SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Long-term effect of lifestyle interventions in the cardiovascular and all-cause mortality of subjects with prediabetes and type 2 diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Summary

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES	.3
Table S1. Search strategy conducted for identifying randomized clinical trials and post-trial follow-up studies of the long-term lifestyle interventions of subjects with prediabetes or type 2 diabetes	3
Table S2. Reasons for exclusion in the selection and extraction of records	.4
Table S3. Quality and certainty of evidence of included studies through the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) framework	5
Table S4. Results of Meta Analysis, Subgroup and Sensitivity analyses according to Der Simonian and Laird and Generalized Linear Mixed Model methods	6
Table S5. PRISMA Check-list	.9
SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES	11
Figure S1. Risk of bias of studies that tested the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all- cause mortality using the RoB 2.0 tool	11
Figure S2. Risk of bias of studies that tested the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality using the RoB 2.0 tool	12
Figure S3. Sensitivity analysis to assess the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality excluding studies that reported mortality as losses to follow-up.	se 13
Figure S4. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to the glycemic status of the study population.	14
Figure S5. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to the geographic area of the studies	15
Figure S6. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model by the mean age of participants (adults or elderly, according to the cutoff of 60 years-old).	16
Figure S7. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to the dietary intervention modality of the studies.	17
Figure S8. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to the physical exercise intervention modality the studies.	of 18
Figure S9. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to the mean follow-up of the studies	19
Figure S10. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to the risk of bias of the studies	20

Figure S11. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to the characteristics of control groups of the studies
Figure S12. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to intervention dilution over time
Figure S13. Meta regression of the relationship between mean weight change (intervention - control) and relative risk of all-cause mortality
Figure S14. Funnel plot of studies that tested the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all- cause mortality
Figure S15. Sensitivity analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality excluding studies that reported cardiovascular mortality as loss to follow-up25
Figure S16. Sensitivity analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality excluding the study with some concerns in the risk of bias
Figure S17. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality using a random-effect model according to the glycemic status of the study population.
Figure S18. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality using a random-effect model by the mean age of participants (adults or elderly, according to the cutoff of 60 years-old)
Figure S19. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality using a random-effect model according to the dietary intervention modality of the studies
Figure S20. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality using a random-effect model according to the physical exercise intervention modality of the studies
Figure S21. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality using a random-effect model according to the mean follow-up of the studies
Figure S22. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality using a random-effect model according to the geographic location of the studies32
Figure S23. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality according to the control group of the studies
Figure S24. Meta regression of the relationship between mean weight change (intervention - control) and relative risk of cardiovascular mortality

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

Table S1. Search strategy conducted for identifying randomized clinical trials and post-trial follow-up studies of the long-term lifestyle interventions of subjects with prediabetes or type 2 diabetes.

Database	Search terms
PubMed	(Diabetes Mellitus, Type 2[mh] OR Prediabetic State[mh] OR Non-Insulin-Dependent Diabetes Mellitus[tw] OR Type II Diabetes Mellitus[tw] OR Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus[tw] OR Noninsulin-Dependent Diabetes Mellitus[tw] OR Type 2 Diabetes[tw] OR Prediabet*[tw]) AND (("Life Style"[Mesh] OR "Life Style*"[tw] OR Lifestyle*[tw] OR "Healthy Diet*"[tw] OR "Healthy Eating"[tw] OR "Prudent diet*"[tw]) OR ("Weight Loss/diet therapy"[mh] OR Diet Therapy[mh:noexp] OR Diet, Diabetic[mh] OR Dietary Modification*[tw] OR Diet Modification*[tw] OR Diabetic Diet*[tw] OR Weight Reduction Diet*[tw] OR Weight Loss Diet*[tw])) AND (((clinical[tiab] AND trial[tiab]) OR clinical trials as topic[mh] OR clinical trial[pt] OR random*[tiab] OR random allocation[mh] OR therapeutic use[sh]) OR (Continuity of Patient Care[mh] OR Follow-Up Studies[mh] OR Continuity of Patient Care[tw] OR Care Continu*[tw] OR Continuum of Care[tw] OR Continuity of Care[tw] OR (care[tw] AND after[tw] AND trial*[tw]) OR post-trial[tw] OR posttrial[tw] OR Follow-Up[tw] OR Followup[tw] OR 24-month*[tw]))
Embase	("non insulin dependent diabetes mellitus"/exp OR "impaired glucose tolerance"/exp OR "Non-Insulin-Dependent Diabetes Mellitus":ti,ab,kw OR "Type II Diabetes Mellitus":ti,ab,kw OR "Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus":ti,ab,kw OR "Noninsulin-Dependent Diabetes Mellitus":ti,ab,kw OR "Type 2 Diabetes":ti,ab,kw OR "Prediabet*":ti,ab,kw) AND ("lifestyle"/exp OR "Life Style*":ti,ab,kw OR "Lifestyle*":ti,ab,kw OR "Healthy Diet*":ti,ab,kw OR "Healthy Eating":ti,ab,kw OR "Prudent diet*":ti,ab,kw OR "body weight loss"/exp OR "diet therapy"/de OR "diabetic diet"/exp OR "Dietary Modification*":ti,ab,kw OR "Diet Modification*":ti,ab,kw OR "Diabetic Diet*":ti,ab,kw OR "Weight Reduction Diet*":ti,ab,kw OR "Weight Loss Diet*":ti,ab,kw) AND ("clinical trial"/exp OR "clinical trial (topic)"/exp OR ("clinical":ti,ab AND "trial":ti,ab) OR "random*":ti,ab OR "randomization"/de OR "drug therapy"/exp OR "patient care"/de OR "patient monitoring"/de OR "follow up"/exp OR "Continuity of Patient Care":ti,ab,kw OR ("care Continu*":ti,ab,kw AND "after":ti,ab,kw AND "trial*":ti,ab,kw OR "post-trial":ti,ab,kw OR "posttrial":ti,ab,kw OR "Follow-Up":ti,ab,kw OR "Followup":ti,ab,kw OR "24-month*":ti,ab,kw)
Cochrane	<pre>#TMeSH descriptor: [Diabetes Mellitus, Type 2] explode all trees #2MeSH descriptor: [Prediabetic State] explode all trees #3 "Non-Insulin-Dependent Diabetes Mellitus" OR "Type II Diabetes Mellitus" OR "Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus" OR "Noninsulin-Dependent Diabetes Mellitus" OR "Type 2 Diabetes" OR Prediabet* #4 #1 OR #2 OR #3 #5MeSH descriptor: [Life Style] explode all trees #6MeSH descriptor: [Diet Therapy] explode all trees #7MeSH descriptor: [Diet Therapy] explode all trees #8MeSH descriptor: [Diet, Diabetic] explode all trees #8MeSH descriptor: [Diet, Diabetic] explode all trees #9 "Life Style*" OR Lifestyle* OR "Healthy Diet*" OR "Healthy Eating" OR "Prudent diet*" OR "Dietary Modification*" OR "Diet Modification*" OR "Diabetic Diet*" OR "Weight Reduction Diet*" OR "Weight Loss Diet*" #10 #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9 #11MeSH descriptor: [Clinical Trial] explode all trees #12MeSH descriptor: [Clinical Trial] explode all trees #13MeSH descriptor: [Follow-Up Studies] explode all trees #14MeSH descriptor: [Follow-Up Studies] explode all trees #15 (clinical AND trial) OR random* OR "Continuity of Patient Care" OR "Care Continu*" OR "Continuum of Care" OR "Continuity of Care" OR (care AND after AND trial*) OR "post-trial" OR posttrial OR "Follow-Up" OR FollowupOR"24-month*" #16 #11 OR #12 OR #13 OR #14 OR #15 #17 #4 AND #10 AND #16</pre>
Web of Science	ALL=(("Non-Insulin-Dependent Diabetes Mellitus" OR "Type II Diabetes Mellitus" OR "Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus" OR "Noninsulin-Dependent Diabetes Mellitus" OR "Type 2 Diabetes" OR Prediabet*) AND ("Life Style*" OR Lifestyle* OR "Healthy Diet*" OR "Healthy Eating" OR "Prudent diet*" OR "Dietary Modification*" OR "Diet Modification*" OR "Diabetic Diet*" OR "Weight Reduction Diet*" OR "Weight Loss Diet*") AND ((clinical AND trial) OR random* OR "Continuity of Patient Care" OR "Care Continu*" OR "Continuum of Care" OR "Continuity of Care" OR (care AND after AND trial*) OR "post-trial" OR posttrial OR "Follow-Up" OR Followup OR "24-month*"))

