

G OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Benichou T, Pereira B, Mermillod M, Tauveron I, Pfabigan D, Maqdasy S, et al. (2018) Heart rate variability in type 2 diabetes mellitus: A systematic review and meta–analysis. PLoS ONE 13(4): e0195166. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal. pone.0195166

Editor: Rayaz A Malik, Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar, QATAR

Received: January 21, 2018

Accepted: March 16, 2018

Published: April 2, 2018

Copyright: © 2018 Benichou et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Funding: This study was funded by the University Hospital of Clermont-Ferrand, France.

Competing interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Heart rate variability in type 2 diabetes mellitus: A systematic review and metaanalysis

Thomas Benichou¹, Bruno Pereira², Martial Mermillod^{3,4}, Igor Tauveron⁵, Daniela Pfabigan⁶, Salwan Maqdasy⁵, Frédéric Dutheil^{7,8}*

1 University Hospital of Clermont–Ferrand, CHU Clermont–Ferrand, Endocrinology, Clermont–Ferrand, France, 2 University Hospital of Clermont–Ferrand, CHU Clermont–Ferrand, Clinical Research Direction, Clermont–Ferrand, France, 3 Univ. Grenoble Alpes, LPNC & CNRS, LPNC, Grenoble, France, 4 Institut Universitaire de France, Paris, France, 5 Université Clermont Auvergne, CNRS, GReD, Inserm, University Hospital of Clermont–Ferrand, CHU Clermont–Ferrand, Endocrinology, Clermont–Ferrand, France, 6 Peking University, Culture and Social Cognitive Neuroscience Laboratory, School of Psychological and Cognitive Sciences, Beijing, China, 7 Université Clermont Auvergne, CNRS, LaPSCo, Physiological and Psychosocial Stress, University Hospital of Clermont–Ferrand, CHU Clermont–Ferrand, Preventive and Occupational Medicine, WittyFit, Clermont–Ferrand, France, 8 Australian Catholic University, Faculty of Health, School of Exercise Science, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

* frederic.dutheil@uca.fr

Abstract

Background

Cardiac autonomic neuropathy in type 2 dibetes mellitus (T2DM) patients is frequent and associated with high cardiovascular mortality. Heart rate variability (HRV) is the gold standard to measure cardiac autonomic neuropathy. We aimed to conduct a systematic review and meta–analysis to evaluate the impact of T2DM on HRV parameters.

Methods

The PubMed, Cochrane Library, Embase and Science Direct databases were searched on 1st October 2017 using the keywords "diabetes" AND ("heart rate variability" OR "HRV"). Included articles had to report HRV parameters in T2DM patients and healthy controls measured during 24 hours with a Holter–electrocardiogram. Measurements of HRV retieved were: RR–intervals (or Normal to Normal intervals—NN), standard deviation of RR intervals (SDNN), percetange of adjacent NN intervals differing by more than 50 milliseconds (pNN50), square root of the mean squared difference of successive RR intervals (RMSSD), total power, Low Frequency (LF), High Frequency (HF) and LF/HF ratio, as per Task Force recommendations.

Results

We included twenty-five case-control studies with 2,932 patients: 1,356 with T2DM and 1,576 healthy controls. T2DM patients had significantly (P<0.01) lower RR–intervals (effect size = -0.61; 95%Cl -1.21 to -0.01), lower SDNN (-0.65; -0.83 to -0.47), lower RMSSD (-0.92; -1.37 to -0.47), lower pNN50 (-0.46; -0.84 to -0.09), lower total power (-1.52;

-2.13 to -0.91), lower LF (-1.08; -1.46 to -0.69]), and lower HF (-0.79; -1.09 to -0.50). LF/HF did not differ between groups. Levels of blood glucose and HbA1c were associated with several HRV parameters, as well as Time from diagnosis of T2DM

Conclusions

T2DM was associated with an overall decrease in the HRV of T2DM patients. Both sympathetic and parasympathetic activity were decreased, which can be explained by the deleterious effects of altered glucose metabolism on HRV, leading to cardiac autonomic neuropathy.

Introduction

Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) is a public health concern [1]. T2DM is increasingly frequent in the world in association with the increase of sedentary behaviours, unhealthy diet, obesity and metabolic syndrome [2–6]. The number of people with T2DM is predicted to double within the next three decades [1]. Besides macrovascular [7–10] and microvascular complications [11–13], the leading cause of death in T2DM is cardiovascular mortality [9]. Cardiovascular mortality has been related to the cardiac autonomic neuropathy frequently associated with T2DM [1,5,14].

Screening for cardiac autonomic neuropathy has been recommended at the diagnosis of T2DM, particularly in patients with a history of poor glycaemic control, macro/micro vascular complications, and increased cardiovascular risk [15]. Despite standard cardiovascular reflex tests still belong to the gold standard for the assessment of cardiovascular autonomic neuropathy [16], one of the easiest and most reliable ways to assess cardiac autonomic neuropathy is through the measurement of heart rate variability (HRV). HRV is the variation between two consecutive beats: the higher the variation, the higher the parasympathetic activity. A high HRV reflects the fact that an individual can constantly adapt to micro–environmental changes [17]. Therefore, low HRV is a marker of cardiovascular risk [18]. Conveniently, the measurement of HRV is non–intrusive and pain–free [19]. Although the evaluation of HRV in T2DM has been assessed in several studies, conflicting results have been reported [20–22]. Moreover, there is no consensus on the decreased levels of HRV parameters in T2DM. Furthermore, despite HRV being linked with the severity of T2DM [23], no studies have comprehensively assessed the role of the most common variables, such as age [24], gender [25], blood glucose control [26], or medications treating for T2DM, on HRV parameters [27,28].

Therefore, we aimed to conduct a systematic review and meta–analysis on the impact of T2DM on HRV parameters. A secondary aim was to identify the most frequently reported explanatory variables.

Methods

Literature search

We reviewed all studies measuring HRV in T2DM patients and healthy controls. Animal studies were excluded. Between October 30th 2015 and October 1st 2017, the main articles databases (PubMed, Cochrane Library, Science Direct and Embase) were searched with the following keywords: "diabetes" AND ("heart rate variability" OR "HRV"). All articles compatible with our inclusions criteria were included, independently of article language and years of





Fig 1. Search strategy.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195166.g001

publication. To be included, case-control studies had to describe our main primary outcome, which was the measurement of HRV parameters in T2DM patients and healthy controls. We limited included studies to those reporting 24–hour measurements of HRV with Holter–elec-trocardiogram, following Task Force recommendations [29]. We imposed no limitation on the regional origin or the nature of the control group. Studies needed to be primary research. In addition, reference lists of all publications meeting the inclusion criteria were manually searched to identify any further studies that were not found with the electronic search. Ancestry searches were also completed on previous reviews to locate other potentially eligible primary studies. The search strategy is presented in Fig 1 and in S1 Appendix. One author (Thomas Benichou) conducted the literature searches, collated the articles, and extracted the data. Two authors (Thomas Benichou and Frédéric Dutheil) reviewed the abstracts independently and checked if article could be included in our metanalaysis according to inclusion critera. When consensus on suitability was not reached, a third author (Bruno Pereira) reviewed the debated articles. Then, all authors reviewed the eligible articles.

Quality of the assessment

Despite not designed for quantifying the integrity of studies [30], the "STrengthening the Reporting of OBservational studies in Epidemiology" (STROBE) was used for checking the reporting quality of cohorts studies [31]. The STROBE Statement is a checklist of 22 items related to the title, abstract, introduction, methods, results and discussion sections of articles. Cohort, case control, and cross-sectional studies shared 18 items. Four items are specific to each of the three study designs. Six of the 22 items are splitted into several sub-items. We attributed one point per item or sub-item fulfilling the criteria. We calculated a percentage on a maximal score achievable of 32. The Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CON-SORT) for checking the reporting quality of randomized trials [32]. Similarly, the 25 items (with 11 of them splitted into several sub-items) from the CONSORT criteria could achieve a maximum score of 37, then converted into percentage.

HRV parameters

We included HRV parameters derived from a 24–hour Holter electrocardiogram following task force recommendations [29]. In the time domain, we analysed RR intervals, standard deviations of RR intervals (SDNN), the square root of the mean squared difference of successive RR intervals (RMSSD), and the percentage of adjacent NN intervals differing by more than 50 milliseconds (pNN50). The RMSSD and pNN50 are associated with high–frequency power (HF) and hence parasympathetic activity, whereas SDNN is correlated with low–frequency power (LF) [33]. In the spectral domain, we analysed LF (0.04–0.15 Hz), an index of both sympathetic and parasympathetic activity, and HF (0.15–0.4 Hz), representing the most efferent vagal (parasympathetic) activity to the sinus node. Very low frequency (VLF; 0.003–0.04 Hz) partially reflects thermoregulatory mechanisms, fluctuation in activity of the renin–angiotensin system, and the function of peripheral chemoreceptors. The LF/HF ratio, i.e. the sympathovagal balance, was also calculated.

Statistical considerations

We conducted meta-analyses on the HRV parameters in T2DM patients and healthy controls. P values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant. For the statistical analysis, we used both Comprehensive Meta-analysis software (version 2, Biostat Corporation) [34-37] and Stata software (version 13, StataCorp, College Station, US) [34-36,38,39]. Main characteristics were synthetized for each study population and reported as the mean \pm SD (standard-deviation) for continuous variables and the number (%) for categorical variables.

We evaluated heterogeneity in the study results by examining forest plots, confidence intervals (CI) and I² statistic. Formal tests for homogeneity based on the I² statistic are the most common metric for measuring the magnitude of between–study heterogeneity and are easily interpretable. I² values range from 0 to 100%, and are considered low for <25%, modest for 25–50%, and high for >50%. We assume heterogeneity for a p–value of the I² test <0.05. For example, a significant heterogeneity could be linked to the characteristics of the studies, such as those of the participants (age, sex, etc.), the time from T2DM diagnosis, the glycaemia or the HbA1c levels. We conducted random effects meta–analyses (DerSimonian and Laird approach) when data could be pooled [40]. To describe our results, we calculated the effect size (ES, standardised mean differences—SMD) [41] of each HRV parameter for each dependent variable. An ES is a unitless measure of the levels of the HRV data. The ES is centered at zero if the HRV data in T2DM patients are not different from those in healthy controls. A positive ES denoted higher levels of the tested HRV parameter in T2DM patients compared with heathy controls. An ES of 0.8 reflects a large effect, 0.5 a moderate effect, and 0.2 a small effect. We

searched for potential publication bias using funnel plots of these meta–analyses. We verified the strength of our results by conducting further meta–analyses after exclusion of studies that were not evenly distributed around the base of the funnel.

When possible (sufficient sample size), meta–regressions were proposed to study the relationship between each HRV parameter (RR intervals, RMSSD, pNN50, SDNN, total power, LF, HF, LF/HF) and clinically relevant parameters such as gender, age, fasting blood glucose, and glycated haemoglobin (HbA1c). Results were expressed as regression coefficients and 95% CI.

Results

An initial search produced a possible 3927 articles (Fig 1). Removal of duplicates and use of the selection criteria reduced the number of articles reporting the evaluation of HRV on 24-hour recording in T2DM to 25 articles [42-66]. All included articles were written in English except one study which was written in Hungarian [55].

Quality of articles

The assessment of the quality of the twenty-five studies that were included was performed using the STROBE and CONSORT criteria. Results varied from 50% [59] to 71% [56] for the observational studies (STROBE), with a mean score of 59%. Results varied from 52% [59] to 67% [57] for the randomized trials (CONSORT), with a mean score of 59.5%. Overall, the studies performed best in the methods section and worst in the discussion section.

Objectives of included articles

All included articles aimed to compare HRV between T2DM patients and controls without T2DM [42–66]. Both the T2DM patients and the controls had cardiovascular diseases in five studies [42,48,51,56,60] and renal disease in three studies [43,46,52]. Five studies assessed the influence of high blood pressure on HRV in T2DM compared with healthy controls [49,50,54,55,58]. Other studies compared HRV between T2DM patients and controls based on blood catecholamine levels [44], circadian autonomic rhythm in insulinoresistant subjects [45], in cases of bowel preparation [63], metabolic syndrome [47], circadian rhythm in relation to blood adiponectin [62], or dimethylarginine levels [61], hypoglycaemic episodes [59], in acromegalic patients [53], and inhalation of ultrafine particles [57].

Inclusions and exclusions criteria

For T2DM patients: Inclusion criteria were: aged over 18 [43,48], and under 65 [51], 73 [53], or 75 years old [46,52], treated with oral antidiabetic agents [47], with normal [42,44,45] or high blood pressure [49,61]. The main exclusion criteria were: pregnancy [43,62], neurological disease [43]. Body Mass Index (BMI) over 25 kg/m² [42,44,45], or 35 kg/m² [58,62], chronic heart [42,44,45,50–52,57,58,60–63], liver [56,60,63], or renal [42,42,45,56,58,60–63] failure, insulin treatment [47,51], uncontrolled T2DM [47], thyroid disorder [50,52], or treatment that can influence HRV parameters [44–46,52,54,57–60].

For controls: All studies included controls without T2DM [42–66]. In each individual study, exclusion criteria were the same as for T2DM, i.e. pregnancy [43,62], neurological disease [43], BMI over 25 kg/m² [42,44,45] or 35 kg/m² [58,62], chronic heart [42,44,45,50–52,57,58,60–63], liver [56,60,63], or renal [42,42,45,56,58,60–63] failure, thyroid disorder [50,52], or treatment that can influence HRV parameters [44–46,52,54,57–60]. Controls had high blood pressure in five studies [49,56,58,60,62], and were on dialysis in three studies [43,46,52].

