Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Brijesh Sathian, Hamad Medical Corporation, Qatar

REVIEWED BY Giuseppe Caminiti, IRCCS San Raffaele Roma Srl, Italy Cosmin Mihai Vesa, University of Oradea, Romania Yang Song, Óbuda University, Hungary

*CORRESPONDENCE Xiaoqin Liao ⊠ pomeliao@aliyun.com

[†]These authors have contributed equally to this work and share first authorship

SPECIALTY SECTION This article was submitted to Aging and Public Health, a section of the journal

Frontiers in Public Health

RECEIVED 07 January 2023 ACCEPTED 06 February 2023 PUBLISHED 23 February 2023

CITATION

Dai M, Luo Z, Hu S, Chen H, Yang J, Geng D, Li W and Liao X (2023) Effects of traditional Chinese exercises on the rehabilitation of patients with chronic heart failure: A meta-analysis. *Front. Public Health* 11:1139483. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2023.1139483

COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Dai, Luo, Hu, Chen, Yang, Geng, Li and Liao. 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) and the copyright owner(s) 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.

Effects of traditional Chinese exercises on the rehabilitation of patients with chronic heart failure: A meta-analysis

Mengqiao Dai[†], Ziyan Luo[†], Shuqin Hu, Hu Chen, Jiechao Yang, Dandan Geng, Weina Li and Xiaoqin Liao*

School of Nursing, Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Shanghai, China

Background: With the development of rehabilitation medicine, exercise therapy has gradually become one of the methods to prevent and treat cardiovascular diseases. It is widely used in clinic because it can further reduce the mortality rate, improve clinical symptoms, restore the activity ability of the body, improve the quality of life of patients and reduce the hospitalization rate. Traditional Chinese exercises have developed rapidly in recent years, which mainly include Baduanjin, Tai Ji, etc. However, meta-analyses of all types of exercises are not well characterized.

Objectives: To evaluate the effect of traditional Chinese exercises (TCEs) on the rehabilitation of patients with chronic heart failure (CHF) using a meta-analysis.

Methods: A systematic search of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) on TCEs for patients with CHF in 13 databases (PubMed, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, etc.). Meta-analysis was performed using Review Manager software (version 5.3) after two investigators independently screened the studies, assessed the quality of the studies, and extracted the data.

Results: Meta-analysis of 21 randomized controlled trials which involved 1,665 patients with chronic heart failure showed that practicing TCEs was effective in improving patients' physiological outcomes such as VO₂max [MD = 2.14, 95% CI (1.02, 3.26), P < 0.001], AT [MD = 1.61, 95% CI (1.06, 2.16), P < 0.001], and left ventricular ejection fraction [MD = 2.60, 95% CI (1.17, 4.02), P < 0.001]. Non-physiological outcomes benefited from the application of TCEs: 6-min walking distance [MD = 38.55, 95% CI (36.67, 40.42), P < 0.001], quality of life [MD = 5.52, 95% CI (3.17, 7.88), P < 0.001], and single-item TCM symptom scores in CHF patients: tiredness and fatigue [MD = 0.78, 95% CI (0.03, 1.53), P = 0.04], shortness of breath [MD = 0.44,95% CI (0.26, 0.62), P < 0.0001], facial puffiness and limb swelling [MD = 0.44,95% CI (0.12, 0.76), P = 0.007], palpitations [MD = 0.68,95% CI (0.14, 1.21), P = 0.01] were improved.

Conclusions: TCEs improved several recovery indicators, heart failure-related clinical symptoms, quality of life, and physiological indicators in patients with CHF. It is worthwhile to expand the participants for practical application in clinical practice, but the existing evidence is insufficient and the heterogeneity of outcome is large. Therefore, more high-quality clinical trials are needed to support these results.

Systematic review registration: PROSPERO, identifier [CRD42022383246].

KEYWORDS

traditional Chinese exercises, Tai Chi, chronic heart failure, rehabilitation, meta

1. Introduction

Chronic heart failure (CHF) is the end stage of many cardiovascular diseases. It is a complex syndrome that causes high hospitalization and mortality rates and places a significant burden on the public health system (1, 2). Studies show (3) that the absolute number of people with heart failure has nearly doubled since 1990. With the development of modern medicine, exercise rehabilitation has become one of the most important aspects of cardiac rehabilitation, enabling patients to improve their disease status through active exercise (4). The relevant guidelines $(5)^1$ strongly recommend cardiac rehabilitation.

Traditional Chinese exercises (TCEs) combine internal and external training, rigidity, and flexibility, including Ba Duan Jin, Six-character formula, Taijiquan, Five mimic-animal exercises, and Zhan Zhuang. China's traditional exercises are based on traditional Chinese medicine, Yin and Yang, the theory of five elements, the science of channels and collaterals and the theory of Zang and fu, and China's traditional philosophic thinking and regimen concept are the upper concepts (6, 7). TCEs emphasize the harmony of the body and mind, and promote the operation of one's qi, blood, and fluids. After thousands of years of exploration and renewal, TCEs have evolved into the core of the idea of "adjusting the body, breath and mind," through conscious inhaling and exhaling, relaxing body and mind, concentrating the mind to achieve the effect of disease prevention and cure, and consequently prolonging life. The good implementation effect of traditional Chinese exercises has been verified by meta-analysis in patients with hypertension (8), stroke (9), sleep disorder (10) and other chronic diseases. Practicing traditional Chinese exercises, for example, can effectively improve the gait of stroke patients, the pain symptoms of patients with chronic low back pain, the mood and symptoms of patients with sleep disorders etc. Studies have shown that traditional Chinese exercises as a sort of rhythmic and moderate-intensity aerobic exercises can promote physical ability, quality of life and health level (8). But the existing research on the rehabilitation effect of patients with chronic heart failure is lacking.

TCEs, as a non-pharmacological therapy with great cultural implications in China, have been used in the rehabilitation of patients with CHF because of their advantages of safety, economy, and not being restricted by venue and time (11). There are few studies on the intervention of chronic heart failure patients by traditional methods such as Baduanjin, Yijinjing, and Wuqinxi in China, and their universality and effectiveness need to be further tested. At present, there is a lack of a clear understanding of the regulatory variables (content, cycle, etc.) that affect the intervention effect of China's traditional exercises on patients with chronic heart failure.

However, the results of these clinical studies have varied widely. Some studies have shown that TCEs can effectively improve left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) (12–22), 6-min walking distance (6MWD) (13, 14, 16–19, 21–25), quality of life (QOL) (14–16), and other outcomes. Some related studies have shown that TCEs did not effectively affect patients' LVEF (15), 6WMD (17), and QOL (18, 19) compared with conventional medication or care, which was not statistically significant. However, caregivers need systematic scientific advice and guidelines to support them in developing relevant plans for their patients. Systematic evaluation of the effect of TCEs on the rehabilitation of patients with CHF is lacking.

At present, there is no best practice plan about different traditional Chinese exercises for the rehabilitation of CHF patients. This study evaluated the effect of TCEs on the rehabilitation of patients with CHF through meta-analysis to provide a reliable basis for clinical practice. This study also fills the gap in the current meta-analysis of related topics and provides an in-depth design idea for related clinical trials in the future. At the same time provides an effective practical path for the implementation of the "Key Project Planning for the Inheritance and Development of Chinese Excellent Traditional Culture."

2. Methods

2.1. Search strategy

Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) on TCEs for patients with CHF were searched using a computerized retrieval system in the Chinese full-text journal database, VIP database, Wan Fang database, China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), WeiPu, WanFang, China Biology Medicine disc, National Medical Journal of China, PubMed, Cochrane Library, Web of Science, EBSCO, and Embase databases from the time of database construction to 25 November 2022. Chinese database mainly uses keywords such as "Ba Duan Jin," "Taijiquan," "Five mimicanimal exercises," "Six-character formula," "Qigong," and "Yi Jin Jing," "Five Elements Palm," "Zhan Zhuang," "Hui Chun Gong," "Heart Failure," "Chronic Heart Failure," "cardiac insufficiency" for searching, and the specific search strategy is presented in Appendix. Thus, the search for the retrieval strategy for non-Chinese databases could be finalized (the concrete retrieval formula of the database is shown in Appendix). The reference lists of the relevant articles were screened and checked to identify more eligible studies.

2.2. Study inclusion and exclusion criteria

The inclusion criteria for studies were applied as follows. Study's participants: (1) Patients aged ≥ 18 years. (2) Recognized or authoritative guideline criteria confirmed the diagnosis of CHF. (3) Patients with NYHA cardiac function class I to III. (4) The patient does not have other serious complications. (5) The patient does not have physical activity disorder or cognitive impairment.

Abbreviations: LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; MLHFQ, Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire; 6MWD, 6 min walking distance; CHF, chronic heart failure; RCTs, randomized controlled trials; QOL, quality of life; TCEs, traditional Chinese exercises.

¹ Available online at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/ 358352812_Guidelines_for_Cardiac_Rehabilitation_Programs_AACVPR.

Interventions: (1) Patients in the experimental group were given a single traditional Chinese exercise (e.g., Ba Duan Jin, Yi Jin Jing, Five mimic-animal exercises, Six-character formula, etc.). Study design: randomized controlled trial (RCT). Study language: Chinese or English.

The exclusion criteria for studies were applied as follows. (1) The intervention did not match or combined with the other instruments. (2) The intervention participants do not meet the inclusion criteria or is not clear. (3) Book or conference study. (4) Unavailability of the complete study.

2.3. Data extraction and quality assessment

The title and abstract of each retrieved study were read by two independent reviewers (MengQiao Dai and ZiYan Luo) who had undergone an evidence-based nursing course. The study was initially screened manually, while it was imported into EndNoteX9 for duplication. The remaining studies were again read in their entirety, and those that did not meet the criteria were removed according to the exclusion criteria. Two reviewers independently extracted and checked the information about the study, including author characteristics, year of publication, participants, type of study design, specific measures of the control and intervention groups, duration of the intervention, outcomes (LVEF, VO2max, AT, QOL, 6MWD, single-item TCM symptom scores), and the evaluation tool used for the outcome indicator. In case of disagreements between the two reviewers in the above steps, a third reviewer with the same qualifications was asked to discuss the decision.

Two reviewers performed an independent quality assessment of all the included studies. The Cochrane 5.1.0 quality evaluation criteria were used which consisted of seven items, and the reviewers made "low risk," "high risk," and "unclear" classifications for each item. If a study fully satisfied the criteria, the study was considered to have a low possibility of bias i.e., was classified as grade A; partially satisfied as grade B, the study was considered to have a moderate possibility of bias; completely unsatisfied as grade C; the study was considered to have a high possibility of bias.

2.4. Statistical analyses

Meta-analysis was performed using RevMan 5.3 software, and the count data were expressed as relative risk (RR) with 95% CI; continuous variables, such as maximal oxygen uptake (VO₂max), anaerobic threshold (AT), LVEF, 6WMD, QOL, and traditional Chinese medicine (TCM) evidence alone scores, were expressed as mean difference (MD) or standardized mean difference (SMD) with 95% CI. If P > 0.05, $I^2 < 50\%$, there was no significant statistical heterogeneity among the studies, and a meta-analysis was performed using a fixed-effects model. If P < 0.05, $I^2 >$ 50%, there was greater heterogeneity among the studies, and a random-effects model was used to calculate the combined effect size. A subgroup analysis was conducted to further explore the sources of heterogeneity. Statistical significance was set at P < 0.05.

3. Results

3.1. Results of literature retrieval

A total of 2,539 documents were obtained by computer and manual search, including 1,827 documents in English and 712 documents in Chinese, and a total of 853 duplicate documents were removed using Endnote software manually. After reading the titles and abstracts of the remaining studies, 1,558 irrelevant pieces of study were removed. The full text of the remaining 128 papers was read according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the study, and 21 papers were finally included in the final statistical analysis. A flow diagram of the search and selection of the studies is shown in Figure 1.

3.2. Study characteristics

The 21 included papers (12–32) were sorted by article. A total of 1,665 patients with CHF were included. In this study, the sample size ranged from 18 to 150. The time span for literature publication was from 2016 to 2022. Among them, 17 were Chinese studies and four were English studies. The basic characteristics of the included studies are presented in Supplementary Table 1.

3.3. Risk of bias assessment

The quality of the study was evaluated using Review Manager version 5.3. We assessed the risk of bias in all the included studies. All 21 (12–32) included studies mentioned "randomization," of which four mentioned allocation concealment. Participants could not be blinded due to the intervention; therefore, all articles were at a high risk of blinding of participants and personnel. Six mentioned the blind method of outcome assessment. The risk of incomplete outcome data was low in all trials. All studies had an unclear risk of bias in selective reporting. The detailed results of the bias risk assessment are summarized in Figures 2, 3.

4. Meta-analysis results

4.1. Left ventricular ejection fraction

LVEF values in patients with CHF were reported in 13 studies (12–22, 25, 26), which showed that LVEF values were higher in the trial group than in the control group. Meta-analysis showed a statistically significant difference in LVEF values in the trial group compared with the control group [MD = 2.60, 95% CI (1.17, 4.02), P < 0.001] due to high heterogeneity between studies ($I^2 = 94\%$, P < 0.001) (Figure 4).

Because of the large bias in LVEF results across studies, subgroup analyses were performed with different types of gong methods, whether instructions other than drugs and gong methods







Bias risk summary: judgment of risk of bias and items with bias included in the studies; "+", low risk; "-", high risk; "?", unclear.

were given, length of intervention (≤ 3 ; >3 months), and length of single intervention (≤ 30 ; >30 min) as subgroup variables (Figure 5).

In the subgroup analysis with an intervention using different types of exercises as subgroup variables, in which Bada Duan Jin and Taijiquan were used in five studies each [14–17, 19–21, 23, 27, respectively], the analysis was performed using a random effects model. The results showed that the LVEF values in the studies with Bada Duan Jin experimental group was statistically significant (P = 0.03) compared with the control group. However, in the studies in which the intervention exercises were combined using different gong methods, results showed that there was no statistically significant difference between the groups (P = 0.23) (Figure 5A).

In the subgroup analysis with the subgroup variable of whether or not to give instructions other than drugs and exercises, seven studies (13, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22) mentioned administering drugs and exercise interventions, while five studies (14, 18, 20, 25, 26) additional instructions were given to patients such as health education and emotional guidance (P = 0.19 and P =0.10, respectively) (Figure 5B).

In a subgroup analysis with intervention duration as a subgroup variable, eight studies (13, 15, 17–20, 22, 25) with intervention duration \leq 3 months and four studies (14, 16, 21, 26) with intervention duration >3 months were analyzed using a random effects model. The results showed that the LVEF values were not statistically significant in the experimental group compared to the intervention group for intervention lengths of < or > 3 months (*P* = 0.14, *P* = 0.16) (Figure 5C).

In a subgroup analysis with a single intervention duration as a subgroup variable, it was shown that nine studies (13-17, 19, 21, 22, 25, 26) had a single intervention duration of ≤ 30 min, and three studies (16, 18, 20) had a single intervention duration >30 min, which were analyzed using a random effects model. The results showed that the LVEF values were not statistically significant in the experimental group compared to the control group for single intervention durations of < or > 30 min (P = 0.05 and P = 0.14, respectively) (Figure 5D).

4.3. Maximum oxygen uptake (VO₂max)

Four studies (21, 26, 27, 29) reported patient VO₂max, which is an indicator of aerobic exercise capacity in humans. Owing to the large heterogeneity of the included studies (P < 0.001, $I^2 =$ 94%), meta-analysis using a random effects model showed that the VO₂max levels in the group using TCEs were greater than those in the control group, and the difference between the two groups was statistically significant [MD = 2.14, 95% CI (1.02, 3.26), P < 0.001] (Figure 6).

