



Therapeutic Efficacy and Safety of Paeoniae Radix Rubra Formulae in Relieving Hyperbilirubinemia Induced by Viral Hepatitis: A Meta-Analysis

Yin-Qiu Huang^{1,2†}, Xiao Ma^{1,2†}, Jian Wang^{1†}, Yan-Ling Zhao^{2*}, Jia-Bo Wang³, Zhe Chen^{1,2}, Yun Zhu⁴, Li-Mei Shan⁴, Shi-Zhang Wei^{1,2}, Ji Wang⁵ and Xiao-He Xiao^{3*}

¹ Pharmacy College, Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Chengdu, China, ² Department of Pharmacy, 302 Military Hospital of China, Beijing, China, ³ China Military Institute of Chinese Medicine, 302 Hospital of People's Liberation Army, Beijing, China, ⁴ Department of Integrative Medical Center, 302 Hospital of People's Liberation Army, Beijing, China, ⁵ Department of Evidence-Based Medicine and Clinical Epidemiology, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Adolfo Andrade-Cetto, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico

Reviewed by:

Jianfei Jiang, University of Pittsburgh, USA Fang-Rong Chang, Kaohsiung Medical University, Taiwan

*Correspondence:

Yan-Ling Zhao zhaoy/2855@126.com; Xiao-He Xiao xiaoxiaohe302@163.com [†]These authors have contributed equally to this work.

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Ethnopharmacology, a section of the journal Frontiers in Pharmacology

Received: 07 November 2015 Accepted: 04 March 2016 Published: 22 March 2016

Citation:

Huang Y-Q, Ma X, Wang J, Zhao Y-L, Wang J-B, Chen Z, Zhu Y, Shan L-M, Wei S-Z, Wang J and Xiao X-H (2016) Therapeutic Efficacy and Safety of Paeoniae Radix Rubra Formulae in Relieving Hyperbilirubinemia Induced by Viral Hepatitis: A Meta-Analysis. Front. Pharmacol. 7:63. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2016.00063 **Objective:** Hyperbilirubinemia is one of the most devastating pathologies induced by various liver diseases. Formulae related to *Paeoniae Radix Rubra* (PRR) at high doses have been applied to treat hyperbilirubinemia in traditional Chinese medicine (TCM). The aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis is to assess the efficacy and safety of formulae relevant to high-dose PRR in patients suffering from hyperbilirubinemia induced by viral hepatitis.

Methods: We performed a meta-analysis of randomized-controlled clinical trials to evaluate the efficacy and safety of formulae that apply a high dose of PRR for hyperbilirubinemia. Seven databases were searched until April, 2015. All studies were included according to detailed criteria and assessed for methodological quality. The outcome measurements were recorded for further analysis using the RevMan 5.2.11 software.

Results: Fifteen articles involving 1323 patients with hyperbilirubinemia were included. Formulae with high-dose PRR might promote the efficacy of either a combined application ([OR: 3.98, 95% CI (2.91, 5.43)]; P < 0.01) or a single application ([OR: 4.00, 95% CI (1.50, 10.68)]; P < 0.01) for hyperbilirubinemia. The indices of TBIL, ALT, and AST significantly decreased ([MD: -75.57, 95% CI (-94.88, -56.26)], [MD: -26.54, 95% CI (-36.19, -16.88)], and ([MD: -28.94, 95% CI (-46.26, -11.61)]; P < 0.01), respectively. In addition, formulae with high-dose PRR could enhance the treatment efficacy of hyperbilirubinemia triggered by hepatitis B ([OR: 2.98, 95% CI (1.75, 5.05)]; P < 0.01). Furthermore, the efficacy was enhanced with an increasing dosage of PRR. Two articles reported that no side effects occurred in clinical trials, and three studies noted that patients presented light digestive tract symptoms.

Conclusion: Formulae relevant to high-dose PRR ameliorate hyperbilirubinemia and might constitute a promising therapeutic approach. For widespread acceptance by practitioners, more rigorously designed multicenter, double-blind, randomized, and large-scale controlled trials are required.

Keywords: Paeoniae Radix Rubra formulae, efficacy and safety, meta-analysis, hyperbilirubinemia, viral hepatitis, high dose Paeoniae Radix Rubra

1

INTRODUCTION

Hyperbilirubinemia presenting high serum bilirubin or severe jaundice is one of the most devastating pathologies in patients with various liver diseases (Duan et al., 2006). Continuous hyperbilirubinemia without proper treatment commonly leads to hepatocyte edema, necrosis, inflammation, and even liver cirrhosis, which can directly threaten quality of life (Garg et al., 2011). Current therapies for hyperbilirubinemia mainly focus on a combination of decreasing serum bilirubin, liver protection, regulating transaminase levels, and nutrition support. However, there are unstable curative rates as well as side effects in the clinic. Ursodeoxycholic acid (UDCA) and Ademetionine are the firstline drugs used to decrease serum bilirubin. The inconsistent efficiency and expensive medical costs are common obstacles for some patients (Hou et al., 2010). Potassium magnesium aspartate as an adjuvant is limited by its efficacy in decreasing serum bilirubin. In addition, glucocorticosteroid therapy, due to side effects and the possibility of symptom rebound, is controversial, particularly when treating hyperbilirubinemia for a long duration (Zhang and Shen, 2011).

Growing evidence indicates that traditional Chinese medicine (TCM), as a complementary and alternative therapy, has an important role in hyperbilirubinemia or jaundice treatment (Li et al., 2008). The decoctions of Yin Chen Hao, Yin Chen Si Ni, Da Huang Xiao Shi, Zhi Zi Bai Pi, and Chi Dan Tui Huang have been proven to effectively decrease serum bilirubin and protect hepatocytes (He et al., 2003; Zhou, 2010). In particular, several formulae that reverse blood stasis are commonly applied in hyperbilirubinemia. Paeoniae Radix Rubra (PRR, Chishao in Chinese), the dried root of Paeonia lactiflora Pall, has been used for thousands of years in TCM to treat blood stasis. A series of PRR-relevant formulae, due to their significant function as blood invigorators, have been used as treatments for jaundice for decades and have obtained satisfactory efficacy (Ding et al., 2003). Currently, these formulae have been reported as promising therapies in the clinic and are widely used in China. However, a systematic review on formulae relevant to high-dose PRR for treating hyperbilirubinemia has not been reported. Therefore, this meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) was conducted to assess the clinical value of formulae relevant to high-dose PRR in treating hyperbilirubinemia and to provide a possible complementary and alternative therapy for widespread use by practitioners (Figure 1).

METHODS

Search Strategy

Comprehensive searches were performed in seven databases by two researchers. The databases included PubMed, Embase,

Cochrane Library, Chinese Biomedical Database (CBM), Wanfang, VIP medicine information system (VMIS), and China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI) from inception to April, 2015. Search terms included "TCM" or "PRR" or "Chishao" "*Paeonia lactiflora* pall" or "*Paeonia veitchii* Lynch", and "severe jaundice," or "hyperbilirubinemia," and "viral hepatitis" according to databases in the Chinese and English languages. The first author, year of publication, title, and journal name from searched articles were recorded.

Exclusion Criteria

Studies with the following criteria were excluded: (1) reviews, non-clinical studies, and case observations, (2) the absence of Randomized controlled trials (RCTs), or (3) interventions with another TCM formulae (not including extracted agents) or acupuncture therapies in the control group.

Inclusion Criteria

According to the advice of a liver specialist, the inclusion criteria were designed as follows: (1) RCTs with patients diagnosed as having hyperbilirubinemia by meeting the criteria of Viral Hepatitis Prevention and Treatment Programs (VHPTP) version 2010, 2005, 2000, 1995, or 1990. (2) Studies must have claimed that patients developed hyperbilirubinemia due to viral hepatitis. In addition, participant serum TBIL was above 171 μ mol/L before treatment. (3) PRR served as the main component in the formulae and the high dosage was defined as >25 g (two times higher than the prescribed maximum dose of Chinese Pharmacopeia 2010 version). (4) High-dose PRRrelevant formulae alone or as a combined application served as the trial group. Placebo or conventional therapy served as the control group. (5) Outcome measurements must have included one or more of the following indices: total effective rate, alanine aminotransferase (ALT), aspartate aminotransferase (AST), total bilirubin (TBIL), direct bilirubin (DBIL), γ-glutamyl transferase (γ -GT), albumin (ALB), and prothrombin time (PT). (6) The total efficacy was coincident with the Guidance for Clinical Research on New Drugs of TCM, i.e., recovery as evidenced by the absence of symptoms and TBIL decreasing to nearly normal levels. Effectiveness was identified by ameliorated symptoms and TBIL decreasing below half of the original value (85.5 μ mol/L). Invalidation was defined as symptoms and TBIL remaining unchanged or worsening.

Data Extraction and Risk of Bias Assessment

Data extraction and quality assessment were independently performed by two researchers, and disagreements were resolved by consensus. Detailed data such as study design, participants' information, interventions, outcome measures, and adverse events were extracted to a conclusive table.

The Cochrane risk of bias tool was used to access the methodological quality of the included RCTs. There were six domains, including random sequence generation (selection bias), allocation concealment (selection bias), blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias), blinding of outcome data

Abbreviations: PRR, *Paeoniae Radix Rubra*; ALT, alanine aminotransferase; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; TBIL, total bilirubin; UDCA, ursodeoxycholic acid; TCM, traditional Chinese medicine; RCTs, randomized control trials; VMIS, VIP medicine information system; CBM, Chinese Biomedical Database; CNKI, China National Knowledge Infrastructure; VHPTP, Viral Hepatitis Prevention and Treatment Programs; γ -GT, γ -glutamyl transferase; DBIL, direct bilirubin; PT, prothrombin time; MD, mean difference; OR, odds ratio.



(attrition bias), incomplete outcome data (attrition bias), and selective reporting (reporting bias).

Data Analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using Cochrane RevMan 5.2.11 (Cochrane Collaboration). Dichotomous data were presented as the odds ratio (OR) and continuous variables as the mean difference (MD) with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). Statistical heterogeneity was assessed by Cochrane's Q-test. Data with low heterogeneity ($P \ge 0.10$ and $I^2 \le 50\%$) were analyzed by a fixed-effects model, whereas a random-effect model was used for data with high heterogeneity. A funnel plot was used to assess potential publication bias.

RESULTS

Characteristics of the Included Studies

A total of 4300 publications from 7 databases were identified for the initial screen. We removed 1278 duplicated citations, and 2780 were excluded due to irrelevance. The full texts of 242 articles were retrieved for detailed assessment. Of the remaining articles, there were 57 non-randomized controlled studies, 6 animal studies, 97 inconsistent criteria, 40 ineligible PRR doses in the formulae or no mention of dosage, 14 with no PRR in the formulae, 8 summaries, and 5 review articles. Fifteen studies were ultimately used for further meta-analysis (**Figure 2**).

subjects Fifteen articles involving 1323 with hyperbilirubinemia (729 cases in the trial group, 594 cases in the control group) were included in this study. Because most of the formulae-form therapy was applied in TCM, the 15 studies that had been screened were all published in Chinese. There was no significance in terms of age and sex between these two groups (Table 1). Formulae with high-dose PRR with essential treatment or as a single application were used in the trial group, whereas essential treatment was applied in the control group in all studies. The dose of PRR in the formulae ranged from 30 to 200 g. The treatment duration described in the articles ranged from 2 weeks to 60 days, and 5 articles (Li and Gu, 1994; Xu et al., 1999; Wang et al., 2003; Lou et al., 2007; Bo, 2008) reported adverse events and side effects. No trial reported a follow-up (**Table 2**).

Methodological Quality of Included Trials

The methodological quality of the 15 included trials was generally low. According to the Cochrane risk of bias estimation, a randomized allocation of participants was mentioned in all trials. However, only 2 trials (Huang and Yang, 2005; Zhang, 2009) mentioned an appropriate randomized method. Allocation concealment, blinding of participants and blinding of outcome assessment were not recorded in the 15 studies. Six of the 15 articles (Feng et al., 2006; Lou et al., 2007; Luo, 2007; Shi et al., 2009; Zhang, 2009; He, 2010) were at low risk of incomplete outcome data or essential data missing. Selective reporting was generally unclear. Only four articles (Li and Gu, 1994; Wang et al., 2003; Luo, 2007; Bo, 2008) reported research protocols, and the result of the detailed indices indicated a low risk of selective reporting. (**Figure 3**).

Outcome Measures with Subgroup Analysis

Efficacy Rate of High-Dose PRR-Relevant Formulae Combined with Essential Treatment or Single Application vs. Essential Treatment

Thirteen of the 15 articles described the application of formulae on high-dose PRR combined with essential treatment as the trial group. The remaining 2 RCTs (Liu, 2000; Shi et al., 2009) reported a single application of high-dose PRR formulae in the trial group. No heterogeneity was found in both analyses and a fixed effects model was used (P > 0.10). The results displayed as OR with 95% CI in the combination treatment and single application were [OR: 3.98, 95% CI (2.91, 5.43)] and [OR: 4.00, 95% CI (1.50, 10.68)], respectively. This revealed that formulae of high-dose PRR might promote the treatment efficacy for hyperbilirubinemia (P < 0.01; **Figure 4**).

TABLE 1 | Characteristics of included studies.

