SGLT2 inhibitor use in type 2 diabetes in England: a population-based cohort study of uptake of NICE guidance

Dr Patrick Muller PhD,[1] Technical Adviser, ORCID: 0000-0002-6824-578X

Dr Jonathan Wray PhD,[1] Senior Analyst

Muksitur Rahman MSc,[1] Health Economist

James Hawkins MSc,[1] Health Economic Adviser

Dr Chirag Bakhai MBA,[2,3] GP and National Clinical Adviser for Diabetes, ORCID: 0009-0008-4708-3305

Dr Daniel J Cuthbertson PhD,[4] Professor of Medicine, ORCID: 0000-0002-6128-0822

Dr Robert Willans PhD,[1] Technical Adviser

Dr Eleanor Yelland PhD,[1] Scientific Adviser, ORCID: 0000-0003-0148-8530

Shaun Rowark MSc,[1] Associate Director of Healthcare Data Analytics

Magdalena Watras MPharm,[1] Pharmacist Clinical Adviser

Dr Luke Sheridan Rains PhD,[1] Senior Technical Adviser, ORCID: 0000-0003-4905-4168

Dr Amanda I Adler PhD, [5] Professor of Diabetic Medicine and Health Policy, ORCID: 0000-0002-2797-3385

Dr Lesley Owen PhD,[1] Health Economic Adviser

1. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence.
2. NHS Bedfordshire Luton and Milton Keynes Integrated Care Board.
3. NHS England.
4. Obesity and Endocrinology Research Group, Institute of Ageing and Chronic Diseases, University of Liverpool.
5. Oxford Centre for Diabetes Endocrinology and Metabolism, University of Oxford.

Corresponding Author

Patrick Muller

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2nd Floor 2 Redman Place, London, E20 1JQ.

Email: **Patrick.muller@nice.org.uk**

Word count

Abstract: 300

Text: 4,093

Summary boxes: 219

What is already known on this topic

- In 2020 approximately 10% of people with type 2 diabetes (T2DM) and cardiovascular disease (CVD) and 14% of people with T2DM but without CVD in England had a current SGLT2 inhibitor prescription.
- In 2022 NICE recommended that an SGLT2 inhibitor should be offered to people with T2DM with heart failure or CVD, and considered for people with T2DM at high risk of CVD; network meta-analyses have found 10% to 40% lower odds of cardiovascular mortality with treatment in these groups.
- Uptake of NICE guidelines in general practice has historically been variable, although higher when accompanied by pay-for-performance schemes such as the Quality and Outcomes Framework.

What this study adds

- By September 2023 the percentage of people with T2DM with a current SGLT2 inhibitor prescription had reached 19.5% in those with CVD as a comorbidity, compared to 19.9% in those at high risk of CVD, and 30.5% in those with heart failure.
- Women, people of Black ethnicity, and people living in areas of high deprivation had lower odds of a current prescription in analyses adjusted for age, gender, cardiovascular comorbidity, and renal function.
- There remains an opportunity to increase uptake of SGLT2 inhibitors for people with T2DM in line with NICE guidelines in general practice in England, and to reduce inequalities in uptake.

ABSTRACT

Objectives An update to the NICE Type 2 diabetes (T2DM) guideline in February 2022 recommended an SGLT2 inhibitor be offered to people with heart failure (HF) or cardiovascular disease (CVD) as comorbidities and considered for people at high CVD risk. We report uptake of this guideline in England by September 2023.

Design Observational cohort study.

Setting General practices contributing to the Clinical Practice Research Data Link, linked to hospital admission records.

Participants 587,826 people aged over 18 with T2DM on 1st September 2023, stratified according to their CVD category (low CVD risk score; high CVD risk score; CVD only; HF only; CVD and HF) and CKD status, and further by age, gender, ethnicity, deprivation, and T2DM diagnosis duration.

Main outcome measures Percentage of patients with a current SGLT2 inhibitor prescription; odds ratios for association between patient characteristics and a current prescription.

Results In people with T2DM, the percentage with a current SGLT2 inhibitor prescription was 20.2% and 19.9% respectively for people at low and high CVD risk, 19.5% for people with CVD, and 30.5% for people with CVD and HF. In age-stratified analyses, uptake ordered from lowest to highest was as follows: low CVD risk score, high CVD risk score, CVD only, HF only, CVD and HF. In models adjusted for clinical and patient characteristics uptake was lower in people aged >70, women, Black people, and people living in areas of higher deprivation.

Conclusions Whilst prescribing of SGLT2 inhibitors continues to rise in England, an opportunity remains to increase uptake in people with T2DM and to reduce inequalities. We report inequalities by ethnicity and deprivation, and lower uptake for people with CVD without HF than people with HF, despite an equal guideline recommendation for these two groups. Additional evidence is needed to interpret the age and gender inequalities we report.

INTRODUCTION

The prevalence of type 2 diabetes (T2DM) has increased in England in recent decades, affecting approximately 7% of adults by March 2024.[1] The percentage of people with T2DM who are living with hypertension, renal disease, and cardiovascular disease as comorbidities has also risen in the same period.[2] In clinical guidance, goals for treating T2DM have evolved from focusing on managing glycaemia to including primary and secondary prevention of cardiovascular and renal disease. Recent trial evidence on the cardiorenal benefits of SGLT2 inhibitors in people with T2DM has led to their addition to treatment strategies to achieve these goals.[3-5]

Between 2014 and 2023, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) in the UK published a range of guidance on SGLT2 inhibitors (Figure 1). In 2022, following Technology Appraisals (TAs) recommending SGLT2 inhibitor therapies for escalation of glucose-lowering treatment in T2DM, for symptomatic heart failure, and for CKD, NICE updated its T2DM guideline.[6] The update expanded the T2DM population to be offered SGLT2 inhibitor therapy, recommending that an SGLT2 inhibitor with proven cardiovascular benefit be offered for people with heart failure or CVD as a comorbidity, and considered for people at high risk of CVD. The change was informed by network meta analyses indicating 10-40% lower odds of cardiovascular mortality associated with taking metformin and an SGLT2 inhibitor compared to metformin alone.[7]

NICE prioritises evaluation of the uptake of guidelines, with additional goals of supporting reductions in health inequalities according to protected characteristics and socioeconomic status.[8] The increasing availability of routinely collected electronic health and prescription records is facilitating evaluations of uptake and inequalities in uptake of medicines recommended by NICE in the populations in scope of guidance,[9] complementing the national surveillance of volumes of medicines prescribed in the NHS Innovation Scorecard.[10]

In the present study, we report variation in the percentage of people with T2DM who had a current SGLT2 inhibitor prescription on 1st September 2023 according to patients' comorbidity status, in a large and representative sample of English GP

practices. We assess the evidence for inequalities in uptake according to age, gender, deprivation, and ethnicity, separately for patients stratified according to their CVD risk (low CVD risk score; high CVD risk score; with CVD; with HF; with CVD and HF) and by whether they have CKD. We consider the clinical and organisational factors that may explain the patterns in uptake of NICE guidance we report. Finally, we compare our findings to those in other high income countries, and discuss the policy implications of our results with reference the forthcoming update to the NICE T2DM guideline in 2026.