Healthy controls were paired with T2DM patients based on age [41,43,44,46,47,49,50,52, 53,58,59,62], gender [42,44,45,47,51,59,60,63], body weight [50,59], BMI [44], and blood pressure [60].

Population

Sample size. Population sizes ranged from 12 [59], to 457 [56]. We included 2,932 patients in total: 1,356 with T2DM and 1,576 healthy controls.

Gender. The proportion of men varied from 35% [45] to 100% [50] in T2DM patients, with a mean of 52.2%, and from 28% [54] to 100% [60] in the control group, with a mean of 54.5%. One study did not specify the proportion of men with T2DM [53], while 3 studies did not specify it for the controls [53,57,59].

Age. The mean age of T2DM patients was 58.1 ± 6.5 years, ranging from 45.9 [57] to 67.9 [52], and 55.9 ± 7.6 years in the controls, ranging from 28.5 [57] to 65.7 [52]. Age was not reported for T2DM patients in two studies [50,53], and for the controls in three studies [50,53,59].

T2DM duration: the mean time from T2DM diagnosis was 7.8±4.4 years ranging from 3.0 [47,54] to 11.2 [51] years. T2DM duration was not reported in five studies [45,48,50,52,53].

Metabolic control. The mean *HbA1c* in T2DM patients was 7.6 \pm 0.8%, ranging from 6.5 [59] to 9.3% [58,62], and 5.2 \pm 0.5% in the controls, ranging from 4.1 [42] to 5.8% [58,62]. Eight studies did not report HbA1c in the T2DM patients [43,45,46,48,50,53,61,64] and nine studies did not specify for the controls [43,45–48,50,53,61,64]. *Blood glucose levels* were reported in 14 studies [42,44,46,47,51,52,55,58,60–63,65,66] with a mean blood glucose level of 147 \pm 16 mg/ dL in T2DM patients, ranging from 117 [47] to 168 [58,62], and 90 \pm 6 in controls, ranging from 75 [46] to 95 [55]. Blood insulin levels were reported in one study [44]. No studies reported HOMA–IR. No studies reported neuropathy scores.

Body weight. Weight was reported in three studies [43,46,49], and waist circumference in two studies [47,52]. The mean BMI in T2DM patients was 27.2 ± 3.5 kg/m², ranging from 22.3 [44] to 33.7 [58,62], and 24.8±2.1 in controls, ranging from 21.8 [61] to 29.7 [54]. BMI was not reported in 11 studies in T2DM patients [42,43,46,48,50–53,55,57,64], and in 12 studies in controls [42,43,46,48,50–53,55,57,59,64].

Blood pressure. Mean systolic blood pressure in T2DM patients was 138.6±11.0 mmHg, ranging from 121.2 [44] to 156.0 [49], and 137.7±11.6 mmHg in controls, ranging from 120.2 [45] to 153.0 [49]. Mean diastolic blood pressure in T2DM patients was 80.8±4.3 mmHg, ranging from 69.9 [50] to 90.1 [49] and 82.2±5.4 mmHg in controls, ranging from 71.9 [50] to 92.9 [58,62]. Six studies did not report blood pressure in either T2DM patients or controls [42,48,52,53,57,64].

Blood lipid levels. Total cholesterol was reported in nine studies [42,47,51,54,55,61,62,65, 66]. HDL and LDL cholesterol in six studies [47,55,60–62,65] and triglycerides in 12 studies [42,47,51,55,56,58–62,65,66].

Other characteristics. *Smoking* was reported in six studies [44,54–57,60], and *alcohol* in one study [44]. *Marital status* was never reported. Insufficient data precluded further analyses of those parameters.

Study designs

All studies described a prospective cohort design, except one study which was a randomly controlled prospective study [57].

HRV measurements and analysis

All included studies measured HRV over 24 consecutive hours using a Holter–electrocardiogram. HRV measurement recording was ambulatory with normal daily activity in most of the studies [42–45,47–51,53,54,56–58,60,62,64–66], ambulatory in non–dialysed patients and during hospitalization for dialysed patients in two studies [46,52], and exclusively during hospitalization in one study [59]. Three studies did not report the conditions of the measurements [55,61,63].

Nearly all studies had a distinct Holter monitoring system: Del Mar Reynolds Medical [61], CardioSmart Institutional CS 550 software [58], Holter cardio Light digital [62], Zymed Medical Instruments [48], Mortara Instruments [53,57], TM 2421 & 2425 systems [56], Holter AD35 TOP [46], Marquette Electronics [43], Meditech Cardiotens [54,55], Fukuda System [44], Spiderview Holter [52], Cardioscan DMS300–4 Model [63], Holter Digital Recorder AsPEKT [42,51], ArguSys Holter Monitor [47], CardioDay GETEMED [59]. Schiller Microvit MT–101 [65,66], and A&D System [49]. Four studies did not report the monitoring system [45,50,60,64], Fifteen studies explicitly mentioned that they followed task force recommandations [42,44,45,47,48,51–56,58,59,61,62]. Premature atrial and ventricular beats were automatically discarded and visually checked.

Meta-analyses of HRV values in T2DM

We noted strong evidence that T2DM patients had significantly lower *RR intervals* (effect size = -0.61; 95%CI -1.21 to -0.01, P = 0.01; I² = 91.6%) (Fig 2) [45,46,48,52,54,57], lower *SDNN* (effect size = -0.65; 95%CI -0.83 to -0.47; P < 0.001; I² = 65.1%) (Fig 3) [42,45,47,48, 50–53,55,57,58,60–66], lower *RMSSD* (effect size = -0.92; 95%CI -1.37 to -0.47); P < 0.001; I² = 94.0%) (Fig 4) [45,47,48,50,52,53,56–58,60–66], lower *pNN50* (effect size = -0.46; 95%CI - 0.84 to -0.09; P = 0.001; I² = 85.5%) (Fig 5) [42,48,50–53,58,60,62,65,66], lower *total power* (effect size = -1.52; 95%CI -2.13 to -0.91; P < 0.001; I² = 93.5%) (Fig 6) [45–48,50,52,54,65, 66], lower *LF* (effect size = -1.08; 95%CI -1.46 to -0.69; p < 0.001; I² = 91.3%) (Fig 7) [42,45,47–54,57,63,65,66], and lower *HF* (effect size = -0.79; 95%CI -1.09 to -0.50; P < 0.001; I² = 85.6%) (Fig 8) [42,44,45,47–54,57,63,65,66]. *LF/HF* did not differ between groups (effect size = 0.02; 95%CI -0.38 to 0.43; P = 0.914; I² = 90.1%) (Fig 9) [42,44,46–48,50–54,57,65,66]. Heterogeneity was significant (P < 0.001) for all meta–analyses. Funnel plots of meta–analyses analysing for potential publication bias are presented in the supplementary file. Meta–analyses were reperformed after the exclusion of studies that were not evenly distributed around the base of the funnel and showed similar results.

		Туре	2 diabe	etes mellit	us		ŀ	lealthy o	controls				
Study	n	Age, years (mean±SD)		HbA1c, % (mean±SD)	BMI, kg/m² (mean±SD)	n	Age, years (mean±SD)			BMI, kg/m² (mean±SD)		Effect size (95% CI)	Weigh (%)
Burger 2001, T2DM with congestive heart failure / healthy	69	61.8±11.6	62.3%	-	-	85	57.7±15.4	65.9%	-	-		* 1.11 (0.77, 1.45)	10.9
Giordano 2001, T2DM with normal renal function / healthy	10	61.0±12.7	40.0%	-	-	10	60.0±6.3	50.0%		-	_ ++	-0.60 (-1.50, 0.30)	9.1
Giordano 2001, T2DM on dialysis / non T2DM on dialysis	9	63.0±9.0	44.4%	-		11	59.0±10.0	45.5%	-	-		-1.46 (-2.46, -0.46)	8.6
Istenes 2014, T2DM without high blood pressure / healthy	40	52.8±8.1	57.5%	8.3±2.3	27.8±4.6	25	52.2±9.1	28.0%	5.4±0.6	25.0±4.3		-0.76 (-1.28, -0.24)	10.9
Istenes 2014, T2DM with high blood pressure / healthy	62	55.2±6.6	54.8%	8.5±2.4	31.5±5.6	74	53.0±12.3	40.5%	5.4±0.8	29.7±4.9		-0.52 (-0.86, -0.18)	10.4
Mylonopoulou 2010, T2DM without dialysis / healthy without dialysis	25	67.7±6.5	44.0%	7.8±1.3		25	65.3±8.1	44.0%	5.8±0.3			-0.08 (-0.64, 0.47)	10.3
Mylonopoulou 2010, T2DM on dialysis / non T2DM on dialysis	25	67.9±7.4	48.0%	7.3±1.2		25	65.7±12.3	56.0%	5.6±0.3	-		-0.71 (-1.28, -0.13)	10.3
Perciaccante 2006, T2DM / healthy	20	52.4±4.7	35.0%		27.3±2.8	20	53.0±8.0	75.0%		25.0±5.1		-1.32 (-2.01, -0.64)	9.9
Perciaccante 2006, T2DM / insulin resistance but normal glucose regulation	20	52.4±4.7	35.0%		27.3±2.8	20	49.1±6.6	60.0%		27.3±4.9		-2.07 (-2.85, -1.30)	9.5
Vora 2014, T2DM after exposure to ultrafine carbone particles / healthy	17	45.9±9.5	52.9%	7.6±0.3	-	23	28.5±7.5		-	-	- +-	-0.05 (-0.68, 0.58)	10.1
Overall (I-squared = 91.6%, p<0.00	1)											-0.61 (-1.21, -0.01) 100

Fig 2. Meta-analysis of RR intervals of type 2 diabetes mellitus patients compared with controls. -: non reported data (missing SD were also non reported). 95% CI: 95% confident intervals; BMI: Body Mass Index; RR: RR intervals; T2DM: Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus; SD: Standard Deviation.

		Туре	2 diabe	etes mellitu	JS		ŀ	lealthy	controls				
Study	n	Age, years (mean±SD)	Sex (% male)	HbA1c, % (mean±SD)	BMI, kg/m² (mean±SD)	n	Age, years (mean±SD)	Sex (% male)	HbA1c, % (mean±SD)	BMI, kg/m² (mean±SD)		Effect size (95% CI)	Weigh (%)
Akyel 2012, T2DM treated by oral antidiabetic drug / healthy	67	54.6±7.8	43.3%		25.8±6.8	42	52.8±6.2	54.8%		21.8±6.5		-0.39 (-0.78, -0.01)	5.04
Akyel 2012, T2DM treated by insulin / healthy	33	51.6±8.8	45.5%	-	25.2±2.9	42	52.8±6.2	54.8%	<u>.</u>	21.8±6.5	+ <u>+</u>	-0.94 (-1.42, -0.46)	4.46
Boer-Martins 2012, T2DM with resistant hypertension / healthy	10	54.9±8.7	40.0%	9.3±2.1	33.7±4.0	15	54.7±10	40.0%	5.8±0.3	26.6±3.7	│	-1.02 (-1.87, -0.17)	2.6
Boer-Martins 2011, T2DM with high blood pressure / healthy	10	54.9±8.7	40.0%	9.3±2.1	33.7±4.0	15	54.7±10	40.0%	5.8±0.3	26.6±3.7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-1.31 (-2.20, -0.43)	2.48
Burger 2001, T2DM with congestive heart failure / healthy	69	61.8±11.6	62.3%			85	57.7±15.4	65.9%			. ¦→+	-0.18 (-0.50, 0.14)	5.49
Comunello 2014, T2DM acromegalic / acromegalic non T2DM	10		-	-	-	37	-	-			· · · · · ·	-0.29 (-0.99, 0.41)	3.24
Li and all 2015	63	56.6±7.2	47.6%	-	-	29	51.9±9.1	48.3%	-	-		-1.16 (-1.63, -0.69)	4.52
Molon 2007, T2DM with normal T wave alternans / healthy	44	64.0±5.0	75.0%	7.1±0.8	29.0±3.0	33	64.0±8.0	78.8%	<u> </u>	27.0±3.0	. 	-0.39 (-0.84, 0.07)	4.62
Molon 2007, T2DM with abnormal T wave alternans / healthy	15	66.0±4.0	80.0%	8.1±0.9	28.0±2.0	2	61.0±7.0	100.0%	<u>.</u>	28.0±3.0		-0.23 (-1.70, 1.25)	1.17
Mylonopoulou 2010, T2DM without dialysis / healthy without dialysis	25	67.7±6.5	44.0%	7.8±1.3	-	25	65.3±8.1	44.0%	5.8±0.3	-		-1.00 (-1.59, -0.41)	3.72
Mylonopoulou 2010, T2DM on dialysis / non T2DM on dialysis	25	67.9±7.4	48.0%	7.3±1.2		25	65.7±12.3	56.0%	5.6±0.3	-	. → <u>+</u>	-1.24 (-1.84, -0.63)	3.82
Nagy 2014, T2DM without essential hypertension / healthy	21	68.2±11.8	43.8%	6.8±1.1	-	53	65.4±18.9	50.6%	5.5±0.5	-		-0.54 (-0.90, -0.18)	5.41
Nagy 2014, T2DM with essential hypertension / healthy	21	68.2±11.8	43.8%	6.8±1.1	-	130	64.2±14.1	40.8%	5.7±0.4	-	 	-0.16 (-0.49, 0.17)	5.24
Ozturk 2009, T2DM after bowel preparation / healthy after bowel preparation	45	52.8±8.3	37.8%	7.1±1.7	31.4±6.0	48	51.4±8.1	43.8%	<u>.</u>	26.6±5.2	. 	-0.44 (-0.85, -0.02)	4.9
Perciaccante 2006, T2DM / healthy	20	52.4±4.7	35.0%		27.3±2.8	20	53.0±8.0	75.0%		25.0±5.1		-2.91 (-3.81, -2.01)	2.43
Perciaccante 2006, T2DM / insulin resistance but normal glucose regulation	20	52.4±4.7	35.0%	-	27.3±2.8	20	49.1±6.6	60.0%	<u>.</u>	27.3±4.9		-1.24 (-1.92, -0.56)	3.35
Poanta 2011, T2DM with normal diastolic blood pressure / healthy	20	58.0±9.0	40.0%	6.7±2.4	-	45	59.0±8.0	55.6%	4.3±1.2	-	· +++	-0.25 (-0.78, 0.28)	4.17
Poanta 2011, T2DM with impaired diastolic blood pressure / healthy	38	62.0±7.0	63.2%	7.3±2.6		45	59.0±8.0	55.6%	4.3±1.2	-	. — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —	-0.52 (-0.96, -0.08)	4.72
Porojan 2010, T2DM / healthy	34	58.3±6.7	52.9%	7.2±1.6	-	31	54.6±5.7	51.6%	4.1±2.1	-	! `+ +-	-0.22 (-0.71, 0.26)	4.42
Rasic-Milutinovic 2010, T2DM / non T2DM without metabolic syndrome	17	55.4±4.6	41.2%	7.2± -	27.8±2.9	15	54.4±8.3	40.0%	4.9± -	26.6±1.8	· · · · ·	-0.11 (-0.81, 0.59)	3.27
Rasic-Milutinovic 2010, T2DM / non T2DM with metabolic syndrome	17	55.4±4.6	41.2%	7.2± -	27.8±2.9	15	54.4±4.6	40.0%	6.1± -	28.6±0.8		-0.52 (-1.23, 0.18)	3.22
Tadic and all 2017	59	54.0±7.7	52.50%	7.5±1.5	29.3±3.1	45	49.0±8.7	53%	5.0±0.7	24.3±2.7	. + 1	-0.64 (-1.04, -0.24))	4.99
Vora 2014, T2DM after exposure to ultrafine carbone particles / healthy	17	45.9±9.5	52.9%	7.6±0.3	-	23	28.5±7.5	-	-	-	· ····	-0.84 (-1.50, -0.19)	3.47
Vukomanovic 2016	50	55.0±7.0	52.00%	7.3±1.5	29.1±3.3	40	50.9±9.0	55.00%	5.2±0.4	24.1±2.8	. — — I	-0.58 (-1.01, -0.16)	4.82
Wang 2006, T2DM with hypertension / non T2DM with hypertension	33		100.0%		-	36		100.0%				-0.65 (-1.13, -0.16)	4.44
Overall (I-squared = 65.1%, p<0.	001)										\diamond	-0.65 (-0.83, -0.47)	100

