

Review Article

A Meta-Analysis of a Cohort Study on the Association between Sleep Duration and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus

Huapeng Lu^(b),¹ Qinling Yang^(b),¹ Fang Tian^(b),² Yi Lyu^(b),¹ Hairong He^(b),³ Xia Xin^(b),⁴ and Xuemei Zheng^(b)

¹Department of Hepatobiliary and Pancreas Surgery, The First Affiliated Hospital, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, Shaanxi 710061, China

²School of Nursing, Yan'an University, Yan'an, Shaanxi 710061, China

³Department of Clinical Research Center, The First Affiliated Hospital, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, Shaanxi, China ⁴Department of Nursing, The First Affiliated Hospital, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, Shaanxi 710061, China

Correspondence should be addressed to Qinling Yang; 13519133867@163.com and Xuemei Zheng; xazhxm@xjtu.edu.cn

Received 25 September 2020; Revised 26 February 2021; Accepted 4 March 2021; Published 24 March 2021

Academic Editor: Takayuki Masaki

Copyright © 2021 Huapeng Lu et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Objective. To study the association between sleep duration and the incidence of type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) and to provide a theoretical basis for the prevention of T2DM through a meta-analysis. *Methods.* PubMed, Web of Science, Scopus, Embase, Cochrane Library, ProQuest, CNKI, Wanfang, VIP, and SINOMED were searched from their inception until May 2020. All cohort studies on the relationship between sleep duration and T2DM in adults were included. According to the inclusion and exclusion criteria, two authors independently assessed the literature and extracted the data. Metaregression and publication bias were evaluated, and sensitivity and meta-analyses were conducted with RevMan 5.3. *Results.* A total of 17 studies were collected, involving 737002 adults. The incidence of T2DM was 4.73% in short sleep duration (SSD) ($t \le 6$ h), 4.39% in normal sleep duration (NSD) (6 h < t < 9 h), and 4.99% in long sleep duration (LSD) ($t \ge 9$ h). The meta-analysis demonstrated that SSD increased the risk of T2DM compared with NSD (RR = 1.22, 95% CI: 1.15-1.29, P < 0.001), LSD increased the risk of T2DM compared with NSD (RR = 1.22, 95% CI: 1.15-1.29, P < 0.001), LSD increased the risk of T2DM and LSD (RR = 0.97, 95% CI: 0.89-1.05, P = 0.41). The sensitivity of each study was robust and the publication bias was weak. *Conclusion*. SSD or LSD can increase the risk of T2DM.

1. Introduction

Diabetes mellitus (DM) is an epidemic disease in recent years. According to the International Diabetes Federation Diabetes Atlas Ninth Edition published in 2019, it is estimated that 463 million adults (aged between 20 and 79 years) have DM worldwide, and the prevalence has reached 9.3%. This number is expected to reach 578 million (10.2%) by 2030 and 700 million (10.9%) by 2045 [1]. With the aging of the population and the change of lifestyle in China, DM has become an epidemic. The prevalence of DM has soared from 0.67% in 1980 to 10.4% in 2013 [2]. China has 116.4 million people with DM nowadays. In 2019, 0.83 million patients died of DM and complications in China [1]. DM is one of the leading causes of retinopathy, vascular disease, neuropathy, amputation, heart disease, kidney failure, and premature death [3]. There are many risk factors for type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM), such as genetic factors and an unhealthy lifestyle. Studies have shown that sleep quality and sleep duration are also risk factors for T2DM [4–6]. However, relevant research conclusions are inconsistent. Some systematic reviews have indicated that short sleep or long sleep are risk factors for T2DM in adult [7–10] and risk factors for gestational diabetes mellitus in pregnant women [11–13]. However, studies for adults have not been updated in time. Therefore, we have conducted a meta-analysis of cohort studies to exhibit the relationship between sleep duration and T2DM in adults to provide the basis for primary prevention of T2DM.



Box 1: Search strategy in Web of Science.



FIGURE 1: Summary of the literature identification and selection process. * signifies Web of Science (442), PubMed (209), Scopus (490), Embase (117), Cochrane (71), ProQuest (34), CNKI (80), WanFang (61), VIP (10), and SinoMed (22).

2. Methods

2.1. Literature Search. We followed the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines in conducting this systematic review and metaanalysis [14]. We performed a serial literature search for English and non-English papers from inception to May 2020. We have systemically searched the Web of Science Core Collection (Science Citation Index Expanded: 1900-present; Social Sciences Citation Index: 1900-present; Arts & Humanities Citation Index: 1975-present; Conference Proceedings Citation Index-Science: 1996-present; Conference Proceedings Citation Index—Social Science & Humanities: 1996-present; and Emerging Sources Citation Index: 2015-present), PubMed, Scopus, Embase, the Cochrane Library, China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), Wanfang, VIP database, and SINOMED from inception to the present. We used the Boolean logic with search terms including "sleep duration," "sleep amount," "length of sleep," "diabetes," "diabetes mellitus," "cohort stud*," "concurrent stud*," and "cohort analy"." To search for all terms that begin with a word, enter the word followed by an asterisk. Box 1 provides the detailed search strategy for the Web of Science.

2.2. Study Eligibility and Selection Criteria. Two authors independently determined study eligibility. Any differences in opinion about eligibility were resolved through another author as a third-party consensus. The inclusion criteria were as follows: (1) cohort studies on the relationship between sleep duration and T2DM in adults, (2) reported sleep duration, (3) diagnosed T2DM, and (4) published English and non-English papers. Studies were not included if (1) they are cross-sectional studies, case-control studies, case reports, and review commentaries; (2) they do not report the incidence of T2DM; (3) they have participants < 10; (4) the subjects were special groups, such as pregnant women and patients after organ transplantation; (5) sleep duration was not reported clearly; (6) they were a duplicate report; and (7) they reported incomplete data and the relevant data were not available.

Study	Study design	Study location	Study period	Total	T2DM	Age	Gender (male/female)	Data acquisition
Asante et al. (2020) [18]	Prospective cohort study	Nord-Trøndelag, Norway	2006–2008	17058	362	20–55	NR	Questionnaires, laboratory measurements
Maskarinec et al. (2018) [19]	Prospective cohort study	Hawaii and California, USA	1993-1996	151691	8487	45-75	69097/82594	Self-reported
Kim et al. (2017) [20]	Cohort study	Seoul and Suwon, South Korea	2011	17983	664	41 ± 5.9	11995/5988	Questionnaires
Han et al. (2016) [21]	Cohort study	Hubei, China	2008-2013	16399	1123	62.5	7083/9316	Face-to-face interviews
Leng et al. (2016) [22]	Prospective cohort study	Britain	1998-2000	13465	285	40-74	5887/7578	Questionnaires
Song et al. (2016) [23]	Prospective cohort study	Hebei, China	2006.6-2015	56588	4899	49	43494/13094	Face-to-face interviews
Ding et al. (2015) [24]	Cohort study	New South Wales, Australia	2006-2010	54997	888	≥45	25038/29959	Self-reported
Lou et al. (2015) [25]	Prospective cohort study	Xuzhou, China	2008-2013	11842	367	≥18	5375/6467	Interviews, laboratory measurements
Gao et al. (2014) [26]	Prospective cohort study	Hebei, China	2006-2011	60715	3084	49.14 ± 11.96	47048/13667	Questionnaires
Heianza et al. (2014) [27]	Prospective cohort study	Niigata, Japan	1999.4-2004.3	38987	2085	18-83	NR	Questionnaires
Boyko et al. (2013) [28]	Cohort study	USA	2001-2007	47093	871	34.9 ± 9.0	35037/12056	Self-reported, questionnaires
Li et al. (2011) [29]	Cohort study	Jiangsu, China	2004-2007	3031	76	52.28 ± 12.31	1381/1647	Questionnaires
Xu et al. (2010) [30]	Prospective cohort study	USA	2000-2006	174542	10143	50-71	99060/75284	Questionnaires
Beihl et al. (2009) [31]	Cohort study	NSA	1992.10-1999.7	006	146	40-69	390/510	Interviews
Tuomilehto et al. (2009) [32]	Prospective cohort study	Finland	2004.10-2005.1	515	182	40-64	170/345	Interviews, laboratory measurements
Mallon et al. (2005) [33]	Cohort study	Sweden	1983-1995	1170	88	45-65	550/620	Questionnaire
Ayas et al. (2003) [34]	Cohort study	USA	1986-1996	70026	1969	30-55	0/70026	Interviews
NR: not reported.								