Figure 1. Timeline of selected NICE Technology Appraisals (blue) and guideline updates (orange) recommending SGLT2 inhibitors for different indications, 2014-2023.



METHODS

Data sources

The cohort and outcomes for analysis were extracted from CPRD Aurum.[11] CPRD Aurum includes recorded symptoms, diagnoses, test results, and medication data for

people at participating GP practices from 1995 to present, with approximately 24% coverage of the UK population by December 2023.[12] Patients in CPRD Aurum are broadly representative of the wider population with respect to their geographic distribution, deprivation, age, gender, and ethnicity.[13 14]

CPRD records of patients in England were linked to their Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) records to retrieve diagnoses and procedures recorded in NHS hospital inpatient admissions (with linkage up to March 2021 only),[15] and to their Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) quintile, categorised from 5 (least deprived) to 1 (most deprived). The IMD ranks small areas in England from most to least deprived using a single score based on 7 components of overall deprivation.[16] Linkages were done using an algorithm managed by NHS England.[17]

Lists of codes from the SNOMED (for CPRD) and ICD-10 and OPCS-4 (for HES) libraries were collated to select demographics, comorbidities, risk factors, and current medicines from the CPRD-HES dataset. Where relevant code lists were available from the General Practice Domain Set maintained by NHS England,[18] the Open Code Lists website maintained by the Bennett Institute,[19] or the CVDPrevent audit,[20] these were used. Otherwise, code lists were taken from the literature or created using the World Health Organisation ICD-10 codes library,[21] or free-text searches in the CPRD code browser. Each code list was reviewed at NICE by a health economist, a T2DM guideline committee member, or both. Each code list with details of its origin is available online (Appendix 1).

Cohort selection, stratification, exposure and outcome definitions

Patients were selected for the cross-sectional analysis of treatment uptake on 1 September 2023 (the “index date”) through identifying patients with any record of T2DM and no other form of diabetes in CPRD between 1st January 2000 and the index date, and retaining those whose records could be linked to both HES and IMD datasets, who were judged by CPRD to have a ‘research-quality’ record, and who were aged 18 or over on the index date.[22] Patients were excluded if they died or de-registered prior to the index date, or if they had less than one year registration on the index date.

The selected people were categorised into mutually exclusive groups of CVD without HF, HF without CVD, CVD with HF, high CVD risk score (QRISK2 score >10% [23]) without CVD or HF and low CVD risk score (QRISK2 score <10%) without CVD or HF. These were further subcategorised according to CKD status, with CKD defined as either an ACR > 3 mg/mmol or eGFR <60 ml/min/1.73m^2 in the most recent record of these in General Practice within two years prior to the index date. Most people did not have a recent QRISK2 recorded in CPRD Aurum. This was instead estimated using an algorithm developed by researchers at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.[24] Appendix 2 describes the implementation and validation of that algorithm for the present analysis.

Patients' IMD was divided into five groups defined by quintiles from least (5) to most (1) deprived. For CVD risk factors, including laboratory results and BMI, the most recent measurement within two years prior to the index date was used; if none were available in this window the value was set to missing.

Presence of a current prescription of any medication was defined using the algorithm developed by Farmer *et al*.[25] This estimates the days supply of a prescription using any data available on the quantity of pills and the daily dose; or number of days prescribed; or the average gap between previous prescriptions. If none of these are available then a 28 day prescription length is assumed. If the most recent prescription date plus two times the estimated days supply falls after the index date, then the prescription is considered current. People with a current prescription for dapagliflozin, empagliflozin, canagliflozin, or ertugliflozin were counted as having a current SGLT2 inhibitor.

Descriptive and statistical analysis

The demographic and clinical characteristics of the prevalent population with T2DM in September 2023 were summarised using counts, percentages, and means, stratified by comorbidity (CVD risk score category, and CVD and HF status).

Uptake of SGLT2 inhibitors in each CVD group was defined the percentage of the population with a current prescription on the index date, without reference to whether they previously had an SGLT2 prescription which stopped prior to the index date or if SGLT2 inhibitor therapy was contraindicated. Uptake was calculated overall, by

comorbidity status, and further by age, gender, ethnicity, deprivation status, and duration of diagnosis.

The association between patient characteristics and odds of a current SGLT2 inhibitor prescription was then evaluated using logistic regression. First, one model was fitted to all people with either CVD or HF, with categorical variables for comorbidity status (CVD and CKD status) and all patient characteristics. Then, separate models were fitted for each CVD category group (including people without CVD), each model including CKD status and all patient characteristics as covariables, to assess for heterogeneity in the association between patient characteristics and uptake between the different subpopulations. The analysis was conducted in STATA 16; all analysis code is available online (Appendix 1).

No representatives of service users were involved at the design or analysis stages of this study.

RESULTS

Baseline characteristics

Demographics

In total 587,826 people with prevalent T2DM in CPRD Aurum on 1st September 2023 met all the study inclusion criteria (Table 1). Most people were aged over 60 years (71.2%), 56.5% were male, and 75.0% were white. People with T2DM were more likely to live in deprived areas than the general population: 138,899 (23.6%) were living in the most deprived quintile in England compared to 95,425 (16.2%) living in the least deprived.

Cardiovascular disease and heart failure status

Cardiovascular disease was common: 129,306 (22.0%) had CVD without HF; 13,693 (2.3%) had HF without CVD; 35,266 (6.0%) had CVD and HF; 362,792 (61.7%) had neither CVD or HF but estimated 10 year CVD risk > 10%; and 46,769 (8.0%) had neither but CVD risk <10%.

Chronic kidney disease

In total 202,667 (34.5%) of the cohort had a record of comorbid CKD. Of these, 31,835 (15.7%) had stage 1 disease, 50,800 (25.1%) had stage 2 disease, 104,882 (51.8%) had stage 3 disease, and 15,150 (7.5%) had stage 4 or 5 disease (Appendix 3). A record of eGFR within 2 years prior to the index date was missing for 3.3% of the cohort.