Fig 3. Meta-analysis of SDNN of type 2 diabetes mellitus patients compared with controls. -: non reported data (missing SD were also non reported). 95% CI: 95% confident intervals; BMI: Body Mass Index; SDNN: Standard Deviation of RR intervals; T2DM: Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus; SD: Standard Deviation.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195166.g003

Meta-regressions

Age and *male* gender were associated with both a decrease in LF (coefficient = -0.7; 95%CI -1 to -0.4, P < 0.001; and coefficient = -0.3; 95%CI -0.4 to -0.1, P = 0.006, respectively) and a decrease in HF (coefficient = -0.6; 95%CI -0.9 to -0.3, P < 0.001; and coefficient = -0.3; 95% CI -0.4 to -0.1, P = 0.006). Similarly, both *blood glucose levels* and *total cholesterol* were associated with both an increase in LF (coefficient = 112; 95%CI 31-193, P = 0.015; coefficient = 1133; 95%CI 408-1858, P = 0.01; respectively) and in HF (coefficient = 34; 95%CI 6-63, P = 0.024; coefficient = 490; 95%CI 100-879, P = 0.023). *Blood glucose* levels were also significantly associated with an increase in RMSSD (coefficient = 4.2; 95%CI 1.7-6.6, P = 0.003) and with an increase in SDNN (coefficient = 24; 95%CI 17-30, P < 0.001). Higher levels of *HbA1c* were

		Туре	2 diabe	tes mellit	us		Н	ealthy	controls		_			
Study	n	Age, years (mean±SD)	Sex (% male)		BMI, kg/m ² (mean±SD)	n	Age, years (mean±SD)	Sex (% male)	HbA1c, % (mean±SD)			Effec	t size (95% CI)	Weight (%)
Akyel 2012, T2DM treated by oral antidiabetic drug / healthy	67	54.6±7.8	43.3%		25.8±6.8	42	52.8±6.2	54.8%	-	21.8±6.5	-+	-1.08	(-1.49, -0.67)	5.08
Akyel 2012, T2DM treated by insulin / healthy	33	51.6±8.8	45.5%	-	25.2±2.9	42	52.8±6.2	54.8%	-	21.8±6.5		-1.78	(-2.32, -1.24)	4.93
Boer-Martins 2012, T2DM with resistant hypertension / healthy	10	54.9±8.7	40.0%	9.3±2.1	33.7±4	15	54.7±10	40.0%	5.8±0.3	26.6±3.7	+	-1.51	(-2.42, -0.60)	4.37
Boer-Martins 2011, T2DM with high blood pressure / healthy	10	54.9±8.7	40.0%	9.3±2.1	33.7±4	15	54.7±10	40.0%	5.8±0.3	26.6±3.7	_++	-0.55	(-1.36, 0.27)	4.53
Burger 2001, T2DM with congestive heart failure / healthy	69	61.8±11.6	62.3%		-	85	57.7±15.4	65.9%	-		4	-0.11	(-0.42, 0.21)	5.17
Comunello 2014, T2DM acromegalic / acromegalic non T2DM	10		-		-	37		-	-		-	-0.03	(-0.73, 0.67)	4.71
Eguchi 2010, T2DM / healthy	200	66.1±8.9	47.0%	7.4±1.1	24.1±3.8	257	67.5±8	31.1%	-	23.8±3.1	+	-0.32	(-0.51, -0.14)	5.26
Li and all 2015	63	56.6±7.2	47.6%		-	29	51.9±9.1	48.3%	-	-	+-	0.35	(-0.1, 0.8)	5.05
Molon 2007, T2DM with normal T wave alternans / healthy	44	64.0±5.0	75.0%	7.1±0.8	29.0±3.0	33	64.0±9.4	78.8%	-	27.0±3.0	-	0.56	(0.10, 1.02)	5.03
Molon 2007, T2DM with abnormal T wave alternans / healthy	15	66.0±4.0	80.0%	8.1±0.9	28.0±2.0	2	61.0±7.0	100.0%	-	28.0±3.0		-0.81	(-2.31, 0.70)	3.35
Mylonopoulou 2010, T2DM without dialysis / healthy without dialysis	25	67.7±6.5	44.0%	7.8±1.3	-	25	65.3±8.1	44.0%	5.8±0.3		+	-0.44	(-1.00, 0.12)	4.91
Mylonopoulou 2010, T2DM on dialysis / non T2DM on dialysis	25	67.9±7.4	48.0%	7.3±1.2	-	25	65.7±12.3	56.0%	5.6±0.3	-		0.03	(-0.52, 0.59)	4.9
Ozturk 2009, T2DM after bowel preparation / healthy after bowel preparation	45	52.8±8.3	37.8%	7.1±1.7	31.4±6.0	48	51.4±8.1	43.8%	-	26.6±5.2	+	-0.42	(-0.83, -0.06)	5.08
Perciaccante 2006, T2DM / healthy	20	52.4±4.7	35.0%		27.3±2.8	20	53.0±8.0	75.0%	-	25.0±5.1	⊢ • -	-0.30	(-0.92, 0.32)	4.82
Perciaccante 2006, T2DM / insulin resistance but normal glucose regulation	20	52.4±4.7	35.0%		27.3±2.8	20	49.1±6.6	60.0%	-	27.3±4.9	++-	-0.57	(-1.21, 0.06)	4.81
Rasic-Milutinovic 2010, T2DM / non T2DM without metabolic syndrome	17	55.4±4.6	41.2%	7.2± -	27.8±2.9	15	54.4±8.3	40.0%	4.9± -	26.6±1.8	-+-	-0.13	(-0.82, 0.57)	4.72
Rasic-Milutinovic 2010, T2DM / non T2DM with metabolic syndrome	17	55.4±4.6	41.2%	7.2± -	27.8±2.9	15	54.4±4.6	40.0%	6.1± -	28.6±0.8		-1.00	(-1.74, -0.26)	4.65
Tadic and all 2017	59	54.0±7.7	52.50%	7.5±1.5	29.3±3.1	45	49.0±8.7	53%	5.0±0.7	24.3±2.7	→	-6.00	(-6.91, -5.09)	4.37
Vora 2014, T2DM after exposure to ultrafine carbone particles / healthy	17	45.9±9.5	52.9%	7.6±0.3	-	23	28.5±7.5	-	-		-∔-	-0.70	(-1.34, -0.05)	4.79
Vukomanovic 2016	50	55.0±7.0	52.00%	7.3±1.5	29.1±3.3	40	50.9±9.0	55.00%	5.2±0.4	24.1±2.8	_ →	-4.95	(-5.79, -4.11)	4.48
Wang 2006, T2DM with hypertension / non T2DM with hypertension	33		100.0%		-	36		100.0%			+	-0.62	(-1.10, -0.13)	5
Overall (I-squared = 94.0%, p<0.001)										♦	-0.92	(-1.37, -0.47)	100
											47 1			

Fig 4. Meta-analysis of RMSSD of type 2 diabetes mellitus patients compared with controls. -: non reported data (missing SD were also non reported). 95% CI: 95% confident intervals; BMI: Body Mass Index; RMSSD: square root of mean squared differences of successive RR intervals; T2DM: Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus; SD: Standard Deviation.

	_	Туре	2 diabe	tes mellit	us		H	lealthy o	controls		_					
Study	n	Age, years (mean±SD)	Sex (% male)	HbA1c, % (mean±SD)	BMI, kg/m² (mean±SD)	n	Age, years (mean±SD)	Sex (% male)	HbA1c, % (mean±SD)	BMI, kg/m ² (mean±SD)				Effec	t size (95% CI)	Weight (%)
Boer-Martins 2012, T2DM with resistant hypertension / healthy	10	54.9±8.7	40.0%	9.3±2.1	33.7±4	15	54.7±10	40.0%	5.8±0.3	26.6±3.7		_	-	-0.68	(-1.50, 0.15)	6.2
Boer-Martins 2011, T2DM with high blood pressure / healthy	10	54.9±8.7	40.0%	9.3±2.1	33.7±4	15	54.7±10	40.0%	5.8±0.3	26.6±3.7		_	-	-0.70	(-1.53, 0.12)	6.19
Burger 2001, T2DM with congestive heart failure / healthy	69	61.8±11.6	62.3%		-	85	57.7±15.4	65.9%		-				-0.95	(-1.28, -0.61)	8.24
Comunello 2014, T2DM acromegalic / acromegalic non T2DM	10	-		-	-	37	-		-	-		-		- 0.33	(-0.37, 1.03)	6.75
Molon 2007, T2DM with normal T wave alternans / healthy	44	64.0±5.0	75.0%	7.1±0.8	29±3	33	64.0±8.0	78.8%		27±3				0.53	(0.07, 0.99)	7.79
Molon 2007, T2DM with abnormal T wave alternans / healthy	15	66.0±4.0	80.0%	8.1±0.9	28±2	2	61.0±7.0	100.0%		28±3		-+		-0.39	(-1.88, 1.09)	3.73
Mylonopoulou 2010, T2DM without dialysis / healthy without dialysis	25	67.7±6.5	44.0%	7.8±1.3	-	25	65.3±8.1	44.0%	5.8±0.3	-		+		-0.47	(-1.03, 0.10)	7.38
Mylonopoulou 2010, T2DM on dialysis / non T2DM on dialysis	25	67.9±7.4	48.0%	7.3±1.2	-	25	65.7±12.3	56.0%	5.6±0.3			_	-	0.39	(-0.17, 0.95)	7.37
Poanta 2011, T2DM with normal diastolic blood pressure / healthy	20	58.0±9.0	40.0%	6.7±2.4	-	45	59.0±8.0	55.6%	4.3±1.2	-	-	-+	_	-0.15	(-0.68, 0.38)	7.52
Poanta 2011, T2DM with impaired diastolic blood pressure / healthy	38	62.0±7.0	63.2%	7.3±2.6	-	45	59.0±8.0	55.6%	4.3±1.2	-	_	-		-0.40	(-0.84, 0.03)	7.88
Porojan 2010, T2DM / healthy	34	58.3±6.7	52.9%	7.2±1.6	-	31	54.6±5.7	51.6%	4.1±2.1				_	-0.15	(-0.63, 0.34)	7.68
Tadic and all 2017	59	54.0±7.7	52.50%	7.5±1.5	29.3±3.1	45	49.0±8.7	53%	5.0±0.7	24.3±2.7	$\leftarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow$			-1.75	(-2.20, -1.29)	7.8
Vukomanovic 2016	50	55.0±7.0	52.00%	7.3±1.5	29.1±3.3	40	50.9±9.0	55.00%	5.2±0.4	24.1±2.8	—— I			-1.43	(-1.90, -0.97)	7.76
Wang 2006, T2DM with hypertension / non T2DM with hypertension	33		100.0%		-	36		100.0%				—		-0.55	(-1.03, -0.07)	7.7
Overall (I-squared = 85.5%, p<0.001)											>		-0.46	(-0.84, -0.09)	100

