Use of FGF21 analogs for the treatment of metabolic disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Maria Paula Carbonetti¹ https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4212-3506

Fernanda Almeida-Oliveira² https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2901-3281

David Majerowicz^{1,3} https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7916-5315

ABSTRACT

FGF21 is a hormone produced primarily by the liver with several metabolic functions, such as induction of heat production, control of glucose homeostasis, and regulation of blood lipid levels. Due to these actions, several laboratories have developed FGF21 analogs to treat patients with metabolic disorders such as obesity and diabetes. Here, we performed a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials that used FGF21 analogs and analyzed metabolic outcomes. Our search yielded 236 articles, and we included eight randomized clinical trials in the meta-analysis. The use of FGF21 analogs exhibited no effect on fasting blood glucose, glycated hemoglobin, HOMA index, blood free fatty acids or systolic blood pressure. However, the treatment significantly reduced fasting insulinemia, body weight and total cholesterolemia. None of the included studies were at high risk of bias. The quality of the evidence ranged from moderate to very low, especially due to imprecision and indirection issues. These results indicate that FGF21 analogs can potentially treat metabolic syndrome. However, more clinical trials are needed to increase the quality of evidence and confirm the effects seen thus far.

Keywords

FGF21; blood glucose; metabolic syndrome; glycated hemoglobin A; fasting; blood pressure; obesity; lipids

INTRODUCTION

iscovered in 2000, fibroblast growth factor 21 **D**(FGF21) is a peptide hormone of the endocrine FGF subfamily, along with FGF23 and FGF15/19 (1). The liver is the primary site of the production of this hormone, although white and brown adipose tissues (WAT and BAT) also express this gene (1-3). The structural domains of FGFs are well conserved, and the core region of the protein consists of 12 β-sheets. However, FGF21, similar to other FGFs of the endocrine subfamily, lacks a heparin-binding site. This difference means that these FGFs do not bind to endothelial receptors and can travel greater distances through the bloodstream (4). To act on target cells, FGF21 binds to FGF receptors and β -klotho coreceptors, which activate the extracellular signalregulated kinase pathway. However, how FGF21 causes its multiple cellular effects remains unclear (5). Dipeptidyl peptidase 4 and fibroblast activation protein (FAP) can cleave the N- and C-terminal regions of FGF21. C-terminal cleavage by FAP shortens the hormone's half-life in circulation (6).

Arch Endocrinol Metab, 2024, v.68, 1-14, e220493.

Various factors, such as diet, exercise, drug use, and metabolic conditions, regulate the gene expression and levels of FGF21 (6,7). Fasting and specific diets (ketogenic, low-calorie, and methionine-restricted) increase plasma levels and gene expression of FGF21 in both animals and humans (8-12). High-fat and sucrose-rich diets also increase plasma levels and gene expression of FGF21 in the liver and pancreatic islets (13-16). In cell culture, high concentrations of glucose and fatty acids increase FGF21 in pancreatic islets and hepatocytes (13,17). In addition, fatty acid infusion increases plasma levels of FGF21 (17).

Using overexpression or knockout models allows us to investigate the metabolic effects of FGF21. First, FGF21 knockout mice exhibit increased glucose tolerance (18). Moreover, knockout or knockdown pancreatic β -cells are less autophagic (13). On the other hand, mice overexpressing FGF21 exhibit reduced body weight, with reduced blood glucose, insulin, total cholesterol, and triglycerides (TAG). Furthermore, increased expression of FGF21 increases the concentration of bile salts in the liver and small

¹ Faculdade de Farmácia, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil ² Instituto de Bioquímica Médica Leopoldo de Meis, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil ³ Programa de Pós-graduação em Biociências, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil

Correspondence to: David Majerowicz majerowicz@pharma.ufrj.br

Received on Dec/7/2022 Accepted on Apr/23/2023

DOI: 10.20945/2359-4292-2022-0493

intestine, probably caused by significant changes in the expression profile of genes in the metabolism of cholesterol and bile salts in these organs. These models also show reduced hepatic TAG and cholesterol in the stool (19).

The functions of FGF21 have spurred several research groups to test the effects of treatment with FGF21 or developed analogs on models of metabolic diseases such as obesity and diabetes (20). In preclinical trials, using FGF21 reduced weight gain and fat and lean mass, independent of food and water consumption, which increased in some studies (21-25). Increased energy expenditure and thermogenesis help explain these effects (26,27). Regarding plasma concentrations of energy substrates and other metabolic substances, treatment with FGF21 reduced glucose and glycated hemoglobin, TAG, and total cholesterol, with a reduction in VLDL and LDL but increased levels of HDL and plasma fatty acids (21,25,28-31). Furthermore, using FGF21 analogs increased plasma levels of β-hydroxybutyrate, indicating induction of hepatic β -oxidation (26,28).

Different factors help to explain this improvement in glucose homeostasis. First, FGF21 increases glucose tolerance and insulin sensitivity, reducing the HOMA index and increasing phosphorylation of protein kinase B and extracellular signal-regulated kinase in WAT and BAT. In addition, FGF21 reduces glucose production in the liver, inhibiting the expression of glucose-6-phosphate phosphatase (G6Pase) and phosphoenolpyruvate carboxykinase (PEPCK). Finally, FGF21 increases tissue glucose uptake, stimulating the expression of the GLUT1 glucose transporter, and increases hepatic glycogen synthesis (28,31-35). The improvement in blood lipid levels corroborates the effect of FGF21 on the reduction of atheroma plaque in mice on a high-fat diet (32).

Regarding the cardiovascular system, treatment with FGF21 analogs increases heart rate and blood pressure but improves heart condition and endothelial function (36-38). This treatment reduces inflammation in the blood vessels and the amount of cholesterol in the arteries (39). FGF21 also regulates the levels of various hormones in the blood, reducing insulin, leptin, and glucagon levels while increasing the concentration of adiponectin and FGF21 itself (21,28,32). In this sense, treatment with FGF21 analogs increases the number of pancreatic islets and insulin secretion (40). In addition, FGF21 acted on the liver of the models, reducing

organ weight, in addition to the amount of TAG and cholesterol, hepatic steatosis scores, plasma levels of hepatic enzymes, and the expression of inflammatory and fibrotic genes, indicating a reduction in liver damage (21,24,41,42). FGF21 increases cholesterol concentration in the feces and reduces lipid synthesis in the liver through sterol-responsive element-binding protein 2 (SREBP-2) inhibition (39). These effects help explain the reduction in cholesterolemia and the levels of hepatic cholesterol.

In adipose tissue, treatment with FGF21 analogs increases the expression of GLUT1 and peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor γ coactivator 1 α in WAT, indicating a greater capacity for glucose uptake and mitochondrial respiration. In BAT, FGF21 also alters the gene expression profile, leaving cells with greater thermogenic, glucose uptake, lipogenic, and lipolytic capacity (23,28,31,43).

FGF21 also acts on the immune and inflammatory system, reducing *ex vivo* secretion of IL-1 β by human macrophages and reducing the expression of MMP-9 and ICAM-1 in WAT, in addition to the amount of CD68 cells in this tissue (9,28,32). In addition, using FGF21 reduces TNF- α levels (37).

In diabetic or obese models, FGF21 analog treatment reduced urine volume, the amount of creatinine in the urine, and the plasma levels of urea and creatinine (22,30). The same treatment increased the amount of chlorine in the urine (22). Furthermore, using FGF21 analogs reduces the amount of TAG and cholesterol in the kidneys, the levels of lipid peroxidation, and inflammatory and fibrotic factors in the kidneys (30). These results indicate an improvement in diabetes and kidney function.

In bone metabolism, using FGF21 increases plasma levels of CTX-1, indicating induction of bone resorption (25). These results indicate that FGF21-based therapies are promising for the treatment of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease, type II diabetes, and obesity (44,45).

The positive results of FGF21 analogs in preclinical trials stimulated the pharmaceutical industry to move toward clinical trials. Thus, in phase I and II clinical trials, several companies have tested FGF21 analogs created with different technologies in healthy humans or those with metabolic disorders. Here, we performed a systematic review and meta-analysis of clinical trials using FGF21 analogs to summarize the evidence of success or failure of this type of treatment for the future.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Search for articles and inclusion criteria

We followed the PRISMA 2020 guide (46) to develop this systematic review and meta-analysis (Table S1). We searched for articles indexed in the PubMed, Scopus, and SciELO databases up to March 2023 using the search key ((((men) OR (women)) AND (obesity) OR (diabetes) OR (dyslipidemia) OR (hypertension)) AND (FGF21 AND (agonist OR analog))) AND (glycemia OR hblac OR HOMA OR weight OR cholesterol OR FFA OR "blood pressure"). The three authors independently analyzed the abstracts of articles obtained in the search, and we included only randomized clinical trials of FGF21 analogs versus placebos. In addition, the three authors independently analyzed the included articles and excluded articles that did not have extractable data from the studied outcomes, namely, fasting blood glucose, glycated hemoglobin, fasting blood insulin, HOMA index, body weight, total blood cholesterol, systolic blood pressure, and blood free fatty acids.