Uptake of SGLT2 inhibitors

Overall uptake of SGLT-2 inhibitors for people with T2DM in General Practice was 20.7%, varying between 19.5% and 30.5% according to CVD group (Table 2). Uptake was higher in patients with heart failure (29.4% and 30.5% in patients with HF with and without CVD respectively) and lower in patients without heart failure (19.5%, 19.9%, and 20.2% in the patients without HF but with current CVD, high CVD risk, and low CVD risk, respectively). In the unadjusted results, uptake was markedly higher for people diagnosed with T2DM over 2 years prior to the analysis index date compared to those diagnosed more recently; higher in men then women; and higher in people aged under 70 years than those older than 70 years. Smaller differences were present according to CKD status, deprivation, and ethnicity.

When stratified by age group, a consistent association between CVD group and SGLT2 inhibitor uptake was present, with uptake ordered from lowest to highest as follows: low CVD risk score, high CVD risk score, CVD only, HF only, CVD and HF (Table 3). In analysis stratified by CVD group and age, CKD was also consistently associated with higher uptake of SGLT2 inhibitors for patients in each age category with CVD or HF. In people aged 60-69 years with CVD, uptake was 26.2% in people without CKD and 31.5% in people with CKD; similar differences were present in other age groups.

Table 1. Clinical and demographic characteristics of people in CPRD with prevalent T2DM by cardiovascular disease comorbidity status, September 2023.

	All T2DM patients	CVD only	HF only	CVD + HF	High CVD risk, no HF	Low CVD risk, no HF*
Overall						
All patients	587,826 (100.0%)	129,306 (100.0%)	13,693 (100.0%)	35,266 (100.0%)	362,792 (100.0%)	46,769 (100.0%)
By CKD status						
No CKD**	365,549 (62.2%)	71,321 (55.2%)	5,167 (37.7%)	12,067 (34.2%)	240,048 (66.2%)	36,946 (79.0%)
Any CKD***	202,667 (34.5%)	55,529 (42.9%)	8,347 (61.0%)	22,778 (64.6%)	109,399 (30.2%)	6,614 (14.1%)
Missing	19,610 (3.3%)	2,456 (1.9%)	179 (1.3%)	421 (1.2%)	13,345 (3.7%)	3,209 (6.9%)
T2DM duration						
0-2 years	83,137 (14.1%)	13,145 (10.2%)	1,733 (12.7%)	3,049 (8.6%)	53,426 (14.7%)	11,784 (25.2%)
>2 years	504,689 (85.9%)	116,161 (89.8%)	11,960 (87.3%)	32,217 (91.4%)	309,366 (85.3%)	34,985 (74.8%)
Age (years)						
Mean age	67	72	74	76	67	50
18-39	13,894 (2.4%)	305 (0.2%)	103 (0.8%)	39 (0.1%)	2,267 (0.6%)	11,180 (23.9%)
40-49	43,494 (7.4%)	2,779 (2.1%)	395 (2.9%)	411 (1.2%)	20,056 (5.5%)	19,850 (42.4%)
50-59	112,272 (19.1%)	14,620 (11.3%)	1,309 (9.6%)	2,307 (6.5%)	79,429 (21.9%)	14,610 (31.2%)
60-69	156,682 (26.7%)	33,095 (25.6%)	2,622 (19.1%)	6,659 (18.9%)	113,179 (31.2%)	1,130 (2.4%)
70-79	153,988 (26.2%)	43,047 (33.3%)	4,164 (30.4%)	11,570 (32.8%)	95,205 (26.2%)	N/A
80-89	90,267 (15.4%)	29,532 (22.8%)	3,980 (29.1%)	11,405 (32.3%)	45,350 (12.5%)	-
90+	17,229 (2.9%)	5,928 (4.6%)	1,120 (8.2%)	2,875 (8.2%)	7,306 (2.0%)	-
Sex						
Male	332,160 (56.5%)	80,952 (62.6%)	6,950 (50.8%)	22,931 (65.0%)	203,181 (56.0%)	18,146 (38.8%)
Female	255,666 (43.5%)	48,354 (37.4%)	6,743 (49.2%)	12,335 (35.0%)	159,611 (44.0%)	28,623 (61.2%)
Deprivation (IMD)						
5 (Least deprived)	138,899 (23.6%)	30,890 (23.9%)	3,164 (23.1%)	8,616 (24.4%)	81,267 (22.4%)	14,962 (32.0%)
4	132,385 (22.5%)	28,417 (22.0%)	2,903 (21.2%)	7,834 (22.2%)	80,878 (22.3%)	12,353 (26.4%)
3	113,615 (19.3%)	24,850 (19.2%)	2,757 (20.1%)	6,670 (18.9%)	71,014 (19.6%)	8,324 (17.8%)
2	107,502 (18.3%)	24,118 (18.7%)	2,534 (18.5%)	6,579 (18.7%)	68,140 (18.8%)	6,131 (13.1%)
1 (Most deprived)	95,425 (16.2%)	21,031 (16.3%)	2,335 (17.1%)	5,567 (15.8%)	61,493 (16.9%)	4,999 (10.7%)
Ethnicity						
White	440,777 (75.0%)	103,630 (80.1%)	11,556 (84.4%)	29,534 (83.7%)	273,131 (75.3%)	22,926 (49.0%)
Mixed	7,266 (1.2%)	1,183 (0.9%)	122 (0.9%)	249 (0.7%)	4,235 (1.2%)	1,477 (3.2%)
Asian	87,284 (14.8%)	17,090 (13.2%)	987 (7.2%)	3,803 (10.8%)	54,790 (15.1%)	10,614 (22.7%)
Black	38,471 (6.5%)	5,324 (4.1%)	842 (6.1%)	1,292 (3.7%)	21,648 (6.0%)	9,365 (20.0%)
Chinese or Other	9,506 (1.6%)	1,644 (1.3%)	120 (0.9%)	329 (0.9%)	5,645 (1.6%)	1,768 (3.8%)
Not stated/known	4,522 (0.8%)	435 (0.3%)	66 (0.5%)	59 (0.2%)	3,343 (0.9%)	619 (1.3%)

*Counts rounded to nearest 10 where any cells have less than 10. *eGFR >59 & ACR <3/missing **ACR > 3 or eGFR <60

Table 2. Percentage of people with prevalent T2DM and a current prescription for an SGLT-2 inhibitor, by cardiovascular disease status, September 2023.