TABLE 1: Characteristics of included studies.

Journal of Diabetes Research

TABLE 2: Quali	y of included studies.
----------------	------------------------

<u>c</u> , 1		Seleo	ction		Compa	rability		Outcome	
Study	1	2	3	4	5A	5B	6	7	8
Asante et al. (2020) [18]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maskarinec et al. (2018) [19]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kim et al. (2017) [20]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Han et al. (2016) [21]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν
Leng et al. (2016) [22]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν
Song et al. (2016) [23]	Ν	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ding et al. (2015) [24]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lou et al. (2015) [25]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gao et al. (2014) [26]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν	Ν	Y	Y	Ν
Heianza et al. (2014) [27]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν
Boyko et al. (2013) [28]	Ν	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν
Li et al. (2011) [29]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Xu et al. (2010) [30]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν
Beihl et al. (2009) [31]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν
Tuomilehto et al. (2009) [32]	Ν	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν
Mallon et al. (2005) [33]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ayas et al. (2003) [34]	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Ν

Y: yes; N: no.

	SS	SD	N	SD		Risk Ratio		Ris	k Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	I Year	M-H, Rar	ndom, 95	% CI	
Ayas et al. 2003	698	20868	1153	45937	9.1%	1.33 [1.21, 1.46]	2003		+		
Mallon et al. 2005	12	82	72	1063	1.0%	2.16 [1.22, 3.81]	2005		<u> </u>	_	
Beihl et al. 2009	64	361	75	514	2.9%	1.21 [0.90, 1.65]	2009	+	-		
Tuomilehto et al. 2009	19	47	68	222	1.9%	1.32 [0.89, 1.97]	2009	+			
Xu et al. 2010	3817	56993	5965	111731	11.0%	1.25 [1.21, 1.30]	2010		*		
Li et al. 2011	27	752	41	2052	1.4%	1.80 [1.11, 2.90]	2011				
Boyko et al. 2013	461	38198	362	38357	7.3%	1.28 [1.12, 1.47]	2013		-		
Gao et al. 2014	786	14305	2242	45411	9.7%	1.11 [1.03, 1.20]	2014	-	T		
Heianza et al. 2014	534	8862	1457	28521	9.0%	1.18 [1.07, 1.30]	2014		-		
Ding et al. 2015	151	8908	697	46434	5.9%	1.13 [0.95, 1.34]	2015	†	-		
Lou et al. 2015	102	2188	181	7137	4.1%	1.84 [1.45, 2.33]	2015		-		
Song et al. 2016	265	2955	3156	37533	8.0%	1.07 [0.95, 1.20]	2016	†	-		
Han et al. 2016	82	1302	789	11492	4.6%	0.92 [0.74, 1.14]	2016		-		
Leng et al. 2016	83	2826	160	8893	3.7%	1.63 [1.26, 2.12]	2016		_		
Kim et al. 2017	154	3513	455	12665	5.8%	1.22 [1.02, 1.46]	2017	ŀ	-		
Maskarinec et al. 2018	3013	50922	4658	87698	10.9%	1.11 [1.07, 1.16]	2018		•		
Asante et al. 2020	112	6596	121	7480	3.8%	1.05 [0.81, 1.35]	2020	-	—		
Total (95% CI)		219678		493140	100.0%	1.22 [1.15, 1.29]			•		
Total events	10380		21652								
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.01; Cl	$hi^2 = 60.$	60, df =	16 (<i>P</i> < 0	.00001);	$I^2 = 74\%$			<u> </u>		-+
Test for overall effect:	Z = 6.41	(<i>P</i> < 0.0	00001)				0.1 0.2	0.5 1	2	5	10
							Favours	(NSD)	Favou	rs (SSD)

FIGURE 2: Pooled results for the association between SSD and T2DM.

2.3. Definition of Variables and Outcomes. DM was defined as fasting glucose over 126 mg/dl or 2-hour postprandial glucose (at a glucose tolerance test) over 200 mg/dl or if the subjects were on diabetic drugs or insulin medication. The number of hours of sleep was defined as the average length

of their sleep in whole hours at night. The usual sleep duration was self-reported. Taking sleep duration 6 hours < t < 9hours as a reference, it is categorized as short sleep duration (SSD) ($t \le 6$ hours), normal sleep duration (NSD) (6 hours < t < 9 hours), and long sleep duration (LSD) ($t \ge 9$ hours).

	SSI)	NS	D		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Random, 95% CI
1.2.1 male and female								
Poibl et al. 2000	61	261	75	514	2 20/	1 21 [0 00 1 65]	2000	<u> </u>
Tuomilahta at al 2009	10	47	75	214	2.0%	1.21 [0.90, 1.05] 1.32 [0.80, 1.07]	2009	<u> </u>
Yu at al. 2010	2017	4/ 56002	506E	111721	2.0%	1.52[0.05, 1.57] 1.25[1.21, 1.30]	2009	
Au et al. 2010 Portro et al. 2012	3017	20100	3903	20257	0.5%	1.25 [1.21, 1.50] 1.28 [1.12, 1.47]	2010	
Height at al 2013	534	20190	1457	28521	12.6%	1.20 [1.12, 1.47] 1.18 [1.07, 1.30]	2013	+
Ding et al. 2015	151	8002	607	16131	7 3%	1.13 [0.95, 1.34]	2014	
Long et al. 2015	83	2826	160	8803	1 2%	1.13[0.95, 1.94] 1.63[1.26, 2.12]	2015	
Song et al. 2016	265	2020	3156	37533	10.7%	1.05 [1.20, 2.12] 1.07 [0.95, 1.20]	2010	-
Hon et al. 2016	203	1202	780	11402	5 40%	1.07 [0.93, 1.20] 0.02 [0.74, 1.14]	2010	
Vim et al. 2017	02	2512	109	11492	7 10%	1.22 [0.74, 1.14]	2010	
Machaninas at al 2019	2012	5515	433	07600	16 70/	1.22 [1.02, 1.40] 1.11 [1.07, 1.16]	2017	
Maskarinec et al. 2018	3015	50922	4058	7490	10.7%	1.11 [1.07, 1.10]	2010	
Subtotal (95% CI)	112	181483	121	7480 391540	4.5%	1.05[0.81, 1.35] 1.17[1.10, 1.25]	2020	•
Total events	8755		17963					
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$	01; Chi ²	= 32.16	, df = 11	(P = 0.	$0007); I^2$	= 66%		
Test for overall effect: $Z =$	= 5.18 (P	< 0.000	001)					
1 2 2 male								
Mallon at al. (male) 2005	0	20	41	504	20.20/	2 50 [1 21 5 12]	2005	
Li at al. (male) 2003	0	201	41	004	20.370	2.59 [1.51, 5.12] 2.50 [1.22, 5.10]	2003	
Li et al. (male) 2011	15	11056	1/	34458	32 10%	2.50 [1.25, 5.10] 1.07 [0.08, 1.17]	2011	
Low et al. (male) 2014	47	11050	1052	2241	27.004	1.07 [0.90, 1.17] 1.02 [1.26 , 2.75]	2014	_ _
Subtotal (95% CI)	4/	13181	80	39189	100.0%	1.95 [1.00, 2.75] 1.79 [1.08, 2.95]	2015	
Total aventa	744	15101	1070	57107	100.070	1.79 [1.00, 2.95]		-
Hotorogonaity $T_{au}^2 = 0.2$	744	- 20.90	df = 2	(D - 0.0)	$(0,1), t^2 =$	960/		
Test for overall effect: $7 = 0.2$	20; Chi - 2 26 (D	= 20.80	, a = 5	(P = 0.0)	(001); 1 =	80%		
rest for overall effect. Z –	- 2.20 (F	- 0.02)						
1.2.3 female								
Ayas et al. 2003	698	20868	1153	45937	73.5%	1.33 [1.21, 1.46]	2003	
Mallon et al. (female) 200	5 4	44	31	559	0.8%	1.64 [0.61, 4.43]	2005	
Li et al. (female) 2011	14	451	24	1066	1.8%	1.38 [0.72, 2.64]	2011	
Gao et al. (female) 2014	110	2449	410	10953	16.9%	1.20 [0.98, 1.47]	2014	-
Lou et al. (female) 2015	55	1202	101	3896	7.1%	1.77 [1.28, 2.44]	2015	
Subtotal (95% CI)		25014		62411	100.0%	1.34 [1.23, 1.46]		•
Total events	881		1719					
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0$	00; Chi ²	= 4.09,	df = 4 (1)	P = 0.39); $I^2 = 2\%$)		
Test for overall effect: $Z =$	= 6.62 (P	< 0.000	001)					
						1		
						0.1	0.2	0.5 1 2 5 10
Test for subgroup differen	nces: Ch	$i^2 = 8.00$	5, df = 2	(P = 0.0)	$(12), I^2 = 7$	5.2% Fax	vours (NSD) Favours (SSD)
0 1			-		<i>,,</i>	Fav	ours (NSD) Favours (SSD)