Fig 5. Meta-analysis of pNN50 of type 2 diabetes mellitus patients compared with controls. -: non reported data (missing SD were also non reported). 95% CI: 95% confident intervals; BMI: Body Mass Index; pNN50: percentage of RR intervals with more than 50 ms variation; T2DM: Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus; SD: Standard Deviation.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195166.g005

		Туре	2 diabe	tes mellitu	JS		F	lealthy	controls						
Study	n	Age, years (mean±SD)	Sex (% male)	HbA1c, % (mean±SD)	BMI, kg/m ² (mean±SD)	n	Age, years (mean±SD)	Sex (% male)	HbA1c, % (mean±SD)	BMI, kg/m ² (mean±SD)			Effect	size (95% CI)	Weigl (%)
Burger 2001, T2DM with congestive heart failure / healthy	69	61.8±11.6	62.3%		-	85	57.7±15.4	65.9%	-	•		+	-0.11	(-0.43, 0.20)	8
Giordano 2001, T2DM with normal renal function / healthy	10	61.0±12.7	40.0%		-	10	60.0±6.3	50.0%	-	-		+	-0.07	(-0.94, 0.81)	6.99
Giordano 2001, T2DM on dialysis / non T2DM on dialysis	9	63.0±9.0	44.4%		-	11	59.0±10.0	45.5%		-	+	•	-0.89	(-1.82, 0.04)	6.87
Istenes 2014, T2DM without high blood pressure / healthy	40	52.8±8.1	57.5%	8.3±2.3	27.8±4.6	25	52.2±9.1	28.0%	5.4±0.6	25.0±4.3	-		0.001	(-0.50, 0.50)	7.87
Istenes 2014, T2DM with high blood pressure / healthy	62	55.2±6.6	54.8%	8.5±2.4	31.5±5.6	74	53.0±12.3	40.5%	5.4±0.8	29.7±4.9		+	-2.05	(-2.47, -1.63)	7.75
Mylonopoulou 2010, T2DM without dialysis / healthy without dialysis	25	67.7±6.5	44.0%	7.8±1.3	-	25	65.3±8.1	44.0%	5.8±0.3	-		-	-0.57	(-1.14, -0.01)	7.64
Mylonopoulou 2010, T2DM on dialysis / non T2DM on dialysis	25	67.9±7.4	48.0%	7.3±1.2	-	25	65.7±12.3	56.0%	5.6±0.3	-	-	•	-0.48	(-1.04, 0.08)	7.64
Perciaccante 2006, T2DM / healthy	20	52.4±4.7	35.0%		27.3±2.8	20	53.0±8.0	75.0%	-	25.0±5.1	<u> </u>		-6.44	(-8.01, -4.86)	5.29
Perciaccante 2006, T2DM / insulin resistance but normal glucose regulation	20	52.4±4.7	35.0%		27.3±2.8	20	49.1±6.6	60.0%	-	27.3±4.9			-8.42	(-10.4, -6.43)	4.37
Rasic-Milutinovic 2010, T2DM / non T2DM without metabolic syndrome	17	55.4±4.6	41.2%	7.2± -	27.8±2.9	15	54.4±8.3	40.0%	4.9± -	26.6±1.8			-2.54	(-3.48, -1.59)	6.83
Rasic-Milutinovic 2010, T2DM / non T2DM with metabolic syndrome	17	55.4±4.6	41.2%	7.2± -	27.8±2.9	15	54.4±4.6	40.0%	6.1± -	28.6±0.8	-	•	-0.80	(-1.53, -0.08)	7.33
Tadic and all 2017	59	54.0±7.7	52.50%	7.5±1.5	29.3±3.1	45	49.0±8.7	53%	5.0±0.7	24.3±2.7	- +	-	-1.32	(-1.75, -0.89)	7.86
Vukomanovic 2016	50	55.0±7.0	52.00%	7.3±1.5	29.1±3.3	40	50.9±9.0	55.00%	5.2±0.4	24.1±2.8	+		-1.57	(-2.05, -1.10)	7.79
Wang 2006, T2DM with hypertension / non T2DM with hypertension	33		100%			36	-	100.0%	-			-	-0.52	(-1.00, -0.04)	7.78
Overall (I-squared = 93.5%, p<0.001)										\diamond	•	-1.52	(-2.13, -0.91)) 100

Fig 6. Meta-analysis of total power of type 2 diabetes mellitus patients compared with controls. -: non reported data (missing SD were also non reported). 95% CI: 95% confident intervals; BMI: Body Mass Index; TP: Total Power; T2DM: Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus; SD: Standard Deviation.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195166.g006

D) 8 3 6 2 7 2 2 2 4 3 2 4 3 2 4 4 4 4	(mear 5 57.7± 7 - 5 52.2: 4 53± 5 65.3: 5 65.7± 8 51.4: 0 53.0: 0 49.1:	Approx Sex (martsD) (% martsD) (% mar	nale) (mean±SD) 00% - 00% 5.4±0.6 55% 5.4±0.8 00% 5.8±0.3 00% 5.6±0.3 8% - 00% - 00% -		-+ - -	+	-0.28 -1.99 -1.73 -3.29 -0.78 -0.52 -0.68	t size (95% Cl) (-0.60, 0.04) (-2.80, -1.18) (-2.31, -1.15) (-3.81, -2.77) (-1.36, -0.21) (-1.09, 0.04) (-1.09, -0.26)	Weight (%) 5 4.21 4.73 4.63 4.66 4.64 4.88
3 5 2 7 2 2 2 4 8 2 8 2 4	7 - 5 52.2: 4 53± ⁻ 5 65.3: 5 65.7± 8 51.4: 0 53.0: 0 49.1:	2.2±9.1 28.05 3±12.3 40.55 3±8.1 44.05 7±12.3 56.05 .4±8.1 43.85 0.0±8.0 75.05 0.1±6.6 60.05		29.7±4.9 - - 26.6±5.2 25.0±5.1		i .	-1.99 -1.73 -3.29 -0.78 -0.52 -0.68	(-2.80, -1.18) (-2.31, -1.15) (-3.81, -2.77) (-1.36, -0.21) (-1.09, 0.04)	4.21 4.73 4.63 4.66 4.64
2 3 7 2 2 2 2 4 3 2 3 2 4 4	5 52.2: 4 53± 5 65.3: 5 65.7± 8 51.4: 0 53.0: 0 49.1:	3±12.3 40.59 0.3±8.1 44.09 7±12.3 56.09 .4±8.1 43.89 0.0±8.0 75.09 .1±6.6 60.09	0% 5.4±0.6 5% 5.4±0.8 0% 5.8±0.3 0% 5.6±0.3 8% - 0% - 0% -	29.7±4.9 - - 26.6±5.2 25.0±5.1		i .	-1.73 -3.29 -0.78 -0.52 -0.68	(-2.31, -1.15) (-3.81, -2.77) (-1.36, -0.21) (-1.09, 0.04)	4.73 4.63 4.66 4.64
5 7 2 2 2 4 3 2 4 3 2 4	4 53± 5 65.3 5 65.7± 8 51.4 0 53.0 0 49.1	3±12.3 40.59 0.3±8.1 44.09 7±12.3 56.09 .4±8.1 43.89 0.0±8.0 75.09 .1±6.6 60.09	5% 5.4±0.8 0% 5.8±0.3 0% 5.6±0.3 8% - 0% - 0% - 0% -	29.7±4.9 - - 26.6±5.2 25.0±5.1		i .	-3.29 -0.78 -0.52 -0.68	(-3.81, -2.77) (-1.36, -0.21) (-1.09, 0.04)	4.63 4.66 4.64
2 2 4 3 2 4 4 3 2 4	5 65.3 5 65.7± 8 51.4 0 53.0 0 49.1	.3±8.1 44.09 7±12.3 56.09 .4±8.1 43.89 0.0±8.0 75.09 0.1±6.6 60.09	0% 5.8±0.3 0% 5.6±0.3 8% - 0% - 0% -	- 26.6±5.2 25.0±5.1		i .	-0.78 -0.52 -0.68	(-1.36, -0.21) (-1.09, 0.04)	4.66 4.64
2 4 3 2 4 3 2 4	5 65.7± 8 51.4 0 53.0 0 49.1	7±12.3 56.09 .4±8.1 43.89 0.0±8.0 75.09 0.1±6.6 60.09	0% 5.6±0.3 8% - 0% - 0% -	26.6±5.2 25.0±5.1		+ + +	-0.52 -0.68	(-1.09, 0.04)	4.64
4 2 3 2 4	8 51.4 0 53.0 0 49.1	.4±8.1 43.8 0.0±8.0 75.0 0.1±6.6 60.0	8% - 0% - 0% -	26.6±5.2 25.0±5.1		•	-0.68	(
2 2 4	0 53.0 0 49.1	0.0±8.0 75.09	0% - 0% -	25.0±5.1		+		(-1.09, -0.26)	4.88
8 2 4	0 49.1	.1±6.6 60.09	0% -						
4				27.3±4.9	→		-4.70	(-5.93, -3.48)	3.39
	5 59.0	0.0±8.0 55.69	6% 4.3+1.2	-			-6.65	(-8.27, -5.03)	2.7
						+	-0.21	(-0.74, 0.32)	4.72
4	5 59.0	0.0±8.0 55.69	6% 4.3±1.2	-		+	-0.43	(-0.87, 0.01)	4.86
3	1 54.6	.6±5.7 51.69	6% 4.1±2.1			+	-0.26	(-0.75, 0.23)	4.78
1	5 54.4	.4±8.3 40.09	0% 4.9± -	26.6±1.8		⊢ ∣	-1.19	(-1.95, -0.43)	4.31
1	5 54.4	.4±4.6 40.09	0% 6.1± -	28.6±0.8	-	+	-0.76	(-1.48, -0.04)	4.38
4	5 49.0	.0±8.7 53%	% 5.0±0.7	24.3±2.7		+	-0.66	(-1.06, -0.26)	4.91
2	3 28.5	.5±7.5 -		-	-	•	-0.68	(-1.33, -0.04)	4.52
4	0 50.9	.9±9.0 55.00	00% 5.2±0.4	24.1±2.8	-	+	-0.92	(-1.36, -0.49)	4.85
3	6 -	- 100.0	.0% -			+	-0.35	(-0.83, 0.13)	4.8
3	4 60.0	0.0±8.0 52.99	9% 5.2±0.3	23.6±3.3		+	-0.22	(-0.75, 0.30)	4.73
3	4 60.0	0.0±8.0 52.9	9% 5.2±0.3	23.6±3.3		+	0.00	(-0.52, 0.52)	4.73
	4 60.0	.0±8.0 52.95	9% 5.2±0.3	23.6±3.3		+	-0.53	(-1.01, -0.04)	4.78
3	4 60.0	.0±8.0 52.9	9% 5.2±0.3	23.6±3.3		-	-0.48	(-0.96, 0.01)	4.78
_						5	-1.08	(-1.46, -0.69)	100
	3.2 3	3.2 34 60	3.2 34 60.0±8.0 52.	3.2 34 60.0±8.0 52.9% 5.2±0.3	3.2 34 60.0±8.0 52.9% 5.2±0.3 23.6±3.3	3.2 34 60.0±8.0 52.9% 5.2±0.3 23.6±3.3	3.2 34 60.0±8.0 52.9% 5.2±0.3 23.6±3.3	3.2 34 60.0±8.0 52.9% 5.2±0.3 23.6±3.3 3.2 34 60.0±8.0 52.9% 5.2±0.3 23.6±3.3 ↔ -0.48	3.2 34 60.0±8.0 52.9% 5.2±0.3 23.6±3.3 + -0.53 (-1.01, -0.04)

Fig 7. Meta-analysis of the LF of type 2 diabetes mellitus patients compared with controls. -: non reported data (missing SD were also non reported). 95% CI: 95% confident intervals; BMI: Body Mass Index; LF: Low Frequency; T2DM: Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus; SD: Standard Deviation.