Author and published year(reference)	Cases T/C	Diagnostic standard	Age(years) Range, mean	Sex Male/female
He, 2010	36/27	VHPTP(2005)+TBIL	T:9–62, 36	T:27/9
			C:13-65, 42	C:16/11
Shi et al., 2009	53/50	VHPTP(2000)+TBIL	T:45.3	T:28/25
			C:46.9	C:27/23
Zhang, 2009	64/40	VHPTP(2000)+TBIL	T:18–56, 41	T:40/24
			C:19–58, 43	C:28/12
Bo, 2008	40/40	VHPTP(2000)+TBIL	T:20-63, 44.4	T:30/10
			C:18-62, 46.3	C:28/12
Luo, 2007	31/30	VHPTP(2000)+TBIL	T:21–50, 35.6	T:20/11
			C:22-52, 36.7	C:20/10
uo, 2007	30/25	VHPTP(2000)+TBIL	T: 26–62, 36.3	T:23/7
			C:25-60, 34.2	C:21/4
eng et al., 2006	60/60	VHPTP(2000)+TBIL	T:38.6	T:45/15
			C:37.8	C:47/13
Han et al., 2006	45/35	VHPTP(2000)+TBIL	T/C:41.9	65/15
Zhu et al., 2006	56/44	VHPTP(2000)+TBIL	T:33.5	T:45/11
			C:34.2	C:38/6
Huang and Yang, 2005	72/37	VHPTP(2000)+TBIL	T:19–58, 40.5	T:46/26
			C:18–56, 38.6	C:23/14
(ong et al., 2003	50/32	VHPTP(1995)+TBIL	T:12–74, 45.7	T:44/6
			C:14-72, 46.9	C:28/4
Vang et al., 2003	48/42	VHPTP(2000)+TBIL	37	NR
.iu, 2000	43/43	VHPTP(1990)+TBIL	T/C:12-58, 36	60/26
Ku et al., 1999	60/48	VHPTP(1995)+TBIL	T:22/58, 41	T:44/16
			C:21–56, 38	C:32/16
Li and Gu, 1994	41/41	VHPTP(1990)+TBIL	T/C:18-50	T:28/13
				C:27/14

T, trial group; C, control group. NR, no report.

Hyperbilirubinemia Indices of High-Dose PRR-Relevant Formulae vs. Essential Treatment

The serum TBIL level, which is the direct and crucial index of hyperbilirubinemia, was described in 12 trials. In addition, 3 studies (Huang and Yang, 2005; Lou et al., 2007; Zhang, 2009) reported the serum DBIL level. The serum ALT level was measured in 11 articles, and five studies (Huang and Yang, 2005; Feng et al., 2006; Lou et al., 2007; Shi et al., 2009; Zhang, 2009) recorded the AST level. Serum ALB and y-GT were reported in 4 (Kong et al., 2003; Wang et al., 2003; Luo, 2007; Bo, 2008) and two trials (Feng et al., 2006; Shi et al., 2009), respectively. Two trials (Kong et al., 2003; Wang et al., 2003) recorded the PT level. There was heterogeneity in the indices of TBIL, DBIL, ALT, AST, PT, and ALB (P < 0.10). Therefore, a random effects model was used for analysis. There was no heterogeneity (P > 0.10) in the index of γ -GT; the fixed-effect model was thus used. The MD with 95% CI of serum TBIL, ALT, and AST levels were [MD: -75.57, 95% CI (-94.88, -56.26)], [MD: -26.54, 95% CI (-36.19, -16.88)], and [MD: -28.94, 95% CI (-46.26, -11.61)], respectively, indicating a significant decrease in the pathologic index in the trial group compared with the control group (P < 0.01). The indices of serum DBIL, γ-GT, and PT were [MD: -28.41, 95% CI (-57.81, 0.99)], [MD: -0.03, 95% CI (-12.95, 12.89)], and [MD: -1.29, 95% CI (-3.33, 0.74)], respectively. There were no significant decreases in the trial group compared with the control group (P > 0.05). There was no difference between the trial group and control group for the serum index [MD: ALB 1.84, 95% CI (-0.14, 3.82)] (P > 0.05; **Figures 5**–7).

Efficacy Rate of High-Dose PRR-Relevant Formulae Combined with Essential Treatment vs. Essential Treatment in Hyperbilirubinemia Patients with Hepatitis B

Hepatitis B virus is the most common and important cause of hyperbilirubinemia. In this study, the efficacy rate of formulae of high-dose PRR combined with essential treatment was specifically analyzed. There were five articles (Feng et al., 2006; Lou et al., 2007; Luo, 2007; Zhang, 2009; He, 2010) that reported hyperbilirubinemia patients with hepatitis B virus. Based on the fixed effects model (P > 0.10), the OR with 95% CI was [OR: 2.98, 95% CI (1.75, 5.05)]. The efficacy rate showed a significant increase in the trial group compared with the control group (**Figure 8**).

TABLE 2 | Intervention and outcome measures of included studies.

Study ID	Inter	vention	Duration/follow	Adverse events	Outcome measures
	Trials group (high-dose PRR-relevant formulae)	Control group (essential treatment)	up		
He, 2010	Tui Huang Decoction (PRR 60 g)+Essential treatment	Diammonium glycyrrhizinate +Vitamin+Inosine+Ku Huang injection potassium magnesium aspartate+Reduced glutatione	6 weeks/NR	NR	Total efficacy rate, ALT, TBIL
Shi et al., 2009	Qing Re Liang Xue Jie Du Decoction (PRR 30 g)	Hepatocyte growth promotion +Liver protection+Improving minicirculation	2 weeks/NR	NR	Total efficacy rate, ALT, AST, TBIL, γ-GT, PT
Zhang, 2009	Tui Huang Decoction (PRR 30 g)+Essential treatment	Diammonium glycyrrhizinate +Inosine+Vitamin+Reduced glutatione+glucuronolactone	30 days/NR	NR	Total efficacy rate, ALT, AST, TBIL, DBIL
Bo, 2008	Jia Wei Wen Dan Decoction (PRR 30 g)+Essential treatment	Diammonium glycyrrhizinate +Potassium magnesium aspartate+Vitamin	30 days/NR	NO	Total efficacy rate, ALT, ALB, TBIL
Luo, 2007	Tui Huang Decoction (PRR 30 g)+Essential treatment	Diammonium glycyrrhizinate +Potassium magnesium aspartate+Vitamin	6 weeks/NR	T: 1 case diarrhea C: NO	Total efficacy rate, ALT, AST, TBIL, DBIL
Luo, 2007	Jie Du Huo Xue Decoction (PRR 60 g)+Essential treatment	Diammonium glycyrrhizinate +Potassium magnesium aspartate +Reduced glutatione	30 days/NR	NR	Total efficacy rate, ALT, TBIL, ALB
Feng et al., 2006	Da Huang Chi Shao Decoction (PRR 30-60 g)+Essential treatment	Liver Protection+symptom Treatment	60 days/NR	NR	Total efficacy rate, ALT, AST, TBIL, γ-GT
Han et al., 2006	Chi Ze Decoction (PRR 100 g) +Essential treatment	Liver Protection+symptom Treatment	1 month/NR	NR	Total efficacy rate, ALT, TBIL
Zhu et al., 2006	PRR 200 g+Essential treatment	Dan Shen injection+Vitamin	1 month/NR	NR	Total efficacy rate
Huang and Yang, 2005	Liang Xue Hua Yu Decoction(PRR 50 g)+Essential treatment	Vitamin+Hepatocyte growth-promoting factors+Potassium magnesium aspartate+ALB	30 days/NR	NR	Total efficacy rate, ALT, AST, TBIL, DBIL
Kong et al., 2003	PRR Relevant Formulae(PRR 30-60 g)+Essential treatment	Diammonium glycyrrhizinate +Potassium magnesium aspartate+Vitamin+Hepatocyte growth-promoting factors	6 weeks/NR	NR	Total efficacy rate, ALT, TBIL, ALB, PT
Wang et al., 2003	Tui Gao Huang Decoction(PRR 120 g)+Essential treatment	Vitamin+Adenosine disodiu+Yin Zhi Huang injection	4 weeks/NR	T: Few with light digestive tract side effect C: NO	Total efficacy rate, ALT, TBIL, ALB, PT
Liu, 2000	PRR relevant formulae(PRR 100–150 g)	Potassium magnesium aspartate +Vitamin+Bifendate	2 weeks/NR	NR	Total efficacy rate
Xu et al., 1999	Chi Zhi Huang Decoction(PRR 90 g)+Essential treatment	Potassium magnesium aspartate +Vitamin+Adenosine Disodiu+Glucuronolactone+ Silymarin	30 days/NR	T: Few with light digestive tract side effect C: NO	Total efficacy rate
Li and Gu, 1994	PRR relevant formulae(PRR 60–120 g)+Essential treatment	Silymarin+Vitamin+Inosine+ Potassium magnesium aspartate+Yin Zhi Huang injection	30 days/NR	NO	Total efficacy rate, TBIL

T, trial group, C, control group. NR, no report.



FIGURE 2 | Flow diagram of the study selection process for the

systematic review. As shown, our initial searches yielded 4300 records. The full texts of 242 articles were retrieved for detailed assessment after exclusion. Of these, 227 studies were subsequently excluded because they did not meet the inclusion criteria; 15 eligible studies were identified.

Efficacy Rate of Different Ranges of High-Dose PRR-Relevant Formulae Combined with Essential Treatment vs. Essential Treatment in Hyperbilirubinemia

Because there was a wide range of high-dose PRR from 30 to 200 g, a subgroup analysis of different ranges of formulae of high-dose PRR was needed. We classified these studies into three subgroups (PRR in 30–60 g, PRR in 60–120 g, and PRR greater than 120 g) according to the dose application. There were six studies (Kong et al., 2003; Huang and Yang, 2005; Feng et al., 2006; Lou et al., 2007; Bo, 2008; Zhang, 2009) ascribed to the 30-60 g subgroup and five studies (Li and Gu, 1994; Xu et al., 1999; Han et al., 2006; Luo, 2007; He, 2010) ascribed to the 60-120 g subgroup. In addition, the remaining 2 studies (Wang et al., 2003; Zhu et al., 2006) were classified to the PRR greater than 120 g subgroup. On the basis of the fixed effect model (P > 0.10), the ORs with 95% CI of the three subgroups were [OR: 3.46, 95% CI (2.23, 5.37)] (PRR in 30-60 g), [OR: 3.76, 95% CI (2.12, 6.69)] (PRR in 60-120 g), and [OR: 6.15, 95% CI (3.03, 12.47)] (PRR more than 120 g), respectively. All three of the subgroups showed a significant increase in the efficacy rate of the trial group compared with the control group (P < 0.01). Furthermore, the efficacy was enhanced with an increasing dosage of PRR in relevant formulae (**Figure 9**).

Adverse Events

Among the 15 RCTs, two articles (Li and Gu, 1994; Bo, 2008) reported no side effects in clinical trials. Another three studies (Xu et al., 1999; Wang et al., 2003; Lou et al., 2007) observed side effects as light digestive tract symptoms in patients treated with formulae of high-dose PRR. However, the side effect did not influence the patients' efficacy or daily life. The remaining articles did not report whether there was a side effect. Despite the results suggesting that high-dose PRR is safe, more assessments on the safety of high-dose PRR are needed (**Table 2**).

Publication Bias

A funnel plot was used to express the publication bias. The publication bias was explored when the indices or efficacy rate were above 9 cases. A funnel plot of the formulae of high-dose PRR combined with essential treatment vs. essential treatment was applied. Further, the indices of TBIL and ALT were also analyzed. The plots were symmetric, suggesting that there was no obvious publication bias (**Figure 10**).