4.4. Anaerobic threshold

Four studies (19, 24, 27, 29) reported patient AT levels, which are indicators of the ability to perform daily activities, and are



closely related to cardiac function classification. Due to the large heterogeneity of the included studies (P < 0.001, $I^2 = 83\%$), a meta-analysis using a random-effects model showed that AT levels were greater in the TCE group than in the control group, and the difference between the two groups was statistically significant [MD = 1.61, 95% CI (1.06, 2.16), P < 0.001] (Figure 7).

4.5. Quality of life

Seventeen studies (12-14, 17-27, 29, 30, 32) reported quality of life scores in patients with CHF. All the included study used the uniform Minnesota Malfunctional Heart Quality of Life Scale (MLHFQ) for scoring. Due to the high heterogeneity of the included studies ($I^2 = 95\%$, P < 0.001), a random-effects model was used for the analysis. The results of the meta-analysis showed that the test group had a statistically significant difference from the control group in terms of QOL scores [MD = 5.52, 95% CI (3.17, 3.17)]7.88), P < 0.001]. Subgroup analyses were performed using the subgroup indicator of intervention duration (≤ 3 and > 3 months). Of the subgroup analyses with intervention duration, five studies (14, 21, 26, 27, 30) had intervention duration >3 months, and 12 studies (12, 14, 17-20, 22-25, 29, 32) had intervention durations \leq 3 months. The heterogeneity of the included studies was high and a meta-analysis with a random-effects model was used. The results showed that the quality of life was statistically significant in the experimental group of different time studies of intervention feats, compared to the intervention group (P < 0.001 and P = 0.007, respectively) (Figure 8).

4.6. 6MWD

Twelve studies (13, 14, 16–19, 21–24, 28) reported 6MWD in patients with CHF, and all 6MWD were higher in the trial

group than in the control group. Due to the high heterogeneity of the included studies ($I^2 = 86\%$, P < 0.001), a random-effects model was used for the analysis. The results of the meta-analysis showed that the test group differed significantly from the control group in terms of QOL scores [MD = 36.83, 95% CI (29.11, 44.56), P < 0.001]. In the subgroup analysis of interventions by intervention duration, three studies (14, 16, 21) and (13, 17, 19, 22– 25, 28) had an intervention duration greater than and ≤ 3 months, respectively. The heterogeneity of the included studies was high and a meta-analysis with a random-effects model was used. The results showed that the QOL was statistically significant in the experimental group of different time studies of intervention feats, compared to the intervention group (P < 0.001 and P = 0.007, respectively) (Figure 9).

4.7. Single-item TCM symptom scores in CHF patients

4.7.1. Tiredness and fatigue

Three studies (17, 20, 22) reported the level of fatigue and weakness in the single-item TCM score of patients. Owing to the large heterogeneity of the included studies (P < 0.001, $I^2 = 94\%$), meta-analysis using a random-effects model showed that the level of fatigue and weakness in the group using TCEs was better than that in the control group, and the difference was statistically significant when comparing the two groups [MD = 0.78, 95% CI (0.03, 1.53), P = 0.04] (Figure 10).

4.7.2. Shortness of breath

Three studies (17, 20, 22) reported the level of shortness of breath in the single-item TCM score of patients. Due to the small heterogeneity of the included studies (P = 0.45, $I^2 = 0\%$), meta-analysis using a fixed-effects model showed that the level of