		Туре	2 diabe	tes mellit	us		Н	lealthy	controls					
Study	n	Age, years (mean±SD)	Sex (% male)		BMI, kg/m ² (mean±SD)	n	Age, years (mean±SD)	Sex (% male)		BMI, kg/m ² (mean±SD)		Effect	size (95% CI)	Weigh (%)
Burger 2001, T2DM with congestive heart failure / healthy	69	61.8±11.6	62.3%	-	-	85	57.7±15.4	65.9%	-	-	+	-0.06	(-0.37, 0.26)	5.04
Comunello 2014, T2DM acromegalic / non T2DM acromegalic	10		-		-	37	-		-	-		-0.09	(-0.79, 0.61)	4.11
Istenes 2014, T2DM without high blood pressure / healthy	40	52.8±8.1	57.5%	8.3±2.3	27.8±4.6	25	52.2±9.1	28.0%	5.4±0.6	25.0±4.3		-0.35	(-0.9, 0.16)	4.9
Istenes 2014, T2DM with high blood pressure / healthy	62	55.2±6.6	54.8%	8.5±2.4	31.5±5.6	74	53±12.3	40.5%	5.4±0.8	29.7±4.9	+++	-1.61	(-2.00, -1.23)	4.63
Kondo 2002, T2DM / healthy	10	57.6±8.9	50.0%	9.3±2.5	22.3±1.3	8	53.9±15	62.5%	5.0±0.3	22.4±0.6		-2.04	(-3.21, -0.87)	2.89
Mylonopoulou 2010, T2DM without dialysis / healthy without dialysis	25	67.7±6.5	44.0%	7.8±1.3	-	25	65.3±8.1	44.0%	5.8±0.3	-	-+-	-0.32	(-0.88, 0.24)	4.5
Mylonopoulou 2010, T2DM on dialysis / non T2DM on dialysis	25	67.9±7.4	48.0%	7.3±1.2	-	25	65.7±12.3	56.0%	5.6±0.3	-	+++	0.10	(-0.45, 0.66)	4.49
Ozturk 2009, T2DM after bowel preparation / healthy after bowel preparation	45	52.8±8.3	37.8%	7.1±1.7	31.4±6.0	48	51.4±8.1	43.8%	-	26.6±5.2	+-	-0.51	(-0.92, -0.10)	4.84
Perciaccante 2006, T2DM / healthy	20	52.4±4.7	35.0%		27.3±2.8	20	53.0±8.0	75.0%	-	25.0±5.1		-5.92	(-7.39, -4.45)	2.28
Perciaccante 2006, T2DM / insulin resistance but normal glucose regulation	20	52.4±4.7	35.0%		27.3±2.8	20	49.1±6.6	60.0%	-	27.3±4.9	—	-2.64	(-3.49, -1.78)	3.67
Poanta 2011, T2DM with normal diastolic blood pressure / healthy	20	58.0±9.0	40.0%	6.7±2.4	-	45	59.0±8.0	55.6%	4.3±1.2	-		-0.15	(-0.68, 0.38)	4.57
Poanta 2011, T2DM with impaired diastolic blood pressure / healthy	38	62.0±7.0	63.2%	7.3±2.6	-	45	59.0±8.0	55.6%	4.3±1.2	-		-0.46	(-0.90, -0.02)	4.79
Porojan 2010, T2DM / healthy	34	58.3±6.7	52.9%	7.2±1.6	-	31	54.6±5.7	51.6%	4.1±2.1	-	-+-	-0.27	(-0.75, 0.22)	4.66
Rasic-Milutinovic 2010, T2DM / non T2DM without metabolic syndrome	17	55.4±4.6	41.2%	7.2± -	27.8±2.9	15	54.4±8.3	40.0%	4.9± -	26.6±1.8	- -	-2.34	(-3.25, -1.43)	3.52
Rasic-Milutinovic 2010, T2DM / non T2DM with metabolic syndrome	17	55.4±4.6	41.2%	7.2± -	27.8±2.9	15	54.4±4.6	40.0%	6.1± -	28.6±0.8		-0.66	(-1.36, 0.05)	4.06
Tadic and all 2017	59	54.0±7.7	52.50%	7.5±1.5	29.3±3.1	45	49.0±8.7	53%	5.0±0.7	24.3±2.7	· · · ·	-0.66	(-1.06, -0.26)	4.88
Vora 2014, T2DM after exposure to ultrafine carbone particles / healthy	17	45.9±9.5	52.9%	7.6±0.3	-	23	28.5±7.5			-		-0.56	(-1.20, 0.08)	4.27
Vukomanovic 2016	50	55.0±7.0	52.00%	7.3±1.5	29.1±3.3	40	50.9±9.0	55.00%	5.2±0.4	24.1±2.8	-+	-0.92	(-1.36, -0.49)	4.79
Wang 2006, T2DM with high blood pressure / healthy	33		100.0%		-	36	-	100.0%	-	-	-++	-1.04	(-1.54, -0.54)	4.63
Yasuda 2005, T2DM with normoalbuminuria without doxazosin / healthy	24	62.0±9.0	58.3%	7.2±1.8	23.9±3.3	34	60.0±8.0	52.9%	5.2±0.3	23.6±3.3	+++	-0.35	(-0.88, 0.18)	4.57
Yasuda 2005, T2DM with normoalbuminuria after doxazosin / healthy	24	62.0±9.0	58.3%	7.2±1.8	23.9±3.3	34	60.0±8.0	52.9%	5.2±0.3	23.6±3.3	├• ┼	-0.33	(-0.86, 0.20)	4.57
Yasuda 2005, T2DM with macroalbuminuria without doxazosin / healthy	33	61.0±9.0	57.6%	7.9±2.1	22.9±3.2	34	60.0±8.0	52.9%	5.2±0.3	23.6±3.3	+++	-0.37	(-0.85, 0.12)	4.68
Yasuda 2005, T2DM with macroalbuminuria after doxazosin / healthy	33	61.0±9.0	57.6%	7.9±2.1	22.9±3.2	34	60.0±8.0	52.9%	5.2±0.3	23.6±3.3	++-	-0.40	(-0.88, 0.09)	4.68
Overall (I-squared = 85.6%, p<0.001)										\$	-0.79	(-1.09, -0.50)	100

Fig 8. Meta-analysis of the HF of type 2 diabetes mellitus patients compared with controls. -: non reported data (missing SD were also non reported). 95% CI: 95% confident intervals; BMI: Body Mass Index; HF: High Frequency; T2DM: Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus; SD: Standard Deviation.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195166.g008

associated with shorter RR intervals (coefficient = -383; 95%CI -756 to -8.8, P = 0.046). *HDL cholesterol* levels were associated with both an increase in SDNN (coefficient = 1251; 95%CI 292–2210, P = 0.017) and RMSSD (coefficient = 246; 95%CI 186–307, P < 0.001). *Body mass index* was associated with both an increase in LF (coefficient = 0.8; 95%CI 0.3–1.3, P = 0.003) and in HF (coefficient = 0.7; 95%CI 0.3–1.1, P = 0.005). An increase in *systolic blood pressure* was linked with shorter RR intervals (coefficient = -380; 95%CI -703 to -53, P = 0.032) and a decrease in HF (coefficient = -3.1; 95%CI -6.2 to -0.02, P = 0.049). *Time from diagnosis* of T2DM was linked with a higher level of SDNN (coefficient = 10; 95%CI 2.1–18, P = 0.018) and a lower level of total power (coefficient = -1214; 95%CI -2129 to -299, P = 0.021) (Fig 10).

Discussion

The main findings were that T2DM patients exhibited a strong decrease in HRV. Both sympathetic and parasympathetic activity were decreased compared with non–T2DM patients, which can be explained by the deleterious metabolic effects of blood glucose levels on HRV.

		Туре	2 diabe	tes mellit	us		H	lealthy o	controls					
Study	n	Age, years (mean±SD)	Sex (% male)	HbA1c, % (mean±SD)	BMI, kg/m² (mean±SD)	n	Age, years (mean±SD)	Sex (% male)	HbA1c, % (mean±SD)	BMI, kg/m ² (mean±SD)		Ef	fect size (95% CI)	Weight (%)
Burger 2001, T2DM with congestive heart failure / healthy	69	61.8±11.6	62.3%	-	-	85	57.7±15.4	65.9%	-	-	-	-0.4	15 (-0.78, -0.13)	6.18
Comunello 2014, T2DM acromegalic / non T2DM acromegalic	10	-		-	-	37	-		-	-		-1.8	88 (-2.68, -1.08)	5.14
Giordano 2001, T2DM with normal renal function / healthy	10	61±12.7	40.0%		-	10	60.0±6.3	50.0%	-	-	│	- 1.0	3 (0.09, 1.97)	4.78
Giordano 2001, T2DM on dialysis / non T2DM on dialysis	9	63.0±9.0	44.4%	-	-	11	59.0±10.0	45.5%	-	-		0.6	2 (-0.28, 1.53)	4.87
Istenes 2014, T2DM without high blood pressure / healthy	40	52.8±8.1	57.5%	8.3±2.3	27.8±4.6	25	52.2±9.1	28.0%	5.4±0.6	25.0±4.3	 .	0.1	4 (-0.36, 0.64)	6.16
Istenes 2014, T2DM with high blood pressure / healthy	62	55.2±6.6	54.8%	8.5±2.4	31.5±5.6	74	53±12.3	40.5%	5.4±0.8	29.7±4.9		0.2	8 (-0.06, 0.61)	5.85
Kondo 2002, T2DM / healthy	10	57.6±8.9	50.0%	9.3±2.5	22.3±1.3	8	53.9±15	62.5%	5.0±0.3	22.4±0.6		-1.3	27 (-2.30, -0.24)	4.54
Mylonopoulou 2010, T2DM without dialysis / healthy without dialysis	25	67.7±6.5	44.0%	7.8±1.3	-	25	65.3±8.1	44.0%	5.8±0.3	-	<u> </u>	-0.1	4 (-0.70, 0.42)	5.67
Mylonopoulou 2010, T2DM on dialysis / non T2DM on dialysis	25	67.9±7.4	48.0%	7.3±1.2	-	25	65.7±12.3	56.0%	5.6±0.3	-		-0.8	39 (-1.48, -0.31)	5.74
Poanta 2011, T2DM with normal diastolic blood pressure / healthy	20	58.0±9.0	40.0%	6.7±2.4	-	45	59.0±8.0	55.6%	4.3±1.2	-	—	-1.3	23 (-1.80, -0.66)	5.7
Poanta 2011, T2DM with impaired diastolic blood pressure / healthy	38	62.0±7.0	63.2%	7.3±2.6	-	45	59.0±8.0	55.6%	4.3±1.2	-		-0.8	59 (-1.03, -0.15)	5.97
Porojan 2010, T2DM / healthy	34	58.3±6.7	52.9%	7.2±1.6	-	31	54.6±5.7	51.6%	4.1±2.1	-	-+-	-0.1	0 (-0.58, 0.39)	5.88
Rasic-Milutinovic 2010, T2DM / non T2DM without metabolic syndrome	17	55.4±4.6	41.2%	7.2± -	27.8±2.9	15	54.4±8.3	40.0%	4.9± -	26.6±1.8		0.7	2 (0.01, 1.44)	5.35
Rasic-Milutinovic 2010, T2DM / non T2DM with metabolic syndrome	17	55.4±4.6	41.2%	7.2± -	27.8±2.9	15	54.4±4.6	40.0%	6.1± -	28.6±0.8	++-	0.4	4 (-0.26, 1.14)	5.38
Tadic and all 2017	59	54.0±7.7	52.50%	7.5±1.5	29.3±3.1	45	49.0±8.7	53%	5.0±0.7	24.3±2.7	-+	-0.3	2 (-0.61, 0.17)	6.07
Vora 2014, T2DM after exposure to ultrafine carbone particles / healthy	17	45.9±9.5	52.9%	7.6±0.3		23	28.5±7.5	-		-	_ ↓	0.2	3 (-0.40, 0.86)	5.57
Vukomanovic 2016	50	55.0±7.0	52.00%	7.3±1.5	29.1±3.3	40	50.9±9.0	55.00%	5.2±0.4	24.1±2.8	 ⊷	0.1	9 (-0.22, 0.61)	6.02
Wang 2006, T2DM with hypertension / non T2DM with hypertension	33		100%	-	-	36		100%	-	-		3.8	4 (3.04, 4.65)	5.13
Overall (I-squared = 90.1%, p=0.914)											0.0	2 (-0.38, 0.43)	100

Fig 9. Meta-analysis of LF/HF of type 2 diabetes mellitus patients compared with controls. -: non reported data (missing SD were also non reported). 95% CI: 95% confident intervals; BMI: Body Mass Index; LF/HF: Low Frequency/High Frequency ratio; T2DM: Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus; SD: Standard Deviation.