DISCUSSION

As we mentioned, cholestatic hepatitis, and hyperbilirubinemia are both related to the dysfunction of bilirubin metabolism. However, there are several differences between cholestatic hepatitis. Cholestatic hepatitis is more concerned about the whole progression of the disease which could result in partial or complete blocking bile flow, high serum concentrations of bile acid, bilirubin, and liver injury. On the other side, hyperbilirubinemia could be widely expressed during the specific progression of various liver diseases and is more focused on the manifestation of high bilirubin. Moreover, the degree of bilirubin in hyperbilirubinemia is usually far more severe than in cholestatic hepatitis. In our former research, we have investigated the effect of high dose PRR relevant formulae on cholestatic hepatitis and found that this therapy could promote the efficacy (Ma et al., 2014). Therefore, according to the former result, we performed this meta-analysis on hyperbilirubinemia triggered by viral hepatitis. This systematic review included 15 RCTs; a total of 1323 participants with hyperbilirubinemia were screened from 4300 publications. All of the studies were based on highdose PRR (30-200 g) serving as the primary component of the formulae. The treatment duration described by the RCTs ranged from 2 weeks to 60 days, and five of the 15 studies reported side effects. According to the outcome, a single application or a combination of high-dose PRR formulae promoted efficacious hyperbilirubinemia treatment. The indices of hyperbilirubinemia also verified the result. TBIL is considered a direct index of hyperbilirubinemia. The serum TBIL level in 12 trials was analyzed by the random effects model. The MD with the 95% CI of the serum TBIL level was [MD: -75.57, 95% CI (-94.88, -56.26)] and indicated that formulae of high-dose PRR significantly decreased the serum TBIL level compared with



of studies were found to be of low quality.





essential treatment. Furthermore, the serum ALT and AST levels, which are sensitive indices of hepatic function, also decreased. However, there were no differences in DBIL, γ -GT, PT, and ALB between the groups. This suggested that formulae of high-dose PRR might promote the regulation of the main indices of hyperbilirubinemia. Hepatitis B virus is the most common and important cause of hyperbilirubinemia. Therefore, the efficacy of high-dose PRR formulae on hyperbilirubinemia triggered by hepatitis B was specifically analyzed in this study. The result showed a significant increase in the efficacy rate in the trial group compared with the control group. This suggested that formulae

of high-dose PRR might promote efficacious treatment of the hyperbilirubinemia caused by hepatitis B. Because there was a wide range of high-dose PRR, from 30 to 200 g, we performed an analysis on the efficacy rate of different ranges of high-dose PRR formulae. All three subgroups showed a significant increase in the efficacy rate of the trial group. Furthermore, the efficacy enhanced as the dosage of PRR in the relevant formulae was increasing. There were a few patients with light side effects of the digestive tract in the trial group. However, it did not influence the treatment progress and efficacy. A funnel plot was applied to assess the publication bias. The result indicated that little

