Supplementary Figure 1. Forest plot reports body mass index (BMI) comparing pre-diabetic men with controls.

	Prediabetes			Euglycemic			Std. Mean Difference			Std. Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI		
Goodman-Gruen 2000a	26.7	2.8	60	25.8	3.3	397	8.0%	0.28 [0.01, 0.55]	2000			
Goodman-Gruen 2000b	25.7	3.3	206	25.8	3.3	397	8.6%	-0.03 [-0.20, 0.14]	2000	+		
Ho 2013	25.2	3.1	543	24.4	3	577	8.8%	0.26 [0.14, 0.38]	2013	+		
Chen 2014	27.6	1.01	52	26.3	4.84	46	7.0%	0.38 [-0.02, 0.78]	2014	 • 		
Rabijewski 2015	29.6	1.5	196	27.1	0.9	184	8.1%	2.00 [1.76, 2.25]	2015			
Zhu 2016	24.725	26.3098	907	24.1	31.6801	1405	9.0%	0.02 [-0.06, 0.10]	2016	+		
Rabijewski 2016	28.6	1.2	84	27.9	0.9	58	7.4%	0.64 [0.30, 0.98]	2016			
Arthur 2016	27.5	10.6	411	25.4	10.2	728	8.8%	0.20 [0.08, 0.32]	2016	-		
Boeri 2019b	26	11.3681	105	25.25	14.9415	253	8.3%	0.05 [-0.17, 0.28]	2018	 -		
Lu 2018	24.61	2.84	495	24.37	2.8	545	8.8%	0.09 [-0.04, 0.21]	2018	+		
Liu 2019	24.16	3.32	355	23.13	3.11	355	8.7%	0.32 [0.17, 0.47]	2019	-		
Boeri 2019a	26	10	114	25.2	11	630	8.4%	0.07 [-0.13, 0.27]	2019	+		
Total (95% CI)			3528			5575	100.0%	0.35 [0.13, 0.56]		•		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.14	4; Chi² = 2	47.07, df=	11 (P	< 0.000	01); I² = 98	6%			⊢			
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.09 (P = 0.002)										Higher in euglycemic Higher in prediabetes		

Supplementary Figure 2. Forest plot reports patients' age comparing pre-diabetic men with controls.

	Pi	rediabetes	Euglycemic				!	Std. Mean Difference		Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI
Goodman-Gruen 2000a	68.6	8.5	60	70.5	8.6	397	8.2%	-0.22 [-0.49, 0.05]	2000	
Goodman-Gruen 2000b	74.2	7.5	206	70.5	8.6	397	8.4%	0.45 [0.28, 0.62]	2000	-
Ho 2013	55.8	8.5	543	52.6	8.6	577	8.5%	0.37 [0.26, 0.49]	2013	+
Chen 2014	50	10	52	48	10	46	7.9%	0.20 [-0.20, 0.60]	2014	+-
Rabijewski 2015	68.4	3.1	196	65.8	3.4	184	8.4%	0.80 [0.59, 1.01]	2015	-
Zhu 2016	58.5	402.5222	907	50	465.0293	1405	8.5%	0.02 [-0.06, 0.10]	2016	†
Rabijewski 2016	66.5	3.8	84	65.7	3.8	58	8.1%	0.21 [-0.13, 0.54]	2016	+-
Arthur 2016	39.6	3.6	411	47.5	4.2	728	8.4%	-1.98 [-2.12, -1.83]	2016	+
Lu 2018	77.2	9.12	495	73.58	9.21	545	8.5%	0.39 [0.27, 0.52]	2018	+
Boeri 2019b	58.25	34.8793	105	50.25	82.7838	253	8.3%	0.11 [-0.12, 0.34]	2018	 -
Boeri 2019a	39	10	114	38	11	630	8.4%	0.09 [-0.11, 0.29]	2019	+
Liu 2019	59.87	9.03	355	59.85	9.04	355	8.4%	0.00 [-0.14, 0.15]	2019	†
Total (95% CI)			3528			5575	100.0%	0.04 [-0.38, 0.45]		*
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.5		-	: 11 (P	< 0.000	01); I²= 999	%			_	-2 -1 0 1 2
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.17 (P = 0.87)									Higher in euglycemic Higher in prediabetes	



PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Page 1
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Page 2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Page 3-6
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Page 6
METHODS	1		
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Page 7
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Page 7-8
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Page 7-8
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page 7-8
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page 7-8
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Page 7-8
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	Page 7-8
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	NA
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	Page 7-8
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	Page 7-8
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	Page 7-8
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Page 7-8
_	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	Page 7-8
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Page 7-8
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Page 7-8
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	Page 7-8
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	Page 7-8



PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported					
RESULTS								
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.						
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Page 9-12					
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.						
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.						
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	Page 9-12					
Results of	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Page 9-12					
syntheses	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.						
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Page 9-12					
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Page 9-12					
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	Page 9-12					
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	Page 9-12					
DISCUSSION								
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Page 13-16					
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Page 13-16					
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Page 13-16					
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Page 13-16					
OTHER INFORMA	TION							
Registration and	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	NA					
protocol	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	NA					
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	NA					
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Not provided					
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Page17					
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	NA					

From: 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. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71