	All T2DM patients		CVD, no HF		HF, no CVD		HF and CVD		High CVD risk		Low CVD risk	
	Count patients	Percent prescribed SGLT2i	Count patients	Percent prescribed SGLT2i	Count patients	Percent prescribed SGLT2i	Count patients	Percent prescribed SGLT2i	Count patients	Percent prescribed SGLT2i	Count patients*	Percent prescribed SGLT2i
Overall												
All patients	587,826	20.7%	129,306	19.5%	13,693	29.4%	35,266	30.5%	362,792	19.9%	46,769	20.2%
CKD status												
No CKD	365,549	20.9%	71,321	20.7%	5,167	29.8%	12,067	31.6%	240,048	20.4%	36,946	20.1%
Any CKD	202,667	21.8%	55,529	18.5%	8,347	29.7%	22,778	30.3%	109,399	20.7%	6,614	27.8%
Missing	19,610	6.5%	2,456	7.6%	179	8.4%	421	9.0%	13,345	6.4%	3,209	5.4%
T2DM duration												
0-2 years	83,137	8.3%	13,145	7.8%	1,733	27.9%	3,049	25.5%	53,426	6.8%	11,784	8.6%
>2 years	504,689	22.8%	116,161	20.9%	11,960	29.7%	32,217	31.0%	309,366	22.2%	34,985	24.1%
Age (years)												
18-39	13,894	16.1%	305	23.9%	103	46.6%	39	43.6%	2,267	20.1%	11,180	14.7%
40-49	43,494	22.2%	2,779	29.0%	395	42.3%	411	48.2%	20,056	22.2%	19,850	20.4%
50-59	112,272	26.1%	14,620	30.3%	1,309	39.8%	2,307	44.0%	79,429	25.0%	14,610	24.1%
60-69	156,682	25.9%	33,095	27.4%	2,622	37.7%	6,659	41.4%	113,179	24.4%	1,130	20.3%
70-79	153,988	19.3%	43,047	18.9%	4,164	32.1%	11,570	34.1%	95,205	17.2%	0	N/A
80-89	90,267	10.5%	29,532	8.8%	3,980	21.6%	11,405	22.0%	45,350	7.6%		
90+	17,229	4.4%	5,928	2.4%	1,120	9.8%	2,875	11.0%	7,306	2.6%		
Sex												
Male	332,160	23.2%	80,952	22.2%	6,950	35.6%	22,931	34.9%	203,181	22.3%	18,146	19.1%
Female	255,666	17.5%	48,354	15.1%	6,743	23.1%	12,335	22.4%	159,611	17.0%	28,623	20.9%
Deprivation (IMD)												
5 (Least deprived)	138,899	20.9%	30,890	20.4%	3,164	28.7%	8,616	30.7%	81,267	20.0%	14,962	19.3%
4	132,385	20.7%	28,417	19.7%	2,903	30.1%	7,834	30.5%	80,878	20.0%	12,353	19.5%
3	113,615	20.5%	24,850	19.3%	2,757	28.5%	6,670	29.5%	71,014	19.8%	8,324	20.3%
2	107,502	20.9%	24,118	19.1%	2,534	30.8%	6,579	31.3%	68,140	20.1%	6,131	22.4%
1 (Most deprived)	95,425	20.6%	21,031	18.7%	2,335	29.2%	5,567	30.5%	61,493	19.9%	4,999	21.7%
Ethnicity												
White	440,777	21.0%	103,630	18.9%	11,556	29.5%	29,534	30.0%	273,131	20.3%	22,926	22.7%
Mixed	7,266	18.6%	1,183	21.0%	122	36.1%	249	34.5%	4,235	17.1%	1,477	17.0%
Asian	87,284	21.9%	17,090	24.5%	987	27.0%	3,803	34.8%	54,790	20.5%	10,614	19.3%
Black	38,471	16.5%	5,324	16.5%	842	29.8%	1,292	26.9%	21,648	15.5%	9,365	16.3%
Chinese or Other	9,506	18.6%	1,644	20.7%	120	35.8%	329	35.3%	5,645	17.0%	1,768	17.6%
Not stated / known	4,522	17.2%	435	15.4%	66	34.8%	59	30.5%	3,343	17.20%	619	15.7%

*Counts rounded to nearest 10 where any cells have less than 10.

Table 3. Percentage of people with a current prescription for an SGLT-2 inhibitor, in patients with T2DM and heart failure or CVD, by CKD status, September 2023

	CVD only				HF only				CVD + HF			
	Comorbid CKD		**No comorbid CKD**		**Comorbid CKD**		**No comorbid CKD**		**Comorbid CKD**		**No comorbid CKD**	
	Count patients	Percent prescribed SGLT2i	Count patients	Percent prescribed SGLT2i	Count patients	Percent prescribed SGLT2i	Count patients	Percent prescribed SGLT2i	Count patients	Percent prescribed SGLT2i	Count patients	Percent prescribed SGLT2i
Overall												
All patients	55,529	18.5%	71,321	20.7%	8,347	29.7%	5,167	29.8%	22,778	30.3%	12,067	31.6%
T2DM duration												
0-2 years	8,313	28.7%	11,282	47.5%	1,284	52.5%	1,288	52.6%	2,329	48.3%	2,316	48.0%
>2 years	51,729	19.3%	62,057	22.7%	7,471	29.8%	4,320	30.3%	21,160	30.6%	10,647	32.7%
Age (years)												
18-39	58	31.0%	225	23.1%	26	69.2%	73	39.7%	11	18.2%	25	60.0%
40-49	574	36.4%	2,068	27.9%	119	44.5%	264	41.3%	122	51.6%	268	49.6%
50-59	3,239	36.1%	10,864	29.5%	466	46.4%	805	37.6%	815	44.8%	1,427	44.8%
60-69	9,674	31.5%	22,691	26.2%	1,202	38.6%	1,371	37.9%	3,073	43.7%	3,458	40.4%
70-79	19,181	20.7%	23,274	17.7%	2,541	35.3%	1,588	27.5%	7,424	36.9%	4,051	29.6%
80-89	18,438	9.6%	10,733	7.8%	3,056	23.8%	897	14.9%	8,885	23.8%	2,448	16.3%
90+	4,365	2.6%	1,466	2.2%	937	10.8%	169	5.3%	2,448	11.6%	390	8.2%
Sex												
Male	33,286	21.8%	46,022	22.9%	3,996	36.2%	2,867	35.5%	14,046	35.1%	8,596	35.3%
Female	22,243	13.6%	25,299	16.8%	4,351	23.7%	2,300	22.7%	8,732	22.6%	3,471	22.4%
Deprivation (IMD)												
5 (Least deprived)	12,328	19.4%	17,817	21.6%	1,829	28.9%	1,288	29.0%	5,264	29.8%	3,196	33.1%
4	12,154	19.0%	15,685	20.8%	1,720	29.8%	1,145	31.4%	5,012	30.1%	2,737	31.9%
3	10,840	18.7%	13,573	20.2%	1,711	29.6%	1,002	27.3%	4,454	29.8%	2,148	29.6%
2	10,623	18.0%	13,113	20.4%	1,558	30.3%	948	32.3%	4,281	31.3%	2,240	31.7%
1 (Most deprived)	9,584	17.2%	11,133	20.2%	1,529	29.8%	784	28.8%	3,767	30.8%	1,746	30.6%
Ethnicity												
White	44,794	17.5%	57,017	20.3%	7,047	29.5%	4,383	30.0%	18,990	29.9%	10,222	30.9%
Mixed	468	22.2%	665	21.5%	73	31.5%	47	44.7%	180	34.4%	68	35.3%
Asian	6,835	25.7%	9,923	24.2%	597	28.0%	371	26.4%	2,442	34.2%	1,305	37.0%
Black	2,666	16.9%	2,507	16.8%	526	32.7%	291	25.8%	943	27.5%	317	27.8%
Chinese or Other	606	21.1%	977	21.5%	66	33.3%	50	42.0%	191	33.5%	131	39.7%
Not stated / known	160	20.6%	232	14.2%	38	34.2%	25	40.0%	32	31.3%	24	33.3%