$ \begin{array}{c} 1.2.5 \mbox{ scm} 161. level \\ \mbox{Herrores} 1.2.0 \mbox$	Study or Subgroup	Expe Mean	riment SD			ontrol SD	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Year	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
$ \begin{array}{c} \text{He} 2010 & 84.2 & 48.7 & 36 & 14.5 & 128.5 & 27 & 5.\% & -61.70 (\pm 13.07,\pm 10.33) & 2010 \\ \hline \text{Sh} 2009 & 118.2 & 49.3 & 53 & 168.2 & 109.3 & 60 & 8.4\% & -50.00 (\pm 30.8,\pm 16.8) & 2000 \\ \hline \text{Sh} 2008 & 76.6 & 97.5 & 40 & 75.2 & 95.8 & 40 & 7.2\% & -48.6 (\pm 9.16, 7.24) & 2000 \\ \hline \text{Sh} 2007 & 45.6 & 26.7 & 31 & 65.2 & 38.5 & 30 & 10.2\% & -18.6 (\pm 35.28,\pm 22) & 2007 \\ \hline \text{Feng 2006 } 92 & 44.6 & 60 & 150.4 & 90.7 & 60 & 9.3\% & -58.40 (\pm 35.7,\pm 22.83) & 2006 \\ \hline \text{Huang 2005 } 120.2 & 19.5 & 72 & 206.2 & 25.4 & 37 & 10.8\% & -48.60 (\pm 95.3,\pm 7.58.61 & 2006 \\ \hline \text{Huang 2005 } 120.2 & 19.5 & 72 & 206.2 & 25.4 & 37 & 10.8\% & -86.00 (\pm 53.4, 7.68.61 & 2006 \\ \hline \text{Huang 2005 } 120.2 & 19.5 & 72 & 206.2 & 25.4 & 37 & 10.8\% & -75.01 (\pm 40.69, 9.71) & 2000 \\ \hline \text{Wang 2003 } 37.4 & 20.6 & 48 & 19.5 & 41.2 & 42 & 10.5\% & -86.20 (\pm 10.49, 9.71) & 2003 \\ \hline \text{Wang 2003 } 37.4 & 20.3 & 64 & 81.5 & 36.6 & 0.21\% & -5.57 (\pm 40.86, -76.20 & 10.48, 9.71) & 2007 \\ \hline \text{Hetrogeneity, Tau' = 976.51; Chi'' = 82.70, d' = 11.0 + 0.00001; P'' = 97\% \\ \hline \text{Test for overall effect } 2 = 7.87 (P < 0.00001) \\ \hline \text{Hetrogeneity, Tau'' = 976.50; Chi'' = 136.55 (d' = 2.P < 0.00001); P'' = 97\% \\ \hline \text{Test for overall effect } 2 = 1.89 (P = 0.00) \\ \hline \text{Lo 2007 } 24.8 & 66.3 & 36 & 129.3 & 108.7 & 27 & 35\% & -62.50 (\pm 88.2, -5.18) & 2000 \\ \hline \text{Hetrogeneity, Tau'' = 976.50; Chi''' = 136.55 (d' = 2.9 & 0.00001); P'' = 97\% \\ \hline \text{Test for overall effect } 2 = 1.89 (P = 0.00) \\ \hline \text{Lo 2007 } 24.8 & 66.3 & 36 & 129.3 & 108.7 & 27 & 35\% & -62.50 (\pm 88.2, -5.18) & 2000 \\ \hline \text{Hetrogeneity, Tau'' = 136.57 (d' = 10.0^{\circ} - 0.003); P'' = 93\% \\ \hline \text{Test for overall effect } 2 = 13.87 (C''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''$			30	Total	Nean	30	Total	Treight	IV, Nandolli, 55 / Cl	Tear	
$ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Trans} 2009 & 70.1 & 20.3 & 64 & 207 & 10.9 & 40 & 8.1\% & 178.69 (+71.76, -102.40) & 2009 \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 76.6 & 97.5 & 40 & 126.2 & 95.8 & 40 & 7.2\% & +48.01 (+91.96, 7.24) & 2009 \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 76.6 & 97.5 & 40 & 126.2 & 95.8 & 40 & 7.2\% & +48.01 (+91.96, 7.24) & 2009 \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 50.2 & 24.25 & 45 & 156.2 & 60.4 & 35 & 5.5\% & -168.00 (+126.55, 82.45 & 2006 & + \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 50.2 & 42.5 & 45 & 156.2 & 60.4 & 35 & 5.5\% & -168.00 (+126.55, 82.45 & 2006 & + \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 50.2 & 42.5 & 45 & 156.2 & 60.4 & 35 & 5.5\% & -168.00 (+126.25, 82.45 & 2006 & + \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 50.2 & 42.5 & 43.6 & 10.8 & -123.6 & 41 & 7.5\% & -86.00 (+106.82, -26.38) & 1994 \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 31.5 & 173.4 & 32.4 & 47.5\% & -98.20 (+110.49, -9.71) & 2003 & + \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 31.5 & 173.4 & 124 & 61.2 & 30 & 34.1\% & -3.30 (+5.29, -3.38) & 1994 \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 37.4 & 20.6 & 48 & 135.6 & 40 & 32.1\% & -3.30 (+5.29, -3.38) & 1994 \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 37.4 & 20.3 & 64 & 81.5 & 38.6 & 40 & 32.1\% & -3.30 (+5.29, -3.38) & 1994 \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 37.4 & 20.3 & 64 & 81.5 & 38.6 & 40 & 32.1\% & -3.30 (+5.29, -3.31) & 2007 \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 37.4 & 20.4 & 41.42 & 62.2 & 30 & 34.1\% & -3.30 (+5.29, -3.31) & 2007 \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 35.7 & 31 & 14.2 & 62.2 & 30 & 34.1\% & -3.30 (+5.29, -3.31) & 2007 \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 78.8 & 66 & 36 & 129.2 & 108.7 & 77 & 3.38\% & -40.10 + 40.17, -30.31 & 2007 \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 78.8 & 66 & 36 & 129.2 & 108.7 & 77 & 3.38\% & -40.10 + 40.17, -30.31 & 2007 \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 78.8 & 66 & 36 & 129.2 & 108.7 & 77 & -55\% & -52.50 (+98.92, -6.16) & 2007 & + \\ \mbox{Trans} 400 & 78.8 & 66 & 36 & 129.2 & 108.7 & 77 & -55\% & -25.50 (+98.92, -6.16) & 2007 & + \\ \mbox{Trans} 700 & 78.8 & 66 & 30 & 128.8 & -100.70 (+00.001.98) & -3000 (+00.198) & 2000 & + \\ \mbox{Trans} 700 & 78.8 & 78.4 & 10.82 & 72.3 & 10.07 (+0.48, +28.80 (+0.68, +2.28) & 20.00 & + \\ \mbox{Trans} 700 & 78.8 & 78.4 & 98.2 & 24.1 & 98.4 & 52.3 & 71.404.8 & -32.00 (+50.7, 71.20 & 2006 & + \\ Trans$			487	36	145.0	129.5	27	6 2%	-61 70 6113 07 -10 33	2010	
Shi 2009 112.2 49.3 63 618.2 109.3 60 4.4% -50.00 198.0 2008											I
$ \begin{array}{c} bc 2008 & 76.6 & 97.5 & 40 & 128.2 & 95.8 & 40 & 72.\% & -48.06 \ 91.08, -7.24 & 2008 & -48.06 \ 91.08, -7.24 \ 91.08 \ 91$											
Low 2007 46.6 26.7 31 65.2 38.5 30 10.2% -18.06 j68.8.2.292 2007											
Luc 2007 60.8 65.2 30 156.6 99.8 25 7.4% -95.80 (-138.34, -55.26) 2007 Fen 2006 50.2 42.5 45 156.2 60.4 35 9.5% -106.00 (-128.55, -24.45) 2006 Han 2006 50.2 42.5 45 156.2 60.4 35 9.5% -106.00 (-128.55, -24.45) 2006 Han 2006 50.2 42.5 45 156.2 60.4 35 9.5% -106.00 (-128.55, -24.45) 2005 Han 2003 60.1 93.1 50 135.2 173.4 32 4.9% -75.10 (-140.49, -9.71) 2003 Han 2003 37.4 20.6 48 13.56 11.2 42 10.5% -95.20 (-119.8, -44.40) 2003 Heterogeneity. Tat' = 87.61; Ch ⁺ = 82.76, df = 11 ($P < 0.00001$); P = 87% Test for overall effect Z = 7.67 ($P < 0.00001$); P = 87% Test for overall effect Z = 1.38 ($P = 0.0001$); P = 99% Test for overall effect Z = 1.38 ($P = 0.0001$); P = 99% Test for overall effect Z = 1.38 ($P = 0.0001$); P = 99% Test for overall effect Z = 1.38 ($P = 0.0001$); P = 99% Test for overall effect Z = 1.38 ($P = 0.0001$); P = 99% Test for overall effect Z = 1.38 ($P = 0.0001$); P = 99% Test for overall effect Z = 1.38 ($P = 0.0001$); P = 99% Test for overall effect Z = 1.38 ($P = 0.0001$); P = 99% Test for overall effect Z = 1.38 ($P = 0.0001$); P = 99% Test for overall effect Z = 1.38 ($P = 0.0001$); P = 99% Test for overall effect Z = 1.38 ($P = 0.0001$); P = 99% Test for overall effect Z = 1.38 ($P = 0.0001$); P = 99% Test for overall effect Z = 1.38 ($P = 0.0001$); P = 63% Test for overall effect Z = 1.39 ($P = 0.0001$); P = 63% Test for overall effect Z = 1.39 ($P = 0.0001$); P = 63% Test for overall effect Z = 1.39 ($P = 0.0001$); P = 63% Test for overall effect Z = 5.39 ($P < 0.00001$); P = 63% Test for overall effect Z = 5.39 ($P < 0.00001$); P = 63% Test for overall effect Z = 5.39 ($P < 0.00001$); P = 63% Test for overall effect Z = 2.39 ($P < 0.00001$); P = 63% Test for overall effect Z = 2.39 ($P < 0.00001$); P = 63% Test for overall effect Z = 5.39 ($P < 0.00001$); P = 63% Test for overall effect Z = 5.39 ($P < 0.00001$); P = 63% Test for overall effect Z = 5.39 ($P < 0.00001$); P = 63% Test for overall effect Z = 5.39 ($P < 0.00001$); P = 63% Test for overa											
Feng 2006 92 44.6 60 150.4 90.7 60 9.3% -58.40 [93.97, 22.83] 2006 + 40.75.64 [2005 120.2 19.5 72 206.2 25.4 97 10.8% -66.00 [95.34, 75.66] 2005 + 9.20 [11.925, 92.45] 2006 + 7.57 [10.4.98, 9.7] 12.925, 92.45] 2006 + 7.57 [10.4.98, 9.7] 12.925, 92.45] 2006 + 7.57 [10.4.98, 9.7] 12.925, 92.45] 2006 + 7.57 [10.4.98, 9.7] 12.04 2.9, 75.66] 2005 + 7.57 [10.4.98, 9.7] 12.04 2.9, 75.66] 2005 + 7.57 [10.4.98, 9.7] 12.04 2.9, 75.7 [10.4.98, 9.7] 10.4.9, 9.7] 10.9.9, 9.9] 10.9											
Han 2006 50.2 42.5 45 162.2 64.3 5 9.5% -106.00 [+28.56, 92.45] 2006 + Huang 2005 1202 195 72 2052 254.3 7 108% -86.60 [+56.5, 92.45] 2005 + 7.510 [+10.44, 9.71] 2003 37.4 205 44.5 41 96.1 123.6 41 7.5% -92.50 [+11.96, 94.44 2003 + 1.1994 29.5 44.6 41 96.1 123.6 41 7.5% -66.60 [+10.82, 26.38] 1994 - 7.557 [-9.4.88, 56.26] + 1.1994 29.5 44.5 41 96.1 23.8 41 7.5% -66.60 [+10.82, 26.38] 1994 - 7.557 [-9.4.88, 56.26] + 1.1994 29.5 70 - 7.57 (P < 0.00001); P = 87% + 2.256 (-1.196, 94.41 2003 - 66.60 [+10.82, 26.38] 1994 - 7.557 [-9.4.88, 56.26] + 1.1994 2005 35.3 13.4 72 75.4 162.3 7 33.8% - 4.2.80 [+55.75, -28.85] 2009 + 4.100 [+46.17, -34.03] 2005 - 3.3 14.4 72 75.4 162.3 7 33.8% - 4.0.10 [+61.7, -34.03] 2005 - 2.8.41 [-57.81, 0.99] + 1.1996 - 1.1996 + 1.1996 - 1.1996 + 1.1996 - 1.1996 + 1.1996											
Huang 2005 120.2 19.5 7.2 20.6.2 25.4 37 10.8% -#6.001963.4,76.661 2005 # Wang 2003 37.4 20.6 48 155.6 41.2 42 10.5% -#6.001963.4,76.861 2005 # Subtotal (95% C) 57.0 45.9 100.0% + + 45.9 100.0% + - 5.571.94.88,-56.261 + + + + 42.80.155.7520.851 19.94 + - - - - - - 5.571.94.88,-56.261 + + 42.80.155.7520.851 2005 + - - - - - 5.250.19.82,-56.261 2009 + - - - 0.01.16.17, -34.031 2005 - - - - - 0.01.16.17, -34.031 2005 + - - 0.01.16.17, -34.031 2005 - - - - - - - 0.01.16.17, -34.031 2005 - - - - - - - - - - - -											
$ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{cons}^{2} 2003 & 00.1 & 93.1 & 60.1 125.2 172.4 & 32.4 94 % & -75.10 [+10.49, -97.1] 2003 & + 1198, -44.4 2003 & + 1194 & 24.5 & 44.5 & 41.9 & 66.5 & 41.2 & 42.1 & 156 \% & -95.20 (+111.86, -44.4 2003 & + 66.60 (+10.82, -26.38) [1994 & -75.57 [-9.4.88, -56.26] & + 66.60 (+10.82, -26.38) [1994 & -75.57 [-9.4.88, -56.26] & + 66.60 (+10.82, -26.38) [1994 & -75.57 [-9.4.88, -56.26] & + 66.60 (+10.82, -26.38) [1994 & -75.57 [-9.4.88, -56.26] & + 66.60 (+10.82, -26.38) [1994 & -75.57 [-9.4.88, -56.26] & + 66.60 (+10.82, -26.38) [1994 & -75.57 [-9.4.88, -56.26] & + 66.60 (+10.82, -26.38) [1904 & -75.57 [-9.4.88, -56.26] & + 66.60 (+10.82, -26.38) [1001 & + 67.57 [-9.4.88, -56.26] & -75.25 (-9.6.82, -6.18) [2010 & + 67.57 [-9.4.88] (-76.57 [-76.58] (-76.58 [-76.57 [-76.58] (-76.58 [-76.57 [-76.58] (-76.58 [-76$	Han 2006										
Wang 2003 37.4 20.6 48 123.6 41.2 12.4 10.5% -98.20 [+11.86,-84.4] 2003 + Subtotal (95% C) -57.0 459 100.0% -557.5 -43.80 [-10.862,-26.38] 1994 - Heterogenely: Tar# = 57.65; (1.76 = 20.7.6; (f = 11 (P < 0.00001); P = 87%	Huang 2005								-86.00 [-95.34, -76.66]	2005	*
Li 1994 29.5 44.6 41 96.1 12.8 41 7.5% Subtotal (6% C) 570 459 100.0% Heterogeneity: Tau" = 276.5; C H" = 62.76; df = 11 ($P < 0.00001$); P = 87% Test for overall effect $Z = 7.67$ ($P < 0.00001$) 1.2.2 Serum BBL veel Zhang 2000 38.7 20.3 64 81.5 38.6 40 32.1% Lou 2007 38.7 20.3 64 81.5 28.6 40 32.1% Lou 2007 38.7 31 14.2 62.30 34.1% 1.2.3 Serum AL Tievel Heterogeneity: Tau" = 56.90; Ch" = 136.55; df = 2 ($P < 0.00001$); P = 89% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.89$ ($P = 0.06$) 1.2.3 Serum AL Tievel He 2010 78.8 66 36 129.3 108.7 27 3.5% Shi 2009 168.2 129.3 36.8 129.3 108.7 27 3.5% Shi 2009 168.2 129.3 36.8 129.3 108.7 27 3.5% Shi 2009 168.2 129.3 36.8 129.3 108.7 27 3.5% Shi 2009 168.2 129.3 108.7 27 3.5% Shi 2009 174.2 34 64 104.2 85.7 40 10.3% Bo 2008 72.9 78 40 89 82.8 40 5.3% -12.10 (F9.60, 2.06) 2007 -3.80 (F1.81, 6.58] 2017 -4.80 (F1.81, 6.58] 2017 -4.80 (F1.81, 6.58] 2017 -4.80 (F1.81, 6.58] 2007 -4.80 (F1.81, 6.58] 2007 -4.80 (F1.81, 6.58] 2007 -4.80 (F1.81, 6.58] 2007 -4.80 (F1.81, 6.68] 2005 +4.400 2007 5.8 10 72.6 14.6 20.5 33 -2.2 40 (F4.81, 6.68] 2005 +4.400 2007 -4.80 (F1.81, 6.68] 2007 -4.80 (F1.84, 6.69 2005 +4.400 2007 -4.80 (F1.84, 6.69 2005 +4.400 2007 -4.80 (F1.84, 6.60 2007 -4.80 (F1.84, 6.60 2007 -4.80 (F1.84, 6.60 2007 -4.80 (F1.84, 6.60 2007 -4.80	-										
Subtotal (95% C) 570 459 100.0% Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 565.0; Ch ² = 136.55, df = 10 ($\mathcal{P} < 0.00001$); P = 87% Test for overall effect Z = 7.67 ($\mathcal{P} < 0.00001$) 1.2.2 Serum DBIL level Zhang 2009 3.8.7 20.3 6.4 81.5 38.6 40 32.1% Lu 2007 10.9 5.7 31 14.2 6.2 30 34.1% -3.30 [$62.29, 0.31$] 2007 Huang 2005 3.3 13.4 72 75.4 16.2 37 33.8% -4.010146.17, -34.03] 2005 1.2.3 Serum ALT level He 2010 76.8 66 30 (29.3 108.7 27 3.5% Fest for overall effect Z = 18.9 ($\mathcal{P} = 0.06$) 1.2.3 Serum ALT level He 2010 76.8 66 31 62.9 3 108.7 27 3.5% -52.50 [$98.82, -6.18$] 2010 1.2.3 Serum ALT level He 2010 76.8 66 31 62.9 3 108.7 27 3.5% -52.50 [$98.82, -6.18$] 2010 1.2.3 Serum ALT level He 2010 76.8 66 31 62.8 3 10.3.8 66.6 25 3.3% -2.00 [$55.01, -9.89$] 2009 Thang 2009 74.2 34 64 10.4.2 58.7 40 10.3% -3.000 [$55.01, -9.98$] 2008 -1.00 2007 82.9 86.5 30 10.3.8 66.6 25 3.3% -2.10 [$69.60, 0.2760$] 2007 +4 16.6 31 62.8 05.5 30 14.4 % -3.80 [$-16.18, 0.58$] 2007 +4 16.0 51 15.4 45 70 30 35 14.9% -3.40 [$+36.60, 2.238$] 2006 +4 40.3 60 68.2 46 60 11.8% -4.80 [$+31.80, -58$] 2006 +4 40.3 60 68.2 44 60 11.8% -4.80 [$+48.18, 0.58$] 2006 +4 40.3 80 68.2 44 60 11.8% -4.80 [$+48.18, 0.58$] 2007 +4 16.0 5.75 ($-14.28, -23.8$] 2006 +4 40.3 36 5.75 ($-14.28, -23.8$] 2006 +4 40.3 36 5.75 ($-14.28, -23.8$] 2005 +4 40.000% +4 20.0003 55.1 15.4 45 70 30 35 14.9% -3.20 [$+42.37, -24.8$] 2003 -4 40 [$+45.66, -23.8$] 2006 +4 40.3 36 5.75 ($-14.28, -23.8$] 2006 +4 40.3 36.6 2.2 32.7 7 +2 40 [$+43.33, -15.77$] 2003 +4 40.2 2007 +2 40 [$+43.33, -15.77$] 2003 +4 40.2 207 +4 40.000% +4 40.2 207 +4 40.000% +4 40	Wang 2003	37.4	20.6	48	135.6	41.2	42	10.5%	-98.20 [-111.96, -84.44]	2003	
$ \begin{array}{c} \text{Heterogeneity: Tau"= 576.51; \ \text{Chi"= 82.76, \ df= 11 \ (P < 0.00001); \ P= 87\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect } Z=7.67 \ (P < 0.00001) \\ \hline 1.2.2 \ \text{Serum DBIL level} \\ \text{Lou 2007} & 10.9 & 5.7 & 31 & 14.2 & 6.2 & 30 & 34.1 \\ \text{Lou 2007} & 10.9 & 5.7 & 31 & 14.2 & 6.2 & 30 & 34.1 \\ \text{Lou 2007} & 10.9 & 5.7 & 31 & 14.2 & 6.2 & 30 & 34.1 \\ \text{Heterogeneity: Tau"= 56.60 \ (Chi"= 136.55, \ df= 2 \ (P < 0.00001); \ P= 99\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect } Z=1.89 \ (P= 0.06) \\ \hline 1.2.3 \ \text{Serum AL level} \\ \text{He 2010} & 76.8 & 66 & 36 & 129.3 & 108.7 & 27 & 35\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect } Z=1.89 \ (P= 0.06) \\ \hline 1.2.3 \ \text{Serum AL level} \\ \text{He 2010} & 76.8 & 66 & 36 & 129.3 & 108.7 & 27 & 35\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect } Z=1.89 \ (P= 0.06) \\ \hline 1.2.3 \ \text{Serum AL level} \\ \text{He 2010} & 76.8 & 66 & 36 & 129.3 & 108.7 & 27 & 35\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect } Z=1.89 \ (P= 0.06) \\ \hline 1.2.3 \ \text{Serum AL level} \\ \text{He 2010} & 76.4 & 16.6 & 31 \ 6.28 \ 2.05 & 30 & 15.7\% \\ \text{Han 2006} & 72.4 & 78 & 40 \ 89 \ 2.28 \ 46 & 53\% & -16.10 \ [51.31; 151.2 \ 2008 \\ \text{Luo 2007} & 54.1 \ 16.6 & 31 \ 6.28 \ 2.05 \ 3.0 \ 15.7\% \\ \text{Han 2006} & 55.1 \ 71.2 \ 48 \ 82.2 \ 42.1 \ 44.3 \ 45 \ 70 \ 30.3 \ 51.4 \ 74\% \\ \text{Heterogeneity: Tau"= 131.67; \ Chi"= 27.05, \ df= 10 \ (P= 0.003); \ P= 63\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect } Z= 3.9 \ (P \ 0.00001); \ P= 86\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect } Z= 3.9 \ (P \ 0.00001); \ P= 27.0 \ 2.29 \ 4.1 \ 40.00.5\% \\ \text{Heterogeneity: Tau"= 131.67; \ Chi"= 27.05, \ df= 10 \ (P= 0.003); \ P= 63\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect } Z= 3.3 \ (P \ 0.00001); \ P= 86\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect } Z= 3.2 \ (P \ 0.00001); \ P= 86\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect } Z= 3.2 \ (P \ 0.00001); \ P= 86\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect } Z= 3.2 \ (P \ 0.00001); \ P= 86\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect } Z= 3.2 \ (P \ 0.00001); \ P= 86\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect } Z= 2.2 \ (P \ 0.0001); \ P= 76\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect } Z= 2.2 \ (P \ 0.0001); \ P= 76\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect } Z= 1.2 \ (P \ 0.003); \ P= 78\% \\ \text{Test for overall effect }$	Li 1994	29.5	44.6		96.1	123.6	41	7.5%	-66.60 [-106.82, -26.38]	1994	