FIGURE 3: Gender subgroup analysis of the association between SSD and T2DM.

2.4. Data Abstraction and Validity Assessment. Data were independently recruited from all included studies on a template adopted from the Cochrane collaboration [15]. For all studies, we extracted the first author, publication year, study design, study location, study period, population, number of T2DM, age, gender (male/female), and data acquisition.

2.5. Assessment of Risk Bias. The risk bias of the included studies was independently assessed by two authors. The cohort study was evaluated by the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS), which included eight items, categorized into three groups: the selection of study groups, comparability of groups, and ascertainment of outcome [16]. Each study will be evaluated by eight items, and high-quality choices were identified with a star. There are a maximum of one star for each high-quality item within the selection and outcome categories and a maximum of two stars for comparability.

2.6. Statistical Analysis. The meta-analyses were conducted using Review Manager software, version 5.3 (https:// community.cochrane.org/help/tools-and-software/revman-5). Dichotomous outcomes eligible in each study are reported as a risk ratio (RR) with an estimated 95% confidence interval (CI). Continuous outcomes are shown as the weighted mean difference (WMD) with the 95% CI, which were calculated from the mean, standard deviation (SD), P value, and sample size in each study. Heterogeneity was assessed using Higgins I^2 , which evaluates the percentage of total variation across studies that were due to heterogeneity rather than by chance. Thus, if $I^2 > 50\%$, which was considered to reflect substantial heterogeneity, a random effect model was used. If $I^2 \leq 50\%$, which was considered to reflect no heterogeneity, a fixed effect model was employed. The chi-square tests were also used to evaluate the heterogeneity: P < 0.1 indicates heterogeneity, while P > 0.1 indicates no heterogeneity. Based on

	SS	D	NS	D		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Random, 95% CI
1.3.1 Asia								
Li 2011	27	752	41	2052	4.7%	1.80 [1.11, 2.90]	2011	
Heianza et al. 2014	534	8862	1457	28521	19.1%	1.18 [1.07, 1.30]	2014	+
Gao et al. 2014	786	14305	2242	45411	19.9%	1.11 [1.03, 1.20]	2014	•
Lou et al. 2015	102	2188	181	7137	11.5%	1.84 [1.45, 2.33]	2015	
Han et al. 2016	82	1302	789	11492	12.4%	0.92 [0.74, 1.14]	2016	
Song et al. 2016	265	2955	3156	37533	17.8%	1.07 [0.95, 1.20]	2016	
Kim et al. 2017 Subtotal (95% CI)	154	3513 33877	455	12665 144811	14.5% 100.0%	1.22 [1.02, 1.46] 1.20 [1.07, 1.35]	2017	•
Total events	1950	00077	8321	111011	1001070	1120 [1107, 1100]		·
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.02: Chi ²	$^{2} = 25.21$	df = 6	(P = 0.0)	$(003): I^2$	= 76%		
Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.01 (1	P = 0.00	3)	(1 010	,,1	, 0,0		
			- /					
1.3.2 America								
Ayas et al. 2003	698	20868	1153	45937	21.7%	1.33 [1.21, 1.46]	2003	-
Beihl et al. 2009	64	361	75	514	5.7%	1.21 [0.90, 1.65]	2009	
Xu et al. 2010	3817	56993	5965	111731	28.5%	1.25 [1.21, 1.30]	2010	•
Boyko et al. 2013	461	38198	362	38357	16.2%	1.28 [1.12, 1.47]	2013	-
Maskarinec et al. 2018 Subtotal (95% CI)	3013	50922 167342	4658	87698 284237	27.9%	1.11 [1.07, 1.16]	2018	•
Total events	8053	107542	12213	204237	100.070	1.25 [1.14, 1.55]		·
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$	01. Chi ²	2 - 21 24	12213	(P - 0)	$1003) \cdot I^2$	- 81%		
Test for overall effect: Z	= 5.07 (l	P < 0.00	001)	(1 - 0.0	,005),1	- 01/0		
1 3 3 Europe								
Mallon et al. 2005	12	82	72	1063	15.8%	2 16 [1 22 3 81]	2005	
Tuomilehto et al. 2009	19	47	68	222	22.9%	1.32[0.89, 1.97]	2005	+
Leng et al. 2016	83	2826	160	8893	30.5%	1.63 [1.26, 2.12]	2016	
Asante et al. 2020	112	6596	121	7480	30.9%	1.05 [0.81, 1.35]	2020	
Subtotal (95% CI)		9551		17658	100.0%	1.42 [1.06, 1.89]		◆
Total events	226		421					
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.05; Chi ²	$^{2} = 8.47,$	df = 3 (P = 0.04	(a); $I^2 = 65$	5%		
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.37 (1	P = 0.02)		,,			
1.3.4 Oceania								
Ding et al. 2015	151	8908	697	46434	100.0%	1.13 [0.95, 1.34]	2015	
Subtotal (95% CI)		8908		46434	100.0%	1.13 [0.95, 1.34]		•
Total events	151		697					
Heterogeneity: Not appl	icable							
Test for overall effect: Z	= 1.37 (1	P = 0.17)					
						0.1	0.2	0.5 1 2 5 10
Test for subgroup different	ences: Cl	hi ² = 1.9	94, df = 3	B(P=0)	.59), I ² =	0%		(NSD) Eavours (SSD)
						F	avours	(113D) ravours $(35D)$

FIGURE 4: Regional subgroup analysis of the association between SSD and T2DM.

clinical knowledge, the study location and study period were considered to be responsible for heterogeneity, and so, these parameters were set as covariates in the meta-regression. Funnel plots judged the publication biases, and a P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant [17].

2.7. IRB Approval. This meta-analysis study was approved by the institutional review board of the Department of Hepatobiliary and Pancreas Surgery, The First Affiliated Hospital, Xi'an Jiaotong University.

3. Results

3.1. Eligible Studies. A total of 1540 studies were identified, and 325 duplicated articles were excluded. One thousand one hundred and twenty-one studies were excluded after

screening the title and abstract. After full-text screening, an additional 77 studies were excluded due to the following criteria: review article (n = 33), reported incomplete data (n = 23), commentary (n = 12), case report (n = 5), and duplicate report (n = 4). Finally, seventeen cohort studies were included in the present meta-analysis [18–34]. Among them, fifteen were in English [18–25, 27, 28, 30–34] and two were in Chinese [26, 29]. The flow chart of the study selection is summarized in Figure 1.