| | | TCE | | - | ontrol | | | Mean Difference | Mean Difference |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| Study or Subgroup 2.1.2 Ba Duan Jin | Mean | 50 | Total | Mean | SD | Total | Weight | IV. Random. 95% CI | IV. Random. 95% Cl |
| Lei Zhang et al 2022 | 48 | 4 | 40 | 47 | 3 | 40 | 10.8% | 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] | |
| Wei Qi et al2020 XiangFeng Deng2019 | 48.35 45.26 | 2.05 | 50 49 | 45.39 44.41 | 14.65 2.35 | 50 51 | 6.7% 11.2% | 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] | |
| XiangHui Xiong et al2016 | 49.8 | 5.8 | 33 | 44.7 | 4.9 | 30 | 9.8% | 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] | |
| XueJiao Hong2020 Subtotal (95% CI) | 59.18 | 7.97 | 33 205 | 58.97 | 7.78 | 34 205 | 8.5% 47.0% | 0.21 [-3.56, 3.98] 1.72 [0.21, 3.24] | - |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.48; Test for overall effect: Z = 2. | | | 4 (P = | 0.05); P | * = 59% | | | | |
| 2.1.3 Taijiquan | | | | | | | | | |
| ChengDong Yao et al2010 HanXuan Yang et al2021 | 48.63 | 9.37 | 80 | 39.62 51.99 | 7.28 | 70 | 9.8% 11.1% | 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] | • |
| HanXuan Yang et al2021 HongJie Liu2017 | 53.77 | 0.78 | 33 | 49.39 | 0.69 | 47 | 11.1% | 4.38 [4.02, 4.74] | - |
| WenJun Feng2017 | 42 | 3 | 32 | 44 | 8 | 28 36 | 9.2% | -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] | |
| XinTing Wang et al2022 Subtotal (95% Cl) | | 0.922 | 225 | 61.31 | 0.905 | 214 | 11.4% 53.0% | -1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 2.09 [-1.29, 5.46] | |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 13.94 Test for overall effect: Z = 1. | | | f = 4 (| P < 0.00 | 0001); F | 99% | | | |
| Total (95% CI) | | | 430 | | | 419 | 100.0% | 2.02 [-0.15, 4.19] | - |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ^a = 10.68 Test for overall effect: Z = 1. | | | | P < 0.00 | 0001); P | | | | -4 -2 0 2 4 |
| Test for subaroup difference | | | = 1 (P | = 0.85 | . I ^z = 09 | 6. | | | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Study or Subgroup | Mean | TCE SD | Total | | ontrol | Total | Weight | Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI | Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl |
| 3.1.6 Giving the rest of the ChengDong Yao et al2010 | guidanc 48.63 | 9.37 | 80 | 39.62 | 7.28 | 70 | 8.6% | 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] | |
| Liang Zheng 2017 | 58.78 | 12.81 | 9 | 64.24 | 17.64 | 7 | 1.6% | -5.46 [-20.98, 10.06] | |
| Wei Qi et al2020 WenJun Feng2017 | 42 | 12.87 | 50 32 | 45.39 44 | 14.65 8 | 50 28 | 5.9% 8.2% | 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] | |
| XueJiao Hong2020 Subtotal (95% CI) | 49.8 | 5.8 | 33 | 44.7 | 4.9 | 30 | 8.7% 32.8% | 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 3.21 [-1.55, 7.96] | |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 22.05 | | | | < 0.000 | 001); I ² | | 02.10.10 | over [| |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 1. | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1.7 No remaining guidan HanXuan Yang et al2021 | ce was g 52.43 | 2.82 | 47 | 51.99 | 2.52 | 47 | 9.9% | 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] | + |
| HongJie Liu2017 | 53.77 | 0.78 | 33 | 49.39 | 0.69 | 33 | 10.1% | 4.38 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] | ÷. |
| Lei Zhang et al 2022 XiangFeng Deng2019 | 45.26 | 2.05 | 49 | 44.41 | 2.35 | 51 | 10.0% | 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] | - |
| XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2022 | 49.8 | 5.8 | 33 33 | 44.7 | 4.9 | 30 36 | 8.7% | 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] | |
| YiWen Ke2021 | 48.82 | 4.89 | 34 | 44.3 | 5.41 | 33 | 8.8% | 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau* = 10.26 | ; Chi* = 4 | 15.53, 0 | | P < 0.00 | 0001); P | | | 2.06 [-0.39, 4.50] | - |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | .65 (P = 0 | .10) | | | | | 100.00 | | - |
| Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau* = 10.54 Test for overall effect: Z = 2. | ; Chi ² = 4 45 (P = 0 | 54.80, c | | | | 1" = 98% | 100.0% % | 2.53 [0.51, 4.56] | -20 -10 0 10 20 Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogoneily: Teu ² = 10.54 Toet for overall effect? Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference | ; Chi [#] = 4 .45 (P = 0 es: Chi [#] = | 54.80, c .01) 0.18. df | if = 11 = 1 <i>(</i> P | = 0.67) | . I° = 09 Control | 1" = 98% | 8 | - Mean Difference | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogoneily: Tau ² = 10.54 Toet for overall effect? Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference <u>Study or Subaroup</u> 4.1.4 3 months or loss | ; Chi ^s = 4 45 (P = 0 m; Chi ^s = 1 Mean | 54.80, c .01) 0.18. df TCE | If = 11 = 1 (P Total | = 0.67) Mean | Control | 1" = 987 6 Total | % Weight | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Hoterogeneily: Tau ² = 10.54 Test for overall effect Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference situdy or Subaroup 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Lu2017 | ; Chi [#] = 4 .45 (P = 0 es: Chi [#] = | 54.80, c .01) 0.18. df | if = 11 = 1 <i>(</i> P | = 0.67) (Mean | . I° = 09 Control | 1" = 98% | % Weight 10.2% | Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Hoterogeneily: Tau ² = 10.54 Test for overall effect Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference study or Subaroup 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Lu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Leiang Zheng 2017 | Chi ² = 4 45 (P = 0 e: Chi ² = <u>Mean</u> 53.77 48 58.78 | 54.80, c 0.01) 0.18. df TCE <u>SD</u> 0.78 4 12.81 | Total 33 40 9 | = 0.67) (Mean 49.39 47 64.24 | Control SD 0.69 3 17.64 | 1" = 987 6 Total 33 40 7 | Weight 10.2% 9.7% 1.5% | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] -5.46 [-2.98, 10.00] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Hoterogeneily: Tau ² = 10.54 Test for overall effect? Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference subaroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less Hong.Jie Liu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 | 53.77 48 50 53.77 | 54.80, c 0.1) 0.18. df TCE SD 0.78 4 | Total 33 40 | = 0.67) (Mean 49.39 47 | Control SD 0.69 3 | 1" = 987 6 Total 33 40 | Weight 10.2% 9.7% | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.08, 1.0.06] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 5.10 [-2.46, 7.74] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 10.54 Tost for overall effect? Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Liu2017 Lei Zhang Zhang 2017 Wai Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2028 | Chi² = 4 45 (P = 0) en: Chi² = 0 en: Chi² = 0 mean 53.77 48 56.78 48.35 49.8 60.08 | 54.80, c .01) 0.18. df TCE <u>SD</u> 0.76 4 12.81 12.87 5.8 0.922 | If = 11 = 1 (P Total 33 40 9 50 333 33 | = 0.67) (Mean 49.39 47 64.24 46.39 44.7 61.31 | Control SD 0.69 3 17.64 14.65 4.9 0.905 | 1" = 983 6 Total 33 40 7 50 30 36 | Weight 10.2% 9.7% 1.5% 6.0% 8.8% 10.2% | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 (-0.55, 2.55) -5.46 [-20.98, 10.00] 2.96 (-2.45, 8.37) 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] -1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 10.54 Tost for overall effect? Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Liu2017 Lei Zhang zt al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XianTing Wang et al2022 XueJiao Hong2020 YiWen Ke2021 | , Chi ² = 4 45 (P = 0 m; Chi ² = 53.77 48 56.78 48.35 49.8 | 54.80, c 0.01) 0.18. df TCE SD 0.76 4 12.81 12.87 5.8 | Total 33 40 9 50 33 33 34 | = 0.67) Mean 49.39 47 64.24 45.39 44.7 | Control 3D 0.69 3 17.64 14.65 4.9 | I" = 987 6 Total 33 40 7 50 30 30 30 30 33 33 | Weight 10.2% 9.7% 6.0% 8.8% 10.2% 7.6% 8.9% | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 (-0.55, 2.55] -5.46 [-20.98, 10.00] 2.96 (-2.45, 8.37] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] -1.25 [-1.68, -0.63] 0.21 [-3.66, 3.08] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Test for overall effect Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Lu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XiangHui Xiong et al2018 XiangHui Xiong et al2018 XiangHui Xiong et al2012 XiangHui Xiong et al2012 XiangHui Xiong et al2018 XiangHui Xiong et al2018 | Chi^a = 4 46 (P = 0) Schi^a = 1 Chi^a = 1 Chi^a = 1 Schi^a = 1< | 54.80, c .01) 0.18, df TCE SD 0.78 4 12.81 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.97 4.89 4.99 4.89 4.99 4.99 4.99 4.99 4.89 4.99 4.89 4.99 4. | Total 33 40 9 50 33 33 33 33 34 265 | = 0.67) Mean 49.39 47 64.24 45.39 44.7 61.31 58.97 44.3 | Control 3D 0.69 3 17.04 4.9 0.905 7.78 5.41 | I* = 987 6 Total 33 40 7 50 30 36 34 33 263 | Weight 10.2% 9.7% 1.5% 6.0% 8.8% 10.2% 7.6% 8.9% 62.9% | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.098, 10.06] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] -1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.56, 3.08] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 10.54 Test for overall effect Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Lu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Weng et al2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 13.66 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 | Chi^a = 4 46 (P = 0) Schi^a = 1 Chi^a = 1 Chi^a = 1 Schi^a = 1< | 54.80, c .01) 0.18, df TCE SD 0.78 4 12.81 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.97 4.89 4.99 4.89 4.99 4.99 4.99 4.99 4.89 4.99 4.89 4.99 4. | Total 33 40 9 50 33 33 33 33 34 265 | = 0.67) Mean 49.39 47 64.24 45.39 44.7 61.31 58.97 44.3 | Control 3D 0.69 3 17.04 4.9 0.905 7.78 5.41 | I* = 987 6 Total 33 40 7 50 30 36 34 33 263 | Weight 10.2% 9.7% 1.5% 6.0% 8.8% 10.2% 7.6% 8.9% 62.9% | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 (-0.55, 2.55] -5.46 [-20.98, 10.00] 2.96 (-2.45, 8.37] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] -1.25 [-1.68, -0.63] 0.21 [-3.66, 3.08] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Hoterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Test for overall effect Z = 2. Test for subarous difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Liu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2021 Subhotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 13.56 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months ChengDong Yao et al2010 | Chi[*] = 4 45 (P = 0) res: Chi[#] = 1 S3.77 48 58.78 49.8 58.78 49.8 50.18 48.35 49.8 50.05 49.8 50.18 48.48 50.18 48.48 50.18 48.48 50.18 48.48 50.18 48.48 50.18 48.48 50.05 50.18 48.48 50.05 50.18 48.48 50.05 50.18 40.83 | 54.80, c 0.1) 0.18. df TCE SD 0.78 4 12.87 5.88 0.922 7.07 4.89 402.03, 0.14) 9.37 | ff = 11 = 1 (P Total 33 40 9 9 50 33 33 33 34 265 df = 7 (80 | = 0.67) (Mean 49.39 47 64.24 46.39 44.7 61.31 58.07 44.3 (P < 0.0 39.62 | Control 3D 0.69 3 17.64 14.65 5.41 0.905 5.41 0001); I | 1* = 987 6 33 40 30 30 34 30 30 34 33 35 34 33 35 34 33 35 34 33 37 70 | Weight 10.2% 9.7% 1.5% 6.0% 8.8% 10.2% 6.2% 62.9% 8.7% | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] -5.46 [-2.096, 10.00] 2.96 [-2.46, 8.37] -1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.66, 3.08] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-6.70, 8.03] 9.01 [0.34, 11.68] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Hoterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Test for overall effect Z = 2. Test for subarous difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Liu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2022 YWen Nong2020 YWen K 2021 ChengDoneily: Tau" = 13.56 Tost for overall effect: Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months ChengDong Yao et al2021 VenJun Feng2017 VenJun Feng2017 | Chi* = 4 A5 (P = 0) res: Chi* = 1 S3.77 48 58.78 48.35 49.8 50.18 48.35 49.8 50.18 48.48 60.06 50.18 48.48 (P = 0) 48.48 (P = 0) 48.63 52.43 42.43 | 54.80, c 0.1) 0.18. df TCE SD 0.78 4 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.97 4.89 402.03, 0.14) 9.37 2.82 3 3 | Total 33 40 9 50 33 33 34 265 df = 7 80 47 32 | = 0.67) (Mean 49.39 44.24 45.30 44.7 61.31 58.07 44.3 (P < 0.0 30.62 51.99 44 | Control 3D 0.69 317.64 4.9 0.905 7.78 5.41 0001); I 7.28 2.52 8 | 1* = 987 6 33 400 7 50 30 34 33 263 * = 98% 70 47 28 | Weight 10.2% 9.7% 1.5% 6.0% 8.8% 10.2% 62.9% 8.7% 10.0% 8.3% | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.096, 10.00] 2.96 [-2.46, 8.37] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.66, 3.08] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-6.70, 8.03] 9.01 [8.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Tost for overall effect? Z = 2. Test for subarous difference Study of Subarous 4.1.4.3 months or less HongJie Liu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al 2022 Xiang Hui Xiong et al2016 XimTing Weng et al2016 XimTing Weng et al2012 XimTing Weng et al2012 XimTing Veng et al2016 XimTing Veng et al2012 XimTing Veng et al2016 XimTing Veng et al2016 XimTing Veng et al2017 Heterogeneity: Tau" = 13.66 Tost for overall offect: Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months ChengDong Yao et al2021 | Mean 53.77 53.77 53.77 48 50.70 48.35 40.8 50.10 48.35 40.8 50.10 48.35 40.8 50.10 48.35 40.8 50.10 48.02 50.11 48.63 52.43 | 54.80, c .01) 0.18. df 0.78 4 12.81 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.09 0.922 7.07 4.09 0.922 0.14) 9.37 2.82 | Total 33 40 9 50 33 33 34 265 df = 7 80 47 | = 0.67) Mean 49.39 47 64.24 45.39 44.7 61.31 58.07 44.3 (P < 0.0 30.62 51.99 | 2001trol 30 0.69 3 17.64 14.65 4.9 0.905 7.78 5.41 00001); 1 7.28 2.52 | 1" = 987 6 33 40 7 50 30 36 34 33 263 " = 98% 70 47 | Weight 10.2% 9.7% 6.0% 8.8% 8.8% 8.9% 8.9% 8.9% 8.7% 10.2% | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.38 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] -5.4 [-20.98, 10.03 2.10 [2.48, 7.74] -1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.56, 3.06] 4.52 [2.05, 6.96] 2.17 [-6.70, 6.03] 9.01 [8.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-5.74, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 10.54 Test for overall effect? Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference subaroup difference Lang 2000 and 2000 and 2000 Heterogeneity: Tau" = 13.60 Cost overall offect: Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months ChangDong Yao et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2022 YiWan Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 13.60 ChangDong Yao et al2011 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 6.79; | Mean 53.77 53.77 53.77 53.77 53.77 548 50.76 48.35 50.76 40.88 50.76 40.82 50.76 40.83 50.16 40.63 52.43 42.45.26 Chi ² = 4 45.26 Chi ² = 4 55.26 Chi ² = 4 5 | 54.80, (01) 0.18. df TCE SD 0.78 412.81 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 402.03, 0.14) 0.37 2.82 3 2.05 9.22, df | Total = 1 (P 33 40 9 50 33 34 265 df = 7 (80 47 32 49 208 | = 0.67) (Mean 49.39 47.7 64.24 45.39 44.7 61.31 58.07 44.3 (P < 0.0 39.62 51.99 51.99 44.41 | Control 3D 0.69 317.64 4.9 0.905 7.78 5.41 0001); I 7.28 2.52 8 | Total 33 40 7 50 36 36 36 36 36 36 36 36 36 36 36 36 36 | Weight 10.2% 9.7% 8.7% 8.8% 6.9% 8.9% 8.7% 10.0% 8.3% 10.0% | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.096, 10.00] 2.96 [-2.46, 8.37] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.66, 3.08] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-6.70, 8.03] 9.01 [8.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] | Favours (control) Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Tost for overall effect? Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Lu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2021 YiWen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 13.56 ChengDong Yao et al2021 Menzuan Yang et al2021 MingTeng Deng2019 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 6.75; Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) | Chi^a = 4 A6 (P = 0) A6 (P = 0) m: Chi^a = 1 S3.77 A8 S6.76 A8.86 A9.8 Chi^a = 4 A8 (P = 0) Chi^a = 3 A2 (P = 0) | 54.80, 0 601) 0.18, df TCE 80 0.76 4 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.97 4.89 402.03, 0 14) 0.37 2.82 3.205 9.22, df 0.16) | Total = 1 (P Total 33 40 9 50 33 33 34 265 df = 7 (80 47 32 208 = 3 (P 473 | = 0.67) Mean 49.39 47 61.31 59.07 44.3 (P < 0.0 30.62 51.99 44 44.41 < 0.000 | 2 control 30 0.69 3 17.64 14.66 6.905 7.78 5.41 00001); I 7.28 2.35 01); I ² = | Total 33 40 7 50 30 36 34 33 263 3 3 50 33 47 28 3 3 263 3 263 3 263 3 47 28 51 196 92% | ** Weight 10.2% 1.5% 6.0% 8.8% 10.2% 7.8% 8.9% 62.9% 8.7% 10.0% 8.3% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.2% 10.3% 10.0% 10.2% 10.0 | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.38 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] -5.4 [-20.98, 10.03 2.10 [2.48, 7.74] -1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.56, 3.06] 4.52 [2.05, 6.96] 2.17 [-6.70, 6.03] 9.01 [8.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-5.74, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Tost for overall effect? Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less Hong.Jie Lu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2022 YWen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 13.55 ChengDong Yao et al2021 WengDong Yao et al2021 WengDong Yao et al2021 WengDong Yao et al2021 WengDong Yao et al2021 YuangPeng Deng2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 6.79; Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 Total (95% CI) | Kohi² = 4 Ka (P = 0) Ka (P = 0) | 54.80, c 601) 0.18, df TCE 80 0.76 4 12.81 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 402.03, 0.14) 9.37 2.82 3 2.05 9.22, df 0.16) 450.31, 0.04) | If = 11 (P Total 33 40 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 | <pre></pre> | 2001trol 300 0.69 317.04 4.69 4.69 5.41 00001); I 7.26 2.52 2.35 01); I ² = 000001); | 1* = 987 6 33 40 7 50 30 36 34 33 263 * = 98% 70 47 28 51 196 92% 459 1 ² = 98 | ** Weight 10.2% 1.5% 6.0% 8.8% 10.2% 7.8% 8.9% 62.9% 8.7% 10.0% 8.3% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.2% 10.3% 10.0% 10.2% 10.0 | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.38 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] -5.46 [-20.96, 10.06] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 6.10 [2.46, 7.74] -1.25 [-1.66, -0.86, 3.06] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 5.03] 9.01 [6.34, 11.66] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.75] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Test for overall effect: Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Liu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wai Qi et al2020 Wai Qi et al2020 Wai Qi et al2020 XueJian Hong2017 Heterogeneily: Tau" = 13.56 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months ChengDong Yao et al2010 Heterogeneily: Tau" = 6.79; Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 | Kohi² = 4 Ka (P = 0) Ka (P = 0) | 54.80, c 601) 0.18, df TCE 80 0.76 4 12.81 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 402.03, 0.14) 9.37 2.82 3 2.05 9.22, df 0.16) 450.31, 0.04) | If = 11 (P Total 33 40 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 | <pre></pre> | 2001trol 300 0.69 317.04 4.69 4.69 5.41 00001); I 7.26 2.52 2.35 01); I ² = 000001); | 1* = 987 6 33 40 7 50 30 36 34 33 263 * = 98% 70 47 28 51 196 92% 459 1 ² = 98 | ** Weight 10.2% 1.5% 6.0% 8.8% 10.2% 7.8% 8.9% 62.9% 8.7% 10.0% 8.3% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.2% 10.3% 10.0% 10.2% 10.0 | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.38 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] -5.46 [-20.96, 10.06] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 6.10 [2.46, 7.74] -1.25 [-1.66, -0.86, 3.06] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 5.03] 9.01 [6.34, 11.66] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.75] | Favoura (control) Favoura [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Tost for overall effect? Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Lu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2022 YWer Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 13.55 ChengDong Yao et al2011 WenJun Feng2017 XiangHui (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 6.79; Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 10.55 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 10.51 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 6.79; Total (95% CI) | Chi^a = 4 A5 (P = 0) as: Chi^a = 1 53.77 48 58.76 48.85 48.85 48.86 60.09 640.20 Chi^a = 4 48 (P = 0) 48.63 52.43 42 (P = 0) 48.63 52.43 42 (P = 0) Chi^a = 36 42 (P = 0) 33. Chi^a = 4 35. Chi^a = 4 35. Chi^a = 4 36. Chi^a = 36 37. Chi^a = 4 38. Chi^a = 4 | 54.80, c 601) 0.18, df TCE 80 0.76 4 12.81 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 402.03, 0.14) 9.37 2.82 3 2.05 9.22, df 0.16) 450.31, 0.04) | If = 11 (P Total 33 40 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 | = 0.67) 49.39 47.7 64.24 45.39 44.37 61.31 58.07 44.3 (P < 0.0 39.62 51.99 44.41 < 0.0000 (P < 0. > = 0.93 | Control 3D 30 17.64 4.95 5.41 0001); I 7.28 2.55 2.35 2.35 0001); I ² = 000001); I | 1* = 987 6 33 40 7 50 30 36 34 33 263 * = 98% 70 47 28 51 196 92% 459 1 ² = 98 | ** Weight 10.2% 1.5% 6.0% 8.8% 10.2% 7.8% 8.9% 62.9% 8.7% 10.0% 8.3% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.2% 10.3% 10.0% 10.2% 10.0 | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.096, 10.00] 2.96 [-2.46, 8.37] 6.10 [2.46, 7.74] 6.12 [2.46, 7.74] 6.21 [-3.66, 3.08] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-6.70, 8.03] 9.01 [0.34, 11.60] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-6.74, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.75] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 10.54 Test for overall effect Z = 2. Test for subarous difference 4.1.4 3 menths or less HongJie Liu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2021 XiangHui Xiong et al2020 Yiubhoti (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 13.60 Tost for overall effect: Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months ChengDong Yao et al2017 XiangFeng Deng2017 XiangFeng Deng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 6.79; Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 10.65 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Tost for auborous difference Study or Subborous difference | Chi^a = 4 A5 (P = 0) rs: Chi^a = 53.77 48 58.76 49.8 60.76 49.8 60.06 60.16 60.16 60.16 60.16 60.16 60.16 60.16 60.17 40.63 52.43 42 (P = 0) 48.63 52.43 42 (P = 0) 60.18 = 36 42 (P = 0) 31 42 (P = 0) 32 33 342 (P = 0) 342 (P = 0) 35 35 49.8 49.8 40.8 40. | 54.80, c 601) 0.18, df TCE 90 12.81 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 0.14) 0.37 2.82 3.2.05 9.22, df 0.16) 1450.31, 0.01, 0.01, 0.01, 0.18, df 12.81 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.09 0.23 2.05 9.22, df 0.16) 15.03 1.00, | If = 11 (P Total 33 40 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 0 9 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 | = 0.67) 49.39 47.7 64.24 45.39 44.37 61.31 58.07 44.3 (P < 0.0 39.62 51.99 44.41 < 0.0000 (P < 0. > = 0.93 | 2001trol 300 0.69 317.04 4.69 4.69 5.41 00001); I 7.26 2.52 2.35 01); I ² = 000001); | 1* = 987 6 33 40 7 50 30 36 34 33 263 * = 98% 70 47 28 51 196 92% 459 1 ² = 98 | ** Weight 10.2% 1.5% 6.0% 8.8% 10.2% 7.8% 8.9% 62.9% 8.7% 10.0% 8.3% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.2% 10.3% 10.0% 10.2% 10.0 | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.38 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] -5.46 [-20.96, 10.06] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 6.10 [2.46, 7.74] -1.25 [-1.66, -0.86, 3.06] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 5.03] 9.01 [6.34, 11.66] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.75] | Favours [CCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 10.54 Test for overall effect Z = 2. Test for subarous difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Liu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2022 Yuwa Nong2020 YWWh Net 2021 City Comparison of the subarous of the subarous Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 13.6K Tost for overall effect: Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months ChengDong Yao et al2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 6.79; Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Test for subarous difference Study or Subarous difference Study or Subarous difference Study or Subarous difference State Less than or equal to | Chi² = 4 A5 (P = 0) rs: Chi² = - S3.77 48 58.76 49.8 60.76 49.8 60.76 60.76 | 54.80, c 601) 0.18, df 12.81 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 402.03, 0.14) 0.37 2.82 3.2.05 9.22, df 0.16) 450.31, 0.04) 0.01, df TCE 5D 450.31, 0.04) 0.01, df TCE 5D 450.31, 0.04) 0.01, df 5D 5D 5D 5D 5D 5D 5D 5D 5D 5D | If = 11 (P Total 33 40 00 9 60 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 3 | = 0.67) Mean 49.39 47.7 64.24 45.39 44.3 (P < 0.0 30.62 51.99 44.4 44.41 < 0.0000 (P < 0. > = 0.93 (P < 0.0 (P < 0. - 0.93 - 0.94 - 0.95 - 0.93 - 0.93 - 0.94 - 0.95 - 0.93 - 0.95 - | Control 3D 30 317.64 4.95 5.41 0001); I 7.28 2.55 8 2.35 5.41 0001); IP 00001); I P = 0 000001); P = 0 000001); P = 0 000001); P = 0 000001; P = 0 0000001; P = 0 00000000000000; P = 0 000000000000; P = 0 00000000; P = 0 00000000; P = 0 0000000; P = 0 0000000; P = 0 0000000; P = 0 000000; P = 0 00000; P = 0 0000; P = 0 000; P = 0 0000; P = 0 000; P = 0 00; P = 0 0; P = 0; P = 0 0; P = 0 0; P = 0; P = | I' = 983 4 - - - - - - - - - - - - - | ************************************** | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.098, 10.00] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 1.1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.65, 3.06] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 8.03] 9.01 [8.34, 11.66] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.153] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 9.01 [0.34, 11.66] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Hoterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Test for overall effect Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Lu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2022 XiusJieo Hong2020 YWen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 13.65 ChengDong Yao et al2011 WanJun Feng2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 6.79; Test for overall effect: Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months ChengDong Yao et al2021 WanJun Feng2019 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 6.79; Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.65 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Test for aubaroup difference S1.8 Less than or equal to ChengDong Yao et al2010 HongJie Lu2017 | Chi² = 4 A5 (P = 0) ms: Chi² = 1 ms: Chi² = 1 53.77 48 58.76 48.85 49.8 60.06 60.16 48.82 0; Chi² = 4 48.63 52.43 45.26 Chi² = 4 45.26 Chi² = 4 Chi² = 4 Chi² = 3 Chi² = 4 Chi² = 6 Chi² = 4 Mean o 30 minute | 54.80, c 54.80, c 51 0.18, df TCE 80 0.76 4 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.97 4.89 402.03, - 0.14) 9.37 2.82 3 2.05 9.22, df 0.16) 450.31, - 0.04) 0.01, df TCE 12.87 5.88 0.922 7.97 4.89 4.80 5.88 5.82 5.88 5.85 | If = 11 (P Total 33 34 40 9 60 0 33 33 34 265 265 265 27 47 329 47 329 47 36 47 36 47 36 47 36 47 36 47 36 47 36 47 47 36 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 | <pre>49.39 47.39 44.24 45.39 44.7 61.31 50.07 44.3 (P < 0.0 30.62 51.99 44.41 < 0.000 (P < 0. 2 = 0.93 </pre> | Control SD 0.69 3 17.64 4.9 5.41 7.28 8 5.41 7.28 8 5.41 7.28 8 0.0001); I = 00001); I = 00001); I = 00001); I = 00001); I = 000010; I = 000010; I = 00000000000000000000000000000000000 | I ⁷ = 983 6 - - - - - - - - - - - - - | ************************************** | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.096, 10.06] 5.40 [-2.096, 10.06] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.56, 3.08] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 6.03] 0.01 [6.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.75] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 4.38 [4.02, 4.76] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Hoterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Test for overall effect Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Lu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2022 YWen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 13.65 ChengDong Yao et al2021 WangHui Q65% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 6.79; Test for overall effect Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months ChengDong Yao et al2021 Wang Deng2019 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 6.79; Test for overall effect Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.65 Test for overall effect Z = 2 Test for auboroup difference Study or Subgroup 51.8 Less than or equal to ChengDong Yao et al2010 HongJie Lu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 | Chi² = 4 A5 (P = 0) ms: Chi² = 1 53.77 48 58.76 48.85 48.85 48.86 50.16 48.82 Chi² = 4 48.63 52.43 43.48 (P = 0 Chi² = 3(Chi² = 3(| 54.80, 0 54.80, 0 51 0.18, df TCE 30 0.76 4 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 402.03, 0 0.14) 0.37 2.82 3 2.05 0.22, df 0.16) 450.31, 0 0.04) 0.01, df TCE 5.8 0.922 3 2.05 0.22, df 0.16) 12.81 0.37 0.04) 0.01, df 12.81 0.37 0.14) 0.37 0.04 0.01, df 12.81 0.37 0.14) 0.37 0.04 0.01, df 12.82 0.37 0.14) 0.37 0.04 0.01, df 12.85 0.922 0.14) 0.37 0.16) 12.85 0.922 0.16) 0.01, df 0.01, df 0.02, df 0.01, df 0.01, df 0.01, df 0.01, df 0.02, df 0.01, df 0.02, df 0.02, df 0.01, df 0.02, df 0.03, | If = 11 Total 33 40 9 9 00 33 34 265 208 47 32 265 208 47 32 40 47 32 40 47 32 40 47 32 40 47 32 40 47 33 40 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 | = 0.67) Mean. 49.39 47.7 64.24 45.39 44.3 (P < 0.0 39.62 51.99 44.41 < 0.0000 (P < 0. (P = 0.93) (P < 0.93) | Control SD 0.69 3 17.04 4.9 5.41 00001); I 2.52 2.52 2.52 2.55 01); I ² = 0 00001); I ² = 0 Control SD 0.09 1, I ² = 0 2.52 2.55 2.55 2.55 2.55 2.55 2.55 2.5 | 17 = 983 6 33 40 70 30 34 30 34 32 8 3 8 3 8 3 8 8 3 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 | ************************************** | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.40 [-2.096, 10.00] 5.40 [-2.096, 10.00] 1.125 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.56, 3.08] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 6.03] 0.01 [6.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.75] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 4.38 [4.02, 4.76] 4.38 [4.02, 4.76] 4.38 [4.02, 4.76] 5.46 [-2.98, 10.00] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Test for overall effect Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Lu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2012 XiangHui Xiong et al2012 Nubicotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 1.0.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months ChengDong Yao et al2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 XiangFeng Deng2019 S1.8 Less than or equal to ChengDong Yao et al2010 Heterogeneity: Tau" = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Test for subaroup difference S1.8 Less than or equal to ChengDong Yao et al2010 Hetggle Liu2017 YenJun Feng2017 YenJun Feng2019 | Chi^a = 4 A5 (P = 0) ms: Chi^a = 1 S3.77 S6.76 49.8 60.76 49.8 60.76 60 | 54.80, 0 601) 0.18, df 12.81 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.97 4.89 402.03, 0.14) 0.37 2.82 3.2.05 9.22, df 0.16) 155.31, 0.04) 0.01, df TCE 50 9.22, df 0.16, df 12.87 5.8 9.22, df 0.16, df 12.87 5.82 9.22, df 0.16, df 12.87 5.82 9.22, df 0.16, df 12.87 5.82 9.22, df 0.16, df 12.87 5.82 9.22, df 0.16, df 12.87 5.82 9.22, df 0.16, df 12.87 5.85 9.22, df 0.16, df 12.87 5.85 9.22, df 0.01, df 12.87 5.85 9.22, df 0.01, df 12.87 5.85 9.22, df 0.01, df 12.87 5.85 9.22, df 0.078 5.78 9.78 4.80 9.76 7.97 7.97 7.97 7.97 1.05 9.22, df 0.01, df 1.05 9.27 9.78 4.05 9.78 4.05 9.78 4.05 9.78 4.05 9.78 4.05 7.078 4.05 9.78 9.78 9.78 9.78 9.78 9.78 9.78 9.78 9.78 9.78 9.78 | If = 11 (P Total 33 40 9 60 33 33 33 34 265 473 36 473 473 265 473 473 473 473 473 473 473 473 | = 0.67) Mean 49.39 47.7 64.24 45.39 44.3 (P < 0.0 30.62 51.99 44.4 44.41 < 0.0000 (P < 0. 2 = 0.93 (P < 0.93 30.62 49.39 49.39 40.32 49.39 40.32 (P < 0.0 40.32 | Control 30 30 317.64 4.95 5.41 0001); I 2.52 8 2.35 5.41 0001); I 2.62 8 2.35 5.41 0001); I 4.65 5.41 00001); I 4.65 5.41 00001); I 5.41 00001); I 4.65 5.41 00001); I 5.41 00001); I 4.65 5.41 00001); I 5.41 00001); I 4.65 5.41 00001); I 5.41 000010; I 4.65 5.41 000010; I 4.65 5.41 0000010; I 4.65 5.41 0000010; I 4.65 5.41 000000000000000000000000000000000000 | I' = 983 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 | ************************************** | Mean Difference IV. Bandom. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.096, 10.06] 5.46 [-2.096, 10.06] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.56, 3.08] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 6.03] 9.01 [8.