Test for overall effect: $Z = 7.67 (P < 0.00001)$ 1.2.2 Serum DBL level 2.2.a Sprum DBL level 2.2.a Sprum ALT level He 2005 35.3 13.4 72 75.4 16.2 37 33.8% -42.80 [-55.75, -28.85] 2009 -3.30 [-6.29, -0.31] 2007 -0.010 [-46.17, -34.03] 2005 -0.28.41 [-57.81, 0.59] -0.28.41 [-57.81, 0.59] -0.2007 -1.24.20 [-88.22, -6.18] 2010 -1.24.20 [-88.2, -6.18] -2.24.41 [-84.22] -2.24.21 [-24.21] -2.24.21 [-24.22] -2.24.21 [-24.22] -2.24.41 [-24.24] -2.24.41 [-24.26] -2.24.41 [-44.26] -2.24.41 [-44.26] -2.24.41 [-44.26]	Subtotal (95% CI)			570			459	100.0%	-75.57 [-94.88, -56.26]		•
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					df=11 (P < 0.00	0001); I	²= 87%			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Test for overall ellect	. 2 = 1.01	(F < 0.0	,0001)							
Lining 2009 36.7 20.3 04 01.2 02.007 10.9 5.7 31 14.2 6.2 32 31.3 14.2 6.2 32 31.3 14.2 6.2 37 33.8% -3.30 (F.2.9, 0.31) 2007 Huang 2005 35.3 13.4 72 75.4 16.2 37 33.8% -40.10 (1-6.17, -34.03) 2005 Subtotal (95% C) 167 107 100.0% -22.50 (-98.82, -6.18) 2010 -22.420 (-138.22, -60.11) 2010 Shi 2009 168.2 129.3 53 29.24 198.4 60 2.0% -124.20 (-138.22, -6.0.12) 2009 Color 72.8 86.5 30 10.23 53 29.24 198.22, -6.51 2010 -22.00 -22.00 -22.00 -22.00 2009 -22.00<											_
Huang 2005 35.3 13.4 72 75.4 16.2 37 33.8% Subtotal (95% C) 167 107 100.0% Letterogeneity. Tau ² = 856.90; Chi ² = 136.55, df = 2 ($P < 0.00001$); $P = 99\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 1.88 ($P = 0.06$) 12.3 Serum ALT level He 2010 76.8 66 36 129.3 108.7 27 3.5% Case 12.23 2009 168.2 129.3 53 292.4 108.4 50 2.0% 2.300 [50.01, 8.99] 2009 Zhang 2009 168.2 129.3 53 292.4 108.4 50 2.0% 2.300 [50.01, 8.99] 2009 Zhang 2009 74.2 34 64 104.2 58.7 40 10.3% 30.00 [50.01, 8.99] 2009 2.300 [50.01, 8.99] 2009 Luo 2007 54 16.6 31 62.8 20.5 30 15.7% Han 2006 35.1 15.4 45 70 30 35 14.9% -19.80 [68.8, -292] 2006 Huang 2005 86.1 35.8 72 114.9 26.3 37 14.4% -28.80 [40.64, -16.96] 2005 Huang 2005 86.1 35.8 72 114.9 26.3 37 14.4% -28.80 [40.64, -16.96] 2005 Huang 2003 62.8 17.2 48 82.2 42.1 42 13.5% Test for overall effect Z = 5.39 ($P < 0.00001$) 12.4 Serum AST level Zhang 2009 10.5 38.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% -37.20 [61.00, -13.40] 2009 Huang 2005 63.2 32.5 72 95.2 23.1 37 23.8% -37.20 [61.00, -13.40] 2009 Huang 2005 63.2 32.5 72 95.2 23.1 37 23.8% -37.20 [61.00, -13.40] 2009 Huang 2005 63.2 32.5 72 95.2 23.1 37 23.8% -32.00 [42.57, -21.43] 2005 -4.28.94 [-46.26, -0.74] 2003 -28.94 [-46.26, -0.74] 2003 -32.84 [-46.26, -0.74] 2003 -32.84 [-46.26, -0.74] 2003 -32.84 [-46.26, -0.74] 2003 -4.29 [-3.33, 0.74] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 23.63, Chi ² = 20.63, di = 4 ($P < 0.003$); $P = 78\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 3.27 ($P = 0.001$) 12.5 PT texel Kong 2003 14.4 3.8 65 01 6.9 42 23 24.5% -25.0 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 -4.29 [-3.33, 0.74] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 23.63, Chi ² = 20.63, di = 4 ($P < 0.003$); $P = 78\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 1.25 ($P = 0.21$)	-										
Subtorial (95% C) 167 107 100.0% -28.41 [-57.81, 0.99] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 666.90; Ch ² = 136.55, df = 2 ($P < 0.00001$); $P = 99\%$ Test for overall effect Z = 1.82 ($P = 0.00$) 1.2.3 Serum ALT level He 2010 76.8 66 36 129.3 108.7 27 3.5% -52.50 [-98.82, -6.18] 2010 Shi 2009 168.2 129.3 53 292.4 198.4 50 2.0% -124.20 [+89.28, -69.12] 2009 Zhang 2009 74.2 34 64 104.2 56.7 40 10.3% -30.00 [+50.01, -9.99] 2009 Bo 2008 72.9 78 40 88 52 30 103.8 956 25 3.3% -16.10 [+51.35, 11515 2008 Lou 2007 54 16.6 31 62.8 20.5 30 15.7% -8.80 [+81.8, 0.58] 2007 Han 2006 35.1 15.4 45 70 30 35 14.9% -34.90 [+46.81, -23.99] 2006 Huang 2005 66.4 48.3 60 88.2 46 60 11.8% -19.80 [+36.80, 2.92] 2006 Huang 2005 86.1 35.8 72 114.9 26.3 37 14.4% -28.80 [+40.84, -15.69] 2005 Huang 2003 52.8 78.9 50 96.2 80.8 32 5.3% -10.70 [+46.21, 24.83] 2003 Subtoral (95% C) 529 418 100.0% -26.54 [-36.19, -16.89] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 131.67; Ch ² = 27.05, df = 10 ($P = 0.003$); $P = 63\%$ Test tor overall effect Z = 5.39 ($P < 0.00001$) 1.2.4 Serum AST level Zhang 2009 61.2 32.8 64 98.4 72.3 40 17.5% -37.20 [-61.00, -13.40] 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% -94.90 [+135.50, -64.30] 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% -94.90 [+135.50, -64.30] 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% -94.90 [+135.50, -64.30] 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% -94.90 [+135.50, -64.30] 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% -94.90 [+135.50, -64.30] 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% -94.90 [+135.50, -64.30] 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% -94.90 [+135.50, -64.30] 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% -94.90 [+135.50, -64.30] 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% -94.90 [+135.60, -0.01] 2006 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% -94.90 [+135.60, -0.01] 2006 Shi 2000 11.4 3.36 50 16.9 4.2 32 4 2.55% -2.50 [+4.26, -0.74] 2003 Shi 40.40 [+5% C) 280 247 100.0% -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.95.4, df = 4 ($P $											_ 1
Heterogeneity, Tau ⁺ = 565.90; Ch ⁺ = 136.55, df = 2 (P < 0.00001); P = 99% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.89 (P = 0.06) 1.2.3 Serum ALT level He 2010 76.8 66 36 129.3 108.7 27 3.5% -52.50 [+9.8.2; -6.18] 2010 Shi 2009 74.2 34 64 104.2 563 74 00 10.3% -30.00 [50.01, -9.98] 2009 Zhang 2009 74.2 34 64 104.2 563 74 00 10.3% -30.00 [50.01, -9.98] 2009 Zhang 2009 74.2 34 64 104.2 563 74 00 10.3% -30.00 [50.01, -9.98] 2009 Zhang 2009 74.2 18.8 85.5 30 15.2 30 15.7% -8.80 [Ha18, 0.58] 2007 Han 2006 68.4 48.3 60 88.2 46 60 11.8% -1.980 [Ha18, 0.58] 2007 Han 2006 68.4 48.3 60 88.2 46 60 11.8% -1.980 [Ha18, 0.58] 2007 Huang 2003 65.8 17.2 48 82.2 42.1 42 13.5% -10.70 [46.22, 24.82] 2003 Huang 2003 65.5 7.8 50 98.2 80.8 32 5.3% -10.70 [46.22, 24.82] 2003 Huang 2003 85.5 7.8 50 98.2 80.8 32 5.3% -10.70 [46.22, 24.82] 2003 Heterogeneity, Tau ⁺ = 131.67; Ch ⁺ = 2.70.6; df = 10 (P = 0.003); P = 63% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.39 (P < 0.00001) 1.2.4 Serum AST level Zhang 2009 61.2 32.8 64 98.4 72.3 40 17.5% -37.20 [-61.00, -13.40] 2009 Huang 2005 63.2 32.5 7.2 95.2 23.1 37 23.8% -32.00 [-6.59, -0.01] 2006 Subtotal (95% Cl) 280 280 21 21.7 98.2 23.2 37 14.9% -32.00 [-6.57, -21.43] 2005 -32.00 [-4.25, 7.21.43] 2005 -32.00 [-4.26, -11.61] Heterogeneity, Tau ⁺ = 298.53; Ch ⁺ = 2.9.54, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); P = 86% Test for overall effect Z = 3.27 (P = 0.01) 1.2.5 PT level Kong 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -	Huang 2005	35.3	13.4	72	75.4	16.2	37	33.8%	-40.10 [-46.17, -34.03]	2005	
Test for overall effect $Z = 1.89$ (P = 0.06) 1.2.3 Serum ALT level He 2010 76.8 66 36 129.3 108.7 27 3.5% -52.50 [+9.8.2, -6.18] 2010 Shi 2009 168.2 129.3 53 292.4 198.4 50 2.0% -124.20 [+189.28, -6.18] 2010 Zhang 2009 74.2 34 64 104.2 58.7 40 10.3% -30.00 [+50.1, -991 2009 Bo 2008 72.9 78 40 89 82.8 40 5.3% -16.10 [+51.35, 19.15] 2008 Luo 2007 82.8 86.5 30 103.8 95.6 25 3.3% -21.00 [+68.60, 27.60] 2007 Luo 2007 54 16.6 31 62.8 20.5 30 15.7% -8.80 [+18.16, 0.58] 2007 Han 2006 35.1 15.4 45 70 30 35 14.4% -34.90 [+4.81, -23.99] 2006 Feng 2006 68.4 48.3 60 88.2 46 60 11.8% -19.80 [+3.68, 0.292] 2006 Huang 2005 86.1 35.8 72 114.9 26.3 37 14.4% -28.80 [+4.81, 0.48, 1.577] 2003 Wang 2003 52.8 17.2 48 82.2 42.1 42 13.5% -28.40 [+0.64, -16.80] 2005 Huang 2003 52.8 17.2 48 82.2 42.1 42 13.5% -28.40 [+0.64, -16.80] 2005 Huang 2003 61.2 32.8 64 98.4 72.3 40 17.5% -28.40 [+0.64, -16.80] 2005 Heterogeneity: Tau" = 131.67; Chi" = 27.05, df = 10 (P = 0.003); P = 63% Test for overall effect Z = 5.39 (P < 0.00001) 1.2.4 Serum AST level Zhang 2009 61.2 32.8 64 98.4 72.3 30 23.2% -37.20 [-61.00, -13.40] 2009 Shit 2009 61.2 32.8 64 98.4 72.3 30 23.2% Heterogeneity: Tau" = 298.53; Chi" = 29.54, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); P = 86% Test for overall effect Z = 5.39 (C + 0.0001) 1.2.5 PT level Kong 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -2.50 [+4.26, -0.74] 2003 Shittotal (95% Ch) 280 74 100.0% -2.50 [+4.26, -1.40] Heterogeneity: Tau" = 2.92.54, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); P = 86% Test for overall effect Z = 3.27 (P = 0.01) 1.2.5 PT level Kong 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% Test for overall effect Z = 1.25 (P = 0.21) 1.2.9 [-3.33, 0.74] Heterogeneity: Tau" = 1.72, Chi" = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); P = 78% Test for overall effect Z = 1.25 (P = 0.21)	Subtotal (95% CI)			167			107	100.0%	-28.41 [-57.81, 0.99]		-
1.2.3 Serum AL Tievel He 2010 76.8 66 36 129.3 108.7 27 3.5% -52.50 [-98.82, -6.18] 2010 Shi 2009 168.2 129.3 53 292.4 198.4 50 2.0% -124.20 [+89.82, -6.18] 2010 Shi 2009 74.2 34 64 104.2 58.7 40 103.% -30.00 [-50.01, -9.99] 2009 Bo 2008 72.9 78 40 89 82.8 40 5.3% -16.10 [-51.35, 19.15] 2008 Luo 2007 54 16.6 16.28 20.5 30 15.7% -8.80 [+18.18, 0.58] 2007 Han 2006 35.1 15.4 45 70 30 35 14.4% -28.80 [+40.84, -16.86] 2005 + Huang 2005 86.1 35.8 72 11.49 26.3 37 14.4% -28.80 [+40.84, -16.86] 2005 + Wang 2003 82.5 78.9 50 96.2 80.3 25.3 +0.10.16.40.2, 24.84.2 2003 + 40.17.5% -27.20 [-61.00, -13.40] 20	Heterogeneity: Tau ² :	= 656.90;	Chi ² = 1	36.55	df = 2 (P < 0.00	0001);1	²= 99%			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Test for overall effect	Z=1.89	(P = 0.0	06)							
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	1.2.3 Serum ALT lev	el									
Shi 2009 166.2 129.3 53 292.4 198.4 50 2.0% $-124.20 [+189.28, -59.12]$ 2009 Zhang 2009 74.2 34 64 104.2 58.7 40 10.3% $-30.00 [+50.01, -9.99]$ 2009 TAU 2007 62.8 86.5 30 103.8 95.6 25 3.3% $-21.00 [+58.0, 27.60]$ 2007 Lou 2007 54 16.6 31 62.8 20.5 30 15.7% $-8.80 [+18.18, 0.56]$ 2007 Han 2006 35.1 15.4 45 70 30 35 14.9% $-3.80 [+45.81, -23.99]$ 2006 Huang 2005 86.1 35.8 72 114.9 26.3 37 14.4% $-28.80 [+40.64, -16.96]$ 2005 Huang 2003 52.8 17.2 44 82.2 42.1 42 13.5% $-28.40 [+43.03, -15.77]$ 2003 Kong 2003 85.5 78.9 50 96.2 80.8 32 5.3% $-10.70 [+46.22, 24.82]$ 2003 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 131.67; Ch ² = 27.05, df = 10 (P = 0.003); P = 63% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.39 (P < 0.00001) 12.2 SPT level Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.7% $-37.20 [+61.00, -13.40]$ 2009 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 28.53; Ch ² = 29.54, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); P = 86% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.27 (P = 0.0001) 12.5 PT level Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% $-2.50 [+4.26, -0.74]$ 2003 3.13 51 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% $-2.50 [+4.26, -0.74]$ 2003 3.14 43 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% $-2.50 [+4.26, -0.74]$ 2003 4.14 100.5% CD 5.29 4.18 100.0% $-2.50 [+4.26, -0.74]$ 2003 4.15 Chi ² = 29.53; Chi ² = 29.54, df = 4 (P < 0.0001); P = 78% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.27 (P = 0.01) 4.25 PT level Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% $-2.50 [+4.26, -0.74]$ 2003 4.14 100.5% CD 5.19 4.18 1.19 1.8 42 57.5% 5.1000 1.17 0.37 2003 5.1000 10.2 2007 5.100 1.17 0.37 2003 5.1000 10.0 200 5.100 1.17 0.77 2003 5.100 1.17 0.77 2003 5.100 1.16 1.2 1.25 (P = 0.01) 5.100 1.17 0.77 2003 5.100 1.16 1.17 0.77 2003 5.100 1.17 0.77 2003 5.100 1.16 1.2 1.25 (P = 0.21)	He 2010	76.8	66	36	129.3	108.7	27	3.5%	-52.50 [-98.82, -6.18]	2010	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				53	292.4	198.4					
Bo 2008 72.9 78 40 89 82.8 40 5.3% -16.10 [-51.35, 19.15] 2008 Luo 2007 82.8 86.5 30 103.8 95.6 25 3.3% -21.00 [F96.0, 27.60] 2007 Han 2006 35.1 15.4 45 70 30 35 14.9% -38.00 [+3.68, 2.59] 2006 Han 2006 86.4 48.3 60 88.2 46 60 11.8% -19.80 [+3.68, 2.59] 2006 Huang 2005 86.1 35.8 72 114.9 26.3 37 14.4% -28.80 [+4.08, 1-6.96] 2005 Kong 2003 85.5 78.9 50 96.2 80.8 32 5.3% -10.70 [+6.22, 24.82] 2003 Subtotal (95% CI) 529 418 100.0% Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 131.67; Chi ² = 27.05, df = 10 ($P = 0.003$); $P = 63\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 5.39 ($P < 0.00001$) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 28.65; Chi ² = 29.24, df = 4 ($P < 0.00001$); $P = 66\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 3.27 ($P = 0.001$) 12.5 PT level Kong 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -0.40 [+1.17, 0.37] 2003 Subtotal (95% CI) 280 22.41, df = 1 ($P = 0.03$); $P = 78\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 1.25 ($P = 0.21$) 1.2.5 PT level Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -0.40 [+1.17, 0.37] 2003 Vang 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Vang 200 10.0 0 100 201 Vang 20.0 10.0 0 100 201 Vang 20.0 10											
Luo 2007 82.8 86.5 30 103.8 95.6 25 3.3% -21.00 [69.60, 27.60] 2007 Lou 2007 54 16.6 31 62.8 20.5 30 15.7% -8.80 [-18.18, 0.58] 2007 +8.90 [-45.81, 23.99] 2006 Feng 2006 68.4 48.3 60 88.2 46 60 11.8% -19.80 [-36.68, 2.9.2] 2006 Huang 2005 86.1 35.8 72 114.9 26.3 37 14.4% -28.80 [-46.4, -16.96] 2005 Wang 2003 52.8 17.2 48 82.2 42.1 42 13.5% -29.40 [-43.03, 15.77] 2003 Kong 2003 85.5 78.9 50 96.2 80.8 32 5.3% -10.70 [-46.22, 24.82] 2003 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 131.67; Ch ² = 27.05, df = 10 (P = 0.003); P = 63% Test for overall effect Z = 5.39 (P < 0.00001) 1.2.4 Serum AST level Zhang 2009 61.2 32.8 64 98.4 72.3 40 17.5% -37.20 [-61.00, -13.40] 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% -94.90 [-45.50, -64.30] 2007 Feng 2006 54.2 15.8 60 62.5 28.7 60 24.7% -8.30 [-16.59, -0.01] 2006 Huang 2005 63.2 32.5 7Z 95.2 23.1 37 23.8% -32.00 [-42.57, -21.43] 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) 280 217 100.0% -28.94 [-46.26, -11.61] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 29.8.53; Chi ² = 29.54, df = 4 (P < 0.0001); P = 86% Test for overall effect Z = 3.27 (P = 0.001) 1.2.5 PT level Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Wang 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -0.40 [-1.17, 0.37] 2003 Subtotal (95% CI) 98 74 100.0% -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.72; Chi ² = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); P = 78% Test for overall effect Z = 1.25 (P = 0.21)											