3.2. Study Characteristics. A total of 17 studies were selected for inclusion in this meta-analysis [18–34], with 737002 people. Among them were five each from China [21, 23, 25, 26, 29], and the United States [19, 28, 30, 31, 34], and one study each from Norway [18], South Korea [20], Britain [22], Australia [24], Japan [27], Finland [32], and Sweden [33]. Four

	LS	D	NS	D		Risk Ratio		Risk	Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95%	CI Year	M-H, Rai	ndom, 95	% CI	
Ayaset al. 2003	118	3221	1153	45937	7.7%	1.46 [1.21, 1.76]	2003				
Mallonet al. 2005	4	25	72	1063	0.9%	2.36 [0.94, 5.96]	2005	+			
Tuomilehtoet al. 2009	95	246	68	222	6.0%	1.26 [0.98, 1.62]	2009	ł	-		
Beihl et al. 2009	7	35	75	514	1.5%	1.37 [0.68, 2.75]	2009	-+	•		
Xu et al. 2010	348	5620	5965	111731	9.8%	1.16 [1.04, 1.29]	2010	-	-		
Li et al. 2011	8	227	41	2052	1.3%	1.76 [0.84, 3.72]	2011	+		_	
Boyko et al. 2013	48	4010	362	38357	5.1%	1.27 [0.94, 1.71]	2013	†			
Gao et al. 2014	56	999	2242	45411	5.9%	1.14 [0.88, 1.47]	2014	+	-		
Heianza et al. 2014	94	1604	1457	28521	7.2%	1.15 [0.94, 1.40]	2014	+	-		
Lou et al. 2015	84	2150	181	7137	6.0%	1.54 [1.19, 1.99]	2015		_		
Ding et al. 2015	101	3745	697	46434	7.1%	1.80 [1.46, 2.21]	2015				
Han et al. 2016	252	3605	789	11492	9.0%	1.02 [0.89, 1.17]	2016	+	-		
Leng et al. 2016	42	1335	160	8893	4.5%	1.75 [1.25, 2.44]	2016				
Song et al. 2016	68	773	3156	37533	6.6%	1.05 [0.83, 1.32]	2016	-	_		
Kim et al. 2017	55	1805	455	12665	5.6%	0.85 [0.64, 1.12]	2017	-+			
Maskarinec et al. 2018	8 816	13071	4658	87698	10.5%	1.18 [1.09, 1.26]	2018		•		
Asante et al. 2020	74	2982	121	7480	5.3%	1.53 [1.15, 2.04]	2020		_		
Total (95% CI)		45453		493140	100.0%	1.26 [1.15, 1.39]			•		
Total events	2270		21652								
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.02; C	$2hi^2 = 4$	8.01, df	= 16 (P	< 0.0001); $I^2 = 67\%$	+ +				+
Test for overall effect:	Z = 5.0	5 (P < 0	0.00001))			0.1 0.2	0.5 1	2	5	10
			,				Favour	s (NSD)	Favour	s (LSD)

FIGURE 5: Pooled results for the association between LSD and T2DM.

studies' research subjects, those of Lou et al. [25]., Gao et al. [26], Li et al. [29], and Mallon et al. [33] were analyzed independently by gender. The research object of Ayas et al. is male [34]. A summary of the included studies is presented in Table 1.

3.3. Study Quality. The study quality for all 17 independent studies is shown in Table 2.

4. Meta-Analysis Results

4.1. A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship between SSD and T2DM. We have analyzed a total of 17 studies that involved 712818 participants [18–34]. The incidence of T2DM was 4.73% (10380/219678) in SSD ($t \le 6$ h) and 4.39% (21652/493140) in NSD (6 h < t < 9 h). There was high heterogeneity among the studies, and the random effect model was used. Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in SSD was higher than that in NSD (RR = 1.22, 95% CI: 1.15-1.29, P < 0.001) (Figure 2).

Subgroup analyses were performed among male [25, 26, 29, 33], female [25, 26, 29, 33, 34], and mixed male and female [18–24, 27, 28, 30–32]. Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in SSD was higher than that in NSD in the male subgroup (RR = 1.79, 95% CI: 1.08-2.95, P = 0.02). Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in SSD was higher than that in NSD in female subgroups (RR = 1.34, 95% CI: 1.23-1.46, P < 0.001). Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in SSD was higher than that in NSD in female subgroups (RR = 1.34, 95% CI: 1.23-1.46, P < 0.001). Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in SSD was higher than that in NSD in the mixed male and female subgroup (RR = 1.17, 95% CI: 1.10-1.25, P < 0.001) (Figure 3).

Subgroup analyses were performed among the Asia [20, 21, 23, 25–27, 29], America [19, 28, 30, 31, 34], Europe [18, 22, 32, 33], and Oceania subgroups [24]. Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in SSD was higher than that in NSD in the Asia subgroup (RR = 1.20, 95% CI: 1.07-1.35, P = 0.003). Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in SSD was higher than that in NSD in the America subgroups (RR = 1.23, 95% CI: 1.14-1.33, P < 0.001). Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in SSD was higher than that in NSD in the Europe subgroup (RR = 1.42, 95% CI: 1.06-1.89, P = 0.02) (Figure 4).

4.2. Meta-Analysis of the Relationship between LSD and T2DM. We have analyzed a total of 17 studies that involved 538593 participants [18–34]. The incidence of T2DM was 4.99% (2270/45453) in LSD ($t \ge 9$ h) and 4.39% (21652/493140) in NSD (6 h < t < 9 h). There was high heterogeneity among the studies, and the random effect model was used. Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in LSD was higher than that in NSD (RR = 1.26, 95% CI: 1.15-1.39, P < 0.001) (Figure 5).

Subgroup analyses were performed among male [25, 26, 29, 33], female [25, 26, 29, 33, 34], and mixed male and female [18–24, 27, 28, 30–32]. Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in LSD was higher than that in NSD in the male subgroup (RR = 1.55, 95% CI: 1.08-2.21, P = 0.02). Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in LSD was higher than that in NSD in female subgroups (RR = 1.41, 95% CI: 1.20-1.64, P < 0.001). Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in LSD was higher than that in NSD in female subgroups (RR = 1.41, 95% CI: 1.20-1.64, P < 0.001). Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in LSD was higher than that in NSD in the mixed male and female subgroup (RR = 1.22, 95% CI: 1.10-1.35, P = 0.0001) (Figure 6).

	L	SD	NS	SD		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	I Year	M-H, Random, 95% CI
2.2.1 male and female								
Beihl et al. 2009	7	35	75	514	1.9%	1.37 [0.68, 2.75]	2009	
Tuomilehto et al. 2009	95	246	68	222	7.7%	1.26 [0.98, 1.62]	2009	
Xu et al. 2010	348	5620	5965	111731	12.6%	1.16 [1.04, 1.29]	2010	-
Boyko et al. 2013	48	4010	362	38357	6.4%	1.27 [0.94, 1.71]	2013	+
Heianza et al. 2014	94	1604	1457	28521	9.2%	1.15 [0.94, 1.40]	2014	+
Ding et al. 2015	101	3745	697	46434	9.1%	1.80 [1.46, 2.21]	2015	
Han et al. 2016	252	3605	789	11492	11.5%	1.02 [0.89, 1.17]	2016	+
Leng et al. 2016	42	1335	160	8893	5.7%	1.75 [1.25, 2.44]	2016	
Song et al. 2016	68	773	3156	37533	8.4%	1.05 [0.83, 1.32]	2016	+
Kim et al. 2017	55	1805	455	12665	7.1%	0.85 [0.64, 1.12]	2017	
Maskarinec et al. 2018	816	13071	4658	87698	13.6%	1.18 [1.09, 1.26]	2018	+
Asante et al. 2020	74	2982	121	7480	6.8%	1.53 [1.15, 2.04]	2020	
Subtotal (95% CI)		38831		391540	100.0%	1.22 [1.10, 1.35]		◆
Total events	2000		17963					
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$).02; Chi ²	$^{2} = 36.4$	9, df = 1	1 (P = 0.	$0001); I^2$	= 70%		
Test for overall effect: Z	z = 3.87 (1	P = 0.00	001)					
2.2.2 male								
Mallon et al. (male) 200	5 1	8	41	504	3.5%	1.54 [0.24, 9.84]	2005 -	
Li et al. (male) 2011	4	97	17	986	9.6%	2.39 [0.82, 6.97]	2011	
Gao et al. (male) 2014	46	734	1832	34458	46.8%	1.18 [0.89, 1.56]	2014	+∎-
Lou et al. (male) 2015	46	975	80	3241	40.1%	1.91 [1.34, 2.73]	2015	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1814		39189	100.0%	1.55 [1.08, 2.21]		-
Total events	97		1970					
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$).05; Chi ²	$^{2} = 5.22$, df = 3 (P = 0.16); $I^2 = 43$	%		
Test for overall effect: Z	c = 2.38 ()	P = 0.02	2)					
2.2.2 fam. de								
	110	2221	1150	15025	=1 00/		2002	
Ayas et al. 2003	118	3221	1153	45937	71.0%	1.46 [1.21, 1.76]	2003	
Mallon et al. (female) 20	005 3	1/	31	559	2.1%	3.18 [1.08, 9.39]	2005	
Li et al. (female) 2011	4	130	24	1066	2.3%	1.37 [0.48, 3.88]	2011	
Gao et al. (female) 2014	10	265	410	10953	6.5%	1.01 [0.54, 1.8/]	2014	
Lou et al. (female) 2015 Subtotal (95% CI)	38	11/5	101	3896 62411	18.2%	1.25 [0.86, 1.80]	2015	
Total events	173	4000	1710	02411	100.0 %	1.41 [1.20, 1.04]		•
Heterogeneity: $T_{au}^2 = 0$	1/3	2 - 3.00	df = 4	D = 0.42	$1 \cdot I^2 = 00$			
Test for overall effect. 7		- 5.90 P < 0.00	(01)	1 - 0.42	,,1 = 0 %	,		
rest for overall chect. Z	- 1.20 (1	0.00						
							+ +	
						(0.1 0.2	0.5 1 2 5 10
Test for subgroup differ	ences: C	$hi^2 = 3.$	20, df =	2 (P = 0.	20), $I^2 = 1$	37.6%	Favour	s (NSD) Favours (LSD)