Variables	Number of studies included	- squared		Coeffici	ent (95% CI)	p-value
RR	studies included	squared	1			
Age, years	12	98.2%	\$	9	(-24, 42)	0.550
Sex, male as reference	12	99.5%	9	-17	(-40, 5.4)	0.121
HbA1c, %	7	94.0%		-383	(-756, -8.8)	0.046
Body mass index, kg.m-2	6	98.3%		-157 -380	(-430, 116)	0.186
Systolic blood pressure, cmHg	6	98.0%			(-703, -53)	0.032
Diastolic blood pressure, cmHg SDNN	0	98.2%		-1534	(-3881, 813)	0.144
Age, years	25	89.5%	Ļ	1.7	(-1.5, 4.9)	0.279
Sex, male as reference	25	88.5%	4	0.1	(-1.2, 1.5)	0.836
Time from diagnosis, years	15	82.6%		10	(2.1, 18)	0.018
Blood glucose levels, 10 mg/dl	18	61.8%	p	24	(17, 30)	<0.001
Systolic blood pressure, cmHg	16	86.9%	Ŷ	6.4	(-20, 32)	0.603
Diastolic blood pressure, cmHg	16	89.1%		5.5	(-52, 63)	0.840
HbA1c, %	19	89.3%	X	10	(-18, 39)	0.453
Body mass index, kg.m-2 Total cholesterol, g/l	15 12	90.2% 90.3%		2.6 25	(-8.8, 14) (-150, 201)	0.634
LDL cholesterol, g/l	12	90.3%		-11	(-465, 443)	0.101
HDL cholesterol, g/l	10	83.7%		1251	(292, 2210)	0.017
Triglycerides, g/l	17	91.4%		14	(-59, 88)	0.688
pNN50			-			
Age, years	14	0.0%	4	0.2	(-0.2, 0.5)	0.316
Sex, Male as reference	14	0.0%	¢	0.0	(-0.1, 0.1)	0.462
Time from diagnosis, years	9	0.0%	¢	0.3	(-0.9, 1.4)	0.587
Blood glucose levels, 10 mg/dl	11	0.0%	Ŷ	-1.0	(-2.9, 1)	0.313
Systolic blood pressure, cmHg	9	0.0%	Ŷ	-1.0	(-3, 1)	0.263
Diastolic blood pressure, cmHg Total cholesterol, g/l	9	0.0%	<u>L</u>	-2.3 15	(-6.2, 1.6)	0.203
Triglycerides, g/L	11	0.0%	X	-2.4	(-13, 43) (-8.4, 3.7)	0.201
RMSSD		0.070	Ĭ	-2.4	(-0.4, 3.7)	0.401
Age, years	21	95.2%		-0.1	(-1.3, 1.1)	0.820
Sex, Male as reference	21	93.9%	J	0.1	(-0.3, 0.4)	0.787
Time from diagnosis, years	12	87.3%		3.0	(-1,7)	0.121
Blood glucose levels, 10 mg/dl	13	60.0%	¢	4.2	(1.7, 6.6)	0.003
HbA1c, %	15	63.9%	¢	2.8	(-5.1, 11)	0.451
Body mass index, kg.m-2	16	93.2%		0.9	(-1.5, 3.2)	0.428
Systolic blood pressure, cmHg	13	96.4%	¢	0.3	(-6.7, 7.3)	0.934
Diastolic blood pressure, cmHg	13	94.1%		-2.1	(-19, 15)	0.783
LDL cholesterol, g/L HDL cholesterol, g/L	8	79.0% 24.2%		-6.9 246	(-172, 159) (186, 307)	0.922
Triglycerides, g/L	13	95.5%		246	(186, 307)	0.751
Total Power	15	90.076	- I	2.1	(-10, 21)	0.751
Age, years	15	78.6%	4	0.1	(-0.6, 0.8)	0.762
Sex, Male as reference	15	78.5%	Y	0.0	(-0.1, 0.1)	0.843
Time from diagnosis, years	8	66.0%		-1214	(-2129, -299)	0.021
HbA1c, %	10	69.1%	¢	4.5	(-13, 22)	0.563
Body mass index, kg.m-2	10	79.3%		1.1	(-1.6, 3.9)	0.364
Systolic blood pressure, cmHg	9	84.4%	¢	8.3	(-17, 33)	0.456
Diastolic blood pressure, cmHg	9	84.3%	Ý	5.2	(-10, 20)	0.431
Triglycerides, g/L	6	64.2%	Ŷ	2.1	(-15, 19)	0.748
LF Age, years	22	80.5%	1	-0.7	(-1.0, -0.4)	<0.001
Sex, Male as reference	22	67.8%	X	-0.7	(-0.4, -0.1)	0.006
Time from diagnosis, years	17	86.7%	ĭ	-0.6	(-1.5, 0.3)	0.173
Blood glucose levels, 10 mg/dl	8	0.0%	Ĭ-œ-	112	(31, 193)	0.015
HbA1c, %	19	85.6%		-2.1	(-11, 6.5)	0.613
Body mass index, kg.m-2	15	86.8%	4	0.8	(0.3, 1.3)	0.003
Systolic blood pressure, cmHg	16	91.4%	4	-3.4	(-6.9, 0.2)	0.062
Diastolic blood pressure, cmHg	16	92.4%	4	-11	(-35, 14)	0.362
Total cholesterol, g/L	7	21.8%		1133	(408, 1858)	0.010
HF		70.001			(
Age, years	23	70.8%	<u>9</u>	-0.6	(-0.9, -0.3)	<0.00
Sex, Male as reference	23	67.8%	<u> </u>	-0.3	(-0.4, -0.1)	0.006
Time from diagnosis, years	18	79.8%	Q	-0.5	(-1.2, 0.2)	0.150
Blood glucose levels, 10 mg/dl	9 20	0.0%	Y	34	(6, 63)	0.024
HbA1c, % Body mass index, kg.m-2	20	78.1% 81.8%	X	-0.8 0.7	(-7.5, 5.8) (0.3, 1.1)	0.792
Systolic blood pressure, cmHg	17	87.0%	î	-3.1	(-6.2, -0.02)	0.003
Diastolic blood pressure, cmHg	17	89.0%	7	-1.0	(-3.1, 1.2)	0.347
Total cholesterol, g/L	7	20.1%		490	(100, 879)	0.023
Triglycerides, g/L	9	19.4%		1.3	(-7.4, 10.1)	0.730
LF / HF	-				. ,,	
Age, years	16	0.0%	¢	-0.03	(-0.1, 0.1)	0.965
Sex, Male as reference	16	0.0%	¢.	0.01	(-0.02, 0.03)	0.367
Time from diagnosis, years	11	0.0%	Ŷ	-0.05	(-0.2, 0.1)	0.395
Blood glucose levels, 10 mg/dl	12	0.0%	ģ	0.10	(-0.2, 0.4)	0.472
HbA1c, %	13	0.0%	9	0.60	(-0.1, 1.3)	0.095
Body mass index, kg.m-2	7	0.0%	Ŷ	0.09	(-0.3, 0.4)	0.562
Systolic blood pressure, cmHg	10	0.0%	'	0.10	(-0.7, 0.9)	0.707
Diastolic blood pressure, cmHg	10 9	0.0%	X	0.20	(-0.2, 0.6)	0.324
Total cholesterol, g/L		0.0%	ĭ	0.70	(-2.1, 3.6) (-3.2, 3.5)	0.561
Triglycerides, g/l	7					

Fig 10. Meta-regression of factors influencing heart rate variability in type 2 diabetes mellitus. 95% CI: 95% confident intervals; RR: RR intervals; SDNN: Standard Deviation of RR intervals; pNN50: percentage of RR intervals with more than 50 ms variation; RMSSD: square root of mean squared differences of successive RR intervals; TP: Total Power; LF: Low Frequency; HF: High Frequency; LF/HF: Low Frequency/High Frequency ratio.

Dyslipdaemia and high blood pressure are linked with a decreased HRV in T2DM. Finally, age and the male gender were associated with both a decrease in sympathetic and parasympathetic activity.

An alteration of both sympathetic and parasympathetic activity

Adaptation to stress is characterized by an increase in sympathetic activity and a decrease in parasympathetic activity, inducing a state of alertness [17]. Interestingly, common diseases such as rheumatoid arthritis [67], depression [68], schizophrenia [69], multiple sclerosis [70], active ulcerative colitis [71], obesity and metabolic syndrome [72,73], myocardial infarctions [74], high blood pressure [75], smoking [76], and cancer [77], are associated with a decrease in parasympathetic activity and an activation of sympathetic activity. However, we demonstrated that T2DM patients had a decrease in both parasympathetic and sympathetic activity. An explanation could be that T2DM is a metabolic disease responsible for a cardiac autonomic neuropathy that affects both sympathetic and parasympathetic fibers. With the exception of the LF/HF ratio, which did not differ in our meta–analysis due to comparable changes in the LF and HF components, T2DM has a negative influence on almost all HRV parameters, reflecting the fact that diabetes leads to a cardiac autonomic dysfunction.

Deleterious effects of altered glucose metabolism

The significant relationship between altered glucose metabolism and HRV may explain the deleterious general metabolic effects on both parasympathetic and sympathetic activity. Interestingly, blood glucose levels were associated with both an increase in LF (sympathetic) and HF (parasympathetic), as well as SDNN (sympathetic) and RMSSD (parasympathetic), which may appear contradictory. In healthy individuals, parasympathetic activity is triggered by an increase in blood glucose levels through insulin responses [78]. Unfortunately, insulin levels were not reported in most studies included in our meta-analysis, which precluded further analysis. Another explanation of this relation that could appear contradictory is that blood glucose levels are not a good marker to evaluate diabetes control compared with HbA1c: blood glucose levels reflect an instantaneous level whereas HbA1c reflect diabetes control over the previous months. In almost all included studies, patients had blood sampling during hospitalisation, after a steady state and in a controlled environment for diet with a close monitoring of capillary blood glucose, which may explain our contradictory results. Another convincing point is that the relationships between HbA1c and HRV is logic. We demonstrated that higher levels of HbA1c were associated with shorter RR intervals, which were associated with an increased risk of ventricular arrhythmias [79]. There was also a tendency for higher LF/HF ratio (i.e. decreased HRV) with higher levels of HbA1c. Furthermore, time from diagnosis of T2DM was linked with a higher level of SDNN. Despite we demonstrated a decreased SDNN in T2DM patients, the metaregression is not contradictory but may simply highlights the fact that cardiac parasympathetic activity in T2DM is affected before sympathetic activity [80]. Time from diagnosis of T2DM was also linked with a lower level of total power, but not with LF and HF. Thus we can hypothesize that very low frequencies (VLF) could be decreased in T2DM. No studies included in our meta-analysis reported VLF. Although less commonly used, VLF are recognised as the most powerful independent predictors of mortality in patients with heart failure or in patients with chronic haemodialysis [81]. Despite few studies assessing VLF in diabetes, interesting relationships were reported between VLF and sleep apnea in diabetics [82]. The potential significance of VLF in diabetes should be studied further.

Other variables linked with HRV in T2DM

Similarly, total cholesterol was associated with both an increase in LF and HF, and HDL was associated with an increase in SDNN and RMSSD. To our knowledge, there is no data on hypercholesterolemia and HRV in the literature. Interestingly, some studies showed that a decrease in LDL by statin therapy could improve HRV parameters [83,84]. We demonstrated that an increase in systolic blood pressure was linked with shorter RR intervals and a decrease in HF. Despite no study previously assessing this relationship in diabetes, conflicting results were reported in the general population, with either high blood pressure associated with an increase in all spectral parameters [85], or a decrease in HRV [86]. It has also been suggested that the decrease in autonomic nervous function precedes the development of clinical hypertension [87]. Moreover, we found a significant relationship between BMI and HRV. Such relationships have been either found [88,89] or not [90,91] in the literature. However, the severity of obesity-related diseases is not directly linked to the accumulation of total body fat but rather to its distribution, and particularly to visceral localization [92]. HRV parameters have been previously correlated with sagittal abdominal diameter, anterior forearm skinfold thickness [93] and waist-hip ratio [90]. HRV parameters can also be improved after weight loss [94]. Finally, in line with the literature, we demonstrated a decrease in both LF and HF with age [95] and the male gender [96]. However, age and gender have a minor role on HRV parameters compared with the variables linked to T2DM.

Limitations

All meta-analyses have limitations [97]. Meta-analyses inherit the limitations of the individual studies of which they are composed and are subjected to a bias of selection of included studies. However, the use of broader keywords in the search strategy limits the number of missing studies. Despite our rigorous criteria for including studies in our meta-analysis, their quality varied. Indeed, most of the studies included were cross-sectional, with different measurement conditions for HRV parameters associated with a high inter and intra-individual variability. We demonstrated that all parameters measuring HRV were significantly decreased in T2DM compared with controls. Though there were similarities between the participants' inclusion criteria, they were not identical. Moreover, the health status of controls was not detailed in all studies, which could have influenced HRV parameters. This may have also minimized the differences in HRV between T2DM patients and controls. In addition, some studies were monocentric, limiting the generalizability of our results. However, included studies were homogeneous according to funnel plots, and the populations investigated in the meta-analysis appeared to be equally distributed around the world. Similarly, the final number of patients included in the metaanalysis was not very high and may precluded generalizability, however the mean age could be considered as quite representative. Despite missing data, our metaregressions demonstrated significant and interesting relationships, particularly between HRV parameters and variables linked with T2DM. Variables retrieved from declarative data in each study included are also a putative bias.

Conclusion

We reported strong evidence for an overall decrease in HRV in T2DM patients. Both sympathetic and parasympathetic activity were decreased, which can be explained by the deleterious effects of altered glucose metabolism on HRV. The benefits of an HRV evaluation in assessing and monitoring the severity of T2DM should be further studied, given its potential as a noninvasive, reliable and pain-free measurement.

Supporting information

S1 Fig. Quality score of included articles. (TIF)

S1 Appendix. Example of search strategy on PubMed database. (PDF)

S2 Appendix. PRISMA checklist. (DOCX)

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Daniela Pfabigan, Salwan Maqdasy, Frédéric Dutheil.

Data curation: Frédéric Dutheil.

Formal analysis: Bruno Pereira, Frédéric Dutheil.

Investigation: Thomas Benichou, Frédéric Dutheil.

Methodology: Frédéric Dutheil.

Project administration: Frédéric Dutheil.

Resources: Thomas Benichou, Frédéric Dutheil.

Software: Thomas Benichou, Bruno Pereira, Frédéric Dutheil.

Supervision: Frédéric Dutheil.

Validation: Martial Mermillod, Igor Tauveron, Daniela Pfabigan, Salwan Maqdasy, Frédéric Dutheil.

Visualization: Martial Mermillod, Igor Tauveron, Daniela Pfabigan, Salwan Maqdasy, Frédéric Dutheil.

Writing - original draft: Thomas Benichou, Frédéric Dutheil.

Writing – review & editing: Martial Mermillod, Igor Tauveron, Daniela Pfabigan, Salwan Maqdasy.