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 4.38 [4.02, 4.76] 4.38 [4.02, 4.76] 4.38 [4.02, 4.76] 5.46 [-2.98, 10.06] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Test for overall effect Z = 2. Test for subarous difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Liu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2021 YiWen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 13.56 ChengDong Yao et al2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 XiangFeng Deng2019 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 6.76; Test for overail effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 Test for overail effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 Test for overail effect: Z = 2 Test for subarous difference St.8. Less than or equal to ChengDong Yao et al2017 Less for auborous difference St.8. Less than or equal to ChengDong Yao et al2017 Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 Test for overail effect: Z = 2 Test for subarous difference St.8. Less than or equal to ChengDong Yao et al2017 XiangFeng Deng2017 XiangFeng Deng2017 XiangFeng Deng2017 XiangFeng Deng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 | Chi^a = 4 A5 (P = 0) A5 (P = 0) m: Chi^a = 1 53.77 48 58.76 49.8 60.08 50.18 49.8 60.08 50.18 49.8 60.08 50.18 49.8 60.08 50.18 49.8 60.08 50.19 40.63 52.43 42.2 45.26 Chi^a = 4 45.26 Chi^a = 4 45.27 63: Chi^a = 4 60.5 (P = 0) 63: Chi^a = 4 63: S3.77 48 58.78 42.8 52.8 52.43 42.45 42.45 42.45 42.45 42.45 | 54.80, 0 601) 0.18, df 12.81 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 10.287 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 10.287 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 10.287 0.78 4.89 10.287 0.78 4.89 10.287 0.78 4.89 10.287 0.78 4.89 10.287 0.78 4.89 10.287 0.78 4.89 10.287 0.70 4.89 10.287 0.70 4.89 10.287 0.70 4.89 10.287 0.70 4.89 10.287 0.70 4.89 10.287 0.70 4.89 10.287 0.70 4.89 10.287 0.70 4.89 10.287 0.01 | If = 11 (P Total 33 40 0 9 50 0 0 33 33 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 | = 0.67) Mean 49.39 47.7 64.24 45.39 44.3 (P < 0.0 30.62 51.99 44.4 44.41 (P < 0.000 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 | Control 20 30 17.64 4.90 3.14.85 4.90 3.5.41 2.52 8 2.35 5.41 00001); P = 0' 000001); P = 0' 0000001); P = 0' 00000000000000000000000000000000000 | I' = 983 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 | ************************************** | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.098, 10.00] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.56, 3.98] 4.52 [2.05, 0.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 8.03] 9.01 [6.34, 11.69] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.152] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.152] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.75] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 9.01 [6.34, 11.69] 4.38 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-20.98, 10.06] 5.46 [-20.98, 10.06] 5.20 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Test for overall effect Z = 2. Test for subarous difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Lu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2021 Yiwen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 13.55 Tost for overall effect: Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 13.05 ChongDong Yao et al2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 6.76; Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Test for subarous difference Study of Subgroup 5.1.8 Less than or equal to ChengDong Yao et al2017 XiangHui Xiong et al2017 XiangFeng Deng2017 XiangFeng Deng2017 Xian | $\begin{array}{c} (Ch)^2 = 4\\ A5 (P = 0)\\ m; (Ch)^2 = 4\\ A5 (P = 0)\\ m; (Ch)^2 = 4\\ 53,77\\ 48\\ 56,76\\ 48,85\\ 60,16\\ 48,86\\ 60,16\\ 48,86\\ 0,16\\ 48,82\\ 0; Ch)^2 = 4\\ 48,63\\ 52,43\\ 42\\ 45,26\\ 0; Ch)^2 = 3\\ (Ch)^2 = 3\\ (Ch)^2$ | 54.80, 0 601) 0.18, df 12.81 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 10.287 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 10.287 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 10.287 0.78 4.89 10.287 0.78 4.89 10.287 0.78 4.89 10.287 0.78 4.89 10.287 0.78 4.89 10.287 0.78 4.89 10.287 0.70 4.89 10.287 0.70 4.89 10.287 0.70 4.89 10.287 0.70 4.89 10.287 0.70 4.89 10.287 0.70 4.89 10.287 0.70 4.89 10.287 0.70 4.89 10.287 0.01 | If = 11 Total 33 40 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 9 | = 0.67) Mean 49.39 47.7 64.24 45.39 44.3 (P < 0.0 30.62 51.99 44.4 44.41 (P < 0.000 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 | Control SD 0.69 3 17.64 4.9 5.41 0.0001); I 7.28 8.252 2.52 2.52 2.52 0.0001); I ² = 0' Control SD 0.0001); I ² = 0' Control SD 0.0001 1, I ² = 0' | I' = 983 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 | Weight 10.2% 9.7% 1.5% 6.0% 8.8% 10.2% 7.8% 8.9% 6.9% 6.9% 8.0% 8. | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.39 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.08, 1.00] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.56, 3.98] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 6.03] 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.00 [-6.14, 1.14] 0.05 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.00 [-6.76, 4.75] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-20.98, 10.00] 5.20 [-6.14, 1.14] 0.05 [-0.01, 1.71] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-20.98, 10.00] 5.20 [-6.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 1.01 [2.46, 7.74] -1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Hoterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Tost for overall effect Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Lu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2021 YiWen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 13.55 ChongDong Yao et al2017 XiangFei (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 ChongDong Yao et al2017 XiangFeing Deng2019 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 0.75; Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.57 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Test for subaroup difference Study of Subgroup 5.1.8 Less than or equal to ChengDong Yao et al2017 XiangFeing Deng2017 XiangFeing Xiong et al2016 XinTing Weng et al2022 YiWen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 11.75 | Chi^a = 4 A5 (P = 0) main Chi^a = 1 main Chi^a = 1 Sarra 48 Sarra 48 Sarra 48 Chi^a = 4 A8 (P = 0) Chi^a = 3 Chi^a = 4 Chi^a = 4<td>54.80, 0 601) 0.18, df 12.87 5.8 0.76 4.281 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 402.03, 0 14) 0.14) 9.37 2.82 3.2.05 9.22, df 0.16) 1450.31, 0 0.04) 0.01, df 12.81 3.2.05 5.88 0.922 4.89 0.76 0.76 4.89 12.81 0.76 12.81 0.76 12.81 0.76 12.82 12.81 0.76 12.81 0.76 12.81 0.70 12.82 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.02 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.83 10.02 10.01 12.83 10.02 10.01 10.02 10.01 10.02 10.02 10.02 10.02 10.01 10</td><td>If = 11 Total 33 40 99 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 9</td><td>= 0.67) Mean 49.39 47.7 64.24 45.39 44.3 (P < 0.0 30.62 51.99 44.41 < 0.000 (P < 0. 2 = 0.93 (P < 0. 2 = 0.93 (P < 0</td><td>Control BD 0.69 3 17.64 4.9 5.41 0001); l² 2.52 8.8 2.55 5.41 0001); l² 00001); l³ 7.28 0.609 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 7.28 0.69 3 17.64 2.55 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5</td><td>17 = 983 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5</td><td>* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *</td><td>Mean Difference IV. Bandom. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.096, 10.06] 5.46 [-2.096, 10.06] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.56, 3.08] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 6.03] 0.01 [8.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.75] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 0.48 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.56] -5.46 [-2.98, 10.06] -5.46 [-0.98, 10.06] -5</td><td>Favours [control] Favours [TCE]</td> | 54.80, 0 601) 0.18, df 12.87 5.8 0.76 4.281 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 402.03, 0 14) 0.14) 9.37 2.82 3.2.05 9.22, df 0.16) 1450.31, 0 0.04) 0.01, df 12.81 3.2.05 5.88 0.922 4.89 0.76 0.76 4.89 12.81 0.76 12.81 0.76 12.81 0.76 12.82 12.81 0.76 12.81 0.76 12.81 0.70 12.82 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.02 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.83 10.02 10.01 12.83 10.02 10.01 10.02 10.01 10.02 10.02 10.02 10.02 10.01 10 | If = 11 Total 33 40 99 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 9 | = 0.67) Mean 49.39 47.7 64.24 45.39 44.3 (P < 0.0 30.62 51.99 44.41 < 0.000 (P < 0. 2 = 0.93 (P < 0. 2 = 0.93 (P < 0 | Control BD 0.69 3 17.64 4.9 5.41 0001); l ² 2.52 8.8 2.55 5.41 0001); l ² 00001); l ³ 7.28 0.609 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 7.28 0.69 3 17.64 2.55 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5 | 17 = 983 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 | * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * | Mean Difference IV. Bandom. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.096, 10.06] 5.46 [-2.096, 10.06] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.56, 3.08] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 6.03] 0.01 [8.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.75] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 0.48 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.56] -5.46 [-2.98, 10.06] -5.46 [-0.98, 10.06] -5 | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Test for overall effect Z = 2. Test for suboroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Liu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XimTing Weng et al2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 13.60 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months Nubotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 6.79; Test for overall effect: Z = 1 7. Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 6.79; Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.65 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Test for suboroup difference Study or Subgroup 5.1.8 Less than or equal to ChengDong Yao et al2017 HongJie Liu2017 Lei Zhang Eng 2019 XiangFeng Deng2019 XiangHui Xiong et al2022 YiWen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) | Chi^a = 4 A5 (P = 0) main Chi^a = 1 main Chi^a = 1 Sarra 48 Sarra 48 Sarra 48 Chi^a = 4 A8 (P = 0) Chi^a = 3 Chi^a = 4 Chi^a = 4<td>54.80, 0 601) 0.18, df 12.87 5.8 0.76 4.281 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 402.03, 0 14) 0.14) 9.37 2.82 3.2.05 9.22, df 0.16) 1450.31, 0 0.04) 0.01, df 12.81 3.2.05 5.88 0.922 4.89 0.76 0.76 4.89 12.81 0.76 12.81 0.76 12.81 0.76 12.82 12.81 0.76 12.81 0.76 12.81 0.70 12.82 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.02 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.83 10.02 10.01 12.83 10.02 10.01 10.02 10.01 10.02 10.02 10.02 10.02 10.01 10</td><td>If = 11 Total 33 40 99 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 9</td><td>= 0.67) Mean 49.39 47.7 64.24 45.39 44.3 (P < 0.0 30.62 51.99 44.41 < 0.000 (P < 0. 2 = 0.93 (P < 0. 2 = 0.93 (P < 0</td><td>Control BD 0.69 3 17.64 4.9 5.41 0001); l² 2.52 8.8 2.55 5.41 0001); l² 00001); l³ 7.28 0.609 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 7.28 0.69 3 17.64 2.55 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5</td><td>17 = 983 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5</td><td>* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *</td><td>Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.39 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.08, 1.00] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.56, 3.98] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 6.03] 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.00 [-6.14, 1.14] 0.05 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.00 [-6.76, 4.75] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-20.98, 10.00] 5.20 [-6.14, 1.14] 0.05 [-0.01, 1.71] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-20.98, 10.00] 5.20 [-6.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 1.01 [2.46, 7.74] -1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99]</td><td>Favours [control] Favours [TCE]</td> | 54.80, 0 601) 0.18, df 12.87 5.8 0.76 4.281 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 402.03, 0 14) 0.14) 9.37 2.82 3.2.05 9.22, df 0.16) 1450.31, 0 0.04) 0.01, df 12.81 3.2.05 5.88 0.922 4.89 0.76 0.76 4.89 12.81 0.76 12.81 0.76 12.81 0.76 12.82 12.81 0.76 12.81 0.76 12.81 0.70 12.82 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.82 10.02 10.01 12.82 10.01 12.83 10.02 10.01 12.83 10.02 10.01 10.02 10.01 10.02 10.02 10.02 10.02 10.01 10 | If = 11 Total 33 40 99 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 9 | = 0.67) Mean 49.39 47.7 64.24 45.39 44.3 (P < 0.0 30.62 51.99 44.41 < 0.000 (P < 0. 2 = 0.93 (P < 0. 2 = 0.93 (P < 0 | Control BD 0.69 3 17.64 4.9 5.41 0001); l ² 2.52 8.8 2.55 5.41 0001); l ² 00001); l ³ 7.28 0.609 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 7.28 0.69 3 17.64 2.55 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5 | 17 = 983 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 | * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.39 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.08, 1.00] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.56, 3.98] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 6.03] 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.00 [-6.14, 1.14] 0.05 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.00 [-6.76, 4.75] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-20.98, 10.00] 5.20 [-6.14, 1.14] 0.05 [-0.01, 1.71] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-20.98, 10.00] 5.20 [-6.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 1.01 [2.46, 7.74] -1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Test for overall effect Z = 2. Test for suboroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Liu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2018 XinTing Wang et al2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 13.50 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 6.79; Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Test for suboroup difference Study or Subgroup 5.1.8 Less than or equal to ChengDong Yao et al2010 HongJie Liu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 XiangFeng Deng2019 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.75 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Test for suboroup difference Study or Subgroup 5.1.8 Less than or equal to Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.75 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Test for suboroup difference Study or Subgroup 5.1.8 Less than or equal to Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.75 XiangFeng Deng2019 XiangFeng Deng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 XiangFeng Deng2019 XiangFe | Chi² = 4 A5 (P = 0) A5 (P = 0) as: Chi² = 1 53.77 48 58.76 48.85 48.85 48.86 60.06 60.16 60.16 60.16 60.17 48.85 48.85 48.85 48.85 48.82 48.63 52.43 42.2 (P = 0) 48.63 52.43 42.2 (P = 0) 31.42 (P = 0) 32.42 (P = 0) 33.77 48.82 54.78 48.83 53.77 48.52 64.63 53.77 48.52 53.77 48.63 53.77 48.82 53.77 48.82 53.77 48.82 54.78 48.63 54.78 48.63 54.78 48.63 54.78 48.63 54.78 48.63 54.78 48.64 48.65 54.74 49.67 49.67< | 54.80, (54.80, (501) 0.18, df 12.81 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.09 0.78 4.09 0.78 4.09 0.78 4.09 0.77 4.09 0.78 4.09 0.78 4.09 0.72 4.09 0.72 4.09 0.72 4.09 0.73 4.09 0.73 4.09 0.73 4.09 0.73 4.09 0.73 4.09 0.73 4.09 0.73 4.09 0.73 4.09 0.73 4.09 0.73 4.09 0.76 4.09 0.76 4.09 0.76 4.09 0.14) 0.15 12.81 0.922 7.07 4.09 0.16) 12.81 0.922 7.07 4.09 0.16) 12.81 0.922 1.05 0.16) 1.001 0.01. df 1.001 0.01. df 1.001 0.01. df 1.005 1.05 | If = 11 (P Total 33 40 00 33 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 | = 0.67) Mean 49.39 44.24 45.39 44.3 (P < 0.0 39.62 51.90 44.41 < 0.000 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 39.62 51.90 44.41 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0) (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0) (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0) (P | Control SD 0.69 3 17.64 4.95 5.41 0001); i 7.28 2.35 0.600 5.41 0001); i P = 0' Control SD 7.78 0.600 5.41 0.000 1; i 2.55 0.000 5.41 0.0000 5.41 0.00000 5.41 0.00000 5.41 0.00000 5.41 0.00000 5.41 0.00000 5.41 0.00000 5.41 0.00000 5.41 0.000000 5.41 0.00000000 5.41 0.00000000000000000000000000000000000 | I' = 983 4 Total 33 40 33 40 33 40 33 40 33 33 28 34 33 28 34 33 28 34 32 33 28 34 45 92% 459 459 459 459 459 459 459 459 | Weichtl 10.2% 9.7% 1.5% 6.0% 8.8% 10.2% 7.8% 8.8% 10.2% 7.8% 10.0% 8.3% 10.0% 8.3% 10.0% 8.3% 10.0% 8.3% 10.0% 8.8% 10.2% 7.6% 10.2% 10.2% 1.5% 10.2% 1.5 | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.098, 10.00] 2.96 [-2.46, 8.37] 6.10 [2.46, 7.74] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.65, 3.08] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 8.03] 9.01 [8.