 Table S2. Reasons for exclusion in the selection and extraction of records.

Initial search: 31,399

	Search	Title and abstract	Full text	Data extraction	Analysis
Duplicates	7,830	234	0	0	-
Study design	-	16,534	35	33	-
Population	-	1,286	40	10	-
Type of intervention	-	3,372	48	21	-
Length of intervention	-	1,569	28	2	-
Outcomes	-	84	21	17	-
No access to full-text	-	-	5	-	-
Conference abstracts and study records	-	-	188	-	-
No access to data	-	-	-	3	-
Results of the same study with shorter follow-up time	-	-	-	-	28
Total	23,569	490	125	39	11

Table S3. Quality and certainty of evidence of included studies through the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) framework.

	Certainty assessment							Sun	nmary of find	ings	
Participants (studies)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	nprecision Other considerations	Overall certainty	Study event rates (%)		Relative effect	Anticipated	absolute effects
follow-up						of evidence	With control	With lifestyle interventions	(95% CI)	Risk with control	Risk difference with lifestyle interventions
All-cause morta	ality (follow-u	ıp: mean 11 yea	ars)								
16554 (11 BCTs)	not serious	not serious	not serious	serious ^a	none	⊕⊕⊕⊖	1085/7772	1205/8782	RR 0.93	140 per	10 fewer per
						Moderate	(14.070)	(13.770)	(0.85 to 1.03)	1.000	(From 21 fewer to 4 more)

Cardiovascular mortality (follow-up: median 15.8 years)

11017							074/5040	050/5004		50	
(5 RCTs)	not serious	not serious	not serious	Seriousa	none	$\Theta \Theta \Theta \bigcirc$	274/5213 (5.3%)	353/5804 (6.1%)	RR 0.99	53 per 1.000	1 fewer per 1,000
						Moderate			(0.79 to 1 23)		(From 11
									0)		fewer to 12 more)
											,

CI, confidence interval; RR, relative risk

Explanations

^a Confidence interval includes important benefit and harm.

 Table S4. Results of Meta Analysis, Subgroup and Sensitivity analyses according to Der Simonian and Laird and Generalized

 Linear Mixed Model methods.

Analysis	DerSimonian and Laird	Generalized Linear Mixed Model
	Principal Results	
Meta-analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions and all- cause mortality	RR, 0.93; 95% CI, 0.85 to 1.03	RR, 0.95; 95% CI, 0.87 to 1.03
Meta-analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions and cardiovascular mortality	RR, 0.99; 95% CI, 0.79 to 1.23	RR, 1.01; 95% CI, 0.86 to 1.18
Sensitivity and Su	ubgroup Analysis – All cause mortality	
Sensitivity analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality excluding studies that reported mortality as loss to follow-up	RR, 0.92; 95% CI, 0.82 to 1.04	Not applicable*
Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality according to the glycemic status of the study population	Prediabetes RR, 0.91; 95% CI, 0.70 to 1.18 Diabetes RR, 0.94; 95% CI, 0.87 to 1.03	Prediabetes RR, 1.08; 95% CI, 0.87 to 1.35 Diabetes RR, 0.92; 95% CI, 0.84 to 1.01
Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality according to the geographic area of the studies	Europe RR, 0.91; 95% CI, 0.77 to 1.07 Asia RR, 0.98; 95% CI, 0.62 to 1.55 North America RR, 0.99; 95% CI, 0.84 to 1.16	Europe RR, 0.91; 95% CI, 0.76 to 1.09 Asia RR, 0.96; 95% CI, 0.68 to 1.35 North America Not applicable*
Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality by the mean age of participants (adults or elderly)	Less than 60 years old RR, 0.95; 95% CI, 0.82 to 1.09 Equal or more than 60 years old RR, 0.92; 95% CI, 0.78 to 1.09	Less than 60 years old RR, 0.95; 95% CI, 0.87 to 1.05 Equal or more than 60 years old RR, 0.93; 95% CI, 0.77 to 1.11
Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality according to the dietary intervention modality of the studies	Dietary prescription RR, 0.91; 95% CI, 0.79 to 1.05 Group based activities RR, 0.97; 95% CI, 0.83 to 1.13	Dietary prescription RR, 0.93; 95% CI, 0.85 to 1.03 Group based activities RR, 0.98; 95% CI, 0.83 to 1.16

Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to the physical exercise intervention modality of the studies	Exercise prescription RR, 0.91; 95% CI, 0.79 to 1.05 General recommendation RR, 0.97; 95% CI, 0.83 to 1.13	Exercise prescription RR, 0.94; 95% CI, 0.85 to 1.03 General recommendation RR, 0.97; 95% CI, 0.83 to 1.15
Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality according to the mean follow-up of the studies	Less than 11 years RR, 0.97; 95% CI, 0.83 to 1.13 Equal or more than 11 years RR, 0.91; 95% CI, 0.77 to 1.08	Less than 11 years RR, 0.98; 95% CI, 0.83 to 1.15 Equal or more than 11 years RR, 0.96; 95% CI, 0.87 to 1.07
Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality according to the risk of bias of the studies	Some concerns RR, 0.82; 95% CI, 0.39 to 1.74 Low risk RR, 0.94; 95% CI, 0.83 to 1.06	Some concerns RR, 0.84; 95% CI, 0.39 to 1.80 Low risk RR, 0.95; 95% CI, 0.87 to 1.03
Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality according to the control group of the studies	No advice at all about diet and exercise RR, 0.77; 95% CI, 0.64 to 0.93 Usual care according to each center RR, 1.00; 95% CI, 0.79 to 1.25 General information, some degree of intervention RR, 0.96; 95% CI, 0.88 to 1.05	No advice at all about diet and exercise RR, 0.78; 95% CI, 0.60 to 1.02 Usual care according to each center RR, 0.97; 95% CI, 0.82 to 1.14 General information, some degree of intervention RR, 0.97; 95% CI, 0.82 to 1.14
Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality according to intervention dilution over time	2 to 5 years RR, 1.10; 95% CI, 0.38 to 3.18 6 to 15 years RR, 0.92; 95% CI, 0.82 to 1.04 16 to 30 years RR, 0.92; 95% CI, 0.77 to 1.10	Not applicable*
Sensitivity and Subg	roup Analysis – Cardiovascular Mortality	
Sensitivity analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality excluding studies that reported cardiovascular mortality as losses to follow-up	RR, 0.98; 95% CI, 0.78 to 1.24	Not applicable*
Sensitivity analysis including only studies with low risk of bias in the overall classification.		
Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality according to the glycemic status of the study population	Prediabetes RR, 0,97; 95% CI, 0.55 to 1.72 Diabetes RR, 1.04; 95% CI, 0.86 to 1.25	Prediabetes RR, 1.32; 95% CI, 0.87 to 2.01 Diabetes Not applicable*

Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality by the mean age of participants (adults or elderly)	Less than 60 years old RR, 0.98; 95% CI, 0.72 to 1.32 Equal or more than 60 years old RR, 1.05; 95% CI, 0.72 to 1.53	Less than 60 years old RR, 0.99; 95% CI, 0.80 to 1.23 Equal or more than 60 years old Not applicable*
Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality according to the dietary intervention modality of the studies	Dietary prescription RR, 0.98; 95% CI, 0.72 to 1.32 Group based activities RR, 1.05; 95% CI, 0.72 to 1.53	Dietary prescription RR, 0.99; 95% CI, 0.80 to 1.23 Group based activities Not applicable*
Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality using a random-effect model according to the physical exercise intervention modality of the studies	Exercise prescription RR, 0.98; 95% CI, 0.72 to 1.32 General recommendation RR, 1.05; 95% CI, 0.72 to 1.53	Exercise prescription RR, 0.99; 95% CI, 0.80 to 1.23 General recommendation Not applicable*
Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality according to the mean follow-up of the studies	Less than 15.8 years RR, 1.04; 95% CI, 0.86 to 1.26 Equal or more than 15.8 years RR, 0.94; 95% CI, 0.51 to 1.72	Less than 15.8 years RR, 1.04; 95% Cl, 0.86 to 1.27 Equal or more than 15.8 years Not applicable*
Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality according to the geographic area of the studies	Europe RR, 1.06; 95% CI, 0.73 to 1.54 Asia RR, 1.70; 95% CI, 0.51 to 0.97 North America RR, 1.09; 95% CI, 0.90 to 1.32	Europe RR, 1.07; 95% CI, 0.73 to 1.56 Asia Not applicable* North America Not applicable*
Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality according to the control group of the studies	No advice at all about diet and exercise RR, 0.71; 95% CI, 0.52 to 0.98 Usual care according to each center RR, 1.05; 95% CI, 0.72 to 1.53 General information, some degree of intervention RR, 1.09; 95% CI, 0.90 to 1.32	No advice at all about diet and exercise RR, 0.72; 95% CI, 0.49 to 1.04 Usual care according to each center Not applicable* General information, some degree of intervention Not applicable*

RR, relative risk *Not Applicable: Analysis that did not include studies with low or zero events.

Table S5. PRISMA Check-list.

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Long-term effect of lifesty	le interve	ntions in mortality of subjects with prediabetes and type 2 diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis	
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Pg 1
		ABSTRACT	
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Pg 4
		INTRODUCTION	
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Pg 5
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Pg 5
	1	METHODS	
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Pg 6
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organizations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Pg 6
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Table S1
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.	Pg 6, 7 and Fig.1
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.	Pg 7
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.	Pg 7
	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.	Pg 7
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.	Pg 8
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.	Pg 8, 9
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)).	Pg 7
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	Pg 8, 9,10
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Pg 8, 9,10
	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.	Pg 9, 10
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Pg 9, 10
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Pg 10

Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	Pg 8
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	Pg 9
		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.	Pg 10
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Table S2 and Fig.1
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Pg 10, 11,12
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Pg 13, Figures S1, S2
Result 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.	Figures 2 and 3, pages 13 and 14
Result of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Pg 13
	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.	Pg 13, 14,15
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Pg 13, 14,15
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Pg 13, 14
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	Pg 12
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	Pg 13, 14, Table S3
		DISCUSSION	
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Pg 15, 16
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Pg. 16,17
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Pg 18, 19
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Pg 19
	r	OTHER INFORMATION	
Registration and	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	Pg 4
protocol	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Pg 4, 6
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	20
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Pg 4, 21
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Pg 21
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.	-