FIGURE 6: Gender subgroup analysis of the association between LSD and T2DM.

Subgroup analyses were performed among the Asia [20, 21, 23, 25–27, 29], America [19, 28, 30, 31, 34], Europe [18, 22, 32, 33], and Oceania subgroups [24]. Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in LSD was higher than that in NSD in the Asia subgroup (RR = 1.12, 95% CI: 1.01-1.25, P = 0.03). Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in LSD was higher than that in NSD in the America subgroups (RR = 1.27, 95% CI: 1.12-1.44, P = 0.0003). Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in LSD was higher than that in NSD in the America subgroups (RR = 1.27, 95% CI: 1.12-1.44, P = 0.0003). Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of T2DM in LSD was higher than that in NSD in the Europe subgroup (RR = 1.49, 95% CI: 1.24-1.79, P < 0.001) (Figure 7).

4.3. Meta-Analysis of SSD versus LSD for T2DM. There was high heterogeneity among the studies, and the random effect model was used. Meta-analysis showed that the incidence of

T2DM was not significantly different between SSD and LSD (RR = 0.97, 95% CI: 0.89-1.05, P = 0.41) (Figure 8).

4.4. Sensitivity Analyses. Sensitivity analyses of the association between SSD, LSD, and T2DM were conducted. The results indicated that the sensitivity of the association between SSD and T2DM was robust after each study was excluded one by one. The RR was 1.22 and 95% CI was 1.15-1.29 (Figure 9). The results indicated that the sensitivity of the association between LSD and T2DM was robust after each study was excluded one by one. The RR was 1.26 and 95% CI was 1.15-1.39 (Figure 10). When the Chinese literature was excluded, the meta-analysis results and heterogeneity did not change significantly. However, according to gender subgroup analysis, the heterogeneity of the male

	LSI)	NS	D		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	s Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	CI Year	M-H, Random, 95% CI	
2.3.1 Asian									
Xu et al. 2010	348	5620	5965	111731	22.1%	1.16 [1.04, 1.29]	2010	-	
Li et al. 2011	8	227	41	2052	1.9%	1.76 [0.84, 3.72]	2011		
Heianza et al. 2014	94	1604	1457	28521	13.9%	1.15 [0.94, 1.40]	2014	+	
Gao et al. 2014	56	999	2242	45411	10.5%	1.14 [0.88, 1.47]	2014	+ - -	
Lou et al. 2015	84	2150	181	7137	10.7%	1.54 [1.19, 1.99]	2015		
Han et al. 2016	252	3605	789	11492	19.1%	1.02 [0.89, 1.17]	2016	+	
Song et al. 2016	68	773	3156	37533	12.1%	1.05 [0.83, 1.32]	2016	-	
Kim et al. 2017	55	1805	455	12665	9.7%	0.85 [0.64, 1.12]	2017		
Subtotal (95% CI)		16783		256542	100.0%	1.12 [1.01, 1.25]		•	
Total events	965		14286	5					
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.	.01; Chi ²	= 14.10), df = 7	P = 0.0	$(5); I^2 = 5$	50%			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.13 (P	9 = 0.03)						
2.3.2 America									
Ayas et al. 2003	118	3221	1153	45937	27.5%	1.46 [1.21, 1.76]	2003	+	
Beihl et al. 2009	7	35	75	514	3.2%	1.37 [0.68, 2.75]	2009		
Boyko et al. 2013	48	4010	362	38357	14.2%	1.27 [0.94, 1.71]	2013	+	
Maskarinec et al. 2018	816	13071	4658	87698	55.2%	1.18 [1.09, 1.26]	2018		
Subtotal (95% CI)		20337		172506	100.0%	1.27 [1.12, 1.44]		•	
Total events	989		6248						
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.	.01; Chi ²	= 4.74,	df = 3	(P = 0.19)	$(9); I^2 = 37$	7%			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.66 (P	9 = 0.00	03)						
2.3.3 Europe									
Mallon et al. 2005	4	25	72	1063	3.8%	2.36 [0.94, 5.96]	2005		
Tuomilehto et al. 2009	95	246	68	222	39.0%	1.26 [0.98, 1.62]	2009		
Leng et al. 2016	42	1335	160	8893	24.9%	1.75 [1.25, 2.44]	2016		
Asante et al. 2020	74	2982	121	7480	32.3%	1.53 [1.15, 2.04]	2020		
Subtotal (95% CI)		4588		17658	100.0%	1.49 [1.24, 1.79]		•	
Total events	215		421						
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$.	.01; Chi ²	= 3.55.	df = 3	(P = 0.3)	1); $I^2 = 15$	5%			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 4.30 (P	0.00	01)		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
2.3.4 Oceania									
Ding et al. 2015	101	3745	697	46434	100.0%	1.80 [1.46, 2.21]	2015	-	
Subtotal (95% CI)	101	3745	077	46434	100.0%	1.80 [1.46, 2.21]	2015		
Total events	101		697						
Heterogeneity: Not appl	icable								
Test for overall effect: Z	= 5.57 (P	0.00	001)						
							0.1 0.2	0.5 1 2 5	10
Test for subgroup differe	ences: Ch	$i^2 = 19$	12. df -	= 3 (P -	0.0003)	$I^2 = 84.3\%$	P		-
1 cot for subgroup unlet		1)	2, ui -	- 1) 2	5.00007,	01.070	Favours	s (NSD) Favours (LSI	ר)

FIGURE 7: Regional subgroup analysis of the association between LSD and T2DM.

subgroup and female subgroup decreased rapidly. The sensitivity of each study was robust.

4.5. Metaregression for the Sleep Duration and T2DM. Metaregression analyses were performed in the meta-analysis of the relationship between SSD and T2DM. The results indicated that neither the study location (coefficient = 0.021, SE = 0.050, t = 0.42, P = 0.678, 95% CI: -0.085 to 0.127) nor the study period (coefficient = 0.056, SE = 0.064, t = 0.87, P= 0.398, 95% CI: -0.082 to 0.194) was responsible for this heterogeneity. Other factors, such as age, cannot be fully extracted from the text.

