictive interval S.5 Modified ABCD, 2015 (44) Lee, 2015 (45) Lee Alticle ABCD, 2015 (45) Alticle ABCD, 2015 (45) Alticle ABCD, 2015 (45) Alticle ABCD, 2018 (56) Chen, 2018 (56) Chen, 2018 (59) Chen, 2017 Chen, 2018 Chen, 2017 Chen, 2017 Chen, 2017 Chen,	Lee. 2017 (49)	0.74 (0.65, 0.83)	3.65
Almalki 1, 2018 (58) Almalki 2, 2018 (54) 5.5 Modified ABCD, 2015 (44) Lee, 2015 (45) Lee, 2015 (45) Almalki 2, 2018 (54) Shen, 2018 (55) Ahuja, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (59) Chen, 2020 (39) Chen durated the therval Chen, 2018 (59) Chen, 2020 (39) Chen durated therval Chen, 2018 (59) Chen durated therval Chen, 2018 (59) Chen durated therval Chen, 2018 (59) Chen durated therval Chen dur	Lee, 2017 (49)	0.85 (0.81, 0.88)	8.71
Almaiki 1, 2018 (58) 0.83 (0.78, 0.90) 5.83 Almaiki 2, 2018 (58) 0.85 (0.80, 0.90) 6.49 Construction of the structure o			
Almaki 2, 2018(58) 0.85 (0.80, 0.90) 6.49 Kam, 2019 (62) 0.75 (0.67, 0.82) 4.31 Lee, 2020 (64) 0.77 (0.65, 0.88) 2.42 Subtotal (I-squared = 28.1%, p = 0.169) 0.77 (0.65, 0.88) 57.63 Widhied ABCD, 2015 (44) 0.77 (0.65, 0.88) 2.42 Lee, 2020 (54) 0.79 (0.69, 0.89) 2.42 0.81 (0.79, 0.83) 57.63 . (0.76, 0.86) 8.5 0.79 (0.69, 0.89) 2.42 0.81 (0.79, 0.83) 57.63 . (0.76, 0.86) 8.6 0.79 (0.69, 0.89) 2.42 0.72 (0.61, 0.83) 2.63 0.73 (0.62, 0.64) Lee, 2015 (45) 0.79 (0.69, 0.80) 2.74 0.72 (0.61, 0.83) 2.63 0.73 (0.62, 0.64) Shen, 2018 (54) 0.73 (0.63, 0.87) 6.39 Shen, 2018 (57) 0.51 (0.64, 0.77) 1.37 Chen, 2018 (59) 0.74 (0.69, 0.88) 3.24 Orter, 0.280 (39) 0.74 (0.69, 0.88) 3.24 Orter, 0.280 (39) 0.85 (0.80, 0.90) 6.76 0.87 (0.059, 0.89) 2.40 0.74 (0.69, 0.88) 3.24 Orter, 0.280 (39) </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>			
Kam, 2019 (62) 0.75 (0.67, 0.82) 4.31 Lee, 2020 (64) 0.77 (0.65, 0.88) 2.42 Subtotal (1-squared = 28.1%, p = 0.169) 0.76 (0.67, 0.82) 4.31 with estimated predictive interval 0.76 (0.67, 0.82) 4.31 6.5 0.79 (0.69, 0.90) 2.74 Lee, 2015 (46) 0.79 (0.69, 0.90) 2.74 Lee, 2015 (45) 0.73 (0.62, 0.84) 2.63 Lee, 2015 (44) 0.72 (0.61, 0.83) 2.63 Lee, 2015 (43) 0.73 (0.62, 0.84) 2.57 Beki, 2018 (54) 0.73 (0.62, 0.87) 6.39 Shen, 2018 (55) 0.73 (0.63, 0.87) 2.43 Anuja, 2018 (57) 0.75 (0.63, 0.87) 2.43 Chen, 2018 (59) 0.79 (0.69, 0.88) 3.24 Ortz (0.60, 0.88) 1.80 0.79 (0.69, 0.88) 3.24 Ortz (0.60, 0.89) 0.79 (0.69, 0.88) 3.24 Ortz (0.60, 0.88) 1.80 0.79 (0.69, 0.88) 3.24 Ortz (0.60, 0.89) 0.85 (0.68, 0.69) 0.85 (0.68, 0.69) 0.85 (0.68, 0.69) 0.85 (0.68, 0.69) 0.85 (0.68, 0.69) 0.85 (0.68, 0.69) 0.85 (0.68, 0.69) 0.85 (0.68, 0.69) <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>			