Data extraction and analysis

The three authors independently extracted data from the included articles. First, we extracted the data manually, or when the manuscript presented the data in the form of graphs, we used the program WebPlotDigitizer 4.5

(47). Finally, we analyzed the data obtained using RevMan 5.4.1 software with random effects and standard mean difference methods.

Analysis of risk of bias and summary of the quality of evidence

First, two authors independently analyzed the included articles for risk of bias using the RoB 2 algorithm (48). Then, we assessed the risk of publication bias based on the funnel plots generated by RevMan 5.4.1 and using Egger's test (49). Finally, we summarize the evidence-based quality on the GRADE algorithm (50).

RESULTS

Systematic review

Our search yielded 237 published articles, one of which was duplicated between databases. We excluded 227 during abstract analysis: 190 were not clinical trials, and 37 did not use FGF21 analogs as an intervention. Thus, we thoroughly analyzed nine articles in total. We excluded one of them (51) for not having an analyzable outcome. Thus, we included eight randomized clinical trials (52-58) in the meta-analysis (Figure S1). Table S2 contains a summary of the characteristics of each study and the participants included in this meta-analysis.

Pubmed: 130 articles found Pubmed: 130 articles found Corrections of the second of t

Figure S1. Flow chart of article selection for meta-analysis.

Copyright® AE&M all rights reserved

Table S1. PRISMA 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 1 |
| INTRODUCTION | | | |
| Rationale | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge. | Pages 1 and 2 |
| Objectives | 4 | Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses. | Page 2 |
| METHODS | | | |
| Eligibility criteria | 5 | Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses. | Page 3 |
| 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. | Page 3 |
| Search strategy | 7 | Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used. | Page 3 |
| 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 3 |
| 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 3 |
| 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 3 |
| | 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 3 |
| 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. | Page 3 |
| 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 3 |
| 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 3 |
| | 13b | Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics or data conversions. | Page 3 |
| | 13c | Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses. | Page 3 |
| | 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 3 |
| | 13e | Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g., subgroup analysis, meta-regression). | Page 3 |
| | 13f | Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results. | Page 3 |
| 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 3 |
| Certainty assessment | 15 | Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome. | Page 3 |
| 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. | Fig. S1 |
| | 16b | Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded. | Page 3 |
| Study characteristics | 17 | Cite each included study and present its characteristics. | Table S2 |
| Risk of bias in studies | 18 | Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study. | Fig. S2 |

| Section and Topic | Item # | Checklist item | Location where item is reported |
|--|--------|--|---------------------------------------|
| 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. | Pages 5 and 8 |
| Results of syntheses | 20a | For each synthesis, briefly summarize the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies. | Pages 5 and 8 |
| | 20b | Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was performed, 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. | Pages 5 and 8 |
| | 20c | Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results. | Pages 5 and 8 |
| | 20d | Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results. | Pages 5 and 8 |
| Reporting biases | 21 | Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed. | Fig. S2 |
| Certainty of evidence | 22 | Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed. | Table 1 |
| DISCUSSION | | | |
| Discussion | 23a | Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence. | Pages 9, 10, and 12 |
| | 23b | Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review. | Page 12 |
| | 23c | Discuss any limitations of the review processes used. | Page 12 |
| | 23d | Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research. | Page 12 |
| OTHER INFORMATION | | | |
| Registration and protocol | 24a | Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered. | Page 12 |
| | 24b | Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared. | Page 12 |
| | 24c | Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol. | Page 12 |
| Support | 25 | Describe sources of financial or nonfinancial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review. | Page 12 |
| Competing interests | 26 | Declare any competing interests of review authors. | Page 12 |
| 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. | Page 12 |

The studies included participants with an average age of 54, mostly men (59%) and white (87%). In addition, all participants were at least overweight and may have type II diabetes. The analyzed studies used five different FGF21 analogs: 1) LY2405319, a human FGF21 analog containing modifications in its primary sequence to create greater stability and large-scale production (59); 2) PF-05231023, an analog consisting of two molecules of human FGF21 modified and conjugated to an antibody, aimed at increasing the half-life (60); 3) Pegbelfermin, a pegylated human FGF21 with an increased half-life (53); 4) AKR-001, human FGF21 with point mutations conjugated to an antibody, targeting greater receptor affinity and half-life (61); and 5) LLF580, human FGF21 stabilized by an inserted disulfide bond and antibody conjugation, increasing its half-life (57).

Effects of FGF21 analogs on glucose homeostasis

First, we analyzed the effect of FGF21 analogs on fasting blood glucose. This analysis included seven studies and 434 subjects, 321 in the treatment group and 113 in the control group. Treatment produced no effect on the outcome, with an estimated effect (95% CI) of -0.11 (-0.34, 0.11), Z = 0.99 (p = 0.32). The heterogeneity was I² = 0% (Figure 1A).

Next, we evaluated glycated hemoglobin levels on FGF21 analog treatment in three studies with 252 participants, 180 in the treatment group and 72 in the placebo groups. Again, the use of FGF21 had no significant effect, with an estimated effect (95% CI) of -0.02 (-0.31, 0.26), Z = 0.15 (p = 0.88). As with the previous analysis, heterogeneity was low (Figure 1B).

| | Intervention | Subcutaneous dose of LY2405319 (3, 10 or 20 mg) daily for 28 days | Single intravenous dose of PF-05231023 (0.5, 1.5, 5, 15, 50, 100 or 200 mg) | Intravenous dose of PF-05231023 (5, 25, 100 or 140 mg) twice weekly for four weeks | Intravenous dose of PF-05231023 (25, 50, 100 or 150 mg) once weekly for four weeks | Subcutaneous dose of pegbelfermin (1, 5 or 20 mg daily, or 20 mg weekly) for 12 weeks | Subcutaneous dose of AKR-001 (7, 21, 70 or 140 mg) once weekly or once every two weeks twice for four weeks | Subcutaneous dose of LLF580 (300 mg) every four weeks for 12 weeks | Subcutaneous dose of pegbelfermin (3, 9, 18 or 27 mg once weekly, or 18 or 36 mg once every two weeks) for 12 weeks |
|-------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| | Status of participants | Obesity and T2DM | Overweight or obesity and T2DM | Overweight or obesity and T2DM | Obesity and hypertriglyceridemia (with or without T2DM) | Obesity and T2DM | Overweight or obesity and T2DM | Obesity and hypertriglyceridemia (with or without T2DM) | Overweight or obesity and NASH (with or without T2DM) |
| | Fasting FFA (µmol/L) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 544.2 | NA | 430.3 |
| | Systolic blood pressure (mmHg) | NA | AN | AN | 121.6 | AN | 123.9 | 124.5 | NA |
| | Total cholesterol (mg/dL) | NA | AN | AN | 153.8 | AN | 196.5 | 214.1 | NA |
| | HbA1c (%) | 7.96 | 8.60 | 8.18 | AA | 7.80 | 7.90 | 5.5 | 6.7 |
| | Fasting glucose (mg/dL) | 171.9 | 173.4 | 168.0 | AN | 151.0 | 183.7 | 100.9 | 132.1 |
| | BMI (kg/ m²) | 32.1 | 30.4 | 29.7 | 34.0 | 35.0 | 32.0 | 36.1 | 34.6 |
| ants | White (%) | 96 | 92 | 06 | 68 | 76 | NA | 80 | 92 |
| es and particip | Male (%) | 26 (57) | 60 (71) | 39 (78) | 76 (71) | 53 (55) | 39 (57) | 30 (49) | 31 (38) |
| included studio | Age (years) | 57.7 | 55.5 | 55.7 | 53.4 | 56.0 | 55.5 | 45.5 | 51.9 |
| eristics of the | Sample size | 46 | 84 | 50 | 107 | 96 | 69 | 61 | 81 |
| Table S2. Charact | Study | Gaich and cols., 2013 | Dong and cols., 2015 | Talukdar and cols., 2016 | Kim and cols., 2017 | Charles and cols., 2019 | Kaufman and cols., 2020 | Rader and cols., 2022 | Loomba and cols., 2023 |

Arch Endocrinol Metab, 2024, v.68, 1-14, e220493.