Modelling analysis of uptake of SGLT2 inhibitors

All clinical patient characteristics were significantly ($p<0.01$) associated with differences in the odds of having a current prescription for an SGLT2 inhibitor in a model for people with CVD or HF which mutually adjusted for all other patient characteristics, CVD group and CKD status (Table 4). CKD was associated with

higher odds of uptake (OR: 1.22, 95% CI: (1.19, 1.25)), as was HF (OR: 2.15 (2.06, 2.24)) and combined CVD and HF (OR: 2.15 (2.09, 2.22)). Patients aged 70-79 years had considerably lower odds than patients aged 18-39 (OR: 0.41 (0.33, 0.51)), women had lower odds than men (OR: 0.67 (0.65, 0.68)), and people living in areas in the highest quintile of deprivation had lower odds than those in the least deprived (OR: 0.84 (0.81, 0.88)). Compared to people of White ethnicity, people of Asian ethnicity had higher odds of a current prescription (OR: 1.07 (1.04, 1.11)) whilst people Black ethnicity had lower odds (OR: 0.77 (0.72, 0.81)).

The same direction of association for each of the different patient characteristics in the overall population was also generally observed within each CVD group (Appendix 4, Figure 2). Higher age and female gender were consistently and strongly associated with lower odds in all groups, except the low CVD risk group, where odds were higher with higher age and only slightly lower for women (OR: 0.95 (0.90, 1.00)). Black ethnicity was associated with lower uptake in all groups, though the difference was greater in patients without HF. In patients with neither CVD nor HF, White ethnicity was associated with considerably higher uptake than any other ethnicity. CKD was associated with higher odds of a prescription in all subgroups (OR ranging between 1.17 and 1.47), while more recent diagnosis was only consistently associated with lower in odds in patients without HF (Appendix Table 4).

Table 4. Logistic regression model for association between current SGLT2 inhibitor prescription and patient clinical and demographic characteristics, people with T2DM and either CVD or HF, September, 2023.

CKD		
No CKD	1.00	
CKD	1.22 (1.19, 1.25)	<0.01
Cardiovascular disease status		
CVD without HF	1.00	
HF without CVD	2.15 (2.06, 2.24)	<0.01
CVD and HF	2.15 (2.09, 2.22)	<0.01
Age group		
18-39	1.00	
40-49	0.98 (0.78, 1.23)	0.89
50-59	0.91 (0.74, 1.14)	0.41
60-69	0.71 (0.57, 0.88)	<0.01
70-79	0.41 (0.33, 0.51)	<0.01
80-89	0.19 (0.15, 0.24)	<0.01
90+	0.07 (0.06, 0.09)	<0.01
Gender		
Male	1.00	
Female	0.67 (0.65, 0.68)	<0.01
Deprivation		
5 (Least deprived)	1.00	
4	0.98 (0.94, 1.02)	0.38
3	0.91 (0.87, 0.95)	<0.01
2	0.89 (0.85, 0.92)	<0.01
1 (most deprived)	0.84 (0.81, 0.88)	<0.01
Ethnicity		
White	1.00	
Mixed	1.03 (0.91, 1.17)	0.60
Asian or Asian British	1.07 (1.04, 1.11)	<0.01
Black or Black British	0.77 (0.72, 0.81)	<0.01
Chinese or Other Ethnic Group	1.01 (0.91, 1.12)	0.88
Not stated/known	0.97 (0.78, 1.22)	0.80
Diagnosis recency		
0-1 years	1.00	
1-2 years	1.15 (1.05, 1.26)	<0.01
2-3 years	1.34 (1.22, 1.46)	<0.01
3-4 years	1.51 (1.38, 1.66)	<0.01
4-5 years	1.67 (1.53, 1.82)	<0.01
>5 years	3.08 (2.88, 3.29)	<0.01

Figure 2. Odds ratios for association between patient characteristics and a current SGLT2 inhibitor prescription, by cardiovascular disease status, models adjusted for diagnosis recency and CKD stage, September 2023.



Discussion

Principal findings

The percentage of people with T2DM with a current SGLT2 inhibitor prescription remained relatively low by September 2023, 18 months after the 2022 NICE T2DM guideline update. The percentage in the whole T2DM cohort was 20.7%. Uptake was lower in people with comorbid CVD without HF (19.5%) and people at high CVD risk without HF (19.9%) than for people with HF (29.4%). In age-stratified results, uptake was higher with in people with comorbidities and greater CVD risk score: higher in people with CKD than those without CKD; higher in people with CVD than people at high CVD risk; and higher in people at high CVD risk than in those at low CVD risk.

In models which adjusted for patients' characteristics and comorbidity status, people aged 70-79 had less than half the odds of having a current prescription than people aged 18-39, and women had approximately two-thirds the odds of men. Ethnicity and deprivation inequalities in uptake were also observed, with 10-25% lower odds of a current prescription in Black people compared to White people, and 13-19% lower odds in people living in the most deprived areas compared to the least deprived.

Interpreting variation in uptake

Variation by comorbidity and NICE guidance type

Some of the variation in prescribing we report may be due to differences in the speed and extent of implementation of different NICE guidance, including Technology Appraisals on SGLT2 inhibitors for different indications between 2021 and 2023, and the 2022 T2DM guideline update (NICE NG28). Clinical considerations may partly explain some of the other inequalities we report.