Lee, 2020 (64) Subtotal (1-squared = 28.1%, p = 0.169) with estimated predictive interval 6.5 Modified ABCD, 2015 (44) Lee, 2015 (45) Shen, 2016 (45) Shen, 2018 (55) Ahuja, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (59) Chen, 2020 (39) Chen, 2020 (39) C		0.75 (0.67, 0.82)	4.31
Subtotal (1-squared = 28 1%, p = 0.169) 0.81 (0.79, 0.83) 57.63 with estimated predictive interval 0.79 (0.69, 0.80) 57.63 S.5 0.79 (0.69, 0.90) 2.74 Modified ABCD, 2015 (44) 0.79 (0.63, 0.87) 2.63 Lee, 2016 (48) 0.73 (0.62, 0.84) 2.57 Seki, 2018 (54) 0.82 (0.76, 0.87) 6.39 Shen, 2018 (55) 0.73 (0.62, 0.87) 6.39 Anuja, 2018 (55) 0.73 (0.62, 0.87) 6.39 Chen, 2018 (59) 0.74 (0.60, 0.88) 3.24 Chen, 2018 (59) 0.74 (0.60, 0.88) 3.24 Umemura et al, 2020 (39) 0.85 (0.87, 0.77) 3.05 Subtotal (1-squared = 51.3%, p = 0.020) 0.81 (0.69, 0.83) 2.43 Vorrall (I-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) 0.80 (0.78, 0.82) 100.00			
with estimated predictive interval . (0.76, 0.86) 6.5 . (0.76, 0.86) Modified ABCD, 2015 (44) . (0.76, 0.86) Lee, 2015 (46) . (0.76, 0.86) Lee, 2015 (43) . (0.76, 0.86) Raj, 2017 (53) . (0.76, 0.86) Seki, 2018 (54) . (0.76, 0.86) Shen, 2018 (55) . (0.76, 0.87) Ahuja, 2018 (57) . (0.76, 0.86) Chen, 2018 (59) . (0.76, 0.86) MDR, 2020 (38) . (0.76, 0.86) Umemura et al, 2020 (39) . (0.76, 0.86) Subtotal (1-squared = 51.3%, p = 0.020) . (0.77, 0.88) Overall (I-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) . (0.80 (0.78, 0.82) 100.00			
Modified ABCD, 2015 (44) 0.79 (0.69, 0.90) 2.74 Lee, 2015 (46) 0.73 (0.62, 0.84) 0.73 (0.62, 0.84) 2.63 Lee, 2015 (45) 0.73 (0.62, 0.84) 2.57 Lee, 2016 (48) 0.73 (0.62, 0.84) 2.57 Seki, 2018 (54) 0.75 (0.63, 0.87) 6.39 Shen, 2018 (55) 0.75 (0.69, 0.88) 2.43 Orta (0.69, 0.88) 3.24 0.74 (0.69, 0.88) 3.24 Chen, 2018 (59) 0.85 (0.80, 0.90) 6.76 0.85 (0.80, 0.90) 6.76 Umemura et al, 2020 (39) 0.81 (0.69, 0.88) 1.80 0.85 (0.87, 0.77) 3.05 Subtotal (1-squared = 51.3%, p = 0.020) 0.81 (0.69, 0.83) 2.43 0.74 (0.69, 0.88) 2.43 Overall (1-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) 0.80 (0.78, 0.82) 100.00 100.00			
Modified ABCD, 2015 (44) 0.79 (0.69, 0.90) 2.74 Lee, 2015 (46) 0.73 (0.62, 0.84) 2.63 Lee, 2015 (45) 0.73 (0.62, 0.84) 2.63 Lee, 2016 (48) 0.73 (0.62, 0.84) 2.57 Raj, 2017 (53) 0.82 (0.76, 0.87) 6.39 Shen, 2018 (55) 0.75 (0.69, 0.88) 2.43 Anuja, 2018 (57) 0.82 (0.78, 0.87) 6.98 Chen, 2018 (59) 0.85 (0.80, 0.90) 6.76 MoR, 2020 (38) 0.85 (0.80, 0.90) 6.76 Ummura et al, 2020 (39) 0.81 (0.69, 0.88) 2.43 Subtotal (1-squared = 51.3%, p = 0.020) 0.81 (0.69, 0.83) 2.40 Overall (1-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) 0.80 (0.78, 0.82) 100.00	6.5		