6

Copyright® AE&M all rights reserved.

| n | |
|-------|--|
| - | |
| | |

| A | Study or Subgroup | Favours | s [FGF21 Anal SD | og] Total | Place | bo SD T | otal Weight | Std. Mean Difference | Std. Mean Difference |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Study or Subgroup Gaich 2013 L/2405319 3 mg Gaich 2013 L/2405319 10 mg Gaich 2013 L/2405319 10 mg Dong 2015 PF-05231023 0.5 mg Dong 2015 PF-05231023 1.5 mg Dong 2015 PF-05231023 1.5 mg Dong 2015 PF-05231023 15 mg Dong 2015 PF-05231023 15 mg Dong 2015 PF-05231023 100 mg Dong 2015 PF-05231023 200 mg Talukdar 2016 PF-05231023 200 mg Kim 2017 PF-05231023 200 mg Kim 2017 PF-05231023 100 mg Kim 2017 PF-05 | Mean 0.0195 0.0195 0.0321 0.681 1.1022 2.8 52 2.8 52 1.6.98 1.19.89 1.19.89 1.19.89 1.19.89 1.14.41 1.2.89 2.06 0.42 1.17 | SD 1.64 1.67 1.67 1.67 2.8.3 19.24 25.88 20.41 25.82 15.24 12.33 13.91 15.51 12.33 13.91 1.55 17.1 1.84 1.23 1.81 1.21 1.24 1.73 0.41 28.4 38.7 38.6 37.6 38.2 36 38.2 36 | Total 10 8 13 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 | Mean Mean 0.176 1. 0.176 1. 0.176 1. 0.176 1. 0.176 1. 0.176 1. 1.4.56 25. -14.56 25. -14.56 25. -14.56 25. -14.56 25. -14.56 25. -14.56 25. -14.56 25. -14.56 25. -14.56 25. -14.56 25. -14.56 25. -14.56 25. -8.82 12. -2.2 2. -2.2 2. -2.2 2. 0.65 1. 0.33 10. 3 10.33 10.33 3. 10.33 3. 10.33 3. 10.33 3. | SD 1 64 64 664 664 664 664 664 67 007 007 007 007 007 007 007 | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{N}, \textbf{Random, 95% C} \\ \textbf{0.21} [+7.3, 1.31] \\ \textbf{0.23} [+7.3, 1.31] \\ \textbf{0.34} [+7.70, 0.84] \\ \textbf{0.14} [+7.70, 0.84] \\ \textbf{0.15} [+1.39, 1.65] \\ \textbf{0.15} [+1.39, 1.65] \\ \textbf{0.15} [+1.31, 1.65] \\ \textbf{0.16} [+1.63, 1.41] \\ \textbf{0.06} [+1.61, 1.43] \\ \textbf{0.06} [+1.61, 0.38] \\ \textbf{0.06} [+1.61, 0.38] \\ \textbf{0.06} [+1.61, 0.38] \\ \textbf{0.06} [+1.61, 0.38] \\ \textbf{0.06} [+1.60, 0.88] \\ \textbf{0.16} [+1.60, 0.86] \\ \textbf{0.06} [+1.62, 0.05] \\ \textbf{0.07} [+1.22, 1.34] \\ \textbf{0.06} [+1.77, 0.188] \\ \textbf{0.06} [+1.32, 1.164] \\ \textbf{0.16} [+1.65, 0.91] \\ \textbf{0.06} [+1.33, 1.16] \\ \textbf{0.06} [+1.33, 1.16] \\ \textbf{0.016} [+1.63, 0.91] \\ \textbf{0.016} [+1.64, 0.91] $ | N, Random, 95% CI |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| В | Study or Subgroup Charles 2019 Pegbelfermin 1 mg OD Charles 2019 Pegbelfermin 20 mg OD Charles 2019 Pegbelfermin 20 mg OW Rader 2022 LLF880 Loomba 2023 Pegbelfermin 3 mg OW Loomba 2023 Pegbelfermin 8 mg OW Loomba 2023 Pegbelfermin 18 mg OW Loomba 2023 Pegbelfermin 27 mg OW Loomba 2023 Pegbelfermin 18 mg O2W Loomba 2023 Pegbelfermin 36 mg O2W | FGF2 Mean 0.32 0.19 0.06 -0.05 -0.1 0.58 0.08 0.08 0.06 -0.26 -0.26 0.54 | SD Tota 0.77 24 0.76 24 0.79 24 0.74 24 0.66 11 0.76 10 0.66 7 0.68 13 0.66 7 | Mean -0.0 -0.0 -0.0 -0.0 -0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0. | Placebo SD Tc 3 0.74 3 0.74 3 0.74 3 0.74 3 0.74 3 0.74 1 0.68 1 0.68 1 0.68 1 0.68 1 0.68 1 0.68 | 6 6 30 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 | Std. M Weight IV. 10.1% 10.2% 10.3% - 31.8% - 3.6% - 5.0% 4.9% 4.9% - 5.2% - | isan Difference Random, 95% CI 0.45 [0.46, 1.35] 0.28 [0.61, 1.18] 0.11 [0.78, 1.01] 0.33 [0.92, 0.87] 0.46 [0.97, 0.05] 0.75 [0.77, 2.27] 0.10 [1.18] 0.07 [1.22, 1.36] 0.07 [1.22, 1.36] 0.37 [1.73, 1.00] 0.13 [1.38, 1.13] 0.72 [0.69, 2.13] | Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl |
| | Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 6.82, d | f= 10 (P = | 180 = 0.74); F = 0 | % | | 72 | 100.0% -(| 0.02 [-0.31, 0.26] | |
| | Test for overall effect 2 = 0.15 (P = 0.88) | | | | | | | F | avours [FGF21 analogs] Favours (placebo) |
| C | Study or Subgroup | FGF21 Mean | Analog SD Total | P Mean | Placebo SD To | otal | Std. N Weight IV, | lean Difference Random, 95% Cl | Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI |
| C | Study or Subgroup Gaich 2013 L/2405319 3 mg Gaich 2013 L/2405319 10 mg Goich 2013 L/2405319 20 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521023 0.5 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521023 0.5 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521023 50 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521023 50 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521023 50 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521023 200 mg Talukdar 2016 PF-0521023 200 mg Talukdar 2016 PF-0521023 200 mg Talukdar 2016 PF-0521023 50 mg Talukdar 2016 PF-0521023 100 mg Talukdar 2016 PF-05231023 100 mg Kim 2017 PF-05231023 100 mg Kaufman 2020 A/R001 70 mg Q/W Kaufman 2020 A/R001 10 mg Q/W Kaufman 2020 A/R001 10 mg Q/W Kaufman 2020 A/R001 140 mg Q/W | Mean -8.77 5 -33.2 5 -36 5 -36 5 -36 5 -0.53 -0.53 -2.11 -3.59 -5.69 -6.68 -4.84 -1.1 -1.28 -1.1 -2.8 -1.1 -2.44 2 -30.47 2 -30.47 2 -31.98 2 -48 8 | Analog SD Total S.02 1.0 5.43 8 5.15 1.3 5.17 1.0 8.12 1.0 7.8 1.0 8.54 1.0 8.54 1.0 4.96 1.0 4.48 1.0 4.48 1.0 4.66 1.9 7.3 1.8 10.7 1.5 6.6 1.1 6.3 1.0 6.3 1.1 10.1 1.6 1.0.3 6.6 9.0.11 6 0.55 6 6.93 9 4.44 1.0 6.5 1.1 6.5 1.0 6.5 1.0 6.5 1.0 6.93 9 4.45 3.1 | P Mean -2.855 -2.855 -3.277 -3.277 -3.277 -3.277 -3.277 -3.277 -3.277 -1.977 -1.977 -1.977 -4.4 -4.4 -4.4 -15.366 29 | Placebo Tr \$51.5 55.15 \$55.5 6.65 \$6.65 6.65 \$6.65 6.65 \$6.65 6.65 \$6.65 7.27 \$4.27 4.27 \$4.27 15.4 \$15.4 15.4 \$25.48 22.85 \$24.88 22.85 \$81.68 81.68 | otal 3 2 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | 3.7% - 2.5% - 3.8% - 2.6% - 2.6% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.6% - 2.6% - 6.4% - 3.9% - 2.6% - 3.9% - 2.6% - 3.9% - 2.6% - 3.9% - 2.8% - 3.9% - 2.8% - 3.9% - 2.8% - 3.9% - 2.2% - | $\begin{array}{l} \text{lean Difference}\\ \text{Random, 95% Cl}\\ \text{O} 10 + 130 + 130 \\ \text{O} 49 + 2.07 + 1.081 \\ \text{O} 49 + 2.07 + 1.081 \\ \text{O} 57 + 144 \\ \text{O} 71 \\ \text{O} 57 + 144 \\ \text{O} 71 \\ \text{O} 57 + 155 \\ \text{O} 52 \\ \text{O} 57 + 155 \\ \text{O} 52 \\ \text{O} 57 + 155 \\ \text{O} 14 \\ \text{O} 52 \\ \text{O} 15 $ | Std. Mean Difference M.Random, 95% Cl |