NICE NG28 does not differentiate between CVD and HF in the strength of its recommendations, stating an SGLT2 inhibitor should be offered to people with T2DM 'if they have chronic heart failure or established atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease'. However, we found prescribing was 50% higher in people with HF than in people with CVD without HF. One explanation of this is that prescribing may have responded more to Technology Appraisals for SGLT2 inhibitors for HF in specialist

teams between 2021-2023, than it has to the 2022 guideline recommendations for their use for T2DM with CVD in primary care. Higher uptake for people with T2DM and HF may therefore be driven by continuation of prescribing initiated outside general practice, due to the HF itself and independent of diabetes status.

Recommendations in NICE NG28 for groups not covered by a relevant Technology Appraisal for another condition appear to have been implemented to some extent in England. Specifically, in age-stratified results prescribing of SGLT2 inhibitors was higher in people with T2DM with elevated CVD risk scores than people with lower scores; and higher still for people with CVD. This ordering mirrors the strength of recommendations in NG28 in these different groups.

Variation by age, gender, ethnicity, and deprivation

We report lower prescribing of SGLT2 inhibitors with higher age, particularly after age 70 years. This could be partly due to concern about adverse outcomes relating to SGLT2 inhibitor therapy, the avoidance of polypharmacy, and caution in the context of frailty. NG28 recommends an SGLT2 inhibitor should be offered to patients with T2DM under 40 if they elevated lifetime CVD risk regardless of their QRISK2 score, and the vast majority will have elevated lifetime risk. Differences by gender may be at least partially due to adverse effects including genital mycotic infections, recurrent UTIs being more common in women, and the need to avoid SGLT2 inhibitors in women of child-bearing potential who are sexually active and not using contraception. However, the extent to which the inequalities we report are due to these factors is unclear. Less than 10% of people in our cohort are under 50. Seghezzo *et al* evaluated several drugs to treat HF in a UK cohort with HF with and without T2DM, and reported similar age and gender inequalities for SGLT2 inhibitors but also for drugs where UTIs and pregnancy are not of concern.[26] That analysis also found a positive association between higher frailty and prescribing, contrary to what would be expected were frailty driving age inequalities in uptake. The draft of the 2026 NICE T2DM guideline update cautions the use of SGLT2 inhibitors in people with T2DM and frailty, but highlights the sparsity of evidence for this population.[27] One study in Wales found similar profiles of comorbidity and adverse events between participants in cardiovascular outcome trials of SGLT2 inhibitors and

the real-world population with a prescription,[28] and there is potential for further observational studies to inform guidance for frailer patient groups.

Additional research is also needed to explore the differences in prescribing of SGLT2 inhibitors by ethnicity. Lower prescribing in people with Black ethnicity may be partly due to concerns about DKA with these medicines, and avoidance of use in those with a history of previous DKA given that ketosis-prone diabetes is more prevalent in people of Black ethnicity.[29] However, it is more likely that these differences by ethnicity, along with lower prescribing in areas of higher deprivation, relate to systemic barriers in accessing healthcare including differential provisional as well as financial, cultural and psychosocial factors. Challenges to engagement with health services in minoritised groups and lack of incentives to initiate SGLT2 inhibitors in primary care may both contribute.

Population health benefits of higher uptake of SGLT2 inhibitors

Network-meta analyses have demonstrated reductions in mortality, hospitalisation for heart failure, and myocardial infarctions associated with SGLT2 inhibitor therapy for people with T2DM and either CVD, HF, CKD, or high risk of CVD.[7] In the UK 92% of people with T2DM have at least one of these. With the loss of exclusivity of the patent for the most prescribed SGLT2 inhibitor in the UK, generic dapagliflozin has recently launched and acquisition costs are reducing, with 18-29% price reductions in the NHS tariff from September 2025. The reductions imply costs of less than £20,000 per additional quality-adjusted life year gained with SGLT2 inhibitor therapy, indicating substantial population health benefits can be gained from higher uptake whilst limiting displaced resources within the wider NHS.

Comparison to other studies on SGLT2 inhibitor uptake in the UK

To our knowledge no previous studies have reported uptake of SGLT2 inhibitors for T2DM up to 2023. Volumes of GP prescriptions for dapagliflozin (for any indication) increased in England approximately 80% between September 2023 and August 2025, from 495,000 individual units per month to 907,000.[30] Applying this increase to overall uptake in the present study (21%), implies it could have reached approximately 37% in people with T2DM by August 2025.

Farmer *et al* evaluated current prescriptions of people with T2DM with and without CVD, using CPRD GOLD up to 2019.[25] They reported that, in people without CVD, the percentage of people with a current SGLT-2 inhibitor prescription increased from 6.7% to 13.8% between end-2016 and end-2019. In people with CVD it increased from 4.3% to 9.8%. These results are compatible with our findings and suggest that, between 2019 and 2023, there was a modest rise in SGLT2i prescribing in those with T2DM without CVD and a greater increase in those with T2DM with CVD.

Seghezzo *et al* reported large increases in uptake of SGLT2 inhibitors in people with HF with reduced ejection from approximately 8% in January 2022 to over 25% by May 2024 in UK General Practice, with no indication of a plateau by 2024, and higher prescribing in people with comorbid T2DM.[26] Another large UK General Practice study on CKD up to December 2022 reported that 62.8% of people with CKD had guideline-directed indication for SGLT2 inhibitor, but uptake in that cohort with CKD and T2DM was only 22%.[31] These results are consistent with those in our subgroups of T2DM patients with comorbid HF and CKD.

Regarding the distribution of CVD risk scores in people with T2DM that we estimated Young *et al* estimated than in 2020 59.6% of people with T2DM had high risk of CVD and 6.9% had low risk,[32] compared to our estimates of 64% and 8% by 2023.

Comparison to other studies on SGLT2 inhibitor uptake internationally

Other comparable studies report lower uptake of SGLT2 inhibitors for T2DM and CKD internationally compared to the UK, though there is sparse data after 2022.