Lee, 2015 (46) Lee, 2015 (45) Lee, 2015 (45) Lee, 2015 (45) Lee, 2015 (45) Lee, 2015 (45) Lee, 2016 (48) Shen, 2018 (55) Shen, 2018 (55) Chen, 2018 (59) Chen, 2018 (5		0.79 (0.69, 0.90)	274
LeeMH, 2015 (45) Lee, 2016 (48) Ray, 2017 (53) Shen, 2018 (54) Shen, 2018 (55) Ahuja, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (59) Chen, 2018 (59) MDR, 2020 (38) WDR, 2020 (39) With estimated predictive interval Vorall (I-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) Other (10, 45, 0.77) Other (10, 45, 0.77)			
Lee, 2016 (48) Raj, 2017 (53) Shen, 2018 (54) Shen, 2018 (55) Chen, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (59) Chen, 20			
Raj. 2017 (53) 0.61 (0.45, 0.77) 1.37 Seki, 2018 (54) 0.75 (0.63, 0.87) 2.43 Shen, 2018 (55) 0.82 (0.78, 0.87) 6.98 Ahuja, 2018 (57) 0.79 (0.69, 0.88) 3.24 Chen, 2018 (59) 0.85 (0.80, 0.90) 6.76 MDR, 2020 (38) 0.87 (0.57, 0.77) 3.05 Umemura et al, 2020 (39) 0.81 (0.69, 0.93) 2.40 Subtata (1-squared = 51.3%, p = 0.020) 0.81 (0.69, 0.93) 2.40 Vorail (1-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) 0.80 (0.78, 0.82) 100.00			
Seki, 2018 (54) Shen, 2018 (55) Ahuja, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (59) MDR, 2020 (38) Junemura et al, 2020 (39) Subtral (-Squared = 51.3%, p = 0.020) with estimated predictive interval Overall (I-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) Overall (I-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) Overall (-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017)			
Shen, 2018 (55) 0.82 (0.78, 0.87) 6.98 Ahuja, 2018 (57) 0.74 (0.60, 0.88) 3.24 Chen, 2018 (59) 0.74 (0.60, 0.88) 3.24 Ofter, 2018 (59) 0.74 (0.60, 0.88) 3.24 Unmemura et al, 2020 (39) 0.85 (0.80, 0.90) 6.76 Subtotal (1-squared = 51.3%, p = 0.020) 0.81 (0.69, 0.83) 2.40 Vorrall (1-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) 0.80 (0.78, 0.82) 100.00			
Ahuja, 2018 (57) Chen, 2018 (59) MDR, 2020 (38) Jmemura et al, 2020 (39) Subtal (1-squared = 51.3%, p = 0.020) with estimated predictive interval Overall (1-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) Overall (1-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017)			
Chen, 2018 (59) 0.74 (0.60, 0.89) 180 Chen, 2018 (59) 0.85 (0.80, 0.90) 6.76 MDR, 2020 (38) 0.85 (0.80, 0.90) 6.76 Umemura et al, 2020 (39) 0.81 (0.69, 0.93) 2.40 Subtotal (-squared = 51.3%, p = 0.020) 0.74 (0.61, 0.89) 1.23 Overall (I-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) 0.80 (0.78, 0.82) 100.00			
Chen, 2018 (59) 0.85 (0.80, 0.90) 6.76 VDR, 2020 (38) 0.67 (0.57, 0.77) 3.05 Jmemura et al, 2020 (39) 0.81 (0.69, 0.83) 2.40 Subtotal (I-squared = 51.3%, p = 0.020) 0.78 (0.74, 0.81) 42.37 Vith estimated predictive interval 0.80 (0.78, 0.82) 100.00			