| C | Study or Subgroup Gaich 2013 L/2405319 3 mg Gaich 2013 L/2405319 10 mg Gaich 2013 L/2405319 20 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521022 3 5 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521023 5 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521023 5 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521023 10 0 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521023 2 0 mg Talukdar 2016 PF-05231023 100 mg Talukdar 2016 PF-05231023 100 mg Talukdar 2016 PF-05231023 100 mg Kim 2017 PF-05231023 100 mg Kaufman 2020 AKR001 70 mg QW Rader 2022 LLF580 Total (95% C) Test for overail effect Z = 2.37 (P = 0.02) | FGF21. Mean 9.77 5 -3.2 2 5 -3.4 8 0 -4.48 0 -4.48 -2.12 -2.11 -3.59 1 -5.59 -4.61 -1.7 -2.8 -4.61 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.48 -1.48 -2.12 -2.11 -3.5 4 -3.5 4 -3.5 4 -4.8 | Analog <u>50</u> Total 5.10 total 5.12 10 5.43 8 5.16 13 5.17 10 6.12 10 7.8 10 8.54 10 0.76 10 4.49 10 4.49 10 4.49 10 4.49 10 4.49 10 4.43 10 6.5 19 0.11 6 6.5 19 0.11 6 0.56 6 6.56 19 0.11 6 0.56 6 0.56 6 6.59 9 4.51 31 272 = 0.58); I [#] = 1 | P Mean -2.85 -2.85 -2.85 -3.27 -1.97 | No. No. SD Ti 55.15 55.15 55.15 55.15 56.65 6.65 6.65 6.65 6.65 6.65 6.65 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.27 15.4 15.4 25.48 25.48 22.85 22.85 81.88 | otal 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | Std. M Weight V. 4 2.5% - 2.5% - 2.2% - 2.8% - 2.8% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.6% - 3.8% - 4.4% - 2.5% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.5% - 2.6% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.5% - 2.6% - 2.6% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.6% - 2.6% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.6% - 2 | lean Difference Random, 95% C1 010 [133] [13] 040 [2.07, 108] 057 [134, 0.71] 031 [122, 184] 049 [1.05, 2.03] 066 [0.98], 2.21] 0.66 [0.98], 2.21] 0.46 [1.13, 1.83] 0.47 [1.3], 1.83] 0.47 [1.3], 1.83] 0.47 [1.3], 1.83] 0.47 [1.3], 1.83] 0.47 [1.5], 1.49] 0.47 [1.3], 1.83] 0.47 [1.5], 1.49] 0.47 [1.3], 1.83] 0.47 [1.5], 1.49] 0.47 [1.3], 1.83] 0.47 [1.5], 1.49] 0.47 [1.5], 0.41 [1.5], 0.4 | Std. Mean 05% CI |
| D | Gaich 2013 L'72405319 3 mg Gaich 2013 L'72405319 20 mg Gaich 2013 L'72405319 20 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521023 0.5 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521023 1.5 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521023 2.0 mg Talukdar 2016 PF-05231023 3.5 mg Talukdar 2016 PF-05231023 1.00 mg Talukdar 2016 PF-05231023 1.00 mg Kim 2017 PF-05231023 1.00 mg Kaufma 2020 AKR001 1.0 mg Q2W Rader | FGF21. Mean 28.77 5 -32.2 6 -3.2 5 -1.48 0 2.22 0.74 2.22 0.74 2.22 0.74 2.22 0.74 2.22 0.74 2.22 0.74 2.23 4.81 -5.89 1.53 5.91 -5.49 -6.6 -6.6 -6.6 -6.6 -1.48 -1.1 -2.7 -2.44 2.2 -2.44 2.2 -2.44 2.2 -2.44 2.2 -2.48 -4.81 -5.39 1.2 -5.39 1.2 -5.39 -1.2 -2.48 -1.2 -2.48 -1.2 -2.488 -2.488 -2.488 -2.488 | Analog <u>50</u> Total 502 10 502 10 502 10 512 10 513 10 615 13 517 10 633 10 449 10 449 10 449 10 449 10 449 10 443 10 65 10 7 8 10 63 3 10 443 10 65 13 10,7 15 63 19 0,76 10 6,83 9 4,43 10 10,7 6 6,3 19 0,11 6 6,93 9 4,51 31 272 = 0.58); * = 1 GF21 Analog | P Mean -2.85 -2.85 -2.85 -3.27 -4.4 -4.4 -4.5 -0.57 -1.53 -0.57 -0. | Hacebo Solution 50.15 55.15 55.15 55.15 6.65 6.65 6.65 6.65 6.65 6.65 6.65 6.65 6.65 15.4 7.15.4 4.27 4.27 15.4 7.5.4 22.25 81.68 81.68 | otal 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | Std. M 3.7% - 3.7% - 2.6% - 3.8% - 2.6% - 2.6% - 2.6% - 2.6% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.6% - 6.4% - 5.3% - 6.4% - 2.8% - 2.8% - 2.8% - 2.8% - 3.9% - 2.2% - 100.0% -0 | lean Difference Random, 95% C1 010 [133] 119] 047 [134] 041 [207] 047 [134] 041 [207] 048 [105] 203] 046 [108] 221] 046 [108] 221] 046 [108] 221] 046 [113] 180] 047 | Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI M. Random, |
| D | Study or Subgroup Gaich 2013 L/2405319 3 mg Gaich 2013 L/2405319 10 mg Gaich 2013 L/2405319 10 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521023 0.5 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521023 1.5 mg Dong 2015 PF-0521023 2.0 mg Jalukdar 2016 PF-05231023 2.0 mg Talukdar 2016 PF-05231023 1.0 mg Talukdar 2016 PF-05231023 1.0 mg Km 2017 PF-05231023 1.0 mg Kaufman 2020 AKR001 1.0 mg Q2W Kaufman 2020 AKR001 1.0 mg Q2W Kaufman 2020 AKR001 1.0 mg Q2W Rader 2021 LF580 Total (95% C1) Talukdar 2016 PF-05231023 5 mg Talukdar 2016 PF-05231023 1.0 mg Kaufman 2020 AKR001 1.0 mg Q2W Kaufman 2020 AKR001 1.0 mg Q2W < | FGF211 -8.77 5 -332 5 -332 5 -332 5 -332 5 -348 5 0 2222 0.74 -1.48 0 0 222 -1.48 0 0 222 -1.48 0 0 2.22 -1.48 0 0 -2.11 -3.59 -4.61 -5.59 -4.61 -5.59 -4.84 8 -4.84 8 -4.84 8 -4.84 8 -4.84 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.48 8 -4.84 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.48 8 -4.84 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.48 8 -4.84 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -4.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -1.1 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -1.1 -1.7 -2.8 -1.1 -1.7 -1.7 -1.1 -1.7 -1.7 -1.1 -1.7 -1.1 -1.7 -1.7 -1.1 -1.7 -1.7 -1.1 -1.7 -1.7 -1.1 -1.7 -1.1 -1 | $\begin{array}{r} \text{Analog} \\ \hline \textbf{SD} & \textbf{Total} \\ \hline \textbf{SD} & \textbf{SD} \\ \hline \textbf{SD} & \textbf{Total} \\ \hline \textbf{SD} & \textbf{SD} \\ \hline \textbf{SD} \\ \hline \textbf{SD} & \textbf{SD} \\ \hline \textbf{SD} & \textbf{SD} \\ \hline \textbf{SD} \hline \textbf{SD} \\ \hline \textbf{SD} \hline \textbf{SD} \\ \hline \textbf{SD} \\ \hline \textbf{SD} \hline \textbf{SD} \\ \hline \textbf{SD} \hline \textbf{SD} \\ \hline \textbf{SD} \hline \textbf{SD} \hline \textbf{SD} \\ \hline \textbf{SD} \hline \textbf{SD} \\ \hline \textbf{SD} \hline \textbf{SD} \hline \textbf{SD} \hline \hline \textbf{SD} \hline \textbf{SD} \\ \hline \textbf{SD} \hline \textbf$ | Pene 2.85 -2.85 -2.85 -2.85 -2.85 -3.27 -3.27 -3.27 -3.27 -3.27 -3.27 -3.27 -3.27 -3.27 -3.27 -3.27 -3.27 -1.97 -1.97 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 -4 | Hacebo SD T 55.15 55.15 55.15 65.5 6.65 55.15 6.65 6.65 6.65 6.65 6.65 6.65 6.65 6.65 6.65 7.4 27 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.27 2.24.8 15.4 15.4 15.4 15.4 15.4 15.4 15.4 15.4 15.4 15.4 15.4 13.4 4.9 4.448 4.8 4.8 4.48 4.8 4.8 4.48 4.8 4.9 1.38 4.9 2.9 1.38 4.9 2.9 1.38 4.9 2.9 1.38 4.9 2.8 0.63 5.0 5.0 0.63 5.0 5.0 0.63 5.0 5.0 | otal 3 3 2 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | Std. N 3.7% - 3.7% - 3.8% - 2.6% - 2.6% - 2.6% - 2.6% - 2.6% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.7% - 2.6% - 3.8% - 2.5% - 3.9% - 2.6% - 3.3% - 2.2.2% - 0.100.0% -0 100.0% -0 4 - 5 - 6 8.4% 6 8.4% 6 8.4% 6 8.4% 6 8.4% 6 8.4% 1 1.2% 2 2.6% 2 2.6% 2 2.2% | lean Difference Random, 95% C1 010 [133, 113] 0.47 [134, 071] 0.57 [144, 071] 0.57 [144, 071] 0.57 [144, 071] 0.57 [144, 071] 0.57 [144, 071] 0.56 [144, 071] 0.56 [144, 071] 0.56 [145, 148] 0.55 [146] 0.55 [146] 0.55 [146] 0.57 [145, 148] 0.56 [145, 148] 0.57 [145, 148] 0.01 [144, 0.33] 0.54 [130, 0.46] 0.54 [130, 0.46] 0.54 [130, 0.46] 0.54 [145, 148] 0.02 [145, 0.45] 0.02 [145, 0.45] 0.03 [145, 0.45] 0.04 [145, 148] 0.05 [147, 156, 0.55] 0.34 [145, 0.45] 0.34 [145, 0.45] 0.3 | Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% Cl |