Lou 2007 54 16.6 31 62.8 20.5 30 15.7% -8.80 [+18,18,0.58] 2007 Han 2006 35.1 15.4 45 70 30 35 14.9% -34.80 [+4.81, 23.99] 2006 Feng 2006 68.4 49.3 60 88.2 45 66 00 11.8% -19.80 [+3.68, 2.92] 2006 Huang 2005 86.1 35.8 72 114.9 26.3 37 14.4% -28.80 [+4.30, -15.7] 2003 Kong 2003 85.5 78.9 50 96.2 80.8 32 5.3% -10.70 [+4.6.22, 24.82] 2003 Subtotal (95% CI) 529 418 100.0% -28.54 [+3.61, 9, -16.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 131.67; Ch ² = 27.05, df = 10 (P = 0.003); P = 63% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.39 (P < 0.00001) 12.24 Serum AST level Zhang 2009 61.2 32.8 64 98.4 72.3 40 17.5% -37.20 [-61.00, -13.40] 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% -94.90 [+135.50, -54.30] 2009 Lou 2007 45.6 26.7 31 56.6 21.2 30 23.2% -11.00 [+3.30, 1.61.8] 2007 Feng 2006 54.2 15.8 60 62.5 28.7 60 24.7% -8.30 [+16.59, -0.01] 2006 Huang 2005 63.2 32.5 72 95.2 23.1 37 23.8% -32.00 [+4.257, -21.43] 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) 280 217 100.0% -32.00 [+4.257, -21.43] 2005 Test for overall effect: Z = 3.27 (P = 0.001) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 298.53; Ch ² = 29.54, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); P = 86% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.27 (P = 0.001) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.72; Ch ² = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); P = 78% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.25 (P = 0.21) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.72; Ch ² = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); P = 78% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.25 (P = 0.21)											
Han 2006 35.1 15.4 45 70 30 35 14.9% -34.90 [$+5.81, -23.99$ 2006 Feng 2006 68.4 48.3 60 88.2 46 60 11.8% -19.80 [$+3.68, -2.92$] 2006 Wang 2003 52.8 17.2 48 82.2 42.1 42 13.5% -29.80 [$+4.06.4, -16.96$] 2005 Wang 2003 65.5 78.9 50 96.2 80.8 32 5.3% -10.70 [$+4.6.22, 24.82$] 2003 Subtotal (95% CI) 529 418 100.0% -26.54 [$-36.19, -16.89$] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 131.67; Ch ² = 27.05, df = 10 (P = 0.003); P = 63% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.39 (P < 0.00001) 12.4 Serum AST level Zhang 2009 61.2 32.8 64 98.4 72.3 40 17.5% -37.20 [$-61.00, -13.40$] 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% -94.90 [$-13.50, -54.30$] 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 63.2 32.5 72 95.2 23.1 37 23.8% -32.00 [$+4.6.59, -0.01$] 2006 Feng 2006 54.2 15.8 60 62.5 28.7 60 24.7% -8.30 [$-16.59, -0.01$] 2006 Huang 2005 63.2 32.5 72 95.2 23.1 37 23.8% -32.00 [$+4.6.26, -11.61$] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 298.53; Ch ² = 29.54, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); P = 86% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.27 (P = 0.001) 12.5 PT level Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [$+2.65, -0.74$] 2003 Subtotal (95% CI) 98 74 100.0% -1.29 [$-3.33, 0.74$] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.72; Ch ² = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); P = 78% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.25 (P = 0.21)											+
Feng 2006 68.4 48.3 60 88.2 46 60 11.8% -19.80 [-36.68, 2.92] 2006 Huang 2005 86.1 35.8 72 114.9 26.3 37 14.4% -28.80 [+40.64, -16.96] 2005 Wang 2003 52.8 17.2 48 82.2 42.1 42 13.5% -29.40 [+3.03, -15.77] 2003 Subtotal (95% CI) 529 418 100.0% -26.54 [-36.19, -16.88] Heterogeneity: Tau" = 131.67; Chi" = 27.05, df = 10 (P = 0.003); P = 63% Test for overall effect Z = 5.39 (P < 0.00001) La.2 Serum AST level Zhang 2009 61.2 32.8 64 98.4 72.3 40 17.5% -37.20 [-61.00, -13.40] 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) 200 21.7 100.0% -94.90 [+3.55, -54.30] 2009 Lou 2007 45.6 26.7 31 65.6 21.2 30 23.2% -11.00 [-23.08, 1.08] 2007 Feng 2006 54.2 15.8 60 62.5 28.7 60 24.7% -8.30 [-16.59, -0.01] 2006 Huang 2005 63.2 32.5 72 95.2 23.1 37 23.8% -32.00 [+2.57, -21.43] 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) 280 217 100.0% -28.94 [-46.26, -11.61] Heterogeneity: Tau" = 298.53; Chi" = 29.54, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I" = 86% Test for overall effect Z = 3.27 (P = 0.001) 12.5 PT level Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Subtotal (95% CI) 98 74 100.0% -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] Heterogeneity: Tau" = 1.72; Chi" = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); I" = 78% Test for overall effect Z = 1.25 (P = 0.21)											-
Huang 2005 86.1 35.8 72 114.9 26.3 37 14.4% -28.80 [-40.64, -16.96] 2005 Wang 2003 52.8 17.2 48 82.2 42.1 42 13.5% -29.40 [-43.03, -15.77] 2003 Kong 2003 85.5 78.9 50 96.2 80.8 32 5.3% -10.70 [-46.22, 24.82] 2003 Subtotal (95% Cl) 529 418 100.0% -26.54 [-36.19, -16.89] -20.94 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 131.67; Chi ² = 27.05, df = 10 (P = 0.003); P = 63% -37.20 [-61.00, -13.40] 2009 Shi 2009 61.2 32.8 64 98.4 72.3 40 17.5% -37.20 [-61.00, -13.40] 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% -49.01 [-13.50, -54.30] 2007 Lou 2007 45.6 26.7 31 56.6 21.2 30 23.2% -11.00 [-23.08, 1.08] 2007 Heargeneity: Tau ² = 298.53; Chi ² = 29.54, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); P = 86%											
Truing 2003 50.1 30.3 72 114.5 20.3 37 14.4% $-29.40[+0.04,-10.30]$ 2003 Kong 2003 85.5 78.9 50 96.2 80.8 32 5.3% $-10.70[+46.22, 24.82]$ 2003 Subtotal (95% CI) 529 418 100.0% $-26.54[-36.19, -16.88]$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 131.67; Chi ² = 27.05, df = 10 (P = 0.003); P = 63% Test for overall effect Z = 5.39 (P < 0.00001) 1.2.4 Serum AST level Zhang 2009 61.2 32.8 64 98.4 72.3 40 17.5% $-37.20[-61.00, -13.40]$ 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% $-94.90[-135.50, -54.30]$ 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% $-94.90[-135.50, -54.30]$ 2009 Lou 2007 45.6 26.7 31 56.6 21.2 30 23.2% $-11.00[-23.08, 1.08]$ 2007 Feng 2006 54.2 15.8 60 62.5 28.7 60 24.7% $-8.30[-16.59, -0.01]$ 2006 Huang 2005 63.2 32.5 72 95.2 23.1 37 23.8% $-32.00[+4.25, -2.14]$ 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) 280 217 100.0% $-28.94[-46.26, -11.61]$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 298.53; Chi ² = 29.54, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 86% Test for overall effect Z = 3.27 (P = 0.001) 1.2.5 PT level Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% $-2.50[+4.26, -0.74]$ 2003 Subtotal (95% CI) 98 74 100.0% $-1.29[-3.33, 0.74]$ Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.72; Chi ² = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); I ² = 78% Test for overall effect Z = 1.25 (P = 0.21)	-										
$\begin{array}{c} \text{Trial 2003} & \text{16.12} & \text{17.1} & $	-										
Subtotal (95% CI) 529 418 100.0% -26.54 [-36.19, -16.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 131.67; Ch ² = 27.05, df = 10 (P = 0.003); P = 63% -26.54 [-36.19, -16.88] -26.54 [-36.19, -16.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 131.67; Ch ² = 27.05, df = 10 (P = 0.003); P = 63% -37.20 [-61.00, -13.40] 2009 12.4 Serum AST level -37.20 [-61.00, -13.40] 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% Lou 2007 45.6 26.7 31 56.6 21.2 30 23.2% -11.00 [-23.08, 1.08] 2007 Feng 2006 54.2 15.8 60 62.5 28.7 60 24.7% -8.30 [-16.59, -0.01] 2006 Huang 2005 63.2 23.2 72 95.2 23.1 37 23.8% -32.00 [-42.57, -21.43] 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) 280 217 100.0% -28.94 [-46.26, -11.61] -28.94 [-46.26, -0.74] 2003 Wang 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.57.5% -0.40 [-1.17, 0.37] 2003 Wang 2003 13.5 1.	-										
$\begin{array}{c} Letter operator (1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 3, 3, 3, 0, 2, 3, 2, 3, 3, 0, 2, 3, 3, 3, 0, 2$		85.5	78.9		96.2	80.8				2003	
Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.39$ (P < 0.00001) 1.2.4 Serum AST level Zhang 2009 612 32.8 64 98.4 72.3 40 17.5% -37.20 [-61.00, -13.40] 2009 Shi 2009 109.5 88.5 53 204.4 118.6 50 10.7% -94.90 [-135.50, -54.30] 2009 Lou 2007 45.6 26.7 31 56.6 21.2 30 23.2% -11.00 [-23.08, 1.08] 2007 Feng 2006 54.2 15.8 60 62.5 28.7 60 24.7% -8.30 [-16.59, -0.01] 2006 Huang 2005 63.2 32.5 72 95.2 23.1 37 23.8% -32.00 [-42.57, -21.43] 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) 280 217 100.0% -28.94 [-46.26, -11.61] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 298.53; Chi ² = 29.54, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 86% Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.27$ (P = 0.001) 1.2.5 PT level Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Wang 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -0.40 [-1.17, 0.37] 2003 Subtotal (95% CI) 98 74 100.0% -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.72; Chi ² = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); I ² = 78% Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.25$ (P = 0.21)									-26.54 [-36.19, -16.88]		•
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					df = 10 (P = 0.01	03); I² =	63%			
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	124 Serum AST low	el									
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			32.8	64	98.4	72.3	40	17.5%	-37.20 [-61.00 -13.40]	2009	
Lou 2007 45.6 26.7 31 56.6 21.2 30 23.2% Feng 2006 54.2 15.8 60 62.5 28.7 60 24.7% Huang 2005 63.2 32.5 72 95.2 23.1 37 23.8% Subtotal (95% CI) 280 217 100.0% Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 298.53; Ch ² = 29.54, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 86% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.27 (P = 0.001) 1.2.5 PT level Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% Wang 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% Subtotal (95% CI) 98 74 100.0% Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.72; Chi ² = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); I ² = 78% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.25 (P = 0.21)											
Feng 2006 54.2 15.8 60 62.5 28.7 60 24.7% -8.30 [-16.59 , -0.01] 2006 Huang 2005 63.2 32.5 72 95.2 23.1 37 23.8% -32.00 [-42.57 , -21.43] 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) 280 217 100.0% -32.00 [-42.57 , -21.43] 2005 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 298.53; Chi ² = 29.54, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 86% -28.94 [-46.26 , -11.61] -28.94 [-46.26 , -11.61] L.5 PT level Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.57% -0.40 [-1.17 , 0.37] 2003 Subtotal (95% CI) 98 74 100.0% -1.29 [-3.33 , 0.74] -200 -100 0 100 201											-
Huang 2005 63.2 32.5 72 95.2 23.1 37 23.8% $-32.00 [+42.57, -21.43]$ 2005 Subtotal (95% Cl) 280 217 100.0% $-32.00 [+42.57, -21.43]$ 2005 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 298.53; Chi ² = 29.54, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 86% $-32.94 [-46.26, -11.61]$ $-28.94 [-46.26, -11.61]$ 1.2.5 PT level Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.57 5% $-2.50 [-4.26, -0.74]$ 2003 Wang 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.57 5% $-0.40 [-1.17, 0.37]$ 2003 Subtotal (95% Cl) 98 74 100.0% $-1.29 [-3.33, 0.74]$ -200 -100 0 100 200 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.72; Chi ² = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); I ² = 78\% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.25 (P = 0.21) -200 -100 0 100 200											-
Subtotal (95% Cl) 280 217 100.0% -28.94 [-46.26, -11.61] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 298.53; Chi ² = 29.54, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 86% -28.94 [-46.26, -11.61] \bullet 12.5 PT level Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Wang 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -0.40 [-1.17, 0.37] 2003 Subtotal (95% Cl) 98 74 100.0% -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.72; Chi ² = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); I ² = 78% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.25 (P = 0.21) -200 -100 0 100 201											•]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 298.53; Chi ² = 29.54, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 86% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.27 (P = 0.001) 1.2.5 PT level Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Wang 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -0.40 [-1.17, 0.37] 2003 Subtotal (95% Cl) 98 74 100.0% -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.72; Chi ² = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); l ² = 78% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.25 (P = 0.21)	-	03.2	52.5		95.2	25.1				2005	▲
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.27$ (P = 0.001) 1.2.5 PT level Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Wang 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -0.40 [-1.17, 0.37] 2003 Subtotal (95% Cl) 98 74 100.0% -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.72; Chi ² = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); l ² = 78% Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.25$ (P = 0.21) -200 -100 0 100 200		- 200 62-	Chiller		1f - 4 /0	~ 0.000			-20.34 [-40.20, -11.01]		•
Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Wang 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -0.40 [-1.17, 0.37] 2003 Subtotal (95% Cl) 98 74 100.0% -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.72; Chi ² = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); l ² = 78% Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.25$ (P = 0.21) -200 -100 0 100 200					ui = 4 (P	~ 0.000	JUT), F	- 00%			
Kong 2003 14.4 3.6 50 16.9 4.2 32 42.5% -2.50 [-4.26, -0.74] 2003 Wang 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -0.40 [-1.17, 0.37] 2003 Subtotal (95% Cl) 98 74 100.0% -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.72; Chi ² = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); l ² = 78% Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.25$ (P = 0.21) -200 -100 0 100 200	125 PT [exel										
Wang 2003 13.5 1.9 48 13.9 1.8 42 57.5% -0.40 [-1.17, 0.37] 2003 Subtotal (95% Cl) 98 74 100.0% -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.72; Chi ² = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); i ² = 78% -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] Test for overall effect: Z = 1.25 (P = 0.21) -200 -100 0 100 200		14.4	20	50	16.0	4.2	22	12 504	-2 50 14 26 -0 741	2002	4
Subtotal (95% Cl) 98 74 100.0% -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.72; Chi ² = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); l ² = 78% -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] Test for overall effect: Z = 1.25 (P = 0.21) -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74] -1.29 [-3.33, 0.74]	-										-
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.72; Chi ² = 4.58, df = 1 (P = 0.03); l ² = 78% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.25 (P = 0.21)		13.5	1.9		13.9	1.8				2003	т
-200 -100 0 100 200	Heterogeneity: Tau ² :			8, df =	1 (P = 0	.03); I² =		100.0%	-1.29 [-3.33, 0.74]		
	Test for overall effect	:Z=1.25	(P = 0.2	21)							
Favours [experimental] Favours [control]										-	
										F	avours (experimental) Favours (control)