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES

			Risk of bia	s domains		
	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	Overall
Oldroyd, 2006	÷	•	•	÷	+	-
JDCS (UMIN-CTRC000000222), 2010	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ
DPS (NCT00518167), 2012	Ŧ	-	Ŧ	Ŧ	•	-
PODOSA (ISRCTN25729565), 2014	•	•	Ŧ	Ŧ	•	-
ADDITION-Europe (NCT00237549), 2019	+	•	Ŧ	Ŧ	•	Ŧ
DIRECT (ISRCTN03267836), 2019	+	+	Ŧ	Ŧ	•	÷
Thailand DPP, 2019	-	-	÷	Ŧ	•	-
NDPS (ISRCTN34805606), 2020	Ŧ	-	-	Ŧ	•	-
Da Qing DPOS, 2021	Ŧ	+	Ŧ	Ŧ	+	•
DPP and DPPOS (NCT00038727 and NCT00004992, 2021	+	•	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ
Look AHEAD (NCT00017953), 2022	Ŧ	•	Ŧ	•	•	Ŧ
	Domains: D1: Bias arising f D2: Bias due to o D3: Bias due to r D4: Bias in meas D5: Bias in selec	rom the randomizat leviations from inter missing outcome da urement of the outc tion of the reported	tion process. Inded intervention. Ita. Come. I result.			Judgement - Some concer - Low

Figure S1. Risk of bias of studies that tested the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using the RoB 2.0 tool.

				Risk of bia	as domains		
		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	Overall
	Oldroyd, 2006	+	-	+	+	Ŧ	•
	ADDITION-Europe (NCT00237549), 2019	•	+	•	+	•	•
Innio	Da Qing DPOS, 2021	Ŧ	+	+	+	Ŧ	+
C	OPP and DPPOS (NCT00038727 and NCT00004992, 2021	Ŧ	+	+	+	Ŧ	+
	Look AHEAD (NCT00017953), 2022	+	+	+	+	Ŧ	+
		Domains: D1: Bias arising t D2: Bias due to D3: Bias due to D4: Bias in selec D5: Bias in selec	from the randomiza deviations from inte missing outcome d urement of the out tion of the reporte	ation process. ended intervention. ata. tcome. d result			Judgement - Some conce - Low

Figure S2. Risk of bias of studies that tested the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality using the RoB 2.0 tool.



Figure S3. Sensitivity analysis to assess the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality excluding studies that reported mortality as losses to follow-up.

	Experin	nental	C	ontrol				
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
Population = Prediabetes					1			
Oldrovd John C et al. 2006 (2 years)	1	39	0	39		- 3 00	[0 13 [.] 71 43]	0.1%
DPS 2012 (13 years)	6	265	10	257		0.58	[0 21: 1 58]	0.9%
PODOSA 2014 (3 years)	Ő	85	1	86 -		0.34	[0.01: 8.16]	0.1%
Thailand DPP 2019 (2 years)	5	1030	3	873	2	1 4 1	[0.34 5.89]	0.4%
NDPS 2020 (2 years)	1	424	0	178	·	1.26	10 05: 30 821	0.1%
Da Qing DPOS, 2021 (30 years)	185	438	76	138	12	0.77	[0.64: 0.92]	18.6%
DPP and DPPOS, 2021 (21 years)	158	1079	143	1082	1	1.11	[0.90: 1.37]	15.6%
Random effects model		3360		2653	4	0.91	[0.70: 1.18]	35.9%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 35\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0302$, p	= 0.16					1.202.01		
3 , , , ,								
Population = Type 2 Diabetes								
JDCS, 2010 (8 years)	54	1017	43	1016	-	1.25	[0.85; 1.85]	5.4%
ADDITION-Europe, 2019 (10 years)	246	1678	219	1379		0.92	[0.78; 1.09]	21.6%
DiRECT, 2019 (2 years)	0	157	1	149 -		0.32	[0.01: 7.71]	0.1%
Look AHEAD, 2022 (16 years)	549	2570	589	2575		0.93	[0.84: 1.03]	37.0%
Random effects model	G193	5422	1202023	5119	ġ	0.94	0.87: 1.031	64.1%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.46$								
Random effects model		8782		7772	¢	0.93	[0.85; 1.03]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 15\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0036$, p	= 0.30							
warrender and the second the					0.1 0.51 2 10			

Figure S4. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to the glycemic status of the study population.

	Experin	nental	Co	ontrol				
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
Continent = Europe								
Oldroyd, John C et al., 2006 (2 years)	1	39	0	39		- 3.00	[0.13; 71.43]	0.1%
DPS, 2012 (13 years)	6	265	10	257	+	0.58	[0.21; 1.58]	0.9%
PODOSA, 2014 (3 years)	0	85	1	86		0.34	[0.01; 8.16]	0.1%
ADDITION-Europe, 2019 (10 years)	246	1678	219	1379	ų.	0.92	[0.78; 1.09]	21.6%
DiRECT, 2019 (2 years)	0	157	1	149 -	+	0.32	[0.01; 7.71]	0.1%
NDPS, 2020 (2 years)	1	424	0	178		1.26	[0.05; 30.82]	0.1%
Random effects model		2648		2088	\$	0.91	[0.77; 1.07]	22.8%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.82$								
Continent = Asia								
JDCS, 2010 (8 years)	54	1017	43	1016		1.25	[0.85; 1.85]	5.4%
Thailand DPP, 2019 (2 years)	5	1030	3	873	— <u>+</u> +	1.41	[0.34; 5.89]	0.4%
Da Qing DPOS, 2021 (30 years)	185	438	76	138		0.77	[0.64; 0.92]	18.6%
Random effects model		2485		2027		0.98	[0.62; 1.55]	24.5%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 68\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0948$, p	= 0.05							
Continent = North America								
DPP and DPPOS, 2021 (21 years)	158	1079	143	1082	<u>}</u>	1.11	[0.90; 1.37]	15.6%
Look AHEAD, 2022 (16 years)	549	2570	589	2575	÷	0.93	[0.84; 1.03]	37.0%
Random effects model		3649		3657		0.99	[0.84; 1.16]	52.6%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 51\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0075$, p	= 0.15							
Random effects model		8782		7772		0.93	[0.85; 1.03]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 15\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0036$, p	= 0.30							
					0.1 0.51 2 10			

Figure S5. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to the geographic area of the studies.