Figure 1. Forest plot comparing the effects of FGF21 analogs to placebo on glucose homeostasis and insulin resistance. The analog used and its dose are indicated in each line. QD: administered every day; QW: administered every week; Q2W: administered every two weeks. (A) Fasted glucose. (B) Glycated hemoglobin. (C) Fasted insulin. (D) HOMA index.

Fasting insulinemia was significantly lower in participants who received treatment with FGF21 analogs, with an estimated effect (95% CI) of -0.30 (-0.55, -0.05), Z = 2.37 (p = 0.02). This analysis included 368 subjects, divided into 272 in the treatment groups and 96 in the control groups, for a total of six studies. Heterogeneity was also low (Figure 1C).

However, this reduction in fasting insulin did not reflect an improvement in the HOMA index. Treatment with FGF21 analogs had an estimated effect (95% CI) of -0.02 (-0.27, 0.24), Z = 0.12 (p = 0.91), in an analysis including five studies and 319 participants (229 in the treated groups and 90 in the control groups). Heterogeneity was low (Figure 1D).

Effects of FGF21 analogs on body weight and blood pressure

Treatment with FGF21 analogs had a significant effect on participants' body weight, with an estimated effect (95% CI) of -0.29 (-0.55, -0.04), Z = 2.23 (p = 0.03). The analysis included five studies, with 342 subjects, divided between 254 in the treatment groups and 88 in the control groups, and the heterogeneity was low (Figure 2A).

We evaluated the effect of FGF21 analogs on systolic blood pressure. The analysis included two studies and 124 participants, 78 in the treatment group and 46 in the control groups. The treatment did not change the outcome, with an estimated effect (95% CI) of 0.36 (-0.02, 0.74), Z = 1.83 (*p* = 0.07). As with other outcomes, heterogeneity was low (Figure 2B).

Effects of FGF21 analogs on blood total cholesterol and free fatty acids

Total cholesterol levels were also much lower in the groups treated with FGF21 analogs. This treatment had an estimated effect (95% CI) of -0.55 (-0.87, -0.22), Z = 3.32 (p = 0.0009), in analysis with four studies and 228 participants, 169 in the treatment groups and 59 in the placebo groups. As with previous outcomes, heterogeneity was low (Figure 3A).

Finally, only one study verified the effects of treatment with FGF21 analogs on plasma levels of free fatty acids. The drug did not alter lipid levels, demonstrating an estimated effect (95% CI) of 0.21 (-0.37, 0.78), Z = 0.7 (p = 0.48). The analysis included 60 patients, 44 in the treatment group and 16 in the placebo group. The heterogeneity of the analysis was low.

Analysis of risk of bias and quality of evidence

We did not identify a high risk of bias in any of the studies included in this meta-analysis. However, in all studies, there are some concerns. According to our analysis of the articles, the lack of reported information does not allow us to exclude the risk of deviations in the intended interventions and the selection of reported results (Figure S2). However, we do not believe this dramatically impacts the quality of the evidence obtained.



Figure 2. Forest plot comparing the effects of FGF21 analogs to placebo on body weight and systolic blood pressure. The analog used and its dose are indicated in each line. (A) Body weight. QD: administered every day; QW: administered every week. (B) Systolic blood pressure. QW: administered every week; Q2W: administered every two weeks.

| | | FGF2 | 1 Analo | g | P | acebo | | | Std. Mean Difference | Std. Mean Difference |
|----|--|-----------|----------|-----------------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|----------------------|--|
| | Study or Subgroup | Mean | SD | Total | Mean | SD | Total | Weight | IV, Random, 95% CI | IV, Random, 95% CI |
| | Gaich 2013 LY2405319 3 mg | 2.13 | 11.07 | 10 | -0.632 | 10.18 | 3 | 6.2% | 0.24 [-1.06, 1.53] | |
| | Gaich 2013 LY2405319 10 mg | -19.2 | 11.88 | 8 | -0.632 | 10.18 | 2 | 3.4% | -1.44 [-3.18, 0.31] | |
| | Gaich 2013 LY2405319 20 mg | -15.4 | 9.95 | 13 | -0.632 | 10.18 | 3 | 5.6% | -1.40 [-2.77, -0.02] | |
| | Dong 2015 PF-05231023 0.5 mg | -0.3 | 11.2 | 10 | -4.9 | 17.5 | 2 | 4.5% | 0.35 [-1.17, 1.88] | |
| | Dong 2015 PF-05231023 1.5 mg | -0.3 | 10.4 | 10 | -4.9 | 17.5 | 2 | 4.5% | 0.38 [-1.15, 1.90] | |
| | Dong 2015 PF-05231023 5 mg | -3.62 | 14.69 | 10 | -4.9 | 17.5 | 2 | 4.5% | 0.08 [-1.44, 1.60] | |
| | Dong 2015 PF-05231023 15 mg | -8.9 | 9.9 | 10 | -4.9 | 17.5 | 2 | 4.5% | -0.34 [-1.87, 1.19] | |
| | Dong 2015 PF-05231023 50 mg | -10.1 | 8.2 | 5 | -4.9 | 17.5 | 1 | 2.2% | -0.51 [-2.71, 1.69] | |
| | Dong 2015 PF-05231023 100 mg | -11.4 | 13.4 | 10 | -4.9 | 17.5 | 2 | 4.5% | -0.43 [-1.97, 1.10] | |
| | Dong 2015 PF-05231023 200 mg | -6.5 | 18.6 | 10 | -4.9 | 17.5 | 2 | 4.5% | -0.08 [-1.60, 1.44] | |
| | Talukdar 2016 PF-05231023 5 mg | -10.74 | 12.44 | 12 | -6.57 | 11.17 | 2 | 4.6% | -0.32 [-1.82, 1.19] | |
| | Talukdar 2016 PF-05231023 25 mg | -11.45 | 10.75 | 10 | -6.57 | 11.17 | 2 | 4.5% | -0.42 [-1.95, 1.11] | |
| | Talukdar 2016 PF-05231023 100 mg | -18.08 | 10.37 | 10 | -6.57 | 11.17 | 2 | 4.1% | -1.02 [-2.61, 0.58] | |
| | Talukdar 2016 PF-05231023 140 mg | -21.37 | 11.35 | 10 | -6.57 | 11.17 | 2 | 4.0% | -1.21 [-2.83, 0.42] | |
| | Rader 2022 LLF580 | -0.76 | 0.46 | 31 | -0.4 | 0.45 | 30 | 38.4% | -0.78 [-1.30, -0.26] | |
| | Total (95% CI) | | | 169 | | | 59 | 100.0% | -0.55 [-0.87, -0.22] | • |
| | Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 9.57, | df = 14 (| P = 0.79 | $(1); ^2 = 0$ | % | | | | | |
| | Test for overall effect: Z = 3.32 (P = 0.00) | 09) | | | | | | | | -2 -1 U 1 2 Eavours (ECE21 analogs) Eavours (placebo) |
| Π. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Б | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | F | GF21 A | nalog | F | lacebo | • | | Std. Mean Difference | Std. Mean Difference |
| | Study or Subgroup | Me | an s | D Tot | al Mea | n SD | Total | Weight | IV, Random, 95% CI | IV, Random, 95% CI |
| | Loomba 2023 Pegbelfermin 3 mg QW | 0 | 15 0.1 | 8 | 5 0.0 | 6 0.2 | 2 | 11.9% | 0.41 [-1.26, 2.08] | |
| | Loomba 2023 Pegbelfermin 9 mg QW | 0 | 12 0.1 | 8 | 7 0.0 | 6 0.2 | 3 | 18.0% | 0.29 [-1.07, 1.66] | |
| | Loomba 2023 Pegbelfermin 18 mg QW | 0 | .03 0.1 | 9 1 | 0 0.0 | 6 0.2 | 3 | 20.0% | -0.15 [-1.44, 1.15] | |
| | Loomba 2023 Pegbelfermin 27 mg QW | 0 1 | .14 0.1 | 7 | 6 0.0 | 6 0.2 | 2 | 12.7% | 0.40 [-1.23, 2.02] | |
| | Loomba 2023 Pegbelfermin 18 mg Q2 | N 0 | 12 0.1 | 8 | 9 0.0 | 6 0.2 | 3 | 19.3% | 0.30 [-1.01, 1.62] | |
| | Loomba 2023 Pegbelfermin 36 mg Q2 | N 0 | .09 0.1 | 8 | 7 0.0 | 6 0.2 | 3 | 18.2% | 0.15 [-1.21, 1.50] | |
| | Total (95% CI) | | | 4 | 4 | | 16 | 100.0% | 0.21 [-0.37, 0.78] | |
| | Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.44, | df = 5 (F | e = 0.99 |); I ² = 0 | % | | | | | |
| | Test for overall effect: Z = 0.70 (P = 0.48 |) | | | | | | | | -2 -1 U 1 2 |
| | | · · · · · | | | | | | | | Favours (FGF21 analog) Favours (Placebo) |

Figure 3. Forest plot comparing the effects of FGF21 analogs to placebo on total cholesterol and free fatty acids. The analog used and its dose are indicated in each line. (A) Total cholesterol. (B) Plasmatic free fatty acids. QW: administered every week; Q2W: administered every two weeks.