and 95% confidence interval.

publication bias occurred in terms of efficacy and indices. This systematic review illustrates that formulae of high-dose PRR are safe to promote the efficacious treatment of hyperbilirubinemia.

Hyperbilirubinemia, presenting with severe jaundice, is one of the most common manifestations in viral hepatitis patients. It usually leads to severe necrosis of hepatocytes over a chronic period (Wang, 2010). It is well-known that a variety of definite factors, including infection, drug abuse, autoimmunity, and heredity, are able to cause hyperbilirubinemia. As for the mechanism, researchers have mainly focused on disorders of bilirubin metabolism such as uptake, synthesis, and excretion (Nie, 2006). In detail, repeated inflammation in viral hepatitis always acts as the trigger of jaundice and ultimately results in hepatocyte damage and even necrosis. Once hepatocytes are

	Expe	rimen	tal	Co	ntro			Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl
1.3.1 Serum ALB lev	el									
Bo 2008	38.9	5	40	39.4	4.6	40	29.7%	-0.50 [-2.61, 1.61]	2008	
Luo 2007	39.8	5	30	36.4	6.6	25	21.0%	3.40 [0.25, 6.55]	2007	
Kong 2003	35.7	5	50	33.9	7.9	32	21.6%	1.80 [-1.27, 4.87]	2003	
Wang 2003	39.2	6.5	48	36	4.7	42	27.7%	3.20 [0.88, 5.52]	2003	
Subtotal (95% CI)			168			139	100.0%	1.84 [-0.14, 3.82]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² :	= 2.29; Cł	ni² = 6.	91, df=	= 3 (P =	0.07)	; l ² = 57	7%			
Test for overall effect	: Z = 1.82	(P = 0)	0.07)							
										-4 -2 0 2 4
										Favours (control) Favours (experiment

FIGURE 6 | Forest plot of ALB in treatment. (1) Study item displayed as the first author with the publication year. (2) The index of serum ALB was assessed in RCTs. (3) I-squared and P are the criterion of the heterogeneity test, \blacklozenge pooled mean difference, $-\blacksquare$ — mean difference, and 95% confidence interval.



FIGURE 7 | Forest plot of γ -GT in treatment. (1) Study item displayed as the first author with the publication year. (2) The index of serum γ -GT was assessed in RCTs. (3) I-squared and P are the criterion of the heterogeneity test, \blacklozenge pooled mean difference, $-\blacksquare$ – mean difference, and 95% confidence interval.

	Experim	ental	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Year	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
He 2010	32	36	19	27	14.8%	3.37 [0.89, 12.71]	2010	
Zhang 2009	57	64	28	40	23.1%	3.49 [1.24, 9.83]	2009	_
Lou 2007	28	31	22	30	13.2%	3.39 [0.80, 14.32]	2007	+
Luo 2007	27	30	17	25	11.4%	4.24 [0.98, 18.22]	2007	
Feng 2006	52	60	46	60	37.6%	1.98 [0.76, 5.14]	2006	+
Total (95% CI)		221		182	100.0%	2.98 [1.75, 5.05]		◆
Total events	196		132					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	1.08, df = -	4 (P = 0	.90); l ^z = l	0%				
Test for overall effect:	Z= 4.04 (F	° < 0.00	01)					Favours [control] Favours [experiment

FIGURE 8 | Forest plot of high dose PRR relevant formulae with essential treatment vs. essential treatment in hyperbilirubinemia patients with hepatitis **B**. (1) Study item displayed as the first author with the publication year. (2) Specific analysis was performed for hepatitis B virus patients with hyperbilirubinemia. (3) I-squared and P are the criterion of the heterogeneity test, \blacklozenge pooled odds ratio, $-\blacksquare$ - odds ratio, and 95% confidence interval.

damaged, the metabolism of bilirubin is disturbed, thus causing bilirubin accumulation. If the high concentration of bilirubin fails to be eliminated, it accumulates such that hyperbilirubinemia or jaundice occurs. Moreover, a micro-imbalance would also occur in hepatocytes, such as inhibition of Na⁺-K⁺-ATPase, down regulation of NTCP and OATP expression, and deregulation of CAR and PXR expression. All of these consequences lead to bilirubin deposition in hepatocytes and jaundice and can cause worsening of hepatocyte damage (Paumgartner and Beuers, 2002; Wagner et al., 2011; Wlcek et al., 2013). According to the mechanism, hyperbilirubinemia is associated with various tissues and targets. Current western medical treatment for hyperbilirubinemia mainly focuses on the combination of alleviating jaundice, liver protection, lowering transaminase levels, nutrition support, etc. However, it lacks comprehensive adjustment and has unstable efficacy. In contrast, complementary and alternative medicine such as TCM for the treatment of hyperbilirubinemia often obtains positive results.

PRR has been widely used in TCM practice for thousands of years for the treatment of blood stasis by targeting the liver. Current studies indicate that PRR and its active components consistently exhibit wide pharmacological effects

Study or Subgroup	Experime Events		Contr		Moinht	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Voor	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
1.6.1 High dose PRR							Tegl	
Zhang 2009	57	64	28	40		3.49 [1.24, 9.83]	2000	
Bo 2008	34	40	23	40	15.8%	4.19 [1.44, 12.22]		
Lou 2007	28	31	23	30	9.9%			
Fena 2006	52	60	46	60				
Huang 2005	63	72	21	37				
Kong 2003	45	50	23	32				
Subtotal (95% CI)	40	317	25		100.0%	3.46 [2.23, 5.37]	2003	•
Total events	279	517	163	233	100.074	5.40 [2.25, 5.57]		•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =		(P - 0		106				
Test for overall effect				70				
restion overall ellect	. 2 - 5.55 (~ 0.00	001)					
1.6.2 High dose PRR	(60-120a) i	elevan	t formula	e vers	us esser	ntial treatment		
He 2010	32	36	19	27		3.37 [0.89, 12.71]	2010	
Luo 2007	27	30	17	25				
Han 2006	42	45	30	35				
Xu 1999	52	60	30	48				
Li 1994	39	41	32	41				
Subtotal (95% CI)	00	212	52		100.0%	3.76 [2.12, 6.69]	1004	•
Total events	192		128		1001010	0110 [2112, 0100]		
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =		(P = 0)		196				
Test for overall effect			<i>/</i> 1					
		0.00						
1.6.3 High dose PRR	(more than	120g)	relevant	formu	lae versu	is essential treatme	nt	
Zhu 2006	49	56	29		63.5%	3.62 [1.32, 9.92]		
Wang 2003	41	48	15	42	36.5%	10.54 [3.80, 29.24]	2003	
Subtotal (95% CI)		104		86	100.0%	6.15 [3.03, 12.47]		•
Total events	90		44					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	= 2.13, df = 1	(P = 0	.14); I ² = 5	53%				
Test for overall effect	: Z = 5.03 (P	< 0.00	001)					
								0.05 0.2 1 5 20
Test for subaroup dif	ferences: C	$hi^2 = 1$	87 df = 2	(P = 0)	39) 17 = 0	1%		Favours [control] Favours [experimer

FIGURE 9 | Forest plot of the different ranges of high-dose PRR-relevant formulae combined with essential treatment vs. essential treatment alone. (1) Study item displayed as the first author with the publication year. (2) Subgroups were classified as PRR 30–60 g, PRR 60–120 g and PRR greater than 120 g. (3) I-squared and P are the criterion of the heterogeneity test, \blacklozenge pooled odds ratio, $-\blacksquare$ – odds ratio, and 95% confidence interval.



such as vasodilatation of the thoracic aorta (Jin et al., 2010), liver protection (Zhao et al., 2013), an anti-allergic effect (Lee et al., 2008), anti-inflammation, and immunoregulation (He and Dai, 2011). According to the TCM theory and modern pharmacology, the original clinical practice of formulae of high-dose PRR to treat hyperbilirubinemia has been gradually applied in recent years (Zhu, 2011). In addition, some studies may partially reveal the mechanism of this application. PRR is able to promote bile acid excretion, enhance the activity of UDPGT and decrease the TXB2 level (Wang, 1986; Lei et al., 1988). In this aspect, PRR is effective in decreasing bilirubin. Although, there is efficacy on hyperbilirubinemia, it remains unclear why PRR should be used at such a high dose. Clinical studies have shown that there is a significant difference in efficacy between the high-dose treatment group (30 g) and the normal-dose treatment group (10 g). The efficacy of the highdose treatment group is markedly higher than the normal-dose treatment group in alleviating hyperbilirubinemia (P < 0.01) (Luo, 2007). This indicates that low-dose PRR cannot effectively treat hyperbilirubinemia compared with a high dose. This is likely related to the characteristic active compounds in PRR. Our previous study demonstrated that the bioavailability of paeoniflorin and albiflorin in PRR is extremely low (Jiang et al., 2012). Herein, a high dose of PRR shows stable treatment efficacy for the alleviation of hyperbilirubinemia, which was not found at low doses. According to these results, formulae of high-dose PRR might help uncover the crucial and specific function of this therapy for hyperbilirubinemia.