	C	ontrol						
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
$\Lambda q_{0} = 1 \cos than 60 year old$					1			
Oldrovid John C at al. 2006 (2 years)	4	20	0	20		- 2.00	10 42: 74 421	0.10/
Oldroyd, John C et al., 2006 (2 years)		39	0	39		3.00	[0.13,71.43]	0.1%
JDCS, 2010 (8 years)	54	1017	43	1016		1.25	[0.85; 1.85]	5.4%
DPS, 2012 (13 years)	6	265	10	257	+	0.58	[0.21; 1.58]	0.9%
PODOSA, 2014 (3 years)	0	85	1	86		0.34	[0.01; 8.16]	0.1%
DiRECT, 2019 (2 years)	0	157	1	149		0.32	[0.01; 7.71]	0.1%
Thailand DPP, 2019 (2 years)	5	1030	3	873		1.41	10.34: 5.891	0.4%
Da Qing DPOS, 2021 (30 years)	185	438	76	138		0.77	0.64 0.921	18.6%
DPP and DPPOS 2021 (21 years)	158	1079	143	1082	1 <u>+</u>	1 1 1	[0.90 1.37]	15.6%
Look AHEAD 2022 (16 years)	549	2570	589	2575	+	0.93	[0.84 1.03]	37.0%
Pandom effects model	545	6690	505	6215	ä	0.00	[0.04, 1.00]	79 3%
Natural effects model	- 0.40	0080		0215		0.95	[0.62, 1.09]	10.3 /0
Heterogeneity: $T = 32\%, \tau = 0.0114, p$	= 0.16							
Age = Equal or more than 60 year of	old							
ADDITION-Europe 2019 (10 years)	246	1678	219	1379	÷	0.92	[0 78 [.] 1 09]	21.6%
NDPS 2020 (2 years)	1	424	0	178		1.26	[0.05:30.82]	0.1%
Random effects model		2102	Ŭ	1557	4	0.92	[0.00, 00.02]	21.7%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\% \tau^2 = 0$, $n = 0.85$		2102				0.02	[0.10, 1.00]	21.1.70
Therefore the second s								
Random effects model		8782		7772	i i	0 93	IO 85· 1 031	100.0%
Hotorogonaity: $l^2 = 150$, $r^2 = 0.0026$ p	- 0.20	0102		1112		0.95	[0.00, 1.00]	100.070
Hereiogeneity. $I = 15\%$, $\tau = 0.0036$, p	- 0.30				04 054 0 10			
					0.1 0.51 2 10			

Figure S6. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model by the mean age of participants (adults or elderly, according to the cutoff of 60 years-old).

	Experin	nental	C	ontrol				
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
Intervention - Distant preservition					1			
intervention - Dietary prescription						0.00.70		0.404
Oldroyd, John C et al., 2006 (2 years)	1	- 39	0	39		— 3.00 [0	.13; /1.43]	0.1%
DPS, 2012 (13 years)	6	265	10	257		0.58 [(0.21; 1.58]	0.9%
PODOSA, 2014 (3 years)	0	85	1	86		0.34 [(0.01; 8.16]	0.1%
DiRECT, 2019 (2 years)	0	157	1	149		0.32 [0.01; 7.71]	0.1%
Da Qing DPOS, 2021 (30 years)	185	438	76	138		0.77 [(0.64; 0.92]	18.6%
DPP and DPPOS, 2021 (21 years)	158	1079	143	1082	÷	1.11	0.90; 1.37]	15.6%
Look AHEAD, 2022 (16 years)	549	2570	589	2575		0.93	0.84; 1.03]	37.0%
Random effects model		4633		4326	4	0.91 [0	.79; 1.05]	72.5%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 34\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0104$, p	= 0.17					-		
laterary tion - Crew based activity								
Intervention = Group based activit	es							
JDCS, 2010 (8 years)	54	1017	43	1016	1 -	1.25 [0	0.85; 1.85]	5.4%
ADDITION-Europe, 2019 (10 years)	246	1678	219	1379		0.92 [(0.78; 1.09]	21.6%
Thailand DPP, 2019 (2 years)	5	1030	3	873		1.41 [(0.34; 5.89]	0.4%
NDPS, 2020 (2 years)	1	424	0	178		1.26 0	.05; 30.82]	0.1%
Random effects model		4149		3446	\$	0.97 [0	.83; 1.13]	27.5%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.51$						_		
Random effects model		8782		7772		0.93 [0).85; 1.03]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 15\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0036$, p	= 0.30							
					0.1 0.51 2 10			

Studies were considered as "dietary prescription" if they had individual counseling or caloric and nutrient targets as part of intervention groups.

Figure S7. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to the dietary intervention modality of the studies.

	nental	C	ontrol					
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
Eversion - Eversion properintion					1			
Exercise - Exercise prescription								
Oldroyd, John C et al., 2006 (2 years)	1	39	0	39		- 3.00	[0.13; /1.43]	0.1%
DPS, 2012 (13 years)	6	265	10	257		0.58	[0.21; 1.58]	0.9%
DiRECT, 2019 (2 years)	0	157	1	149		0.32	[0.01; 7.71]	0.1%
NDPS, 2020 (2 years)	1	424	0	178		1.26	[0.05; 30.82]	0.1%
Da Qing DPOS, 2021 (30 years)	185	438	76	138	=	0.77	[0.64; 0.92]	18.6%
DPP and DPPOS, 2021 (21 years)	158	1079	143	1082	1 	1.11	[0.90; 1.37]	15.6%
Look AHEAD, 2022 (16 years)	549	2570	589	2575	+	0.93	[0.84; 1.03]	37.0%
Random effects model		4972		4418	4	0.91	[0.79; 1.05]	72.5%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 31\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0092$, p	= 0.19						- / -	
5, , , ,,								
Exercise = General recommendati	on							
JDCS, 2010 (8 years)	54	1017	43	1016		1.25	[0.85; 1.85]	5.4%
PODOSA, 2014 (3 years)	0	85	1	86		0.34	[0.01; 8.16]	0.1%
ADDITION-Europe, 2019 (10 years)	246	1678	219	1379	÷	0.92	[0.78: 1.09]	21.6%
Thailand DPP, 2019 (2 years)	5	1030	3	873		1.41	0.34: 5.89	0.4%
Random effects model		3810		3354	\$	0.97	0.83: 1.13	27.5%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.44$							• / •	
Random effects model		8782		7772	d	0.93	[0.85: 1.03]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 15\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0036$. p	= 0.30							
3 , , , , , , , , , ,					0.1 0.51 2 10			

Figure S8. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to the physical exercise intervention modality of the studies.