Metaregression analyses were performed in the metaanalysis of the relationship between LSD and T2DM. Metaregression indicated that study location may have been responsible for this heterogeneity (coefficient = 0.154, SE = 0.040, t = 3.83, P = 0.002, 95% CI: 0.068 to 0.239). And no significant association was observed in the study period (coefficient = 0.135, SE = 0.075, t = 1.79, P = 0.095, 95% CI: -0.027 to 0.297).

	SSI)	LSI)		Risk Ratio		Ri	sk Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	s Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	I Year	M-H, Ra	ndom, 95	% CI	
Ayas et al. 2003	698	20868	118	3221	8.5%	0.91 [0.75, 1.11]	2003		+		
Mallon et al. 2005	12	82	4	25	0.6%	0.91 [0.32, 2.59]	2005		-		
Beihl et al. 2009	64	361	7	35	1.3%	0.89 [0.44, 1.78]	2009				
Tuomilehto et al. 2009	19	47	95	246	3.7%	1.05 [0.72, 1.53]	2009		-		
Xu et al. 2010	3817	56993	348	5620	12.4%	1.08 [0.97, 1.20]	2010		†• -		
Li et al. 2011	27	752	8	227	1.1%	1.02 [0.47, 2.21]	2011			-	
Boyko et al. 2013	461	38198	48	4010	5.3%	1.01 [0.75, 1.35]	2013	_	-		
Heianza et al. 2014	534	8862	94	1604	7.7%	1.03 [0.83, 1.27]	2014	-	-		
Gao et al. 2014	786	14305	56	999	6.1%	0.98 [0.75, 1.28]	2014	_	+		
Ding et al. 2015	151	8908	101	3745	6.5%	0.63 [0.49, 0.81]	2015				
Lou et al. 2015	102	2188	84	2150	5.6%	1.19 [0.90, 1.58]	2015				
Han et al. 2016	82	1302	252	3605	6.8%	0.90 [0.71, 1.15]	2016	_	+		
Leng et al. 2016	83	2826	42	1335	3.9%	0.93 [0.65, 1.35]	2016				
Song et al. 2016	265	2955	68	773	6.3%	1.02 [0.79, 1.31]	2016	_	-		
Kim et al. 2017	154	3513	55	1805	5.1%	1.44 [1.06, 1.95]	2017				
Maskarinec et al. 2018	3013	50922	816	13071	13.8%	0.95 [0.88, 1.02]	2018	-	ł		
Asante et al. 2020	112	6596	74	2982	5.4%	0.68 [0.51, 0.91]	2020				
Total (95% CI)		219678		45453	100.0%	0.97 [0.89, 1.05]			•		
Total events	10380		2270								
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0$	0.01; Chi ²	$^{2} = 31.73$	3, df = 1	6 (P =	0.01); I ² :	= 50%	+				+
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.82 ()	P = 0.41)				0.2	0.5	1 2		5
							Favo	irs (SSD)	Favou	rs (LSD	0

FIGURE 8: Pooled results of SSD versus LSD for T2DM.



FIGURE 9: Sensitivity analyses of the association between SSD and T2DM.

4.6. Publication Bias Analyses. Funnel plots of publication bias for the association between SSD, LSD, and T2DM were assessed. The symmetry found in the funnel plots indicated that the publication bias was weak. (Figures 11 and 12) Most of the studies are at the top of the funnel plot, indicating that the quality of the studies is good.

5. Discussion

The countries with the largest numbers of adults with DM aged 20–79 years in 2019 are China, India, and America with 116.4 million, 77 million, and 31 million DM patients (aged 20–79 years), respectively, and are anticipated to remain so



FIGURE 10: Sensitivity analyses of the association between LSD and T2DM.



FIGURE 11: Funnel plots of publication bias for the association between SSD and T2DM.

in 2030 [1]. T2DM is closely related to unhealthy lifestyles [2]. Studies have shown that sleep is closely related to endocrine and metabolism [35]. With the progress of society and the development of the economy, the pace of modern life is getting faster and faster. Sleep discomfort causes many health problems. Studies have found that the average American sleep duration is from 9 hours in 1910 to 6.8 hours in 2005 [36]. Sleep discomfort causes not only endocrine disorders and other pathological states but also affects personal mental health. Therefore, improving sleep is a good measure to improve the quality of life.

In this meta-analysis of the association between SSD and T2DM, the risk of T2DM with SSD was 1.22 times higher than that with NSD, which was consistent with the conclusions of other cohort studies [37–45]. The risk of T2DM in male with SSD was 1.79 times higher than that with NSD.



FIGURE 12: Funnel plots of publication bias for the association between LSD and T2DM.

The risk of T2DM in females with SSD was 1.34 times higher than that with NSD. The risk of T2DM in males with SSD was slightly higher than that in females. Subgroup analysis by region showed that there was no significant difference among the Asian, American, and European subgroups. The risk of T2DM in Asia with SSD was 1.79 times higher than that with NSD. The risk of T2DM in America with SSD was 1.34 times higher than that with NSD. The risk of T2DM in Europe with SSD was 1.24 times higher than that with NSD. The mechanism of SSD leading to T2DM is still unclear. The possible reason is that sleep deprivation causes the imbalance of the sympathetic vagus nerve, which leads to the decrease of β cell response ability, the inhibition of insulin secretion, and the further development of insulin resistance and T2DM. Lack of sleep may also cause the release of a large number of inflammatory factors, inhibits the activity of islet receptor L-arginine kinase, and leads to insulin resistance. Some studies found that slow-wave sleep duration decreased insulin sensitivity and increased the risk of T2DM [46-48].

In this meta-analysis of the association between LSD and T2DM, the risk of T2DM with LSD was 1.26 times higher than that with NSD, which was consistent with the conclusions of other cohort studies [37-45]. The risk of T2DM in male with LSD was 1.55 times higher than that with NSD. The risk of T2DM in females with LSD was 1.27 times higher than that with NSD. Subgroup analysis by region showed that there were differences among the Asian, American, and European subgroups. The risk of T2DM in Asia with LSD was 1.12 times higher than that with NSD. The risk of T2DM in America with LSD was 1.27 times higher than that with NSD. The risk of T2DM in Europe with LSD was 1.49 times higher than that with NSD. There are few studies on the relationship between LSD and T2DM. The reason may be that long sleeps are a poor sleep quality actually and they may prolong sleep duration to make up for the impact of poor sleep quality. Sleeping for a long time is harmful to

health itself. Excessive sleep duration may be associated with other factors, such as obesity, poor social and economic status, low physical activity, depression, sleep apnea, or other chronic diseases. These factors can produce a confounding effect [46, 47, 49].

The meta-analysis found that LSD or SSD will increase the risk of T2DM. Some studies suggest that LSD or SSD can lead to impaired fasting blood glucose, abnormal HbA1, and insulin resistance [50-56]. There was a Ushaped dose response relationship between sleep duration and risk of T2DM [10, 57]. SSD or LSD increased the risk of T2DM. Therefore, the risk of T2DM can be reduced if the sleep duration of the patients with poor sleep is changed and the sleep duration is maintained between 7 and 8 hours. SSD or LSD is a risk factor for chronic diseases such as DM, coronary heart disease, stroke, and obesity [7, 9, 58, 59]. The sensitivity of each study was robust and the publication bias was weak. While we found that the study location may have been responsible for this heterogeneity in the meta-analysis of the relationship between LSD and T2DM, other factors, such as age, cannot be fully extracted from the text.

5.1. Limitations. Limitations are listed as follows: (1) some studies have not been retrieved. All the included studies are published in Chinese and English, and there may be incomplete literature retrieval, (2) the overall heterogeneity of the study is high, suggesting that there is heterogeneity among the studies. However, after subgroup analyses were performed, the heterogeneity of subgroups decreased significantly, (3) the study explored the association between sleep duration and T2DM but paid less attention to the association between sleep quality and T2DM, which also indicated that we should focus on it in later research, and (4) for special populations such as gestational diabetes, postpartum diabetes, and posttransplant diabetes, there is less attention.

More and more studies have confirmed that an unhealthy lifestyle plays an important role in the pathogenesis of T2DM and glucose control in DM [60]. From the perspective of prevention, appropriate sleep duration can be used as the primary prevention of T2DM [7, 9, 61, 62]. Good sleep should be considered as an important health component in the prevention and treatment of T2DM.