Currently, increasing attention has focused on TCM. Due to the holistic concept and treatment based on syndrome

REFERENCES

- Bo, T. (2008). Clinical Study of Jia Wei Wen Dan Decoction on Treating Hyperbilirubinemia with Viral Hepatitis. Wuhan: Hubei University of Chinese Medicine.
- Ding, Q. X., Liu, T. D., and Wang, L. X. (2003). Analysis on compound Chishao Decoction in treating refractory hyperbilirubinemia. *Chin. J. Dis. Control. Prev.* 7, 478. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1674-3679.2003.05.045
- Duan, Z. J., Li, L. L., Ju, J., Gao, Z. H., and He, G. H. (2006). Treatment of hyperbilirubinemia with blood purification in China. World. J. Gastroenterol. 12, 7467–7471. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v12.i46.7467
- Feng, H. P., Guo, X. P., Zhong, D. J., Zhang, J. H., Cao, Q. J., and Liu, Y. W. (2006). Clinical observation of Da Huang Chi Shao Decoction on treating hyperbilirubinemia induced by viral hepatitis. *J. Mod. Med. Health* 22, 64. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1009-5519.2006.01.061
- Garg, H., Sarin, S. K., Kumar, M., Garg, V., Sharma, B. C., and Kumar, A. (2011). Tenofovir improves the outcome in patients with spontaneous reactivation of hepatitis B presenting as acute-on-chronic liver failure. *Hepatology* 53, 774–780. doi: 10.1002/hep.24109
- Han, Z. W., Liu, J. M., and Han, P. X. (2006). Analysis on integrative medical treatment for hyperbilirubinemia with viral hepatitis. *Mod. J. Integr. Tradit. Chin. West. Med.* 15, 1764–1765. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1008-8849.2006.13.031
- He, D. Y., and Dai, S. M. (2011). Anti-inflammatory and immunomodulatory effects of *paeonia lactiflora* pall, a traditional chinese herbal medicine. *Front. Pharmacol.* 2:10. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2011.00010
- He, J. P., Wang, C. B., Ding, J. B., Liu, F. Q., Han, J., Zhao, Y. L., et al. (2003). Open comparative study of Chidan Tuihuang Granule in treating acute and chronice viral cholestatic hepatitis. *C.J.I.T.W.M* 23, 498–500. doi: 10.3321/j.issn:1003-5370.2003.07.006

differentiation, TCM emphasizes formulae employment instead of a single drug application in treating diseases. Many studies demonstrate that formulae with favorable efficacy for specific diseases regulate body function in various organs and tissues in a network manner (Li et al., 2007; Li and Zhang, 2013). Therefore, further studies to illustrate the potential mechanism should be explored.

CONCLUSION

Formulae of high-dose PRR might safely promote the efficacious treatment of hyperbilirubinemia and are thus a promising treatment approach. For acceptance by widespread practitioners, more rigorously designed multicenter, doubleblind, randomized, and large-scale controlled trials are required for further investigation.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

YH, XM, and JW analyzed the data and wrote the manuscript. YZ, ZC, and WZ collected and prepared samples. JW, JW, LS performed the analyses. YZ and XX designed the study and amended the paper.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The current work was supported by the Major Projects of the National Science and Technology (no.2012ZX10005010-002-002) and the National Natural Science Foundation Project of China (no.81303120) and (no.81173571).

- He, Q. Z. (2010). Observation on combination of Tui Huang Decoction and western medicine in treating 36 cases of hyperbilirubinemia. *Hebei. J. TCM* 32, 714–715. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1002-2619.2010. 05.043
- Hou, G. H., Hu, Q. J., Wang, H. L., Li, M., Xu, M. H., Zhu, S. Y., et al. (2010). Adjuvant enema medicine treatment of 54 cases viral hepatitis hyperbilirubinemia. *Chin. J. Integr. Trad. West. Med. Dig.* 18, 398–400. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1671-038X.2010.06.015
- Huang, J. S., and Yang, R. Q. (2005). Clinical observation on treating hyperbilirubinemia in viral hepatitis with Liang Xue Hua Yu Decoction. *J. Sichuan Tradit. Chin. Med.* 23, 58–59. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1000-3649.2005.03.033
- Jiang, F. J., Zhao, Y. L., Wang, J. B., Wei, S. S., Wei, Z. M., Li, R. S., et al. (2012). Comparative pharmacokinetic study of paeoniflorin and albiflorin after oral administration of Radix Paeoniae Rubra in normal rats and the acute cholestasis hepatitis rats. *Fitoterapia* 83, 415–421. doi: 10.1016/j.fitote.2011. 12.009
- Jin, S. N., Wen, J. F., Wang, T. T., Kang, D. G., Lee, H. S., and Cho, K. W. (2010). Vasodilatory effects of ethanol extract of Radix Paeoniae Rubra and its mechanism of action in the rat aorta. *J. Ethnopharmacol.* 142, 188–193. doi: 10.1016/j.jep.2012.04.035
- Kong, Q. H., Lan, Y., Li, B., and Zhou, A. P. (2003). Combination of Yin Chen Chi Ling Decoction and western medicine in treating 50 cases of severe jaundice in viral hepatitis. *Chin. J. Integr. Tradit. West. Med. Liver Dis.* 13, 234–235. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1005-0264.2003.04.023
- Lee, B., Shin, Y. W., Bae, E. A., Han, S. J., Kim, J. S., Kang, S. S., et al. (2008). Antiallergic effect of the root of *Paeonia lactiflora* and its constituents paeoniflorin and paeonol. *Arch. Pharm. Res.* 31, 445–450. doi: 10.1007/s12272-001-1177-6

- Lei, Z. Y., Xu, J. H., Sun, J. F., Li, X. L., Du, X. Y., Tian, N., et al. (1988). Study on hepatic microcirculation of intrahepatic cholestasis. *Med. J. Chin. Peoples Liberation Army* 13, 382–384
- Li, S. B., and Gu, R. W. (1994). Observation on treating hyperbilirubinemia in viral hepatitis with high dosage of Chishao. *Zhejiang J. Integr. Tradit. Chin. West. Med.* 4, 16–17.
- Li, S., and Zhang, B. (2013). Traditional Chinese medicine network pharmacology: theory, methodology and application. *Chin. J. Nat. Med.* 11, 110–120. doi: 10.3724/SP.J.1009.2013.00110
- Li, S., Zhang, Z. Q., and Wu, L. J. (2007). Understanding ZHENG in traditional Chinese medicine in the context of neuro-endocrine-immune network. *IET Syst. Biol.* 1, 51–60. doi: 10.1049/iet-syb:20060032
- Li, Y. M., Yang, H. Z., Guan, W. B., Ke, Q. S., Dai, M., Xie, H. P., et al. (2008). Therapeutic effect of traditional Chinese medicine on coagulation disorder and accompanying intractable jaundice in hepatitis B virus-related liver cirrhosis patients. *World J. Gastroenterol.* 14, 6060–6064. doi: 10.3748/wjg. 14.6060
- Liu, Y. (2000). Treatment on 86 cases of severe jaundice hepatitis with high dose Radix Paeoniae Rubra. J. New Chin. Med. 12:40. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.0256-7415.2000.12.022
- Lou, H. M., Li, Z. G., and Wang, Y. Y. (2007). Clinical analysis of treating hyperbilirubinemia in viral hepatitis with Tui Huang Decoction. Mod. J. Integr. Tradit. Chin. West. Med. 16, 4939–4940. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1008-8849.2007.33.021
- Luo, X. B. (2007). Clinical observation on detoxification and promoting blood flow decoction using large dosage Paeoniae Radix for the treatment of type B hepatitis hyperbilirubinemia. *Guid. J. TCM* 13, 16–17.
- Ma, X., Wang, J., He, X., Zhao, Y. L., Wang, J. B., Zhang, P., et al. (2014). Large dosage of chishao in formulae for cholestatic hepatitis: a Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Evid. Based Complement. Alternat. Med.* 2014:328152. doi: 10.1155/2014/328152
- Nie, Q. H. (2006). Relevant disease of bilirubin metabolic disturbance. *Chin. Hepatol.* 11, 189–192. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1008-1704.2006.03.016
- Paumgartner, G., and Beuers, U. (2002). Ursodeoxycholic acid in cholestatic liver disease: mechanisms of action and therapeutic use revisited. *Hepatology* 36, 525–531. doi: 10.1053/jhep.2002.36088
- Shi, J., Qiang, J., Tan, G. M., Wang, P. J., and Li, L. Q. (2009). Clinical observation of clearing heat, cooling blood and detoxicating principle on treating chronic severe jaundice with viral hepatitis B. J. E. T. C. M 18, 884–885. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1004-745X.2009.06.019
- Wagner, M., Zollner, G., and Trauner, M. (2011). Nuclear receptors in liver disease. *Hepatology* 53, 1023–1034. doi: 10.1002/hep.24148
- Wang, C. B. (1986). Effect and mechanism of cooling blood and invigorating blood circulation herb in treating severe jaundice hepatitis. *Chin. J. Integr. Med.* 27, 271–272.

- Wang, C. B. (2010). Integrative Medical Treatment in Liver Disease with Severe Jaundice. Beijing: People's Military Medical Press.
- Wang, L. J., Zhu, Y. G., Li, M., Zhang, Y. Y., and Dou, Z. H. (2003). Clinical observation on treating 120 cases of severe jaundice with Tui Gao Huang Decoction. *Jiangsu J. Tradit. Chin. Med.* 24, 15–17. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1672-397X.2003.09.007
- Wlcek, K., Koller, F., and Ferenci, P. (2013). Hepatocellular organic aniontransporting polypeptides (OATPs) and multidrug resistance-associated protein 2 (MRP2) are inhibited by silibinin. *Drug Metab. Dispos.* 41, 1522–1528. doi: 10.1124/dmd.113.051037
- Xu, H. J., Su, T. B., and Wang, Y. Z. (1999). Chi Zhi Huang Decoction in treating 60 cases of severe jaundice with viral hepatitis. J. Henan Univ. Chin. Med. 14, 32–33.
- Zhang, L. L. (2009). Integrative medical treatment for 64 cases of chronic hyperbilirubinemia induced by viral hepatitis B. *Hunan J. Tradit. Chin. Med.* 25, 58–59. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1003-7705.2009.05.035
- Zhang, M. F., and Shen, Y. Q. (2011). Re-evaluation of therapeutic effect of glycyrrhizic acid on hepatopathy. Anti. Infect. Pharm. 8, 82–87. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1672-7878.2011.02-002
- Zhao, Y. L., Zhou, G. D., Wang, J. B., Jia, L., Zhang, P., and Li, R. S. (2013). Paeoniflorin protects against ANIT-induced cholestasis by ameliorating oxidative stress in rats. *Food Chem. Toxicol.* 58, 242–248. doi: 10.1016/j.fct.2013.04.030
- Zhou, G. L. (2010). Research on Ancient Formulae Resource and Drug Application Principle in Treating Jaundice. Shenyang: Liaoning University of Chinese Medicine.
- Zhu, G. H., Lan, N., and Wang, Y. Z. (2006). High dose Paeoniae Radix Rubra in treating 56 cases of acute hyperbilirubinemia with viral hepatitis. J. Mod. Med. Health 22, 1717. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1009-5519.2006.11.114
- Zhu, Y. (2011). Professor Wang Chengbo's experience of high dosage of promoting Qi flow and blood circulation herbs in treating liver disease. *Chin. J. Integr. Tradit. West. Med. Liver Dis.* 21, 105–108. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1005-0264.2011.02.018

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2016 Huang, Ma, Wang, Zhao, Wang, Chen, Zhu, Shan, Wei, Wang and Xiao. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) or licensor are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.