	Experin	nental	C	ontrol				
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
Years = Less than 11					1			
Oldrovd, John C et al. 2006 (2 years)	1	39	0	39		- 3.00	[0.13:71.43]	0.1%
JDCS. 2010 (8 years)	54	1017	43	1016		1.25	[0.85: 1.85]	5.4%
PODOSA, 2014 (3 years)	0	85	1	86		0.34	[0.01: 8.16]	0.1%
ADDITION-Europe, 2019 (10 years)	246	1678	219	1379		0.92	[0.78: 1.09]	21.6%
DiRECT. 2019 (2 years)	0	157	1	149 -		0.32	[0.01: 7.71]	0.1%
Thailand DPP, 2019 (2 years)	5	1030	3	873	·	1.41	[0.34: 5.89]	0.4%
NDPS, 2020 (2 years)	1	424	0	178	·	1.26	[0.05: 30.82]	0.1%
Random effects model		4430		3720	\$	0.97	[0.83; 1.13]	27.8%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.72$							• / •	
Years = Equal or more than 11								
DPS, 2012 (13 years)	6	265	10	257	+	0.58	[0.21; 1.58]	0.9%
Da Qing DPOS, 2021 (30 years)	185	438	76	138		0.77	[0.64; 0.92]	18.6%
DPP and DPPOS, 2021 (21 years)	158	1079	143	1082	÷-	1.11	[0.90; 1.37]	15.6%
Look AHEAD, 2022 (16 years)	549	2570	589	2575	10 III III III III III III III III III I	0.93	[0.84; 1.03]	37.0%
Random effects model		4352		4052	4	0.91	[0.77; 1.08]	72.2%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 61\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0160$, p	= 0.05							
Random effects model		8782		7772	4	0.93	[0.85; 1.03]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 15\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0036$, p	= 0.30			_			- / -	
<u> </u>					0.1 0.512 10			

Figure S9. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to the mean follow-up of the studies.

	Experin	nental	C	ontrol				
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
Bias = Some concerns								
Oldroyd, John C et al., 2006 (2 years)	1	39	0	39		- 3.00	[0.13; 71.43]	0.1%
DPS, 2012 (13 years)	6	265	10	257		0.58	[0.21; 1.58]	0.9%
PODOSA, 2014 (3 years)	0	85	1	86		0.34	[0.01; 8.16]	0.1%
Thailand DPP, 2019 (2 years)	5	1030	3	873		1.41	[0.34; 5.89]	0.4%
NDPS, 2020 (2 years)	1	424	0	178		1.26	[0.05; 30.82]	0.1%
Random effects model		1843		1433		0.82	[0.39; 1.74]	1.6%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.73$								
Bias = Low								
JDCS, 2010 (8 years)	54	1017	43	1016		1.25	[0.85; 1.85]	5.4%
ADDITION-Europe, 2019 (10 years)	246	1678	219	1379		0.92	[0.78; 1.09]	21.6%
DiRECT, 2019 (2 years)	0	157	1	149 ·		0.32	[0.01; 7.71]	0.1%
Da Qing DPOS, 2021 (30 years)	185	438	76	138		0.77	[0.64; 0.92]	18.6%
DPP and DPPOS, 2021 (21 years)	158	1079	143	1082	÷-	1.11	[0.90; 1.37]	15.6%
Look AHEAD, 2022 (16 years)	549	2570	589	2575		0.93	[0.84; 1.03]	37.0%
Random effects model		6939		6339	ģ	0.94	[0.83; 1.06]	98.4%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 48\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0096$, p	= 0.08							
Random effects model	- 0.20	8782		7772		0.93	[0.85; 1.03]	100.0%
neuerogeneity. $I = 15\%$, $\tau = 0.0036$, p	- 0.30				0.1 0.51 2 10			

Figure S10. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to the risk of bias of the studies.

	Experim	nental	C	ontrol				
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
Control = No adivice at all about di	et and ex	xercis	e					
Oldroyd, John C et al., 2006 (2 years)	1	39	0	39	+	- 3.00	[0.13; 71.43]	0.1%
NDPS, 2020 (2 years)	1	424	0	178		1.26	[0.05; 30.82]	0.1%
Da Qing DPOS, 2021 (30 years)	185	438	76	138		0.77	[0.64; 0.92]	18.6%
Random effects model		901		355	\$	0.77	[0.64; 0.93]	18.8%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.67$								
Control = Usual care according to	each cei	nter						
JDCS, 2010 (8 years)	54	1017	43	1016		1.25	[0.85; 1.85]	5.4%
ADDITION-Europe, 2019 (10 years)	246	1678	219	1379	di d	0.92	[0.78; 1.09]	21.6%
DiRECT, 2019 (2 years)	0	157	1	149 -		0.32	[0.01; 7.71]	0.1%
Random effects model		2852		2544	\$	1.00	[0.79; 1.25]	27.1%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 19\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0109$, p	= 0.29							
Control = General information, son	ne degre	e of in	terventio	on				
DPS, 2012 (13 years)	6	265	10	257		0.58	[0.21; 1.58]	0.9%
PODOSA, 2014 (3 years)	0	85	1	86 -		0.34	[0.01; 8.16]	0.1%
Thailand DPP, 2019 (2 years)	5	1030	3	873		1.41	[0.34; 5.89]	0.4%
DPP and DPPOS, 2021 (21 years)	158	1079	143	1082	_1	1.11	[0.90; 1.37]	15.6%
Look AHEAD, 2022 (16 years)	549	2570	589	2575	+	0.93	[0.84; 1.03]	37.0%
Random effects model		5029		4873	ģ	0.96	[0.88; 1.05]	54.1%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.44$								
Random effects model		8782		7772		0.93	[0.85; 1.03]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 15\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0036$, p	= 0.30							
					0.1 0.512 10			

Figure S11. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to the characteristics of control groups of the studies.