6. Conclusions

The purpose of the current study was to determine the cohort studies of the relationship between sleep duration and T2DM in adults with a systematic review and meta-analysis. This study provides the first systematic assessment of the cohort study of the relationship between sleep duration and T2DM. The findings indicate that SSD or LSD is a risk factor for T2DM. The findings of this study have several important implications for future practice. Further research is required to attend to the association between sleep quality and T2DM.

Data Availability

The data used to support the findings of this study are included within the article.

Ethical Approval

This meta-analysis study was approved by the institutional review board of the Department of Hepatobiliary and Pancreas Surgery, The First Affiliated Hospital, Xi'an Jiaotong University. All protocols conformed with the ethical guidelines of the 1975 Helsinki Declaration, and written, informed consent was obtained from all patients.

Disclosure

None of the authors have any financial and personal relationships with other people or organizations that could inappropriately influence their work.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Authors' Contributions

The study design was done by Huapeng Lu, Qinling Yang, Fang Tian, and Yi Lyu. Data collection was done by Huapeng Lu and Qinling Yang. Data analysis was done by Fang Tian and Yi Lyu. The manuscript writing was done by Huapeng Lu and Qinling Yang. Critical revisions were done by Xuemei Zheng, Hairong He, and Xia Xin. Huapeng Lu and Qinling Yang contributed equally to this study.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by grants from the Ministry of Education Innovation Team Development Program (IRT_16R57).

References

- [1] International Diabetes Federation, *IDF Diabetes Atlas*, 9th ed edition, , 20192020, https://diabetesatlas.org/en/.
- [2] Chinese Diabetes Society, "Guideline for the prevention and control of type 2 diabetes in China (2017 edition)," *Chinese Journal of Practical Internal Medicine*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 292– 344, 2018.
- [3] A. R. Cass, W. J. Alonso, J. Islam, and S. C. Weller, "Risk of obstructive sleep apnea in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus," *Family Medicine*, vol. 45, no. 7, pp. 492–500, 2013.
- [4] C. Touma and S. Pannain, "Does lack of sleep cause diabetes?," *Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine*, vol. 78, no. 8, pp. 549– 558, 2011.
- [5] M. T. U. Barone and L. Menna-Barreto, "Diabetes and sleep: a complex cause-and-effect relationship," *Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice*, vol. 91, no. 2, pp. 129–137, 2011.
- [6] S. Larcher, P. Y. Benhamou, J. L. Pépin, and A. L. Borel, "Sleep habits and diabetes," *Diabetes & Metabolism*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 263–271, 2015.
- [7] M. Jike, O. Itani, N. Watanabe, D. J. Buysse, and Y. Kaneita, "Long sleep duration and health outcomes: a systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression," *Sleep Medicine Reviews*, vol. 39, pp. 25–36, 2018.
- [8] Y. H. Xu, L. Shi, Y. P. Bao et al., "Association between sleep duration during pregnancy and gestational diabetes mellitus: a meta-analysis," *Sleep Medicine*, vol. 52, pp. 67–74, 2018.
- [9] O. Itani, M. Jike, N. Watanabe, and Y. Kaneita, "Short sleep duration and health outcomes: a systematic review, meta-analysis, and meta-regression," *Sleep Medicine*, vol. 32, pp. 246– 256, 2017.
- [10] Z. Shan, H. Ma, M. Xie et al., "Sleep duration and risk of type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis of prospective studies," *Diabetes Care*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 529–537, 2015.
- [11] Q. Lu, X. Zhang, Y. Wang et al., "Sleep disturbances during pregnancy and adverse maternal and fetal outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis," *Sleep Medicine Reviews*, vol. 58, p. 101436, 2021.
- [12] X. Zhang, R. Zhang, L. Cheng et al., "The effect of sleep impairment on gestational diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies," *Sleep Medicine*, vol. 74, pp. 267–277, 2020.
- [13] X. Gao, H. Sun, Y. Zhang, L. Liu, J. Wang, and T. Wang, "Investigating causal relations between sleep-related traits and risk of type 2 diabetes mellitus: a Mendelian randomization study," *Frontiers in Genetics*, vol. 11, p. 607865, 2020.
- [14] D. Moher, A. Liberati, J. Tetzlaff, D. G. Altman, and The PRISMA Group, "Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement," *PLoS Medicine*, vol. 6, no. 7, article e1000097, 2009.
- [15] T. Li, J. P. Higgins, and J. J. Deeks, Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions Version 6, John Wiley & Son, 2019.
- [16] G. A. Wells, B. Shea, D. A. O'Connell et al., *The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses*, 2019, http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp.
- [17] H. Lu, Y. Hou, J. Chen et al., "Risk of catheter-related bloodstream infection associated with midline catheters compared with peripherally inserted central catheters: a meta-analysis," *Nursing Open*, 2020.

- [18] E. O. Asante, Y. Sun, T. I. L. Nilsen, B. O. Åsvold, E. P. Sørgjerd, and X. M. Mai, "Hours lying down per day, as a proxy for sedentary behaviour and risk of diabetes in young and middle-aged adults in Norway: an 11-year follow-up of the HUNT study," *BMJ Open*, vol. 10, no. 3, article e0350103, p. e035010, 2020.
- [19] G. Maskarinec, S. Jacobs, Y. Amshoff et al., "Sleep duration and incidence of type 2 diabetes: the multiethnic cohort," *Sleep Health*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 27–32, 2018.
- [20] C. W. Kim, Y. Chang, E. Sung, and S. Ryu, "Sleep duration and progression to diabetes in people with prediabetes defined by HbA1cconcentration," *Diabetic Medicine*, vol. 34, no. 11, pp. 1591–1598, 2017.
- [21] X. Han, B. Liu, J. Wang et al., "Long sleep duration and afternoon napping are associated with higher risk of incident diabetes in middle-aged and older Chinese: the Dongfeng-Tongji cohort study," *Annals of Medicine*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 216–223, 2016.
- [22] Y. Leng, F. P. Cappuccio, P. G. Surtees, R. Luben, C. Brayne, and K. T. Khaw, "Daytime napping, sleep duration and increased 8-year risk of type 2 diabetes in a British population," *Nutrition, Metabolism, and Cardiovascular Diseases*, vol. 26, no. 11, pp. 996–1003, 2016.
- [23] Q. Song, X. Liu, W. Zhou, X. Wang, and S. Wu, "Short-term changes in sleep duration and risk of type 2 diabetes: Kailuan prospective study," *Medicine (Baltimore)*, vol. 95, no. 45, article e5363, 2016.
- [24] D. Ding, S. Chong, B. Jalaludin, E. Comino, and A. E. Bauman, "Risk factors of incident type 2-diabetes mellitus over a 3-year follow-up: results from a large Australian sample," *Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice*, vol. 108, no. 2, pp. 306–315, 2015.
- [25] P. Lou, P. Zhang, L. Zhang et al., "Effects of sleep duration and sleep quality on prevalence of type 2 diabetes mellitus: a 5-year follow-up study in China," *Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice*, vol. 109, no. 1, pp. 178–184, 2015.
- [26] M. Gao, J. Li, and Y. Wu, "Relationship between sleep time and risk of newly onset diabetes," *Chinese Journal of Endocrinology* and Metabolism, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 393–396, 2014.
- [27] Y. Heianza, K. Kato, K. Fujihara et al., "Role of sleep duration as a risk factor for type 2 diabetes among adults of different ages in Japan: the Niigata wellness study," *Diabetic Medicine*, vol. 31, no. 11, pp. 1363–1367, 2014.
- [28] E. J. Boyko, A. D. Seelig, I. G. Jacobson et al., "Sleep characteristics, mental health, and diabetes risk: a prospective study of U.S. military service members in the Millennium Cohort Study," *Diabetes Care*, vol. 36, no. 10, pp. 3154– 3161, 2013.
- [29] J. Li, X. Hong, Y. Liang, Z. Wang, and F. Xu, "The relationship between sleeping duration and type 2 diabetes mellitus among adults: a three-year community-based follow-up study in Nanjing," *Modern Preventive Medicine*, vol. 38, no. 18, pp. 3646– 3648, 2011.
- [30] Q. Xu, Y. Song, A. Hollenbeck, A. Blair, A. Schatzkin, and H. Chen, "Day napping and short night sleeping are associated with higher risk of diabetes in older adults," *Diabetes Care*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 78–83, 2009.
- [31] D. A. Beihl, A. D. Liese, and S. M. Haffner, "Sleep Duration as a Risk Factor for Incident Type 2 Diabetes in a Multiethnic Cohort," *Annals of Epidemiology*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 351–357, 2009.