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.20 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.65 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.75] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 9.01 [8.34, 11.68] 4.38 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-20.98, 10.06] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.68 [-0.01, 1.71] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 1.25 [-1.60, -0.68] 2.47 [0.02, 4.92] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Hoterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Tost for overall effect Z = 2. Test for subaroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Lu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2021 XueJiao Hong2020 YWen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 13.50 ChengDong Yao et al2010 XiangFeng Deng2019 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 6.76; Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.57 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.57 Test for subaroup difference Study of Subgroup 5.1.8 Less than or equal to ChengDong Yao et al2012 Uang Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zhang et al2022 YiWen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 11.77 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 | Chi² = 4 A6 (P = 0) main Chi² = 1 main Chi² = 1 Sarra 48 Sarra 48 Sarra 48 Chi² = 4 Sarra 48 Chi² = 4 <lichi<sup>2 = 4 Chi² = 4 Chi² = 4</lichi<sup> | 54.80, 0 54.80, 0 51 0.18, df 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 402.03, 0 14,89 402.03, 0 14,89 402.04, 0 14,89 402.05, 0 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,125,05 14,1 | If = 11 Total 33 40 99 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 9 | = 0.67) Mean 49.39 47.7 64.24 45.39 44.3 (P < 0.0 30.62 51.99 44.41 < 0.000 (P < 0. 2 = 0.93 (P < 0. 2 = 0.93 (P < 0 | Control BD 0.69 3 17.64 4.9 5.41 0001); l ² 2.52 8.8 2.55 5.41 0001); l ² 00001); l ³ 7.28 0.609 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 7.28 0.69 3 17.64 2.55 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5.01 5 | 17 = 983 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 | * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.098, 10.00] 2.96 [-2.46, 8.37] 6.10 [2.46, 7.74] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 8.03] 9.01 [8.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.75] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 9.01 [8.34, 11.68] 4.38 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-20.98, 10.06] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.03 [-0.54, 1.168] 4.38 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-20.98, 10.06] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 4.52 [2.05, 6.09] 2.47 [0.02, 4.92] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.06 [-2.45, 8.37] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Hoterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Tost for overall effect Z = 2. Test for suboroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Lu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2022 YWen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 13.55 ChengDong Yao et al2017 ViangHui 2057 Ci at for overail effect: Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months ChengDong Yao et al2017 ViangHui 2057 Ci at for overail effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 0.76; Test for overail effect: Z = 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 10.55 Test for overail effect: Z = 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 10.57 Test for suboroup difference 5.1.8 Less than or equal to ChengDong Yao et al2010 HongJie Lu2017 ViangFeng Deng2019 XiangFeng Xiong et al2016 XimTeg Xiong et al2016 XimTeg Xiong et al2017 Wei Autor Ang et al2022 XimTeg Xiong et al2018 XiangFeng Deng2019 XiangFeng Deng2019 XiangFeng Deng2019 XiangFeng Xiong et al2014 XiangFeng Xiong et al2016 XimTeg Xiong et al2020 XiveJiao Hong2020 XueJiao Hong2020 | Chi² = 4 A6 (P = 0) main Chi² = 4 A6 (P = 0) main Chi² = 4 A8 (B = 0) Chi² = 4 A8 (P = 0) Chi² = 4 Chi² | 54.80, 0 54.80, 0 51 0.18, df 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 402.03, 0 14,89 402.03, 0 14,89 402.04, 0 14,89 402.05, 0 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,122,05 14,125,05 14,1 | If = 11 Total 33 34 40 9500 500 33 34 265 265 265 265 27 47 32 47 36 47 37 47 36 47 37 47 37 47 37 47 37 37 47 37 47 37 47 37 47 37 47 47 37 47 47 47 47 37 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 4 | <pre>e 0.67) Mean. 49.39 44.24 45.39 44.7 61.31 50.07 30.62 51.99 44.41 <0.000 (P < 0.0 30.62 44.41 <0.000 (P < 0.0 30.62 44.41 <0.000 (P < 0.0 30.62 44.41 (P < 0.0 30.62 49.39 47 64.24 44.41 (P < 0.0 51.99 51.99</pre> | . * = 09 20ntrol 30 17.04 14.65 4.9 3 17.04 6.69 5.41 00001); * 20ntrol 5.01 1.0 20ntrol 5.01 1.0 20ntrol 5.01 2.52 | I' = 98% 4 Total 33 40 33 40 50 00 36 34 47 50 0 1 ² = 98% 459 1 ² = 98% 47 1 ² = 98% 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 | ************************************** | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.096, 10.00] 5.40 [-2.096, 10.00] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.56, 3.00] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 6.03] 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.05 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.76] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 4.38 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] -5.46 [-2.98, 10.00] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.08 [-0.01, 1.71] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 1.25 [-1.66, -0.62] 2.47 [0.02, 4.92] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 0.10 [-2.46, 7.74] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 0.45 [-0.64, | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Tost for overall effect: Z = 2. Test for suboroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Liu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangTeu Xiong et al2016 XiangTeu Xiong et al2022 XueJian Hong2020 YWen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 13.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months ChengDong Yao et al2010 HanXuan Yang et al2021 XiangTeing Deng2019 XiangTeing Deng2019 XiangTeing Deng2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Test for suboroup difference Study of Subgroup 5.1.8 Less than or equal to ChongDo 107 Heterogeneily: Tau" = 11.77 XiangFeng Deng2019 XiangHui Xiong et al2021 YiWen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 11.77 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 5.1.9 Greater than 30 milm HanXuan Yang et al2021 Wei Qi et al2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 11.77 Lia JGreater than 20 milm Henxyan Yang et al2021 Wei Qi et al2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 11.77 Heterogeneily: Tau" = 11.74 Heterogeneily: T | Chi ² = 4 4.6 (P = 0 ms: Chi ² = 4 53.77 48 53.77 48 56.76 48.38 80.06 50.16 48.39 48.09 48.09 48.09 48.09 48.09 48.09 48.09 48.03 52.43 4.2 (P = 0 48.63 52.43 4.2 (P = 0 3; Chi ² = 4 .05 (P = 0 0 30 minut 48.63 53.77 53.78 49.8 53.77 48.59 53.77 48.59 53.77 48.59 53.77 48.59 53.77 48.59 53.77 48.59 53.77 48.59 53.77 49.59 53.77 49.59 53.77 49.59 49.69 49.69 49.69 53.77 49.59 49.69 49.69 49.69 53.77 49.59 49.69 49.69 49.69 53.77 49.59 49.69 49.69 49.69 53.77 49.59 49.69 49.69 49.69 49.69 49.69 49.69 53.77 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 53.79 49.59 49.59 53.77 49.59 53.79 49.59 53.79 53.77 | 54.80, c 51.01) 0.18. df 12.81 0.78 4 12.81 12.83 0.922 7.97 12.87 0.92 12.83 0.922 0.95 0.95 | If = 11 (P Total 33 40 95 60 33 33 33 32 33 32 33 32 45 52 47 47 33 33 33 33 33 34 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 4 | = 0.67) 49.39 47.37 64.24 45.39 44.37 61.31 58.07 44.3 (P < 0.0 39.62 51.99 44.41 44.41 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 39.62 49.39 47.7 61.31 44.3 (P < 0.0 51.99 45.39 45.39 45.39 47.7 61.31 44.3 (P < 0.0 51.99 45.39 45.39 47.7 51.31 50.62 51.95 51 | Control 3D 30 37.64 4.9 5.41 7.28 2.55 7.78 2.55 2.35 0001); l ² = 00001); l 2.52 7.78 8 2.35 7.78 8 2.35 7.78 8 2.35 5.41 0001); l 2.52 2.35 0.000 1, l ² = 0' 3 17.64 8 2.35 5.41 0001); l 2.52 2.54 17.64 8 2.35 5.41 10001); l 2.52 2.54 17.64 8 2.55 2.54 17.64 8 2.35 5.41 10001); l 2.52 2.54 17.64 8 2.55 2.55 17.64 8 2.55 2.55 17.64 8 2.55 17.64 8 2.55 17.64 8 2.55 17.64 8 2.55 17.64 8 2.55 17.64 8 2.55 17.64 8 2.55 17.64 17.65 17.65 17.64 17.65 17.75 17.65 17.7 | I' = 983 4 - Total 33 40 7 50 32 459 92% 459 12 = 98% 459 12 = 98% 51 151 151 151 151 151 151 151 | Weicht 10.2% 9.7% 1.5% 6.0% 8.8% 10.2% 7.8% 8.9% 62.9% 10.0% 8.3% 10.0% 8.3% 10.1% 37.1% 100.0% % Weicht 8.8% 10.2% 9.8% 5.9% | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.098, 10.00] 2.96 [-2.46, 8.37] 6.10 [2.46, 7.74] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 8.03] 9.01 [8.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.75] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 9.01 [8.34, 11.68] 4.38 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-20.98, 10.06] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.03 [-0.54, 1.168] 4.38 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-20.98, 10.06] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 4.52 [2.05, 6.09] 2.47 [0.02, 4.92] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.06 [-2.45, 8.37] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" = 10.54 Test for overall effect Z = 2. Test for suboroup difference 4.1.4 3 months or less HongJie Liu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zheng 2017 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2018 XiangHui Song et al2019 Heterogeneity: Tau" = 13.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 6.79; Test for overall effect: Z = 1 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 10.55 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Test for suboroup difference Study or Subgroup 5.1.8 Less than or equal to ChengDong Yao et al2010 HongJie Liu2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 XiangHui Xiong et al2022 YiWen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 11.77 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 5.1.9 Greater than 30 mint HenXuan Yang et al2022 Wen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 11.77 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 5.1.9 Greater than 30 mint HenXuan Yang et al2021 Oxegu et al2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" = 7.44; Test for overall effect: Z = 1 | Chi ² = 4 4.6 (P = 0 ms: Chi ² = 4 53.77 48 53.77 48 56.76 48.38 80.06 50.16 48.39 48.09 48.09 48.09 48.09 48.09 48.09 48.09 48.03 52.43 4.2 (P = 0 48.63 52.43 4.2 (P = 0 3; Chi ² = 4 .05 (P = 0 0 30 minut 48.63 53.77 53.78 49.8 53.77 48.59 53.77 48.59 53.77 48.59 53.77 48.59 53.77 48.59 53.77 48.59 53.77 48.59 53.77 49.59 53.77 49.59 53.77 49.59 49.69 49.69 49.69 53.77 49.59 49.69 49.69 49.69 53.77 49.59 49.69 49.69 49.69 53.77 49.59 49.69 49.69 49.69 53.77 49.59 49.69 49.69 49.69 49.69 49.69 49.69 53.77 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 49.59 53.79 49.59 49.59 53.77 49.59 53.79 49.59 53.79 53.77 | 54.80, c 51.01) 0.18. df 12.81 0.78 4 12.81 12.83 0.922 7.97 12.87 0.92 12.83 0.922 0.95 0.95 | If = 11 Total 33 40 95 96 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 | = 0.67) 49.39 47.37 64.24 45.39 44.37 61.31 58.07 44.3 (P < 0.0 39.62 51.99 44.41 44.41 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 39.62 49.39 47.7 61.31 44.3 (P < 0.0 51.99 45.39 45.39 45.39 47.7 61.31 44.3 (P < 0.0 51.99 45.39 45.39 47.7 51.31 50.62 51.95 51 | Control 3D 30 37.64 4.9 5.41 7.28 2.55 7.78 2.55 2.35 0001); l ² = 00001); l 2.52 7.78 8 2.35 7.78 8 2.35 7.78 8 2.35 5.41 0001); l 2.52 2.35 0.000 1, l ² = 0' 3 17.64 8 2.35 5.41 0001); l 2.52 2.54 17.64 8 2.35 5.41 10001); l 2.52 2.54 17.64 8 2.55 2.54 17.64 8 2.35 5.41 10001); l 2.52 2.54 17.64 8 2.55 2.55 17.64 8 2.55 2.55 17.64 8 2.55 17.64 8 2.55 17.64 8 2.55 17.64 8 2.55 17.64 8 2.55 17.64 8 2.55 17.64 8 2.55 17.64 17.65 17.65 17.64 17.65 17.75 17.65 17.7 | I' = 983 4 Total 33 400 70 30 340 407 50 30 32 8 283 32 8 283 283 283 283 | * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.096, 10.00] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.56, 3.00] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 6.03] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.85 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] 9.01 [6.34, 11.61] 1.25 [-0.11, 1.71] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 1.25 [-0.61, 0.01] 2.47 [0.02, 4.02] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.47 [0.02, 4.02] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.96 [-2.46, 6.37] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 2.96 [-2.46, 6.37] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 2.95 [-0.91, 6.21] | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| 4.1.4.3 months or less Hong Jie Liu2017 Lei Zhang et al 2022 Liang Zhang et al 2022 Xiang Hui Xiong et al 2016 Xin Ting Wang et al 2020 YiWen Ke2021 Subtotil (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau* = 13.50 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 4.1.5 More than 3 months ChengDong Yao et al 2010 Hwanwarr engo017 Xiang Feng Deng2019 Subtotil (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau* = 6.76; Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau* = 10.50 Test for overall effect: Z = 2 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau* = 10.50 Heterogeneily: Tau* = 10.77 VenJun (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau* = 10.77 VenJun Feng2017 Xiang Feng Deng2019 Xiang Hui Xiong et al 2010 Hong Jie Liu2017 VenJun Feng2017 Xiang Feng Deng2019 Xiang Hui Xiong et al 2022 YiWen Ke0221 Heterogeneily: Tau* = 11.77 Test for overall effect: Z = 1 5.1.9 Greater than 30 mint HanXuan Yang et al 2021 Wei Al 2022 YuweJiao Hong2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau* = 1.47.47 VenJun Xang et al 2021 | Chi² = 4 A5 (P = 0) A5 (P = 0) m: Chi² = 1 53.77 48 58.76 49.8 60.08 50.18 49.8 60.08 50.18 49.8 60.08 50.19 = 4 45.26 Chi² = 4 45.26 Chi² = 4 45.26 Chi² = 4 32.42 (P = C a3: Chi² = 4 a5: Chi² = 4 a5: Chi² = 4 5: Chi² = 4 98 (P = C a6.06 49.8 55: Chi² = 4 98 (P = C a6.07 a7.48 a8 a8 a9.8 chi² = 4 a6.06 chi² = 4 a6.06 a7.77 a8 a8 a9.8 a9.8<td>54.80, (54.80, (51) 0.18, df 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 12.81 3.2.05 9.37 0.78 4.2.81 3.2.05 9.37 0.78 4.2.81 3.2.05 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.89 1.90 1.60</td><td>If = 11 (P Total 33 40 90 95 00 473 33 34 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265</td><td><pre>e 0.67) Mean 49.39 44.24 45.39 44.7 61.37 50.07 50.07 30.62 51.99 44.41 <<0.000 (P = 0. 30.62 44.41 <<0.000 (P = 0. 30.62 49.39 64.24 44.41 44.31 49.33 (P < 0.00 51.99 44.53 (P < 0.00 51.99 44.53 (P < 0.00 51.99 44.53 (P < 0.00 51.99</pre></td><td>Control SD 0.69 3 17.64 4.9 5.41 7.78 6.541 7.78 6.541 7.78 2.52 2.35 2.35 2.35 2.35 2.35 2.35 2.35</td><td>I' = 983 4 - Total 33 40 70 75 196 92% 459 196 92% 459 19 = 98% % - Total 196 92% 459 12 = 98% % </td><td>**************************************</td><td>Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.096, 10.00] 5.40 [-2.096, 10.00] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.56, 3.00] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 6.03] 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.05 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.76] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 4.38 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] -5.46 [-2.98, 10.00] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.08 [-0.01, 1.71] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 1.25 [-1.66, -0.62] 2.47 [0.02, 4.92] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 0.10 [-2.46, 7.74] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 0.45 [-0.64,</td><td>Favours [control] Favours [TCE]</td> | 54.80, (54.80, (51) 0.18, df 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 12.87 5.8 0.922 7.07 4.89 12.81 3.2.05 9.37 0.78 4.2.81 3.2.05 9.37 0.78 4.2.81 3.2.05 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.87 5.8 0.922 1.89 1.90 1.60 | If = 11 (P Total 33 40 90 95 00 473 33 34 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 | <pre>e 0.67) Mean 49.39 44.24 45.39 44.7 61.37 50.07 50.07 30.62 51.99 44.41 <<0.000 (P = 0. 30.62 44.41 <<0.000 (P = 0. 30.62 49.39 64.24 44.41 44.31 49.33 (P < 0.00 51.99 44.53 (P < 0.00 51.99 44.53 (P < 0.00 51.99 44.53 (P < 0.00 51.99</pre> | Control SD 0.69 3 17.64 4.9 5.41 7.78 6.541 7.78 6.541 7.78 2.52 2.35 2.35 2.35 2.35 2.35 2.35 2.35 | I' = 983 4 - Total 33 40 70 75 196 92% 459 196 92% 459 19 = 98% % - Total 196 92% 459 12 = 98% % | ************************************** | Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 4.30 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] 5.46 [-2.096, 10.00] 5.40 [-2.096, 10.00] 1.25 [-1.68, -0.82] 0.21 [-3.56, 3.00] 4.52 [2.05, 6.99] 2.17 [-0.70, 6.03] 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.05 [-0.01, 1.71] 2.00 [-0.76, 4.76] 2.13 [0.09, 4.17] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 9.01 [6.34, 11.68] 4.38 [4.02, 4.74] 1.00 [-0.55, 2.55] -5.46 [-2.98, 10.00] -2.00 [-5.14, 1.14] 0.08 [-0.01, 1.71] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 1.25 [-1.66, -0.62] 2.47 [0.02, 4.92] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 5.10 [2.46, 7.74] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 2.96 [-2.45, 8.37] 0.10 [-2.46, 7.74] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 0.44 [-0.64, 1.52] 0.45 [-0.64, | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |

FIGURE 5

(A–D) Subgroup of the effect of Traditional Chinese exercises on patients' LVEF.

| | 1 | CE | | С | ontrol | | | Mean Difference | Mean Difference |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|----------|----------|---------|-----------|--------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Study or Subgroup | Mean | SD | Total | Mean | SD | Total | Weight | IV, Random, 95% CI | IV, Random, 95% CI |
| Li Ye et al2021 | 18.89 | 1.63 | 40 | 16.31 | 1.95 | 40 | 23.6% | 2.58 [1.79, 3.37] | |
| WenJun Feng2017 | 16.72 | 1.05 | 32 | 15.49 | 0.87 | 28 | 25.4% | 1.23 [0.74, 1.72] | - |
| XiangFeng Deng2019 | 15.43 | 1.31 | 49 | 12 | 1.11 | 51 | 25.5% | 3.43 [2.95, 3.91] | |
| ZiBo Shi2018 | 15.71 | 0.86 | 26 | 14.36 | 0.93 | 29 | 25.5% | 1.35 [0.88, 1.82] | + |
| Total (95% CI) | | | 147 | | | 148 | 100.0% | 2.14 [1.02, 3.26] | • |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1 | .23; Chi ² | 2 = 53.2 | 24, df = | 3 (P < | 0.000 | 01); l² = | 94% | - | -4 -2 0 2 4 |
| Test for overall effect: Z | 2 = 3.74 (| P = 0.0 | 0002) | | | | | | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| FIGURE 6 | | | | | | | | | |
| The effect of Traditiona | l Chines | e exer | cises o | n patier | its' VO | 2max. | | | |



shortness of breath in the group using TCEs was better than that in the control group, and the difference was statistically significant when comparing the two groups [MD = 0.44, 95% CI (0.26, 0.62), P < 0.0001] (Figure 10).

4.7.3. Facial puffiness and limb swelling

Three studies (17, 20, 22) reported the level of facial puffiness and limb swelling in the single-item TCM score of patients. Owing to the large heterogeneity of the included studies (P = 0.11, $I^2 =$ 55%), meta-analysis using a random-effects model showed that the level of fatigue and weakness in the group using TCEs was better than that in the control group, and the difference was statistically significant when comparing the two groups [MD = 0.44, 95% CI (0.12, 0.76), P = 0.007] (Figure 10).

4.7.4. Palpitations

Three studies (17, 20, 22) reported the level of palpitations in the single-item TCM score of patients. Owing to the large heterogeneity of the included studies (P = 0.006, $I^2 = 80\%$), metaanalysis using a random-effects model showed that the level of fatigue and weakness in the group using TCEs was better than that in the control group, and the difference was statistically significant when comparing the two groups [MD = 0.68, 95% CI (0.14, 1.21), P = 0.01] (Figure 10).

5. Publication bias and sensitivity analysis

Funnel plots were used for the analysis when the number of studies in the meta-analysis was ≥ 10 . The results showed partial asymmetry, suggesting the possibility of a publication bias. Sensitivity analysis was performed by comparing the differences between the effect sizes obtained from the different combined models and comparing the changes in the total effect sizes after excluding each study individually.

6. Discussion

6.1. Improving cardiac function and prognosis

The LVEF is an index related to the myocardial contractility. The stronger the myocardial contractility, the more the stroke volume and the higher the LVEF. A meta-analysis showed that TCEs can effectively improve the LVEF of patients, which is consistent with a previous study by Ren et al. (33). The benefits of TCEs, such as Taijiquan, for patients with chronic heart failure have been included in relevant guidelines². This is due to the fact that

² Available online at: https://www.moh.gov.my/moh/resources/ penerbitan/CPG/CPG%20Heart%20Failure%202019.pdf.