(A)

	Study	Experin Events	mental Total	C Events	ontrol Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
	Oldroyd, John C et al., 2006 (2 years) 1	39	0	39		- 3.00	[0.13; 71.43]	11.3%
	PODOSA, 2014 (3 years)	0	85	1	86		0.34	[0.01; 8.16]	11.1%
	DIRECT, 2019 (2 years)	C C	15/	1	149 -		0.32		11.1%
	NDDS 2020 (2 years)		1030	3	8/3		1.41	[0.34; 5.89]	00.4%
	NDF3, 2020 (2 years)	1	424	0	170		1.20	[0.05, 50.62]	11.170
	Random effects model		1735		1325		1.10	[0.38; 3.18]	100.0%
	Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.80$)							
(B)						0.1 0.51 2 10			
		Experin	nental	C	ontrol				
	Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
	Da Oing DPOS 1997 (6 years)	8	138	3	138		0.84	[0 23: 3 12]	0.8%
	JDCS 2010 (8 years)	54	1017	43	1016		1 25	[0.85:1.85]	9.4%
	DPS 2012 (13 years)	6	265	10	257 -		0.58	[0 21: 1 58]	1.4%
	Look AHEAD, 2018 (12 years)	171	2570	199	2575		0.86	[0.71: 1.05]	37.1%
	ADDITION-Europe, 2019 (10 years)	246	1678	219	1379		0.92	[0.78; 1.09]	51.2%
	Random effects model	246	5968		5365		0.92	[0.82; 1.04]	100.0%
	Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.4$	5							
(C)		<u></u>				0.5 1 2			
		Experim	nental	- Co	ntrol				
	Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
	Da Qing DPOS 2021 (30 years)	185	438	76	138 -	[0.77	[0.64 0.92]	30.9%
	DPP and DPPOS 2021 (21 years)	158	1079	143	1082		1 11	[0.90: 1.37]	28.3%
	Look AHEAD, 2022 (16 years)	549	2570	589	2575		0.93	[0.84: 1.03]	40.8%
		0.701.7	5		55,733,57 1		10000	·	(And Strategics)
	Random effects model		4087		3795		0.92	[0.77; 1.10]	100.0%
	Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 71\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0171$, μ	0 = 0.03							
						0.75 1 1	5		

(A) Studies with follow-up between 2 and 5 years; (B) Studies with follow-up between 6 and 15 years; (C) Studies with follow-up between 16 and 30 years

Figure S12. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality using a random-effect model according to intervention dilution over time.



DPS, Finnish Diabetes Prevention Study; PODOSA, Prevention of Diabetes and Obesity in South Asians; Look AHEAD, Look Action for Health in Diabetes; Thailand DPP, Community-Based Diabetes Prevention Program in Thailand; ADDITION-EUROPE, Anglo–Danish–Dutch Study of Intensive Treatment in People with Screen-Detected Diabetes in Primary Care; Da Qing DPOS, China Da Qing Diabetes Prevention Outcomes Study; DiRECT, Diabetes Remission Clinical Trial; NDPS, Norfolk Diabetes Prevention Study; DPP, Diabetes Prevention Program; DPPOS, Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study.

Figure S13. Meta regression of the relationship between mean weight change (intervention - control) and relative risk of all-cause mortality.



Figure S14. Funnel plot of studies that tested the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on all-cause mortality.



Figure S15. Sensitivity analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality excluding studies that reported cardiovascular mortality as loss to follow-up.



Figure S16. Sensitivity analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality excluding the study with some concerns in the risk of bias.

	Experin	nental	Co	ontrol				
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
Population = Prediabetes					1			
Oldroyd, John C et al., 2006 (2 years)	1	39	0	39		3.00	[0.13; 71.43]	0.5%
Da Qing DPOS, 2021 (30 years)	89	438	40	138		0.70	[0.51; 0.97]	25.1%
DPP and DPPOS, 2021 (21 years)	49	1079	38	1082	-	1.29	[0.85; 1.96]	18.6%
Random effects model		1556		1259	\diamond	0.97	[0.55; 1.72]	44.2%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 67\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.1401$, $p = 0.1401$	= 0.05							
Population = Type 2 Diabetes								
ADDITION-Europe, 2019 (10 years)	60	1678	47	1379	*	1.05	[0.72; 1.53]	21.1%
Look AHEAD, 2022 (16 years)	154	2570	149	2575		1.04	[0.83; 1.29]	34.7%
Random effects model		4248		3954	\$	1.04	[0.86; 1.25]	55.8%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.95$								
Random effects model		5804		5213		0.99	[0.79; 1.23]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 42\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0252$, $p =$	= 0.14							
					0.1 0.51 2 10			

Figure S17. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality using a randomeffect model according to the glycemic status of the study population.

Study	Experin Events	nental Total	Co Events	ontrol Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
Age = Less than 60 year old Oldroyd, John C et al., 2006 (2 years)	1	39	0	39		3.00	[0.13; 71.43]	0.5%
Da Qing DPOS, 2021 (30 years)	89	438	40	138		0.70	[0.51; 0.97]	25.1%
DPP and DPPOS, 2021 (21 years)	49	1079	38	1082	<u>+</u>	1.29	[0.85; 1.96]	18.6%
Look AHEAD, 2022 (16 years)	154	2570	149	2575		1.04	[0.83; 1.29]	34.7%
Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 55\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0460$, p	= 0.08	4126		3834		0.98	[0.72; 1.32]	78.9%
ADDITION-Europe, 2019 (10 years) Random effects model Heterogeneity: not applicable	60	1678 1678	47	1379 1379	+	1.05 1.05	[0.72; 1.53] [0.72; 1.53]	21.1% 21.1%
Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 42\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0252$, p	= 0.14	5804		5213	0.1 0.5 1 2 10	0.99	[0.79; 1.23]	100.0%

Figure S18. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality using a randomeffect model by the mean age of participants (adults or elderly, according to the cutoff of 60 years-old).

	Experin	nental	C	ontrol				
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
Intervention = Dietary prescription								
Oldroyd, John C et al., 2006 (2 years)	1	39	0	39		- 3.00	[0.13; 71.43]	0.5%
Da Qing DPOS, 2021 (30 years)	89	438	40	138		0.70	[0.51; 0.97]	25.1%
DPP and DPPOS, 2021 (21 years)	49	1079	38	1082		1.29	[0.85; 1.96]	18.6%
Look AHEAD, 2022 (16 years)	154	2570	149	2575	÷	1.04	[0.83; 1.29]	34.7%
Random effects model		4126		3834	\$	0.98	[0.72; 1.32]	78.9%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 55\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0460$, p	= 0.08						-	
Intervention = Group based activiti	es							
ADDITION-Europe, 2019 (10 years)	60	1678	47	1379	+	1.05	[0.72; 1.53]	21.1%
Random effects model		1678		1379		1.05	[0.72; 1.53]	21.1%
Heterogeneity: not applicable								
Random effects model		5804		5213		0.99	[0.79; 1.23]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 42\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0252$, p	= 0.14							
					0.1 0.51 2 10			

Studies were considered as "dietary prescription" if they had individualized counseling or caloric and nutrient targets as part of intervention groups.