- [32] H. Tuomilehto, M. Peltonen, M. Partinen et al., "Sleep duration, lifestyle intervention, and incidence of type 2 diabetes in impaired glucose tolerance: the Finnish Diabetes Prevention Study," *Diabetes Care*, vol. 32, no. 11, pp. 1965–1971, 2009.
- [33] L. Mallon, J. E. Broman, and J. Hetta, "High incidence of diabetes in men with sleep complaints or short sleep duration a 12-year follow-up study of a middle-aged population," *Diabe*tes Care, vol. 28, no. 11, pp. 2762–2767, 2005.
- [34] N. T. Ayas, D. P. White, W. K. al-Delaimy et al., "A prospective study of self-reported sleep duration and incident diabetes in women," *Diabetes Care*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 380–384, 2003.
- [35] A. Briançon-Marjollet, M. Weiszenstein, M. Henri, A. Thomas, D. Godin-Ribuot, and J. Polak, "The impact of sleep disorders on glucose metabolism: endocrine and molecular mechanisms," *Diabetology and Metabolic Syndrome*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 25, 2015.
- [36] B. M. Egan, "Sleep and hypertension: burning the candle at both ends really is hazardous to your health," *Hypertension*, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 816-817, 2006.
- [37] J. E. Gangwisch, S. B. Heymsfield, B. Boden-Albala et al., "Sleep duration as a risk factor for diabetes incidence in a large U.S. sample," *Sleep*, vol. 30, no. 12, pp. 1667–1673, 2007.
- [38] the HIPOP-OHP Research group, Y. Hayashino, S. Fukuhara et al., "Relation between sleep quality and quantity, quality of life, and risk of developing diabetes in healthy workers in Japan: the high-risk and population strategy for occupational health promotion (HIPOP-OHP) study," *BMC Public Health*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 129, 2007.
- [39] H. K. Yaggi, A. B. Araujo, and J. B. Mckinlay, "Sleep duration as a risk factor for the development of type 2 diabetes," *Diabetes Care*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 657–661, 2006.
- [40] C. Bjorkelund, D. Bondyr-Carlsson, L. Lapidus et al., "Sleep disturbances in midlife unrelated to 32-year diabetes incidence: the prospective population study of women in Gothenburg," *Diabetes Care*, vol. 28, no. 11, pp. 2739–2744, 2005.
- [41] X. Li and Y. Li, "Sleep patterns, glycolipid metabolism disorders and prospective cohort studies," *Sleep Medicine*, vol. 64, no. S1, pp. S225–S226, 2019.
- [42] H. Kadotani, M. Yamaguchi, Y. Nagai et al., "Poster presentations 1," *Sleep and Biological Rhythms*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 254– 342, 2011.
- [43] E. G. Holliday, C. A. Magee, L. Kritharides, E. Banks, and J. Attia, "Short sleep duration is associated with risk of future diabetes but not cardiovascular disease: a prospective study and meta-analysis," *PLoS One*, vol. 8, no. 11, article e82305, 2013.
- [44] A. von Ruesten, C. Weikert, I. Fietze, and H. Boeing, "Association of sleep duration with chronic diseases in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC)-Potsdam study," *PLoS One*, vol. 7, no. 1, article e30972, 2012.
- [45] T. Kita, E. Yoshioka, H. Satoh et al., "Short sleep duration and poor sleep quality increase the risk of diabetes in Japanese workers with no family history of diabetes," *Diabetes Care*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 313–318, 2012.
- [46] L. Li, J. Wan, Y. Zhou, Q. Deng, and J. Sun, "Sleep and type 2 diabetes mellitus," *International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 182–186, 2019.
- [47] H. Wu, L. Yang, M. Yu, J. Zhong, and R. Hu, "Progress in research of association between sleep duration and type 2 diabetes," *Chinese Journal of Epidemiology*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 411– 416, 2017.

- [48] Z. Pan, L. Peian, C. Peipei et al., "Relationship between sleep duration and risk of type 2 diabetes mellitus," *Chinese Journal* of *Prevention and Control of Chronic Diseases*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 279–281, 2015.
- [49] C. Gutiérrez-Repiso, F. Soriguer, E. Rubio-Martín et al., "Night-time sleep duration and the incidence of obesity and type 2 diabetes. Findings from the prospective Pizarra study," *Sleep Medicine*, vol. 15, no. 11, pp. 1398–1404, 2014.
- [50] S. W. Lee, K. Y. Ng, and W. K. Chin, "The impact of sleep amount and sleep quality on glycemic control in type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis," *Sleep Medicine Reviews*, vol. 31, pp. 91–101, 2017.
- [51] C. R. Kim, Y. M. Song, J. Y. Shin, and W. Gim, "Association between sleep duration and impaired fasting glucose in Korean adults: results from the Korean National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2011-2012," *Korean Journal of Family Medicine*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 51–56, 2016.
- [52] S. Upala, A. Sanguankeo, S. Congrete, and K. Romphothong, "Sleep duration and insulin resistance in individuals without diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis," *Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice*, vol. 109, no. 3, pp. e11–e12, 2015.
- [53] P. Lou, P. Chen, L. Zhang et al., "Interaction of sleep quality and sleep duration on impaired fasting glucose: a population-based cross-sectional survey in China," *BMJ Open*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. e004436–e004436, 2014.
- [54] A. J. Pyykkönen, B. Isomaa, A. K. Pesonen et al., "Sleep duration and insulin resistance in individuals without type 2 diabetes: the PPP-Botnia study," *Annals of Medicine*, vol. 46, no. 5, pp. 324–329, 2014.
- [55] B. K. Kim, B. S. Kim, S. Y. An et al., "Sleep duration and glycemic control in patients with diabetes mellitus: Korea National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2007-2010," *Journal* of Korean Medical Science, vol. 28, no. 9, pp. 1334–1339, 2013.
- [56] S. Katano, Y. Nakamura, A. Nakamura et al., "Association of short sleep duration with impaired glucose tolerance or diabetes mellitus," *Journal of Diabetes Investigation*, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 366–372, 2011.
- [57] T. Ohkuma, H. Fujii, M. Iwase et al., "Impact of sleep duration on obesity and the glycemic level in patients with type 2 diabetes: the Fukuoka Diabetes Registry," *Diabetes Care*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 611–617, 2013.
- [58] O. A. Akinseye, N. I. Ojike, L. I. Akinseye, P. S. Dhandapany, and S. R. Pandi-Perumal, "Association of sleep duration with stroke in diabetic patients: analysis of the National Health Interview Survey," *Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Dis*eases, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 650–655, 2016.
- [59] Y. Kubota, H. Iso, S. Ikehara, and A. Tamakoshi, "Relationship between sleep duration and cause-specific mortality in diabetic men and women based on self-reports," *Sleep and Biological Rhythms*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 85–93, 2015.
- [60] M. H. Gozashti, N. Eslami, M. H. Radfar, and H. Pakmanesh, "Sleep pattern, duration and quality in relation with glycemic control in people with type 2 diabetes mellitus," *Iranian Journal of Medical Sciences*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 531–538, 2016.
- [61] Y. Tang, L. Meng, D. Li et al., "Interaction of sleep quality and sleep duration on glycemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus," *Chinese Medical Journal*, vol. 127, no. 20, pp. 3543–3547, 2014.
- [62] H. C. Chen and P. Chou, "Predictors of change in self-reported sleep duration in community-dwelling older adults: the Shih-Pai Sleep Study, Taiwan," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 4729, 2017.