Gagnon *et al* evaluated uptake of SGLT2 inhibitors in patients with T2DM and comorbid HF, separately in a specialised heart function clinic and in all adults in Alberta, Canada, between 2018 and 2022.[33] In the specialised clinic cohort it reached 49.1% by March 2022, whilst in the whole province it reached 26.4% by January 2022. In one population-based study of adults with T2DM hospitalised with HF in New South Wales in Australia, uptake of SGLT2 inhibitors had reached 13.2% by mid-2021, with lower uptake reported in older age groups, people with higher frailty, and, in contrast to our analysis, people with CKD.[34] Another analysis of 114,000 adults with T2DM in primary care in Australia reported uptake of 13.6% in people without CKD and 14.4% in people with CKD in 2020-2021.[35]

Uptake and inequalities in uptake of other NICE guidelines

There is evidence that including NICE indicators in the Quality and Outcomes Framework has resulted in improved adherence to guidelines. [36] Otherwise, however, there is evidence that adherence to NICE guideline recommendations in General Practice is frequently low. Several small studies in General Practice settings have evaluated uptake of NICE recommendations in areas including heart failure [37], hypertension [38], T2DM and comorbid hypertension [39], and osteoarthritis [40]. They have reported variable and low uptake.

Limitations

Evaluation of the QRISK2 algorithm we applied indicated that up to 20% of people estimated as having a low CVD risk score (QRISK2 <10%) could have had a QRISK2 of greater than 10% (Appendix 2). This imprecision may lead to some under-estimation of the difference in uptake between people with high and low CVD risk. Many people with CVD and HF may have been misclassified as not having them, as recording of these in primary care can be incomplete,[41] and linked data from HES was only available to March 2021. Such misclassification may result in underestimation of uptake differences between people with and without comorbidities.

We did not evaluate how many people had previously initiated but then stopped an SGLT2 inhibitor, would be clinically unsuitable for treatment, or assess for polypharmacy in our population. These factors will explain a proportion of the patients not prescribed one. In the Canadian study of a cohort with T2DM and HF Gagnon *et al* reported that 62.4% of people met all the eligibility criteria for trials proving the effectiveness of SGLT2 inhibitors,[33] and in an analysis of uptake of SGLT2 inhibitors for CKD in the UK, Forbes *et al* reported that 62.8% of patients with T2DM and CKD were indicated for therapy with an SGLT2 inhibitor.[31] Further research would be needed to identify a plausible ceiling for uptake for the people in scope of NG28 in our analysis. However, if approximately a third of people were ineligible for an SGLT2 inhibitor, our results would imply an opportunity to at least double prescribing in people with HF, and triple prescribing in people with CVD without HF.

Conclusion

By September 2023 prescribing of SGLT2 inhibitors remained relatively low for people with T2DM recommended them in recent NICE technology appraisals and guidelines. We report lower uptake in people with T2DM and CVD without HF than people with T2DM and HF, despite an equal guideline recommendation for both these groups, and inequalities by ethnicity and deprivation. SGLT2 inhibitor prescribing increased substantially to September 2023 and afterwards to August 2025 nationally. However, our results show that progress has not been evenly distributed, and point to an opportunity to increase prescribing and reduce inequalities. Healthcare systems and policy makers should explore interventions supporting case-finding and quality improvement, such as pay-for-performance mechanisms, to ensure comprehensive and equitable access to these cost-effective therapies in line with NICE guidance.

A further major update to the NICE T2DM guideline is due to be published in 2026. In draft form this recommends that all T2DM patients, regardless of their CVD risk, should be offered both metformin and an SGLT2 inhibitor. Action is necessary to support uptake of both the current guidance and any widened scope for this important drug class in the final draft of the next iteration.

Contribution to authorship

The study was conceived by LO, PM, and designed by all the authors. PM and JW did the data and statistical analysis with support from RW and EY; JW and MR produced the code lists. All authors assisted with the interpretation of results. PM wrote the manuscript with substantial input and revisions from all other authors. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no other meeting the criteria have been omitted.

Acknowledgements, funding, and disclaimer

PM, JW, MR, JH, RW, EY, SR, MW, LSR and LO are employees of the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. AA is supported by funding from NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre. The authors are solely responsible for any

errors or omissions. The opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position of their affiliations.

Disclosure of interests

DJC has received investigator-initiated grants from Astra Zeneca and Novo Nordisk, support for education from Perspectum and consultancy fees from Madrigal with any financial renumeration from pharmaceutical company consultation made to the University of Liverpool. All other authors declare no competing interests.

Sharing of data and results

No additional data are available; the authors are not the data controllers and do not have permission to share the data.

Transparency statement

PM had full access to all the data in the study, and affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that there are no discrepancies between the study conducted and the study as originally planned.

Ethical approval

This study was based on data from the Clinical Practice Research Datalink obtained under licence from the UK Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency. The study was approved by the CPRD Research Data Governance process (ID: 23_003530).

REFERENCES

1. Office for Health Improvement and disparities. Diabetes profile: statistical commentary, March 2025, 2025.
2. Pearson-Stuttard J, Holloway S, Polya R, et al. Variations in comorbidity burden in people with type 2 diabetes over disease duration: A population-based analysis of real world evidence. *eClinicalMedicine* 2022;52 doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2022.101584
3. Perkovic V, Jardine MJ, Neal B, et al. Canagliflozin and Renal Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes and Nephropathy. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2019;380(24):2295-306. doi: doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1811744
4. Wiviott SD, Raz I, Bonaca MP, et al. Dapagliflozin and Cardiovascular Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2019;380(4):347-57. doi: doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1812389
5. Ndumele CE, Rangaswami J, Chow SL, et al. Cardiovascular-Kidney-Metabolic Health: A Presidential Advisory From the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2023;148(20):1606-35. doi: doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000001184
6. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Type 2 diabetes in adults: management (NG28), 2024.
7. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Type 2 diabetes in adults: management (Medicines update): Cost-effectiveness analysis: subsequent pharmacological therapy for the management of type 2 diabetes (draft for consultation), 2025.
8. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. What we do: NICE guidelines, 2024.
9. Curtis HJ, Walker AJ, Goldacre B. Impact of NICE guidance on tamoxifen prescribing in England 2011-2017: an interrupted time series analysis. *British journal of cancer* 2018;118(9):1268-75. doi: 10.1038/s41416-018-0065-2 [published Online First: 2018/04/24]
10. NHS England. NICE Technology Appraisals in the NHS in England (Innovation Scorecard), 2023.
11. Wolf A, Dedman D, Campbell J, et al. Data resource profile: Clinical Practice Research Datalink (CPRD) Aurum. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2019;48(6):1740-40g. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyz034
12. Clinical Practice Research Datalink. CPRD Aurum December 2023 (Version 2023.12.001) [Data set], 2023.
13. Herrett E, Gallagher AM, Bhaskaran K, et al. Data Resource Profile: Clinical Practice Research Datalink (CPRD). *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2015;44(3):827-36. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyv098
14. Shiekh SI, Harley M, Ghosh RE, et al. Completeness, agreement, and representativeness of ethnicity recording in the United Kingdom's Clinical Practice Research Datalink (CPRD) and linked Hospital Episode Statistics (HES). *Population health metrics* 2023;21(1):3. doi: 10.1186/s12963-023-00302-0 [published Online First: 2023/03/16]
15. Boyd A, Cornish R, Johnson L, et al. Understanding Hospital Episode Statistics (HES). London, UK: CLOSER, 2017.
16. Noble M, Wright G, Smith G, et al. Measuring Multiple Deprivation at the Small-Area Level. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 2006;38(1):169-85. doi: 10.1068/a37168
17. Padmanabhan S, Carty L, Cameron E, et al. Approach to record linkage of primary care data from Clinical Practice Research Datalink to other health-related patient data: overview and implications. *European Journal of Epidemiology* 2019;34(1):91-99. doi: 10.1007/s10654-018-0442-4
18. NHS England. Primary Care Domain reference sets 2023 [Available from: https://isd.digital.nhs.uk/trud/user/guest/group/0/pack/8/subpack/659/releases.
19. OpenCodelists (Bennett Institute UoO. OpenCodelists 2024 [Available from: https://www.opencodelists.org/.