Figure S19. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality using a randomeffect model according to the dietary intervention modality of the studies.

	Experin	nental	C	ontrol				
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
Exercise = Exercise prescription								
Oldroyd, John C et al., 2006 (2 years)	1	39	0	39		3.00	[0.13; 71.43]	0.5%
Da Qing DPOS, 2021 (30 years)	89	438	40	138		0.70	[0.51; 0.97]	25.1%
DPP and DPPOS, 2021 (21 years)	49	1079	38	1082		1.29	[0.85; 1.96]	18.6%
Look AHEAD, 2022 (16 years)	154	2570	149	2575		1.04	[0.83; 1.29]	34.7%
Random effects model		4126		3834	\$	0.98	[0.72; 1.32]	78.9%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 55\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0460$, $p =$	= 0.08							
Exercise = General recommendation	on							
ADDITION-Europe, 2019 (10 years)	60	1678	47	1379	+	1.05	[0.72; 1.53]	21.1%
Random effects model		1678		1379		1.05	[0.72; 1.53]	21.1%
Heterogeneity: not applicable								
Random effects model		5804		5213		0.99	[0.79; 1.23]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 42\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0252$, $p = 0.0252$	= 0.14							
					0.1 0.512 10			

Figure S20. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality using a randomeffect model according to the physical exercise intervention modality of the studies.

Study	Experin Events	nental Total	Co Events	ontrol Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
Years = Less than 15.8 Oldroyd, John C et al., 2006 (2 years) ADDITION-Europe, 2019 (10 years) Look AHEAD, 2022 (16 years) Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.81$	1 60 154	39 1678 2570 4287	0 47 149	39 1379 2575 3993		- 3.00 1.05 1.04 1.04	[0.13; 71.43] [0.72; 1.53] [0.83; 1.29] [0.86; 1.26]	0.5% 21.1% 34.7% 56.3%
Years = Equal or more than 15.8 Da Qing DPOS, 2021 (30 years) DPP and DPPOS, 2021 (21 years) Random effects model Heterogeneity: l^2 = 81%, τ^2 = 0.1575, p	89 49 = 0.02	438 1079 1517	40 38	138 1082 1220		0.70 1.29 0.94	[0.51; 0.97] [0.85; 1.96] [0.51; 1.72]	25.1% 18.6% 43.7%
Random effects model Heterogeneity: I^2 = 42%, τ^2 = 0.0252, p	= 0.14	5804		5213	0.1 0.51 2 10	0.99	[0.79; 1.23]	100.0%

Figure S21. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality using a randomeffect model according to the mean follow-up of the studies.

	Experime		C	ontrol				
Study	Events	Total	Events	Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
Continent = Europe								
Oldroyd, John C et al., 2006 (2 years)	1	39	0	39		3.00	[0.13; 71.43]	0.5%
ADDITION-Europe, 2019 (10 years)	60	1678	47	1379	-	1.05	[0.72; 1.53]	21.1%
Random effects model		1717		1418	\	1.06	[0.73; 1.54]	21.6%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.52$								
Continent = Asia								
Da Qing DPOS, 2021 (30 years)	89	438	40	138		0.70	[0.51; 0.97]	25.1%
Random effects model		438		138		0.70	[0.51; 0.97]	25.1%
Heterogeneity: not applicable								
Continent = North America								
DPP and DPPOS, 2021 (21 years)	49	1079	38	1082]	1.29	[0.85; 1.96]	18.6%
Look AHEAD, 2022 (16 years)	154	2570	149	2575		1.04	[0.83; 1.29]	34.7%
Random effects model		3649		3657	b	1.09	[0.90; 1.32]	53.3%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.35$								
Random effects model		5804		5213		0.99	[0.79; 1.23]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 42\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0252$, p	= 0.14							
					0.1 0.51 2 10			

Figure S22. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality using a randomeffect model according to the geographic location of the studies.

Study	Experin Events	nental Total	Co Events	ontrol Total	Risk Ratio	RR	95%-CI	Weight
Control = No adivice at all about di	et and e	xercis	e					
Oldroyd, John C et al., 2006 (2 years)	1	39	0	39		— 3.00	[0.13; 71.43]	0.5%
Da Qing DPOS, 2021 (30 years)	89	438	40	138		0.70	[0.51; 0.97]	25.1%
Random effects model		477		177	\diamond	0.71	[0.52; 0.98]	25.6%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.37$								
Control = Usual care according to	each cei	nter						
ADDITION-Europe, 2019 (10 years)	60	1678	47	1379	÷	1.05	[0.72; 1.53]	21.1%
Random effects model		1678		1379		1.05	[0.72; 1.53]	21.1%
Heterogeneity: not applicable							- / -	
Control = General information, son	ne degre	e of in	terventio	on				
DPP and DPPOS, 2021 (21 years)	49	1079	38	1082		1.29	[0.85; 1.96]	18.6%
Look AHEAD, 2022 (16 years)	154	2570	149	2575	÷	1.04	[0.83; 1.29]	34.7%
Random effects model		3649		3657		1.09	[0.90; 1.32]	53.3%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 0.35$								
Random effects model		5804		5213		0.99	[0.79; 1.23]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^{-} = 42\%$, $\tau^{-} = 0.0252$, p	= 0.14							
					0.1 0.51 2 10			

Figure S23. Subgroup analysis of the effect of intensive lifestyle interventions on cardiovascular mortality according to the control group of the studies.



Look AHEAD, Look Action for Health in Diabetes; ADDITION-EUROPE, Anglo–Danish–Dutch Study of Intensive Treatment in People with Screen-Detected Diabetes in Primary Care; Da Qing DPOS, China Da Qing Diabetes Prevention Outcomes Study; DPP, Diabetes Prevention Program; DPPOS, Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study.

Figure S24. Meta regression of the relationship between mean weight change (intervention - control) and relative risk of cardiovascular mortality.