References

- da Rocha Fernandes J, Ogurtsova K, Linnenkamp U, Guariguata L, Seuring T, Zhang P, et al. IDF Diabetes Atlas estimates of 2014 global health expenditures on diabetes. Diabetes Res Clin Pract. 2016; 117: 48–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2016.04.016 PMID: 27329022
- Meigs JB. Epidemiology of type 2 diabetes and cardiovascular disease: translation from population to prevention: the Kelly West award lecture 2009. Diabetes Care. 2010; 33: 1865–1871. https://doi.org/10. 2337/dc10-0641 PMID: 20668155
- Jaacks LM, Siegel KR, Gujral UP, Narayan KMV. Type 2 diabetes: A 21st century epidemic. Best Pract Res Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2016; 30: 331–343. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beem.2016.05.003</u> PMID: 27432069
- Ginter E, Simko V. Global prevalence and future of diabetes mellitus. Adv Exp Med Biol. 2012; 771: 35– 41. PMID: 23393669
- 5. Ginter E, Simko V. Type 2 diabetes mellitus, pandemic in 21st century. Adv Exp Med Biol. 2012; 771: 42–50. PMID: 23393670
- Colberg SR, Sigal RJ, Fernhall B, Regensteiner JG, Blissmer BJ, Rubin RR, et al. Exercise and Type 2 Diabetes: The American College of Sports Medicine and the American Diabetes Association: joint position statement. Diabetes Care. 2010; 33: e147–e167. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc10-9990 PMID: 21115758

- Fox CS. Cardiovascular Disease Risk Factors, Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, and the Framingham Heart Study. Trends Cardiovasc Med. 2010; 20: 90–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcm.2010.08.001 PMID: 21130952
- Laakso M. Cardiovascular Disease in Type 2 Diabetes From Population to Man to Mechanisms: The Kelly West Award Lecture 2008. Diabetes Care. 2010; 33: 442–449. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc09-0749 PMID: 20103560
- Tancredi M, Rosengren A, Svensson A-M, Kosiborod M, Pivodic A, Gudbjörnsdottir S, et al. Excess Mortality among Persons with Type 2 Diabetes. N Engl J Med. 2015; 373: 1720–1732. <u>https://doi.org/ 10.1056/NEJMoa1504347</u> PMID: 26510021
- Shah AD, Langenberg C, Rapsomaniki E, Denaxas S, Pujades-Rodriguez M, Gale CP, et al. Type 2 diabetes and incidence of cardiovascular diseases: a cohort study in 1.9 million people. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 2015; 3: 105–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(14)70219-0 PMID: 25466521
- Ponto KA, Koenig J, Peto T, Lamparter J, Raum P, Wild PS, et al. Prevalence of diabetic retinopathy in screening-detected diabetes mellitus: results from the Gutenberg Health Study (GHS). Diabetologia. 2016; 59: 1913–1919. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00125-016-4013-5 PMID: 27314413
- Ksvh Kumar, Modi K, Basile A, Kota S. Profile of microvascular disease in type 2 diabetes in a tertiary health care hospital in India. Ann Med Health Sci Res. 2012; 2: 103. https://doi.org/10.4103/2141-9248. 105654 PMID: 23439986
- Hazari A, Maiya AG, Shivashankara KN, Agouris I, Monteiro A, Jadhav R, et al. Kinetics and kinematics of diabetic foot in type 2 diabetes mellitus with and without peripheral neuropathy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. SpringerPlus. 2016; 5: 1819. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-016-3405-9 PMID: 27812455
- Singh JP, Larson MG, O'Donnell CJ, Wilson PF, Tsuji H, Lloyd-Jones DM, et al. Association of hyperglycemia with reduced heart rate variability (The Framingham Heart Study). Am J Cardiol. 2000; 86: 309–312. PMID: 10922439
- Ziegler D, Zentai CP, Perz S, Rathmann W, Haastert B, Döring A, et al. Prediction of mortality using measures of cardiac autonomic dysfunction in the diabetic and nondiabetic population: the MONICA/ KORA Augsburg Cohort Study. Diabetes Care. 2008; 31: 556–561. <u>https://doi.org/10.2337/dc07-1615</u> PMID: 18086873
- Ewing DJ, Martyn CN, Young RJ, Clarke BF. The value of cardiovascular autonomic function tests: 10 years experience in diabetes. Diabetes Care. 1985; 8: 491–498. PMID: 4053936
- 17. Hufnagel C, Chambres P, Bertrand PR, Dutheil F. The Need for Objective Measures of Stress in Autism. Front Psychol. 2017; 8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00064 PMID: 28191002
- Boudet G, Walther G, Courteix D, Obert P, Lesourd B, Pereira B, et al. Paradoxical dissociation between heart rate and heart rate variability following different modalities of exercise in individuals with metabolic syndrome: The RESOLVE study. Eur J Prev Cardiol. 2017; 24: 281–296. https://doi.org/10. 1177/2047487316679523 PMID: 27856807
- Dutheil F, Chambres P, Hufnagel C, Auxiette C, Chausse P, Ghozi R, et al. "Do Well B.": Design Of WELL Being monitoring systems. A study protocol for the application in autism. BMJ Open. 2015; 5: e007716–e007716. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-007716 PMID: 25710916
- Solanki JD, Basida SD, Mehta HB, Panjwani SJ, Gadhavi BP. Comparative study of cardiac autonomic status by heart rate variability between under-treatment normotensive and hypertensive known type 2 diabetics. Indian Heart J. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ihj.2016.07.013 PMID: 28228307
- Lotric MB, Stefanovska A, Stajer D, Urbancic-Rovan V. Spectral components of heart rate variability determined by wavelet analysis. Physiol Meas. 2000; 21: 441–457. PMID: 11110243
- Roy B, Ghatak S. Nonlinear methods to assess changes in heart rate variability in type 2 diabetic patients. Arg Bras Cardiol. 2013; 101: 317–327. <u>https://doi.org/10.5935/abc.20130181</u> PMID: 24008652
- 23. Gerritsen J, Dekker JM, TenVoorde BJ, Kostense PJ, Heine RJ, Bouter LM, et al. Impaired autonomic function is associated with increased mortality, especially in subjects with diabetes, hypertension, or a history of cardiovascular disease the Hoorn study. Diabetes Care. 2001; 24: 1793–1798. PMID: 11574444
- 24. Zhang J. Effect of Age and Sex on Heart Rate Variability in Healthy Subjects. J Manipulative Physiol Ther. 2007; 30: 374–379. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmpt.2007.04.001 PMID: 17574955
- Saleem S, Hussain MM, Majeed SMI, Khan MA. Gender differences of heart rate variability in healthy volunteers. JPMA J Pak Med Assoc. 2012; 62: 422–425. PMID: 22755301
- Rothberg LJ, Lees T, Clifton-Bligh R, Lal S. Association Between Heart Rate Variability Measures and Blood Glucose Levels: Implications for Noninvasive Glucose Monitoring for Diabetes. Diabetes Technol Ther. 2016; 18: 366–376. https://doi.org/10.1089/dia.2016.0010 PMID: 27258123

- Kilit C, Demir S, Pasali Kilit T, Melek M. The effects of metformin and rosiglitazone on heart rate variability in type 2 diabetes mellitus. Int Soc Electrocardiol Annu Meet—Istanb 200734th Int Congr Electrocardiol. 2007;40: S40–S41.
- Kumarathurai P, Anholm C, Larsen BS, Olsen RH, Madsbad S, Kristiansen O, et al. Effects of Liraglutide on Heart Rate and Heart Rate Variability: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Crossover Study. Diabetes Care. 2016; dc161580. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc16-1580 PMID: 27797930
- Heart rate variability: standards of measurement, physiological interpretation and clinical use. Task Force of the European Society of Cardiology and the North American Society of Pacing and Electrophysiology. Circulation. 1996; 93: 1043–1065. PMID: 8598068
- da Costa BR, Cevallos M, Altman DG, Rutjes AWS, Egger M. Uses and misuses of the STROBE statement: bibliographic study. BMJ Open. 2011; 1: e000048. <u>https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2010-000048 PMID: 22021739</u>
- Elm E v., Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP, et al. Strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. BMJ. 2007; 335: 806–808. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39335.541782.AD PMID: 17947786
- Moher D, Hopewell S, Schulz KF, Montori V, Gotzsche PC, Devereaux PJ, et al. CONSORT 2010 Explanation and Elaboration: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. BMJ. 2010; 340: c869–c869. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.c869 PMID: 20332511
- Otzenberger H, Gronfier C, Simon C, Charloux A, Ehrhart J, Piquard F, et al. Dynamic heart rate variability: a tool for exploring sympathovagal balance continuously during sleep in men. Am J Physiol. 1998; 275: H946–950. PMID: 9724299
- Benoist d'Azy C, Pereira B, Naughton G, Chiambaretta F, Dutheil F. Antibioprophylaxis in Prevention of Endophthalmitis in Intravitreal Injection: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. PloS One. 2016; 11: e0156431. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0156431 PMID: 27257676
- **35.** Benoist d'Azy C, Pereira B, Chiambaretta F, Dutheil F. Oxidative and Anti-Oxidative Stress Markers in Chronic Glaucoma: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. PloS One. 2016; 11: e0166915. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0166915</u> PMID: 27907028
- Courtin R, Pereira B, Naughton G, Chamoux A, Chiambaretta F, Lanhers C, et al. Prevalence of dry eye disease in visual display terminal workers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ Open. 2016; 6: e009675. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-009675 PMID: 26769784
- Ollier M, Chamoux A, Naughton G, Pereira B, Dutheil F. Chest CT scan screening for lung cancer in asbestos occupational exposure: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Chest. 2014; 145: 1339– 1346. https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.13-2181 PMID: 24480869
- Lanhers C, Pereira B, Naughton G, Trousselard M, Lesage F-X, Dutheil F. Creatine Supplementation and Upper Limb Strength Performance: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Sports Med. 2017; 47: 163–173. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-016-0571-4 PMID: 27328852
- Lanhers C, Pereira B, Naughton G, Trousselard M, Lesage F-X, Dutheil F. Creatine Supplementation and Lower Limb Strength Performance: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses. Sports Med. 2015; 45: 1285–1294. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-015-0337-4 PMID: 25946994
- DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Control Clin Trials. 1986; 7: 177–188. PMID: 3802833
- Citrome L, Magnusson K. Paging Dr Cohen, Paging Dr Cohen... An effect size interpretation is required STAT!: visualising effect size and an interview with Kristoffer Magnusson. Int J Clin Pract. 2014; 68: 533–534. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcp.12435 PMID: 24750523
- **42.** Porojan M, Costin S, Poantă L, Cerghizan A, Pop D, Dumitraşcu DL. Autonomic neuropathy and plasma catecholamine in patients with diabetes mellitus. Romanian J Intern Med Rev Roum Médecine Interne. 2010; 48: 341–345.
- Hathaway DK, Cashion AK, Wicks MN, Milstead EJ, Gaber AO. Cardiovascular dysautonomia of patients with end-stage renal disease and type I or type II diabetes. Nurs Res. 1998; 47: 171–179. PMID: 9610651
- 44. Kondo K, Matsubara T, Nakamura J, Hotta N. Characteristic patterns of circadian variation in plasma catecholamine levels, blood pressure and heart rate variability in Type 2 diabetic patients. Diabet Med J Br Diabet Assoc. 2002; 19: 359–365.
- 45. Perciaccante A, Fiorentini A, Paris A, Serra P, Tubani L. Circadian rhythm of the autonomic nervous system in insulin resistant subjects with normoglycemia, impaired fasting glycemia, impaired glucose tolerance, type 2 diabetes mellitus. BMC Cardiovasc Disord. 2006; 6: 19. <u>https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2261-6-19 PMID: 16670002</u>