Figure S2. Bias risk analysis. The articles were analyzed according to the RoB 2 algorithm, and the figures were plotted with the RobVis web application.

Table 1 summarizes the quality of evidence obtained in this meta-analysis. The quality of evidence ranges from moderate to very low. In almost all outcomes, we reduced quality due to indirectionality and imprecision. We also identified publication bias in glycated hemoglobin, fasting insulin, HOMA index, body weight, systolic blood pressure, and plasma free fatty acid outcomes (Figure S3). On the other hand, the sizeable estimated effect of the use of FGF21 analogs on cholesterolemia indicated an increase in the quality of the evidence.

DISCUSSION

In this systematic review and meta-analysis, we evaluated the effects of FGF21 analogs as a treatment for metabolic disorders. Our searches allowed the inclusion of eight randomized clinical trials, and our assessments did not identify a high risk of bias in any of them. Three of the outcomes included in the analysis demonstrated significant results in the included studies, favoring the use of FGF21 analogs in the clinic: fasting blood insulin, body weight, and cholesterolemia.

A

| Outcomes | Number of participants (studies) | Quality of the evidence (GRADE) | Size effect (95% CI) |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Fasting glucose | 434 (7 studies) | Moderate, due to indirectness | -0.11 (-0.34 to 0.11) |
| Glycated hemoglobin | 252 (3 studies) | Very low, due to indirectness, imprecision, and publication bias | -0.02 (-0.31 to 0.26) |
| Fasting insulin | 368 (6 studies) | Very low, due to indirectness, imprecision, and publication bias | -0.30 (-0.55 to -0.05) |
| HOMA | 319 (4 studies) | Very low, due to indirectness, imprecision, and publication bias | -0.02 (-0.27 to 0.24) |
| Body weight | 342 (5 studies) | Very low, due to indirectness, imprecision, and publication bias | -0.29 (-0.55 to -0.04) |
| Systolic blood pressure | 124 (2 studies) | Very low, due to indirectness, imprecision, and publication bias | 0.36 (-0.02 to 0.74) |
| Total cholesterol | 228 (4 studies) | Moderate, due to indirectness, imprecision, and size effect | -0.55 (-0.87 to -0.22) |
| Free fatty acids | 60 (1 study) | Low, due to imprecision and publication bias | 0.21 (-0.37 to 0.78) |

Table 1. GRADE summary of findings

Several preclinical trials have already reported on the effect of FGF21 on reducing plasma insulin levels. For example, FGF21 treatment in obese monkeys and mice reduced fasting insulinemia (25,31,33). Moreover, the administration of human FGF21 mRNA reduced insulinemia in mice with diet-induced obesity (21). Similarly, the FGF21 analog LY2405319 reduced fasting blood insulin in ApoE -/- mice on an atherogenic diet and insulin levels in diabetic monkeys (28,62). Gaich and cols. used this exact analog in 2013 in patients with obesity and diabetes, where the drug could also reduce insulin levels (56). Recombinant and PEGylated versions of human FGF21 also reduce insulinemia in obese mice and rats (30,37,40). Treatment with FGF21 receptor agonists has a similar effect in obese mice and monkeys (27,63). On the other hand, some studies indicate that using FGF21 may have the opposite effect and increase insulinemia in genetically obese db/db and type I diabetic mice (42,64,65). The reason for these differences is unclear but may involve using different analogs and treatment protocols.

Weight loss is also a commonly observed result in animals treated with FGF21. For example, using human FGF21 mRNA in obese mice reduces weight gain (21). FGF21 has a similar effect on obese mice, rats, and monkeys (9,25,27,29,31,33,37,42,63,66). Furthermore, different FGF21 analogs or FGF21 receptor agonists reduced the weight of obese models such as rats, monkeys, and mice (13,22,24). Again, the drug LY2405319 reduces the body weight of dyslipidemic mice, diabetic monkeys, and patients with obesity (28,56,62). Interestingly, FGF21 achieves this weight-reducing effect through an increase in energy expenditure (27,31), as the effects of this hormone on food consumption remains controversial (22,32,62).

Finally, preclinical trials also indicated that FGF21 has the potential to control cholesterolemia. Again, treating obese mice with human FGF21 mRNA reduced the animals' cholesterolemia (21). Likewise, FGF21 or its analogs reduced plasma cholesterol levels in mice, rats, and monkeys (27,30,37,39,41,42). The LY2405319 analog demonstrated the same results in monkeys and patients with obesity (56,62). FGF21 likely reduces cholesterolemia through changes in the expression profile of genes involved in the metabolism of bile salts and cholesterol in the liver, in addition to reducing the capacity for hepatic cholesterol synthesis due to reduced activity of SREBP-2 (19,39).

However, our meta-analysis did not detect significant results in the other evaluated outcomes in the included studies: fasting glucose, glycated hemoglobin, HOMA index, blood free fatty acids, or blood pressure. Preclinical trials with FGF21 and its analogs commonly observe reduced blood glucose and improved glucose homeostasis in different models (13,21,23,27-34,37,40-43,62-67). Consequently, studies that investigated glycated hemoglobin levels and the HOMA index also reported beneficial effects after treatment with this hormone (25,28-30,37,42,64,65). FGF21 appears to act at different points to reduce plasma glucose levels. First, FGF21 increases glucose tolerance by inducing the expression of GLUT and hexokinase and glucose uptake by different tissues (13,23,27-29,31,33,34,37,42,43,63-65,67). In addition, this hormone stimulates glycogen synthesis in the liver and muscles (34,43). Finally, FGF21 reduces hepatic



Figure S3. Funnel plots of comparison between FGF21 analogs and placebo. (**A**) Fasting glucose. Egger's test: p > 0.05. (**B**) Glycated hemoglobin. Egger's test: p < 0.05. (**C**) Fasting insulin. Egger's test: p < 0.05. (**D**) HOMA index. Egger's test: p < 0.05. (**E**) Body weight. Egger's test: p < 0.05. (**F**) Systolic blood pressure. Egger's test: p < 0.05. (**G**) Total cholesterol. Egger's test: p > 0.05. (**H**) Plasma free fatty acids. Egger's test: p < 0.05.

AE&M all

gluconeogenesis, decreasing the expression of enzymes in this pathway, such as G6Pase and PEPCK, which helps control blood glucose in diabetic models (27,33,34,42,64,65,68). However, glucose uptake by brown adipose tissue and increased energy expenditure via thermogenesis in this tissue appear to play an essential role in FGF21-mediated glycemic control (26,31,43). Brown adipose tissue activity in human subjects appears heterogeneous and inversely correlated with metabolic disturbances (69-71). These factors could help explain the lack of effect of FGF21 on blood glucose and related outcomes in the clinical studies included in this meta-analysis.

It is important to note that we detected a reduction in insulinemia and body weight with treatment with FGF21 analogs but without a change in the HOMA index. However, it is not easy to conclude mechanisms of metabolic regulation based on the results of a clinical meta-analysis because we could not estimate the absolute differences, only the estimated effect of treatment versus placebo. Thus, if the effect on insulinemia or weight is minimal, the effect on the HOMA index will be diluted and undetected. Finally, the quality of evidence for these outcomes still needs to be improved. Therefore, it is possible that the accuracy of the effect on insulinemia and weight needs to be refined, and future studies may demonstrate that the effect is insignificant.

Finally, our study indicated that using FGF21 analogs does not affect subjects' blood pressure or plasma free fatty acid levels. Preclinical trials have explored these outcomes relatively little, but using the FGF21 analog PF-05231023 increased rat blood pressure (36). On the other hand, treatment of mice with FGF21 reduces plasma levels of free fatty acids (27,31). Differences in brown adipose tissue metabolism between mice and humans may also help explain the difference in the results obtained.

Overall, the quality of evidence obtained in this meta-analysis remains low. The low quality is primarily due to the small number of clinical studies performed. None of the outcomes included, except fasting glycemia, had a sample number greater than 400 individuals, which reduces the quality of the evidence due to the imprecision of the results. All studies included patients who were at least overweight and may have type 2 diabetes. In addition, two studies included patients with hypertriglyceridemia and one with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. The homogeneous characteristics of the group of participants may have been responsible for keeping the heterogeneity of the meta-analysis results low in all outcomes. Therefore, we did not consider performing subanalyses with the meta-analysis data. However, to carry out the meta-analysis, we combined studies with different FGF21 analogs used at different doses. Therefore, we prefer to reduce the quality of evidence obtained due to indirectionality. Based on the quality of evidence obtained, we anticipate that more clinical trials using existing drugs could help increase the quality of evidence by increasing the number of participants, reducing imprecision, and reducing indirection by facilitating analyses with a single type of FGF21 analog.

In conclusion, FGF21 analogs must be tested in new clinical trials, as they appear to exhibit great potential for treating signs of Metabolic Syndrome such as high blood insulin, obesity, and especially hypercholesterolemia.