MDR, 2020 (39) Unremura et al, 2020 (39) Unremura et al, 2020 (39) Subtral (1-squared = 51.3%, p = 0.020) With estimated predictive interval Overall (1-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) Overall (0-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) Overall (0-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) Overall (0-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017)			
Umemura et al, 2020 (39) 0.81 (0.69, 0.93) 2.40 Subtotal (I-squared = 51.3%, p = 0.020) 0.78 (0.74, 0.81) 42.37 with estimated predictive interval 0.67, 0.88) 0.00 (0.78, 0.82) Overall (I-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) 0.80 (0.78, 0.82) 100.00			
Subtotal (I-squared = 51.3%, p = 0.020) 0.78 (0.74, 0.81) 42.37 with estimated predictive interval 1 0.67, 0.88) 0.80 (0.78, 0.82) Overall (I-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) 0.80 (0.78, 0.82) 100.00			
with estimated predictive interval . (0.67, 0.88) Overall (I-squared = 42.0%, p = 0.017) 0.80 (0.78, 0.82) 100.00			
			42.31
	- 		100.00
(0.73, 0.87)			100.00
	with estimated predictive interval	. (0.73, 0.87)	

Paper	F0 /050/ 00	%
id	ES (95% CI)	Weigh
6		
Sampaio-Neto, 2015 (47) -	• 0.84 (0.76, 0.92)	4.58
Lee, 2016 (48)	0.73 (0.67, 0.79)	6.45
Honarmand, 2017 (51)		9.30
Tharakan 2,2017(52)	0.73 (0.67, 0.80)	5.81
Kam et al, 2020 (62)	0.79 (0.71, 0.86)	5.16
Subtotal (I-squared = 38.5%, p = 0.165)	0.77 (0.74, 0.80)	31.30
with estimated predictive interval	(0.68, 0.86)	
6.5		
Original, 2013 (17)	0.84 (0.80, 0.89)	7.72
Sampaio-Neto, 2015 (47)	0.83 (0.73, 0.92)	3.85
Mehaffey, 2017 (50)	• 0.84 (0.70, 0.98)	2.14
Tharakan 1, 2017(52)	0.68 (0.61, 0.74)	5.56
Wood, 2017(60)	0.82 (0.79, 0.86)	8.65
Shen, 2018(55) -	0.80 (0.76, 0.85)	7.89
Ahuja, 2018 (57) -	0.84 (0.76, 0.92)	4.55
Dicker, 2019 (61)	• 0.78 (0.69, 0.88)	3.74
Guerron, 2020 (65) -	0.79 (0.75, 0.83)	8.65
DiaBetter (SG), 2017(35)	0.87 (0.81, 0.92)	7.20
DiaBetter(VG), 2017 (35)	0.82 (0.76, 0.88)	6.03
Stallard, 2017 (43)	0.80 (0.68, 0.92)	2.73
Subtotal (I-squared = 54.6%, p = 0.012)	0.81 (0.78, 0.84)	68.70
with estimated predictive interval	. (0.73, 0.89)	
	1	
Overall (I-squared = 59.2%, p = 0.001)	0.80 (0.77, 0.82)	100.00
with estimated predictive interval	. (0.72, 0.87)	
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis		
	1 1	
.4 .5 .6 .7	.8 .9 1	




Figure 2 – Meta Analysis (a) – Performance of ABCD based on Follow up; (b) – Performance of DiaRem based on Follow up; (c) Performance of ABCD based on HbA1c cut off defining diabetes duration; (d) - Performance of DiaRem based on HbA1c cut off defining diabetes duration; (e) – Performance of ABCD based in type of bariatric surgery; (f) Performance of ABCD based i