20. Office for Health Improvement and Disparities and the NHS Benchmarking Network. The Cardiovascular Disease Prevention Audit (CVDPREVENT) 2024 [Available from: https://www.cvdprevent.nhs.uk/.
21. World Health Organisation. ICD-10 Version: 2010 2010 [Available from: https://icd.who.int/browse10/2010/en.
22. Clinical Practice Research Datalink. CPRD: Denominator data 2024 [Available from: https://www.cprd.com/denominator-data.
23. Hippisley-Cox J, Coupland C, Vinogradova Y, et al. Predicting cardiovascular risk in England and Wales: prospective derivation and validation of QRISK2. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2008;336(7659):1475-82. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39609.449676.25 [published Online First: 2008/06/25]
24. Herrett E, Gadd S, Jackson R, et al. Eligibility and subsequent burden of cardiovascular disease of four strategies for blood pressure-lowering treatment: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet* 2019;394(10199):663-71. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)31359-5
25. Farmer RE, Beard I, Raza SI, et al. Prescribing in Type 2 Diabetes Patients With and Without Cardiovascular Disease History: A Descriptive Analysis in the UK CPRD. *Clinical Therapeutics* 2021;43(2):320-35. doi: 10.1016/j.clinthera.2020.12.015
26. Seghezzo G, Costello RE, Martineau F, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Treatment and Outcomes Among Patients with Heart Failure with Reduced Ejection Fraction: Nationwide Studies Using the OpenSAFELY Platform. 2025
27. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Type 2 diabetes in adults: management (medicines update) In development, 2025.
28. Hanlon H, Wightman W, Sullivan S, et al. Assessing the representativeness of trials of Sodium-glucose Cotransporter- 2 inhibitors in type 2 diabetes (preprint). 2025
29. Umpierrez GE, Smiley D, Kitabchi AE. Narrative review: ketosis-prone type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Annals of internal medicine* 2006;144(5):350-7. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-144-5-200603070-00011 [published Online First: 2006/03/08]
30. OpenPrescribing.net. Dapagliflozin (0601023AG): Bennett Institute for Applied Data Science, University of Oxford, 2025.
31. Forbes AK, Hinton W, Feher MD, et al. Implementation of chronic kidney disease guidelines for sodium-glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitor use in primary care in the UK: a cross-sectional study. *eClinicalMedicine* 2024;68 doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2024.102426
32. Young KG, Hopkins R, Shields BM, et al. Recent UK type 2 diabetes treatment guidance represents a near whole population indication for SGLT2-inhibitor therapy. *Cardiovascular diabetology* 2023;22(1):302. doi: 10.1186/s12933-023-02032-x [published Online First: 2023/11/03]
33. Gagnon LR, Hazra D, Perera K, et al. Uptake of SGLT2i and Outcomes in Patients with Diabetes and Heart Failure: A Population-Based Cohort and a Specialized Clinic Cohort. *American heart journal* 2024;274:11-22. doi: 10.1016/j.ahj.2024.04.007 [published Online First: 2024/04/27]
34. Lin J, Milder TY, Deakin CT, et al. Trends in use of sodium-glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors among people with type 2 diabetes following hospitalisation with heart failure: A population-based study. *Diabetes research and clinical practice* 2025;224:112242. doi: 10.1016/j.diabres.2025.112242 [published Online First: 2025/05/11]
35. Wallace H, Wick J, Neuen BL, et al. Prevalence of SGLT2 inhibitor and GLP1 receptor agonist prescriptions in type 2 diabetes patients with and without chronic kidney disease: Analysis of an Australian primary care dataset. *Diabetes, Obesity and Metabolism* 2025;27(10):5599-611. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/dom.16608
36. Mendelson A, Kondo K, Damberg C, et al. The Effects of Pay-for-Performance Programs on Health, Health Care Use, and Processes of Care: A Systematic Review. *Annals of internal medicine* 2017;166(5):341-53. doi: 10.7326/m16-1881 [published Online First: 2017/01/24]

37. Paschalis T, Jones C. Plasma HbA1c in the investigation of suspected heart failure in general practice: An audit of the 2018 NICE guidelines update. *Journal of family medicine and primary care* 2020;9(2):1098-102. doi: 10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc_917_19 [published Online First: 2020/04/23]
38. Heneghan C, Perera R, Mant D, et al. Hypertension guideline recommendations in general practice: awareness, agreement, adoption, and adherence. *British Journal of General Practice* 2007;57(545):948-52.
39. Kempegowda P, Chandan JS, Abdulrahman S, et al. Managing hypertension in people of African origin with diabetes: Evaluation of adherence to NICE Guidelines. *Primary care diabetes* 2019;13(3):266-71. doi: 10.1016/j.pcd.2018.12.007 [published Online First: 2019/02/02]
40. Healey EL, Afolabi EK, Lewis M, et al. Uptake of the NICE osteoarthritis guidelines in primary care: a survey of older adults with joint pain. *BMC musculoskeletal disorders* 2018;19(1):295. doi: 10.1186/s12891-018-2196-2 [published Online First: 2018/08/18]
41. Herrett E, Shah AD, Boggon R, et al. Completeness and diagnostic validity of recording acute myocardial infarction events in primary care, hospital care, disease registry, and national mortality records: cohort study. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2013;346:f2350. doi: 10.1136/bmj.f2350 [published Online First: 2013/05/23]