Acknowledgments: *Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro* (Faperj) and *Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior* (Capes) financed this project. Funders had no influence on the conduct of this research. The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. This systematic review and meta-analysis protocol has not been previously registered.

Disclosure: no potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

REFERENCES

- Nishimura T, Nakatake Y, Konishi M, Itoh N. Identification of a novel FGF, FGF-21, preferentially expressed in the liver. Biochim Biophys Acta. 2000;1492(1):203-6.
- Serdan TDA, Masi LN, Pereira JNB, Rodrigues LE, Alecrim AL, Scervino MVM, et al. Impaired brown adipose tissue is differentially modulated in insulin-resistant obese Wistar and type 2 diabetic Goto-Kakizaki rats. Biomed Pharmacother. 2021;142:112019.
- Matsumoto T, Kiuchi S, Murase T. Synergistic activation of thermogenic adipocytes by a combination of PPARγ activation, SMAD3 inhibition and adrenergic receptor activation ameliorates metabolic abnormalities in rodents. Diabetologia. 2019;62(10):1915-27.
- Corbee RJ, van Everdingen DL, Kooistra HS, Penning LC. Fibroblast growth factor-21 (FGF21) analogs as possible treatment options for diabetes mellitus in veterinary patients. Front Vet Sci. 2023;9:1086987.
- Chen Z, Yang L, Liu Y, Huang P, Song H, Zheng P. The potential function and clinical application of FGF21 in metabolic diseases. Front Pharmacol. 2022;13:1089214.

- Keuper M, Häring HU, Staiger H. Circulating FGF21 Levels in Human Health and Metabolic Disease. Exp Clin Endocrinol Diabetes. 2020;128(11):752-70.
- Plomgaard P, Weigert C. Do diabetes and obesity affect the metabolic response to exercise? Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care. 2017;20(4):294-9.
- Kim KH, Lee MS. FGF21 as a mediator of adaptive responses to stress and metabolic benefits of anti-diabetic drugs. J Endocrinol. 2015;226(1):R1-16.
- Kim ER, Kim SR, Cho W, Lee SG, Kim SH, Kim JH, et al. Short Term Isocaloric Ketogenic Diet Modulates NLRP3 Inflammasome Via B-hydroxybutyrate and Fibroblast Growth Factor 21. Front Immunol. 2022;13:843520.
- Mraz M, Bartlova M, Lacinova Z, Michalsky D, Kasalicky M, Haluzikova D, et al. Serum concentrations and tissue expression of a novel endocrine regulator fibroblast growth factor-21 in patients with type 2 diabetes and obesity. Clin Endocrinol (Oxf). 2009;71(3):369-75.
- Plummer JD, Johnson JE. Intermittent methionine restriction reduces IGF-1 levels and produces similar healthspan benefits to continuous methionine restriction. Aging Cell. 2022;e13629.
- Yu D, Yang SE, Miller BR, Wisinski JA, Sherman DS, Brinkman JA, et al. Short-term methionine deprivation improves metabolic health via sexually dimorphic, mTORC1-independent mechanisms. FASEB J. 2018;32(6):3471-82.
- Cheng STW, Li SYT, Leung PS. Fibroblast Growth Factor 21 Stimulates Pancreatic Islet Autophagy via Inhibition of AMPKmTOR Signaling. Int J Mol Sci. 2019;20(10):2517.
- Zarei M, Pujol E, Quesada-López T, Villarroya F, Barroso E, Vázquez S, et al. Oral administration of a new HRI activator as a new strategy to improve high-fat-diet-induced glucose intolerance, hepatic steatosis, and hypertriglyceridaemia through FGF21. Br J Pharmacol. 2019;176(13):2292-305.
- Zeng K, Tian L, Patel R, Shao W, Song Z, Liu L, et al. Diet Polyphenol Curcumin Stimulates Hepatic Fgf21 Production and Restores Its Sensitivity in High-Fat-Diet-Fed Male Mice. Endocrinology. 2017;158(2):277-92.
- Maekawa R, Seino Y, Ogata H, Murase M, Iida A, Hosokawa K, et al. Chronic high-sucrose diet increases fibroblast growth factor 21 production and energy expenditure in mice. J Nutr Biochem. 2017;49:71-9.
- Mai K, Andres J, Biedasek K, Weicht J, Bobbert T, Sabath M, et al. Free fatty acids link metabolism and regulation of the insulinsensitizing fibroblast growth factor-21. Diabetes. 2009;58(7):1532-8.
- Habegger KM, Stemmer K, Cheng C, Müller TD, Heppner KM, Ottaway N, et al. Fibroblast growth factor 21 mediates specific glucagon actions. Diabetes. 2013;62(5):1453-63.
- Zhang J, Gupte J, Gong Y, Weiszmann J, Zhang Y, Lee KJ, et al. Chronic Over-expression of Fibroblast Growth Factor 21 Increases Bile Acid Biosynthesis by Opposing FGF15/19 Action. EBioMedicine. 2017;15:173-83.
- 20. Visser J, van Zwol W, Kuivenhoven JA. Managing of Dyslipidaemia Characterized by Accumulation of Triglyceride-Rich Lipoproteins. Curr Atheroscler Rep. 2022;24(1):1-12.
- Bartesaghi S, Wallenius K, Hovdal D, Liljeblad M, Wallin S, Dekker N, et al. Subcutaneous delivery of FGF21 mRNA therapy reverses obesity, insulin resistance, and hepatic steatosis in diet-induced obese mice. MolTher Nucleic Acids. 2022;28:500-13.
- Tillman EJ, Brock WJ, Rolph T. Efruxifermin, a long-acting Fcfusion FGF21 analogue, reduces body weight gain but does not increase sympathetic tone or urine volume in Sprague Dawley rats. Br J Pharmacol. 2022;179(7):1384-94.

- Watanabe H, Miyahisa M, Chikamatsu M, Nishida K, Minayoshi Y, Takano M, et al. Development of a long acting FGF21 analoguealbumin fusion protein and its anti-diabetic effects. J Control Release. 2020;324:522-31.
- Cui A, Li J, Ji S, Ma F, Wang G, Xue Y, et al. The Effects of B1344, a Novel Fibroblast Growth Factor 21 Analog, on Nonalcoholic Steatohepatitis in Nonhuman Primates. Diabetes. 2020;69(8):1611-23.
- 25. Andersen B, Straarup EM, Heppner KM, Takahashi DL, Raffaele V, Dissen GA, et al. FGF21 decreases body weight without reducing food intake or bone mineral density in high-fat fed obese rhesus macaque monkeys. Int J Obes. 2018;42(6):1151-60.
- 26. Samuel VT, Shulman Gl. Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease as a Nexus of Metabolic and Hepatic Diseases. Cell Metab. 2018;27(1):22-41.
- Kolumam G, Chen MZ, Tong R, Zavala-Solorio J, Kates L, van Bruggen N, et al. Sustained Brown Fat Stimulation and Insulin Sensitization by a Humanized Bispecific Antibody Agonist for Fibroblast Growth Factor Receptor 1/βKlotho Complex. EBioMedicine. 2015;2(7):730-43.
- Maeng HJ, Lee GY, Bae JH, Lim S. Effect of Fibroblast Growth Factor 21 on the Development of Atheromatous Plaque and Lipid Metabolic Profiles in an Atherosclerosis-Prone Mouse Model. Int J Mol Sci. 2020;21(18):6836.
- Gilroy CA, Capozzi ME, Varanko AK, Tong J, D'Alessio DA, Campbell JE, et al. Sustained release of a GLP-1 and FGF21 dual agonist from an injectable depot protects mice from obesity and hyperglycemia. Sci Adv. 2020;6(35):eaaz9890.
- Zhao L, Wang H, Xie J, Chen Z, Li X, Niu J. Potent long-acting rhFGF21 analog for treatment of diabetic nephropathy in db/db and DIO mice. BMC Biotechnol. 2017;17(1):58.
- Mottillo EP, Desjardins EM, Fritzen AM, Zou VZ, Crane JD, Yabut JM, et al. FGF21 does not require adipocyte AMP-activated protein kinase (AMPK) or the phosphorylation of acetyl-CoA carboxylase (ACC) to mediate improvements in whole-body glucose homeostasis. Mol Metab. 2017;6(6):471-81.
- Kim JH, Lee GY, Maeng HJ, Kim H, Bae JH, Kim KM, et al. Effects of Glucagon-Like Peptide-1 Analogue and Fibroblast Growth Factor 21 Combination on the Atherosclerosis-Related Process in a Type 2 Diabetes Mouse Model. Endocrinol Metab (Seoul, Korea). 2021;36(1):157-70.
- Lan T, Morgan DA, Rahmouni K, Sonoda J, Fu X, Burgess SC, et al. FGF19, FGF21, and an FGFR1/β-Klotho-Activating Antibody Act on the Nervous System to Regulate Body Weight and Glycemia. Cell Metab. 2017;26(5):709-18.
- Liu M, Cao H, Hou Y, Sun G, Li D, Wang W. Liver Plays a Major Role in FGF-21 Mediated Glucose Homeostasis. Cell Physiol Biochem. 2018;45(4):1423-33.
- 35. Goto T, Hirata M, Aoki Y, Iwase M, Takahashi H, Kim M, et al. The hepatokine FGF21 is crucial for peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor-α agonist-induced amelioration of metabolic disorders in obese mice. J Biol Chem. 2017;292(22):9175-90.
- Turner T, Chen X, Zahner M, Opsahl A, DeMarco G, Boucher M, et al. FGF21 increases water intake, urine output and blood pressure in rats. PLoS One. 2018;13(8):e0202182.
- Tanajak P, Sa-Nguanmoo P, Apaijai N, Wang X, Liang G, Li X, et al. Comparisons of cardioprotective efficacy between fibroblast growth factor 21 and dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitor in prediabetic rats. Cardiovasc Ther. 2017;35(4):10.1111/1755-5922.12263.
- Huang Z, Xu A, Cheung BMY. The Potential Role of Fibroblast Growth Factor 21 in Lipid Metabolism and Hypertension. Curr Hypertens Rep. 2017;19(4):28.