- 46. Giordano M, Manzella D, Paolisso G, Caliendo A, Varricchio M, Giordano C. Differences in heart rate variability parameters during the post-dialytic period in type II diabetic and non-diabetic ESRD patients. Nephrol Dial Transplant Off Publ Eur Dial Transpl Assoc—Eur Ren Assoc. 2001; 16: 566–573.
- Rasic-Milutinovic ZR, Milicevic DR, Milovanovic BD, Perunicic-Pekovic GB, Pencic BD. Do components of metabolic syndrome contribute to cardiac autonomic neuropathy in non-diabetic patients? Saudi Med J. 2010; 31: 650–657. PMID: 20563363
- **48.** Burger AJ, Aronson D. Effect of diabetes mellitus on heart rate variability in patients with congestive heart failure. Pacing Clin Electrophysiol PACE. 2001; 24: 53–59. PMID: <u>11227970</u>
- 49. Yasuda G, Hasegawa K, Kuji T, Ogawa N, Shimura G, Umemura S, et al. Effects of doxazosin on ambulatory blood pressure and sympathetic nervous activity in hypertensive Type 2 diabetic patients with overt nephropathy. Diabet Med J Br Diabet Assoc. 2005; 22: 1394–1400. https://doi.org/10.1111/j. 1464-5491.2005.01636.x PMID: 16176202
- Wang G. Effects of impaired glucose metabolism on heart rate variability and blood pessure variability in essential hpertensive patients. J Huazhong Univ Sci Technol. 2006; 26: 654–656.
- Poanta L, Porojan M, Dumitrascu DL. Heart rate variability and diastolic dysfunction in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. Acta Diabetol. 2011; 48: 191–196. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00592-011-0256-2</u> PMID: 21298295
- 52. Mylonopoulou M, Tentolouris N, Antonopoulos S, Mikros S, Katsaros K, Melidonis A, et al. Heart rate variability in advanced chronic kidney disease with or without diabetes: midterm effects of the initiation of chronic haemodialysis therapy. Nephrol Dial Transplant Off Publ Eur Dial Transpl Assoc—Eur Ren Assoc. 2010; 25: 3749–3754. https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfq226 PMID: 20466659
- 53. Comunello A, Dassie F, Martini C, De Carlo E, Mioni R, Battocchio M, et al. Heart rate variability is reduced in acromegaly patients and improved by treatment with somatostatin analogues. Pituitary. 2015; 18: 525–534. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11102-014-0605-6 PMID: 25261332
- Istenes I, Körei AE, Putz Z, Németh N, Martos T, Keresztes K, et al. Heart rate variability is severely impaired among type 2 diabetic patients with hypertension. Diabetes Metab Res Rev. 2014; 30: 305– 312. PMID: 24829967
- 55. Nagy K, Sipos E, El Hadj Othmane T. [Heart rate variability is significantly reduced in non-diabetic patients with hypertension]. Orv Hetil. 2014; 155: 865–870. <u>https://doi.org/10.1556/OH.2014.29886</u> PMID: 24860051
- 56. Eguchi K, Schwartz JE, Pickering TG, Hoshide S, Ishikawa J, Shimada K, et al. Increased heart rate variability during sleep is a predictor for future cardiovascular events in patients with type 2 diabetes. Hypertens Res Off J Jpn Soc Hypertens. 2010; 33: 737–742. https://doi.org/10.1038/hr.2010.61 PMID: 20431592
- 57. Vora R, Zareba W, Utell MJ, Pietropaoli AP, Chalupa D, Little EL, et al. Inhalation of ultrafine carbon particles alters heart rate and heart rate variability in people with type 2 diabetes. Part Fibre Toxicol. 2014; 11: 31. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12989-014-0031-y PMID: 25028096
- Boer-Martins L, Figueiredo VN, Demacq C, Martins LC, de Faria APC, Moraes Cde H, et al. Leptin and aldosterone in sympathetic activity in resistant hypertension with or without type 2 diabetes. Arq Bras Cardiol. 2012; 99: 642–648. PMID: 22641394
- Soydan N, Bretzel RG, Fischer B, Wagenlehner F, Pilatz A, Linn T. Reduced capacity of heart rate regulation in response to mild hypoglycemia induced by glibenclamide and physical exercise in type 2 diabetes. Metabolism. 2013; 62: 717–724. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.metabol.2012.12.003 PMID: 23318051
- Molon G, Costa A, Bertolini L, Zenari L, Arcaro G, Barbieri E, et al. Relationship between abnormal microvolt T-wave alternans and poor glycemic control in type 2 diabetic patients. Pacing Clin Electrophysiol PACE. 2007; 30: 1267–1272. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-8159.2007.00849.x PMID: 17897130
- Akyel A, Çengel A, Tavil Y, Şahinarslan A, Topal S, Yayla Ç, et al. Relationship between plasma asymmetric dimethylarginine level and autonomic dysfunction in diabetic patients. Türk Kardiyol Derneği Arş Türk Kardiyol Derneğinin Yayın Organıdır. 2012; 40: 148–154.
- Boer-Martins L, Figueiredo VN, Demacq C, Martins LC, Consolin-Colombo F, Figueiredo MJ, et al. Relationship of autonomic imbalance and circadian disruption with obesity and type 2 diabetes in resistant hypertensive patients. Cardiovasc Diabetol. 2011; 10: 24. https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2840-10-24 PMID: 21426540
- Ozturk NA, Gokturk HS, Demir M, Erdogan D, Unler GK, Gur G, et al. The effect of autonomous neuropathy on bowel preparation in type 2 diabetes mellitus. Int J Colorectal Dis. 2009; 24: 1407–1412. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00384-009-0757-4 PMID: 19582466
- Li X, Yu S, Chen H, Lu C, Zhang K, Li F. Cardiovascular autonomic function analysis using approximate entropy from 24-h heart rate variability and its frequency components in patients with type 2 diabetes. J Diabetes Investig. 2015; 6: 227–235. https://doi.org/10.1111/jdi.12270 PMID: 25802731

- Vukomanovic V, Tadic M, Suzic-Lazic J, Kocijancic V, Celic V. The relationship between heart rate variability and left ventricular layer-specific deformation in uncomplicated diabetic patients. Int J Cardiovasc Imaging. 2017; 33: 481–490. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10554-016-1023-9 PMID: 27853970
- 66. Tadic M, Vukomanovic V, Cuspidi C, Suzic-Lazic J, Stanisavljevic D, Celic V. Left atrial phasic function and heart rate variability in asymptomatic diabetic patients. Acta Diabetol. 2017; 54: 301–308. <u>https:// doi.org/10.1007/s00592-016-0962-x PMID: 28083658</u>
- Adlan AM, Paton JFR, Lip GYH, Kitas GD, Fisher JP. Increased sympathetic nerve activity and reduced cardiac baroreflex sensitivity in rheumatoid arthritis. J Physiol. 2017; 595: 967–981. <u>https://doi.org/10. 1113/JP272944</u> PMID: 27561790
- Chen X, Yang R, Kuang D, Zhang L, Lv R, Huang X, et al. Heart rate variability in patients with major depression disorder during a clinical autonomic test. Psychiatry Res. 2017; 256: 207–211. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2017.06.041</u> PMID: 28646783
- Montaquila JM, Trachik BJ, Bedwell JS. Heart rate variability and vagal tone in schizophrenia: A review. J Psychiatr Res. 2015; 69: 57–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2015.07.025 PMID: 26343595
- 70. Studer V, Rocchi C, Motta C, Lauretti B, Perugini J, Brambilla L, et al. Heart rate variability is differentially altered in multiple sclerosis: implications for acute, worsening and progressive disability. Mult Scler J—Exp Transl Clin. 2017; 3: 2055217317701317. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/2055217317701317</u> PMID: 28607756
- Furlan R, Ardizzone S, Palazzolo L, Rimoldi A, Perego F, Barbic F, et al. Sympathetic overactivity in active ulcerative colitis: effects of clonidine. Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol. 2006; 290: R224– 232. https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpregu.00442.2005 PMID: 16123227
- 72. Thorp AA, Schlaich MP. Relevance of Sympathetic Nervous System Activation in Obesity and Metabolic Syndrome. J Diabetes Res. 2015; 2015: 341583. <u>https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/341583 PMID: 26064978</u>
- Liao D, Sloan RP, Cascio WE, Folsom AR, Liese AD, Evans GW, et al. Multiple metabolic syndrome is associated with lower heart rate variability. The Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities Study. Diabetes Care. 1998; 21: 2116–2122. PMID: 9839103
- Malliani A, Montano N. Sympathetic overactivity in ischaemic heart disease. Clin Sci Lond Engl 1979. 2004; 106: 567–568. https://doi.org/10.1042/CS20040068 PMID: 15030311
- Julius S, Nesbitt S. Sympathetic overactivity in hypertension. A moving target. Am J Hypertens. 1996; 9: 113S–120S. PMID: 8931844
- Niedermaier ON, Smith ML, Beightol LA, Zukowska-Grojec Z, Goldstein DS, Eckberg DL. Influence of cigarette smoking on human autonomic function. Circulation. 1993; 88: 562–571. PMID: 8339419
- 77. Fagundes CP, Murray DM, Hwang BS, Gouin J-P, Thayer JF, Sollers JJ, et al. Sympathetic and parasympathetic activity in cancer-related fatigue: More evidence for a physiological substrate in cancer survivors. Psychoneuroendocrinology. 2011; 36: 1137–1147. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2011.02</u>. 005 PMID: 21388744
- Stockhorst U, Huenig A, Ziegler D, Scherbaum WA. Unconditioned and conditioned effects of intravenous insulin and glucose on heart rate variability in healthy men. Physiol Behav. 2011; 103: 31–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2011.01.014 PMID: 21256144
- 79. Chen-Scarabelli C, Scarabelli TM. Suboptimal glycemic control, independently of QT interval duration, is associated with increased risk of ventricular arrhythmias in a high-risk population. Pacing Clin Electro-physiol PACE. 2006; 29: 9–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-8159.2006.00298.x PMID: 16441711
- Goit RK, Khadka R, Sharma SK, Limbu N, Paudel BH. Cardiovascular autonomic function and vibration perception threshold in type 2 diabetes mellitus. J Diabetes Complications. 2012; 26: 339–342. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.jdiacomp.2012.03.026 PMID: 22534513
- Huang J-C, Kuo I-C, Tsai Y-C, Lee J-J, Lim L-M, Chen S-C, et al. Heart Rate Variability Predicts Major Adverse Cardiovascular Events and Hospitalization in Maintenance Hemodialysis Patients. Kidney Blood Press Res. 2017; 42: 76–88. https://doi.org/10.1159/000469716 PMID: 28315879
- Amra B, Behjati M, Penzel T, Fietze I, Schoebel C, Sarrafzadegan N. Nocturnal heart rate variation in diabetic and non-diabetic patients with sleep apnea syndrome. Sleep Med. 2017; 29: 57–60. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sleep.2016.11.003</u> PMID: 28153217
- Pehlivanidis AN, Athyros VG, Demitriadis DS, Papageorgiou AA, Bouloukos VJ, Kontopoulos AG. Heart rate variability after long-term treatment with atorvastatin in hypercholesterolaemic patients with or without coronary artery disease. Atherosclerosis. 2001; 157: 463–469. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/ S0021-9150(00)00746-2 PMID: 11472748</u>
- Badea AR, Nedelcu L, Valeanu M, Zdrenghea D. The relationship between serum lipid fractions and heart rate variability in diabetic patients with statin therapy. Clujul Med. 2014; 87: 152. https://doi.org/10. 15386/cjmed-313 PMID: 26528015

- Askin L, Cetin M, Turkmen S. Ambulatory blood pressure results and heart rate variability in patients with premature ventricular contractions. Clin Exp Hypertens. 2017; 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1080/ 10641963.2017.1356846 PMID: 28872359
- de Andrade PE, do Amaral JAT, Paiva L da S, Adami F, Raimudo JZ, Valenti VE, et al. Reduction of heart rate variability in hypertensive elderly. Blood Press. 2017; 1–9. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/08037051</u>. 2017.1354285 PMID: 28738697
- Schroeder EB, Liao D, Chambless LE, Prineas RJ, Evans GW, Heiss G. Hypertension, blood pressure, and heart rate variability: the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) study. Hypertens Dallas Tex 1979. 2003; 42: 1106–1111. https://doi.org/10.1161/01.HYP.0000100444.71069.73 PMID: 14581296
- Al-Trad BA, Faris M a. IE, Al-Smadi M, Bashir A, Mansi M, Alaraj M, et al. Cardiac autonomic dysfunction in young obese males is not associated with disturbances in pituitary-thyroid axis hormones. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci. 2015; 19: 1689–1695. PMID: 26004610
- 89. Mustafa G, Kursat FM, Ahmet T, Alparslan GF, Omer G, Sertoglu E, et al. The relationship between erythrocyte membrane fatty acid levels and cardiac autonomic function in obese children. Rev Port Cardiol Orgao Of Soc Port Cardiol Port J Cardiol Off J Port Soc Cardiol. 2017; 36: 499–508. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.repc.2016.10.013 PMID: 28687367
- 90. Yadav RL, Yadav PK, Yadav LK, Agrawal K, Sah SK, Islam MN. Association between obesity and heart rate variability indices: an intuition toward cardiac autonomic alteration—a risk of CVD. Diabetes Metab Syndr Obes Targets Ther. 2017; Volume 10: 57–64. https://doi.org/10.2147/DMSO.S123935 PMID: 28255249
- Yoo HJ, Hwang SY, Choi KM, Baik SH, Lee EM, Kim EJ, et al. Clinical implication of body size phenotype on heart rate variability. Metabolism. 2016; 65: 1589–1596. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.metabol.2016</u>. 08.002 PMID: 27733246
- Dutheil F, Gordon BA, Naughton G, Crendal E, Courteix D, Chaplais E, et al. Cardiovascular risk of adipokines: a review. J Int Med Res. 2017; 300060517706578. https://doi.org/10.1177/0300060517706578 PMID: 28974138
- Rastović M, Srdić-Galić B, Barak O, Stokić E. Association between anthropometric measures of regional fat mass and heart rate variability in obese women: Anthropometry and heart rate variability in obese women. Nutr Diet. 2017; 74: 51–60. https://doi.org/10.1111/1747-0080.12280 PMID: 28731559
- Karason K, Mølgaard H, Wikstrand J, Sjöström L. Heart rate variability in obesity and the effect of weight loss. Am J Cardiol. 1999; 83: 1242–1247. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9149(99)00066-1 PMID: 10215292
- Reardon M, Malik M. Changes in heart rate variability with age. Pacing Clin Electrophysiol PACE. 1996; 19: 1863–1866. PMID: 8945057
- 96. Pavithran P, Madanmohan T, Nandeesha H. Sex differences in short-term heart rate variability in patients with newly diagnosed essential hypertension. J Clin Hypertens Greenwich Conn. 2008; 10: 904–910. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-7176.2008.00052.x PMID: 19120716
- LeLorier J, Grégoire G, Benhaddad A, Lapierre J, Derderian F. Discrepancies between meta-analyses and subsequent large randomized, controlled trials. N Engl J Med. 1997; 337: 536–542. <u>https://doi.org/ 10.1056/NEJM199708213370806</u> PMID: 9262498