- Lin Z, Pan X, Wu F, Ye D, Zhang Y, Wang Y, et al. Fibroblast growth factor 21 prevents atherosclerosis by suppression of hepatic sterol regulatory element-binding protein-2 and induction of adiponectin in mice. Circulation. 2015;131(21):1861-71.
- Mu J, Pinkstaff J, Li Z, Skidmore L, Li N, Myler H, et al. FGF21 analogs of sustained action enabled by orthogonal biosynthesis demonstrate enhanced antidiabetic pharmacology in rodents. Diabetes. 2012;61(2):505-12.
- Pan Q, Lin S, Li Y, Liu L, Li X, Gao X, et al. A novel GLP-1 and FGF21 dual agonist has therapeutic potential for diabetes and non-alcoholic steatohepatitis. EBioMedicine. 2021;63:103202.
- Ye X, Qi J, Yu D, Wu Y, Zhu S, Li S, et al. Pharmacological efficacy of FGF21 analogue, liraglutide and insulin glargine in treatment of type 2 diabetes. J Diabetes Complicat. 2017;31(4):726-34.
- 43. Kim JH, Bae KH, Choi YK, Go Y, Choe M, Jeon YH, et al. Fibroblast growth factor 21 analogue LY2405319 lowers blood glucose in streptozotocin-induced insulin-deficient diabetic mice by restoring brown adipose tissue function. Diabetes Obes Metab. 2015;17(2):161-9.
- Smati S, Canivet CM, Boursier J, Cariou B. Anti-diabetic drugs and NASH: from current options to promising perspectives. Expert Opin Investig Drugs. 2021;30(8):813-25.
- Srivastava G, Apovian C. Future Pharmacotherapy for Obesity: New Anti-obesity Drugs on the Horizon. Curr Obes Rep. 2018;7(2):147-61.
- 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.
- Drevon D, Fursa SR, Malcolm AL. Intercoder Reliability and Validity of WebPlotDigitizer in Extracting Graphed Data. Behav Modif. 2017;41(2):323-39.
- Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ. 2019;366:I4898.
- Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. BMJ. 1997;315(7109):629-34.
- Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. J Clin Epidemiol. 2011;64(4):383-94.
- Sanyal A, Charles ED, Neuschwander-Tetri BA, Loomba R, Harrison SA, Abdelmalek MF, et al. Pegbelfermin (BMS-986036), a PEGylated fibroblast growth factor 21 analogue, in patients with non-alcoholic steatohepatitis: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 2a trial. Lancet. 2019;392(10165): 2705-17.
- Kaufman A, Abuqayyas L, Denney WS, Tillman EJ, Rolph T. AKR-001, an Fc-FGF21 Analog, Showed Sustained Pharmacodynamic Effects on Insulin Sensitivity and Lipid Metabolism in Type 2 Diabetes Patients. Cell Reports Med. 2020;1(4):100057.
- 53. Charles ED, Neuschwander-Tetri BA, Pablo Frias J, Kundu S, Luo Y, Tirucherai GS, et al. Pegbelfermin (BMS-986036), PEGylated FGF21, in Patients with Obesity and Type 2 Diabetes: Results from a Randomized Phase 2 Study. Obesity. 2019;27(1):41-9.
- 54. Talukdar S, Zhou Y, Li D, Rossulek M, Dong J, Somayaji V, et al. A Long-Acting FGF21 Molecule, PF-05231023, Decreases Body Weight and Improves Lipid Profile in Non-human Primates and Type 2 Diabetic Subjects. Cell Metab. 2016;23(3):427-40.
- Dong JQ, Rossulek M, Somayaji VR, Baltrukonis D, Liang Y, Hudson K, et al. Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of PF-05231023, a novel long-acting FGF21 mimetic, in a first-in-human study. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2015;80(5):1051-63.

- Gaich G, Chien JY, Fu H, Glass LC, Deeg MA, Holland WL, et al. The effects of LY2405319, an FGF21 analog, in obese human subjects with type 2 diabetes. Cell Metab. 2013;18(3):333-40.
- Rader DJ, Maratos-Flier E, Nguyen A, Hom D, Ferriere M, Li Y, et al. LLF580, an FGF21 Analog, Reduces Triglycerides and Hepatic Fat in Obese Adults with Modest Hypertriglyceridemia. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2022;107(1):e57-70.
- Loomba R, Lawitz EJ, Frias JP, Ortiz-Lasanta G, Johansson L, Franey BB, et al. Safety, pharmacokinetics, and pharmacodynamics of pegozafermin in patients with non-alcoholic steatohepatitis: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 1b/2a multiple-ascending-dose study. Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2023;8(2):120-32.
- Kharitonenkov A, Beals JM, Micanovic R, Strifler BA, Rathnachalam R, Wroblewski VJ, et al. Rational design of a fibroblast growth factor 21-based clinical candidate, LY2405319. PLoS One. 2013;8(3):e58575.
- Weng Y, Chabot JR, Bernardo B, Yan Q, Zhu Y, Brenner MB, et al. Pharmacokinetics (PK), pharmacodynamics (PD) and integrated PK/PD modeling of a novel long acting FGF21 clinical candidate PF-05231023 in diet-induced obese and leptin-deficient obese mice. PLoS One. 2015;19(10):e0119104.
- Stanislaus S, Hecht R, Yie J, HagerT, Hall M, Spahr C, et al. A Novel Fc-FGF21 With Improved Resistance to Proteolysis, Increased Affinity Toward β-Klotho, and Enhanced Efficacy in Mice and Cynomolgus Monkeys. Endocrinology. 2017;158(5):1314-27.
- Adams AC, Halstead CA, Hansen BC, Irizarry AR, Martin JA, Myers SR, et al. LY2405319, an Engineered FGF21 Variant, Improves the Metabolic Status of Diabetic Monkeys. PLoS One. 2013;8(6):e65763.
- Foltz IN, Hu S, King C, Wu X, Yang C, Wang W, et al. Treating diabetes and obesity with an FGF21-mimetic antibody activating the βKlotho/FGFR1c receptor complex. Sci Transl Med. 2012;4(162):162ra153.
- Ye X, Qi J, Wu Q, Yu D, Li S, Wu Y, et al. Long-lasting hypoglycemic effect of modified FGF-21 analog with polyethylene glycol in type 1 diabetic mice and its systematic toxicity. Eur J Pharmacol. 2016;781:198-208.
- Xu P, Ye X, Zhang Y, Yuan Q, Liu M, Wu Q, et al. Long-acting hypoglycemic effects of PEGylated FGF21 and insulin glargine in mice with type 1 diabetes. J Diabetes Complicat. 2015;29(1):5-12.
- Hecht R, LiYS, Sun J, Belouski E, Hall M, HagerT, et al. Rationale-Based Engineering of a Potent Long-Acting FGF21 Analog for the Treatment of Type 2 Diabetes. PLoS One. 2012;7(11):e49345.
- Ye X, Qi J, Yu D, Li S, Wu Q, Wu Y, et al. Pilot-scale production and characterization of PEGylated human FGF-21 analog. J Biotechnol. 2016;228:8-17.
- Tian L, Zeng K, Shao W, Yang BB, Fantus IG, Weng J, et al. Short-Term Curcumin Gavage Sensitizes Insulin Signaling in Dexamethasone-Treated C57BL/6 Mice. J Nutr. 2015;145(10): 2300-7.
- 69. Pan R, Chen Y. Latest Advancements on Combating Obesity by Targeting Human Brown/Beige AdiposeTissues. Front Endocrinol (Lausanne). 2022;13:884944.
- Wibmer AG, Becher T, Eljalby M, Crane A, Andrieu PC, Jiang CS, et al. Brown adipose tissue is associated with healthier body fat distribution and metabolic benefits independent of regional adiposity. Cell Reports Med. 2021;2(7):100332.
- Becher T, Palanisamy S, Kramer DJ, Eljalby M, Marx SJ, Wibmer AG, et al. Brown adipose tissue is associated with cardiometabolic health. Nat Med. 2021;27(1):58-65.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License

Arch Endocrinol Metab, 2024, v.68, 1-14, e220493.

Copyright® AE&M all