| Bits of Subgroup Neam SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Control min, DawAd2116 (4.8.66) 26.22 30.00 24.57 33 2.4% 10.58 [2.01, 23.17] min, DawAd2116 (4.8.66) 22.12 10 30.00 24.57 33 2.4% 10.58 [2.01, 23.17] min, DawAd2116 (4.8.67) 12.16 10 55.57 4.58 [2.05, 13.11] 10 | | | ontrol | | | TCE | | | Mean Difference | Mean Difference |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Buildwards2016 40.66 22.25 33 2.4% 10.58 [2.01, 2.17] empDay No et al2010 45.44 12.2 10.52 11.61 [1.75] 11.61 [1.75] 11.61 [1.75] empDay No et al2010 45.44 11.22 10.73 22.65 11.61 [1.75] 33 2.4% 10.58 [2.01, 22.13] 11.61 [1.75] Yee at al2011 45.44 11.77 11.77 33 11.77 33 11.75 33 2.4% 10.58 [2.01, 12.21] Yee at al2011 33.33 3.42.5 2.82 [2.01, 17.7 35 63.61 [2.02, 35] 11.75 33 7.75 9.53 [2.01, 12.23] onchin Fragoriti 35.56 [1.77 75 9.53 [1.77, 75] 35.56 [1.77, 75] 36.57 [1.75, 75] 36.51 [1.75, 8.42] anghrui Xinog et al2016 19.7 19.33 11.2 [1.8 3] 7.75 36.51 [1.75, 8.42] 47.56 11.75 [1.75, 8.42] anghrui Xinog et al2016 50.13 [1.75, 75] 33 6.7% 13.11 [1.75, 8.42] 47.56 11.57, 5.51 [1.77, 7.8] anghrui Xinog et al2016 50.17 [1.75, 55] 51.75 [1.75, 8.52] 51.77, 7.8] 52.2 [1.77, 7.8] 42.61 [1.7 | udy or Subgroup | Mean | 2.02.04 | Total | Mean | SD | Total | Weight | IV. Random, 95% CI | IV, Random, 95% CI |
| $ \begin{array}{c} \text{m}, X221 & \text{i} 4223 & \text{i} 22, 73 & \text{i} 22, 70 & \text{i} 22, 73 & \text{i} 145 & \text{B0} & \text{i} 145 & \text{B0} & \text{i} 151 & \text{i} 12, 28, 53, 17, 07 \\ \text{mg} \text{Jel} \text{Lis2017} & 32, 18 & 20, 73 & 21, 15, 77 & 73 & 37, 724 & 40 & \text{J} 38 & 724 & 40 & \text{J} 58, 58 & \text{J} 58, 66, 713, 111 \\ \text{mg} \text{Zhmg} \text{Zhmg} \text{Zhm} & 33 & 11, 57 & 7, 71, 73 & 13, 79 & 3, 88 & 20, 712, 01, 22, 33 \\ \text{mg} \text{Jen} \text{Lis2020} & 32, 23, 21 & 50, 12 & 25, 26 & 57, 32 & 56, 66, 86, 164, 164, 162, 164, 162, 164, 164, 162, 164, 164, 164, 164, 164, 164, 164, 164$ | .1.1 All literature involvir | ng Quality | of life | | | | | | | |
| Engload yas et al2010 45.4 12.2 70 32.6 14.5 80 6.1% 12.80 [E.53, 17.07] Ve et al2021 40.98 8.77 40 31.39 7.21 40 6.5% 9.99 [6.07, 13.11] mel Iang2019 35.39 3.425 22 22.82 10.15 15.75 53.93 3.67 9.75 6.39 [5.28, 6.81] multi Ling2019 35.39 3.425 22 22.82 10.15 55.95 4.58 [1.06, 5.81] multi Ling2019 32.65 9.58 2.82 2.16 (1.5, 10.10) 20.26 (1.5, 10.10) 10.16 (1.5, 10.10) 10.16 (1.5, 10.10) 10.16 (1.5, 10.10) 10.16 (1.5, 10.10) 10.16 (1.5, 10.10) 10.16 (1.5, 10.10) 10.16 (1.5, 10.10) 11.16 (1.5, 10.10) 11.16 (1.5, 10.10) 11.2 (1.8, 33) 7.5% 5.59 (1.4, 10.45 (1.5, 10.2)) 11.16 (1.5, 10.2) (1.5, 10.2) 10.00 (1.5, 10.2) (1.5, 10.2 | nen, Dai-Mei2018 | 40.66 | 26.25 | 30 | 30.08 | 24.57 | 33 | 2.4% | 10.58 [-2.01, 23.17] | |
| Ng/le Liz0071 32.18 2.07 33 23.16 1.75 33 7.5% 9.03 [8,11,995] Ng Ling Zheng 2017 38 11.57 7 7.03 1.87 9 3.8% 20.67 [12:01,23:33] ant Li Lozz2 22.82 15.01 50 23.28 21.47 23.58 23.68 1.07 40 63.58 3.98 20.67 [12:01,23:33] ant Li Lozz2 22.82 15.01 50 23.28 21.48 57.77 50 57.78 6.58 4.36 [12:48, 6.72] and Li Lozz2 22.82 25.22 6.57 7.7 50 57.78 6.57 5.58 6.21 7.7 50 3.67 7.75 50 5.75 5.42 7.75 50 3.77 50 3.75% 5.51 5.58 4.21 2.20 6.58 1.01/4 [4:5, 10:07] 2.20 5.58 7.7 5.52 5.57 7.58 7.52 5.57 7.57 5.57 7.57 5.57 | nen, X.2021 | 14.2628 | 16.25 | 18 | 13.0825 | 20.1114 | 18 | 2.6% | 1.18 [-10.76, 13.12] | |
| Ye et al2021 40.98 6.77 40 31.39 7.21 40 6.5% 9.59 (607, 13.11) metal ing2019 35.39 3.425 28 28.43 2.987 28 7.3% 6.96 (5.28, 6.84) metal ing2019 35.39 3.425 28 28.43 2.987 28 7.3% 6.96 (5.28, 6.84) and in feng2019 22.10 7 5 50 36.7 7.7 50 6.8% 4.00 (12.48, 5.103) metal ingress Dar2010 22.11 7 5 50 36.7 7.7 50 6.8% 4.00 (12.48, 5.103) metal ingress Dar2010 12.26 7.35 51 47.56 5.33 40 7.0% 4.68 (2.09, 7.27) metal ingress dat2020 11.38 6.02 39 4.25 2.6 5.7 34 6.9% 5.07 (14.48, 5.103) metal ingress dat2021 11.38 6.02 39 4.25 2.7 13 37 7.5% 5.05 (14.48, 5.103) metal ingress dat2021 11.38 6.02 39 4.25 2.7 13 37 7.5% 5.05 (14.48, 5.103) metal ingress dat2036 59.12 7.63 20 68.27 622 29 6.3% 4.20 (14.48, 4.50) so bibol 56 51.2 7.53 20 6.64 6.20 6.3% 4.20 (14.42, 4.78) so bibol 56 51.2 7.53 20 6.64 6.20 6.3% 4.20 (14.42, 4.78) so bibol 56 51.2 7.53 20 6.64 6.20 6.3% 4.20 (14.42, 4.78) so bibol 56 51.27 6.3 20 6.64 6.3% 4.20 (14.42, 4.78) so bibol 66 51.27 6.40 (P < 0.00001); P = 95% st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); P = 95% st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) tal (95% C) 60 548 43 7.77 40 31.39 7.21 40 6.5% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] weak intergenetic; Tar= 18.91; Chi# = 31.67, CH = 16 (P < 0.0001); P = 95% st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) tal (95% C) 20 corror 0 614 corror 20 20 5.17 (7.18) tal (95% C) 20 corror 0 614 corror 20 20 5.17 (7.18) tal (95% C) 20 corror 0 614 corror 20 20 5.17 (7.18) tal (95% C) 20 corror 0 614 corror 20 20 5.17 (7.18) tal (95% C) 20 corror 0 614 corror 20 20 5.17 (7.18) tal (95% C) 20 corror 0 614 corror 20 20 5.17 (7.18) tal (95% C) 20 corror 0 614 corror 20 20 5.17 (7.18) tal (95% C) 20 corror 0 614 corror 20 20 5.17 (7.18) tal (95% C) 20 corror 0 614 corror 0 616 corror 0 62 2.28 2.28 2.27 3 2.28 2.28 2.27 3 2.28 2.28 2.27 3 2.28 2.28 2.28 2.28 2.28 2.28 2.28 2. | nengDong Yao et al2010 | 45.4 | 12.2 | 70 | 32.6 | 14.5 | 80 | 6.1% | 12.80 [8.53, 17.07] | |
| Ing Zheng 2017 38 11.57 7 17.33 1.87 9 3.8% 20.67 [12:01, 23:3] ant/L L2022 28:26 15:01 50 23:66 11.66 50 55% 4.58 [-0.65, 9.8] ant/L L2022 28:26 15:01 50 23:66 11.66 50 55% 4.58 [-0.65, 9.8] ant/L E022 27:1 35 56 9.58 28 25:22 6.57 32 6.5% 4.58 [-0.65, 9.8] angl-IL Xong et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11:2 1.8 33 7.5% 5.50 [2.68, 4.4] Ing Yung at a2021 13.8 0.62 36 6.22 2.16 33 7.5% 5.51 [4.37, 5.8] angl-IL Xong et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11:2 1.8 33 7.5% 5.50 [7.8, 9.42] Ing Yung at a2021 13.8 0.62 36 6.22 36 6.25 2.16 13 7.5% 5.51 [4.37, 5.8] angl-IL Xong et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11:2 1.8 33 7.5% 5.50 [7.8, 9.42] Ing Yung at a2021 13.8 0.62 36 6.22 36 6.25 7.15 33 6.7% 1.87 [-1.48, 4.82] angl-IL Xong et al2016 19.7 1.9 50 33 4.256 5.7 34 6.9% 8.50 [7.7, 1.47, 1.48, 4.82] there openely. Tar # 18.91; CM = 316.17, d = 16 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, at for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) at for auboroup differences: Not anolicable | ongJie Liu2017 | 32.18 | 2.07 | 33 | 23.15 | 1.75 | 33 | 7.5% | 9.03 [8.11, 9.95] | |
| Total Targ2019 35.39 3.425 28 28.43 2.897 28 7.3% 6.59 [528, 84] of UL (2022) 27.1 7 50 38.67 7.7 50 6.5% 4.58 [0.65, 8.61] of Ul (3220) 27.1 7 50 38.67 7.7 50 6.5% 4.58 [0.65, 8.61] ang/Eng Derg2019 22.68 7.35 61 47.58 6.43 7.5% 6.50 [7.58, 6.42] ang/Eng Derg2019 23.06 23.3 42.33 7.15 35 6.57 4.58 [1.42, 4.57] ang/Eng Derg2019 23.06 23.3 42.33 7.15 63.6 6.7% 1.67 [1.48, 4.52] 4.63 as 7.201 23.0 23.6 6.25 2.16 33 7.5% 6.50 [1.46, 4.2, 3.78] as 5.12018 55.12 7.63 24 6.34 10.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] as 5.12018 55.17 7.78 50 6.34 10.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] as 16% CD Mean 16% D D Total Wand Mean Difference W< Bandom 98/CD Mean Difference | Ye et al2021 | 40.98 | 8.77 | 40 | 31.39 | 7.21 | 40 | 6.5% | 9.59 [6.07, 13.11] | |
| an'u Lu22z 22 22.6 15.01 50 23.68 11.46 50 5.5% 4.68 (26.6 2.41, 6.53) an'un Fang2017 35.96 0.58 28 25.22 657 32 6.1% 10.74 (6.4, 15.03) ang/Hu Xong et al.2016 19.7 1.5 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 6.50 (7.5.8 9.42) intrig Wang et al.2016 19.7 1.5 30 6.25 2.4 6.3 7.5% 6.50 (7.5.8 9.42) intrig Wang et al.2016 19.7 1.5 30 6.25 2.4 6.3 7.5% 6.50 (7.5.8 9.42) intrig Wang et al.2016 19.7 1.5 20 6.27 2.46 2.9 7.5 33 6.7% 1.67 (1.4.4.8.2) indiao Hong2020 30.06 5.93 34 2.8.39 7.15 33 6.7% 1.67 (1.4.4.8.2) indiao Hong2020 5.10 5.24 33 4.2.66 5.7 34 6.9% 8.8.33 (5.7.1 1.2.7) bothat (9% C) througenety: Tar. 1 5.9 (7.6.9 - 0.00001); P = 95% at for overall effect: 2 = 4.60 (P - 0.00001); P = 95% at for overall effect: 2 = 4.60 (P - 0.00001); P = 95% at for automau affleterences: Not anolicable Tu2 = 10.97 (2.9.7 2.9.7 2.9.1 1.7.47 = 16 (P < 0.00001); P = 95% at for automau affleterences: Not anolicable | ang Zheng 2017 | 38 | 11.57 | 7 | 17.33 | 1.87 | 9 | 3.8% | 20.67 [12.01, 29.33] | |
| ant'u L2022 22 22.6 15.01 50 23.65 11.46 50 5.5% 4.65 [0.61] on Jun Feng2017 35.96 9.58 28 25.22 65.7 32 6.1% 10.74 [6.4, 15.03] ang/hu Xong et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 6.50 [7.5, 9.42] fing Wang tal2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 6.50 [7.5, 9.42] fing Wang tal2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 6.50 [7.5, 9.42] fing Wang tal2016 19.7 1.9 30 41.2 0.62 36 6.25 2.41 6.3 7.5% 6.50 [7.5, 9.42] fing Wang tal2016 19.7 1.9 30 41.2 0.62 36 6.25 2.41 6.3 7.5% 6.50 [7.5, 9.42] fing Wang tal2016 15.0 5.9 33 42 2.59 57 34 6.9% 8.83 [5.7, 11.2] boliab (16.2) 6.51 5.0 5.8 43 3 42.56 5.7 34 6.9% 8.83 [5.7, 11.2] boliab (16.2) 6.51 5.0 5.8 43 3 42.56 5.7 34 6.9% 8.83 [5.7, 1.7, 8] throgenety. Tur ¹ = 10.91 C m ² = 36.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, et for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) et for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); I = 95%, et for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) et for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); I = 95%, et for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) et for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); I = 95%, et for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) et aubaroun differences: Not acolicable Study or Stubaroup Maan Difference Maan Differenc | nHui Tang2019 | 35.39 | 3.425 | 28 | 28.43 | 2.987 | 28 | 7.3% | 6.96 [5.28, 8.64] | |
| el cle al 2020 27.1 7 50 9.57 7.7 50 8.67 4.67 (5.3) anglesg Derg2019 52.26 7.35 51 47.86 52.2 6.57 32 6.1% 10.74 [6.4, 51.03] anglesg Derg2019 52.26 7.35 51 47.86 52.2 6.57 32 6.1% 10.74 [6.4, 51.03] anglesg Derg2019 52.26 7.35 51 47.86 52.3 49 7.0% 4.68 [2.6, 7.27] anglesg Derg2019 52.26 7.35 50 12.181 17.56 50 3.4% 10.88 [1.30, 20.46] Wen Ke2021 51.00 5.43 33 42.26 5.7 34 1.00 .0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.8] also reveal effect 2 - 4.50 (P < 0.0001); P = 95% at for venal effect 2 - 4.50 (P < 0.0001); P = 95% at for venal effect 2 - 5.30 (P < 0.00001); P = 95% at for venal effect 2 - 5.30 (P < 0.00001) Hat 09% CI) 614 62 - 0.722 12 0 23.6 17.7 12 0 25.6 14.5 80 0.4% 10.8 (3.3, 17.07) Uven at 207 13 5.6 8 2.3 2.52 2.7 35 51 4.7, 8 2.52 [3.17, 7.8] bit or venal effect 2 - 4.50 (P < 0.00001); P = 95% at for venal effect 2 - 4.50 (P < 0.00001) at for subtravia offireences. Not sectionale Control TCE Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Differ | | 28.26 | 15.01 | 50 | 23.68 | 11.46 | 50 | 5.5% | | |
| n.Lun Feng2017 35.966 9.58 28 25.22 6.97 32 6.1% 10.74 [6.4, 15.03] angHei Xong et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 8.50 [7.8, 9.42] infing Wang et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 8.50 [7.8, 9.42] infing Wang et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 8.50 [7.8, 9.42] infing Wang et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 41.2 0.83 7.5% 8.50 [7.8, 9.42] infing Wang et al2016 19.7 1.7 1.8 2.8 6.72 6.72 2.9 2.8 3% 1.26 0.164.2, 8.78] isolable Diagonal Berls 12.8 1.7.5 65 6.3 44 6.08 [1.3, 02.46] isolable Diagonal Berls 12.8 1.7.5 6.5 1.4 4.82] isolable Diagonal Berls 12.8 1.7.5 1.2 0.8 1.2 7.68 25 0.12 0.2 0.3% 1.26 0.164.2, 8.78] isolable Diagonal Berls 12.7 6.1 8 1.67. 61 4 16 (P < 0.0001); P = 95% at for overall effect: Z = 4.80 (P < 0.00001) at for overall effect: Z = 4.80 (P < 0.00001) at for subarous differences: Not acclicable Study or Subarous differences: Not acclicable Study or Subarous differences: Not acclicable | | | | | | | | | and the second sec | |
| Endpring Deng2019 52.26 7.35 51 47.88 5.83 49 7.0% 4.86 [2.0, 7.27] Ting Wang et al2020 13.08 0.62 36 6.25 2.16 33 7.5% 5.07 [7.16, 7.58] Bian Hong2020 30.06 59.3 34 2.36 5.7% 1.71 [7.14.8, 4.52] Mic Ka2021 11.08 0.62 36 5.7% 1.67 [7.14.8, 4.52] Josh Mic Ka2021 51.09 5.43 34.256 5.7 34.53 [5.7, 11.29] Josh Mic Ka2021 51.09 5.43 34.256 5.7 34.40.00% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Is for versal effect 7.65 2.46.07 0.00001) 10 20 Is for versal effect 7.46.07 0.00001) 10 20 Favours [control] Total Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Unsupport 1 10.33 7.57 1.50 10.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.8] 20 20 10 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Study or Subgroup Control TCE Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Control TCE Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Control TCE Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference | | | | | | | | | | |
| The Wang et al2022 11.38 0.62 36 6.25 2.16 33 7.7% 5.13 [3.7,58] h, G, Y, 2011 23.0617 29.768 50 12.1851 17.556 50 3.4% 10.88 [13.0, 20.46] Wen ($k2021$ 51.09 5.44 33 42.56 5.7 34 6.9% 6.53 [5.7, 11.28] berogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; Ch ² = 16.(P < 0.00001); P = 95% at for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) at for subarroup differences: Not acolicable Study or Subarroup Mean 3D Total Meight be and the form of the form | 0 0 0 | | | | | | | | and a start will be assured from the start | - |
| Line Mong2020 30.06 5.03 34 22.03 9 7.15 33 6.7% 107 [1.44, 4.82] Mon Ka2021 50.09 5.44 33 42.56 5.7 34 6.9% 6.03 4.4% 10.08 [1.30, 2040] Mon Ka2021 50.10 564 32 6.72 6.72 9 6.3% .120 [1.64, 2.60 [1.64, 2.72] bibbla [65% CI) 6612 7.63 26 68.72 6.72 9 6.3% .120 [1.64, 2.120 [1.64, 2.78] tal (65% CI) 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.8] tal (65% CI) 614 634 102.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.8] tal (7.8% CI) 614 634 102.0% 7.21 100 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | | | | | | | | - |
| h, G.Y. 2011 23.0617 28.7689 50 12.1851 17.556 50 3.4% 10.88 [13.0, 20.46] Wen Ke2021 51.09 544 33 42.65 5.7 34 6.9% 6.53 [5.77, 11.29] 36 5h2018 56.12 7.63 26 66.72 672 29 6.3% -12.80 [-16.42, -8.78] btotal (95% C) 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] 4 crowenal effect. 2 = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) tal (95% C) 614 610 + 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] 4 crowenal effect. 2 = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) tal (95% C) 614 62 + 610 P < 0.00001) tal (95% C) 614 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] 4 crowenal effect. 2 = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) tal (95% C) 614 102 P = 95% to rowenal effect. 2 = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) tal (95% C) 614 102 P = 95% to rowenal effect. 2 = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) tal (95% C) 614 102 P = 95% to rowenal effect. 2 = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) tal (95% C) 614 122 70 32.6 11.6 80 6.1% 128 [95.07 110] 11.1.2 More than 3 months CherryDang Yao tal a200 45.4 12.2 70 32.6 11.4 50 6.1% 128 [95.07 110] Wenum FangoParg02019 45.2 8 7.3 5 61 47.69 5.03 3.4 7.0 48 [2.09, 7.27] Yah, G.Y. 2011 23.0617 23.786 9.56 32 4.2 7.2 29 5.2 2.6 5.7 32 6.1% 10.78 [96.07, 13.11] Wenum FangoParg02019 45.2 8 7.3 5 61 47.69 5.03 3.4 7.04 8.6 [2.09, 7.27] Yah, G.Y. 2011 23.0617 28.789 50 3 3.0 8 24.57 33 2.4% 10.58 [2.01, 23.17] CherryDang Van tal a200 45.2 12.8 17.7 3 17.5 33 7.5% 30.018 [1.10, 20.40] Subtotal (95% C) 12.3 10.77 23.789 50 3.0 3.0 0.8 24.57 33 2.4% 10.58 [1.20, 7.21] Yah, G.Y. 2011 23.0217 23.789 50 3.0 3.0 0.8 24.57 33 2.4% 10.58 [1.20, 7.21] Yah, G.Y. 2011 23.0218 11.75 23.7 29.58 50 3.3 40 7.0% 4.08 [1.30, 20.46] Subtotal (95% C) 12.51 17.7 53 7.5% 50.018 [2.10, 7.21] Yah and Yah a200 12.1 14.2228 16.25 11 13.0825 20.1 13.7 33 7.5% 50.018 [3.10, 20.46] Yah and Yah a201 13 31 1.57 7.53 1.50 7.50 6.58 3.44 8.55 7.53 6.51 4.57.58 1.51 8.57 7.53 6.51 4.57.58 1.51 8.57 7.53 6.50 7.58, 4.58 [1.65, 6.12] Yah and Yah a202 13.3 1.57 7.53 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.58, 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.58, 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.58 6.50 7.5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mem Ro2021 5100 54.4 33 42.56 5.7 34 6.9% 8.53 [57, 11.29] bibbladi 65% C1) 614 67 29 6.3% 120.014, 24.878] 120.014, 24.878] impogneity, Tati' = 18.91; Chi = 216.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); P = 95% | a second s | | | | | | | | Server and strength to a server for an and | |
| bo Sh2018 56.12 7.63 26 68.72 6.72 29 6.3% -12.60 (-16.42, -8.78) terogenety: Tau" = 18.95: (D) = 516.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) terogenety: Tau" = 18.95: (D) = 516.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); P = 71%, Test for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Control TCE Mean Difference Mean Difference Struct or Subgroup 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] is for everal effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); P = 95% | | | | | | | | | | |
| terogeneity: Tau ² = 18 91: Ch ² = 316 17, df = 16 (P < 0.0001); P = 95% st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) at lor overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); D = 614 terogeneity: Tau ² = 18 91: Ch ² = 316 17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); P = 95% st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) at lor overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); D = 95% st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); D = 95% st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); D = 95% st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); D = 95% st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); D = 95% st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); D = 95% st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); D = 95% st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); D = 95% st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001); D = 95% st for overall effect: Z = 5.67 (f = 10 (P < 0.0000); D = 71% st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); D = 251 st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); D = 251 st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); D = 251 st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); D = 251 st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); D = 251 st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); D = 251 st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); D = 251 st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); D = 71% st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); D = 2597 st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); D = 2597 st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); D = 2597 st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); D = 2597 st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); D = 2597 st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); D = 2597 st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); D = 2597 st for overall effect: Z = 5.00 (P < 0.00001); D = 2597 st for overall effect: Z = 6.00001 st for overall effect: Z = 6.000001 st for overall eff | | 56.12 | 7.63 | | 68.72 | 6.72 | | | and the second second second | |
| at for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) tal (95% C) 614 644 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] + 20 + 10 + 10 + 16 (P < 0.00001); P = 95% at for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) at for subbrouo differences: Not acolicable | | | | | | | 634 | 100.0% | 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] | |
| Ital (85% C) 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.8] terogeneity: Tau ² = 18.01; ChP = 316.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); P = 95% | terogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; | Chi ² = 316 | .17, df = 1 | 6 (P < | 0.00001); | $ ^2 = 95\%$ | | | | |
| Encomposity: Tau" = 18.91; Chi" = 316.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); P = 95%, st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) at for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) st for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) Study or Subgroup Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV. Random. 95%; CI Live at a2010 46.4 12.2 70 32.6 1.45 80 6.1% IV. Random. 95%; CI Live at a2021 4.0.98 8.7.7 4.0.9 8.9.9% 1.0.9.0 1.0.9.0 Favours [control] Favours [control] <td>st for overall effect: Z = 4.0</td> <td>60 (P < 0.00</td> <td>0001)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | st for overall effect: Z = 4.0 | 60 (P < 0.00 | 0001) | | | | | | | |
| Study or Subgroup Control TCE Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV Random 95% CI Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV Random 95% CI Total Weight IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI 11.1.2 More than 3 months ChengDong You et al2010 45.4 1.40 6.1% IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI IV Random 95% CI < | | | | | | | | | | |
| Study or Subgroup Control TCE Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Control TCE Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Control TCE Mean Difference Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference | otal (95% CI) | | | 614 | | | 634 | 100.0% | 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] | • |
| Evolute in the standing of the stan | eterogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; | Chi ² = 316 | .17, df = 1 | 6 (P < | 0.00001); | l ² = 95% | | | | |
| Favours (control) | st for overall effect: Z = 4. | 60 (P < 0.00 | 0001) | | | | | | | |
| Control TCE Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subproup Mean SD Total Mean SD | st for subaroup difference | s. Not appli | cable | | | | | | | Favours [control] Favours [ICE] |
| Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV. Random. 95% CI IV. Random. 95% CI 11.1.2 More than 3 months 11.1.2 More than 3 months 45.4 12.2 70 32.6 14.5 80 6.1% 12.80 [8.53, 17.07] LI Ye tal 2021 40.98 8.77 40 31.39 7.21 40 6.5% 9.59 [6.07, 13.11] WenJun Feng2017 32.66 12.185 1 17.56 50 3.4% 10.88 [1.30, 20.46] Studtotal (95% CI) 23.0617 29.7689 50 12.185 1 17.56 50 3.4% 10.58 [-2.01, 23.17] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10.17; Chi ² = 13.76, df = 4 (P = 0.008); P = 71% 73 2.4% 10.58 [-2.01, 23.17] 7.6% 11.81 [-10.76, 13.12] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10.17; Chi ² = 13.76, df = 4 (P = 0.008); P = 71% 73 2.4% 10.58 [-2.01, 23.17] 7.6% 1.65 1.76 1.81 [-10.76, 13.12] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10.17; Chi ² = 13.76, df = 4 (P = 0.008); P = 71% 73 2.87 2.8 2.63 1.65 [-2.01, 23.17] | | | | | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | | | | | | | | | | |
| ChengDorg Yao et al2010 45.4 12.2 70 32.6 14.5 80 6.1% 12.80 [8.53, 17.07] Li Ye et al2021 40.98 8.77 40 31.39 7.21 40 6.5% 9.59 [6.07, 13.11] WenJun FengDorg 2017 35.96 9.58 28 25.22 6.97 32 6.1% 10.74 [6.45, 15.03] XiangFeng Deng2019 52.26 7.35 51 47.58 5.83 49 7.0% 4.68 [2.09, 7.27] Yeh, G, Y, 2011 23.0617 29.7689 50 12.1851 17.556 50 3.4% 10.86 [1.30, 20.6] Subtotal (95% CI) 239 251 29.0% 9.33 [5.88, 12.79] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10.17; Chi ² = 13.76, df = 4 ($P = 0.008$); $P = 71\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 5.30 ($P < 0.00001$) 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 40.66 26.25 30 30.08 24.57 33 2.4% 10.58 [-2.01, 23.17] Chen, X.2021 14.2628 16.25 18 13.0825 20.1114 18 2.6% 1.16 [-10.76, 13.12] HongJie Liu2017 32.18 2.07 33 23.15 1.75 3 7.5% 9.03 [8.11, 9.95] Liang Zheng 2017 38 11.57 7 17.33 1.87 9 3.8% 20.67 [12.01, 29.33] MinHui Tang2019 35.39 3.425 28 28.43 2.987 28 7.3% 6.96 [5.28, 864] QianYu Li2022 28.26 15.01 50 23.68 11.46 50 5.5% 4.58 [-0.65, 9.81] Wei Qi et al2020 27.1 7 50 36.7 7.7 50 6.6% -9.60 [-12.48, -6.72] XiangHui Xiong et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 5.50 (7.58, 9.42] XinarJiui Xiong et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 5.50 (7.58, 9.42] YiWen Ke2021 51.09 5.84 33 42.56 5.7 34 6.9% 8.53 [5.77, 11.29] ZiBo Shi2018 56.12 7.63 26 68.72 6.72 29 6.3% -12.60 [-16.42, -8.78] Subtotal (95% CI) - 375 33 7.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20.18; Chi ² = 29.65.1, df = 11 ($P < 0.00001$); $P = 96\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 ($P < 0.00001$); $P = 95\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 ($P < 0.00001$); $P = 95\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 ($P < 0.00001$); $P = 95\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 ($P < 0.00001$); $P = 82.1\%$ | | | | | | | | | | |
| Li Ye it al2021 40.88 8.77 40 31.39 7.21 40 6.5% 9.59 [6.07, 13.11] WenJun Feng2017 35.96 9.58 28 25.22 6.97 32 6.1% 10.74 [6.45, 15.03] XiangFeng Deng2019 52.26 7.35 51 47.56 5.83 49 7.0% 4.68 [2.09, 7.27] Yeh, G. Y. 2011 23.0617 29.788 50 12.1851 17.556 50 3.4% 10.88 [1.30, 20.46] Subtotal (19% Cl) 239 251 29.0% 9.33 [5.88, 12.79] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10.17; Chi ² = 13.76, df = 4 (P = 0.008); l ² = 71% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.30 (P < 0.00001) 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 40.66 26.25 30 30.08 24.57 33 2.4% 10.58 [-2.01, 23.17] Chen, X.2021 14.2628 16.25 18 13.0825 20.1114 18 2.6% 1.18 [-10.76, 13.12] Liang Zheng 2017 38 11.57 7 17.33 1.87 9 3.8% 20.67 [12.01, 29.33] MinHui Tang2019 33.39 3.425 28 28.43 2.997 28 7.3% 6.96 [5.28, 8.64] Olan'tu Li2022 28.26 15.01 50 23.68 11.46 50 5.5% 4.58 [-6.5, 9.81] Wei Qi et al2020 27.1 7 50 36.7 7.7 50 6.8% 9.60 [-12.48, -6.72] XianTing Wang et al2022 11.38 0.62 36 6.25 2.16 33 7.6% 5.13 [4.37, 5.88] Xuesliao Hong2020 30.06 5.93 34 28.39 7.15 33 6.7% 1.67 [-1.48, 4.82] XimTing Wang et al2022 11.38 0.62 36 6.25 2.16 33 7.6% 5.13 [4.37, 5.88] Xuesliao Hong2020 30.06 5.93 34 28.39 7.15 33 6.7% 1.67 [-1.48, 4.82] XimTing Wang et al2022 15.01 5.01 5.5% 44 5.65 5.7 34 6.9% 5.53 [-1.67, 1.28] ZiBo Shi2018 56.12 7.63 26 68.72 6.72 29 6.3% -12.60 [-1.64.2, -8.78] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20.18; Chi ² = 29.8.51, df = 11 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.68 (P < 0.007) Total (95% Cl) 614 614 642 (-2.00001); l ² = 95% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) Test for suborou differences: Chi ² = 5.57, df = 1 (P = 0.02), l ² = 82.1% | | | | D To | tal Me | | SD To | tal Weig | | |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon | ths | an s | | | an | | | ht IV. Random. 95% | CI IV. Random. 95% CI |
| XiangFeng Deng2019 52.26 7.35 51 47.58 5.83 49 7.0% 4.68 [2.09, 7.27] Yeh, G. Y. 2011 23.0617 29.7689 50 12.1851 17.556 50 3.4% 10.88 [1.30, 20.46] Subtati [9% CI) 239 251 29.0% 9.33 [5.88, 12.79] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10.17; Chi ² = 13.76, df = 4 ($P = 0.008$); $P = 71\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 5.30 ($P < 0.00001$) 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 40.66 26.25 30 30.08 24.57 33 2.4% 10.58 [-2.01, 23.17] Chen, X.2021 14.2628 16.25 18 13.0825 20.1114 18 2.6% 1.18 [-10.76, 13.12] HongJie Liu2017 32.18 2.07 33 23.15 1.75 33 7.5% 9.03 [8.11, 9.95] Liang Zheng 2017 38 11.57 7 17.33 1.87 9 3.8% 20.67 [12.01, 29.33] MinHui Tang2019 35.39 3.425 28 28.43 2.987 28 7.3% 6.96 [5.28, 8.64] QianYu Li2022 28.26 15.01 50 23.68 11.46 50 5.5% 4.58 [-0.65, 9.81] Wei Qi et al2020 27.1 7 50 36.7 7.7 50 6.8% -9.60 [-1.48, 6.72] XiangHui Xiong et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.6% 8.50 [7.58, 9.42] XinTing Wang et al2022 11.38 0.62 36 6.22 2.16 33 7.6% 8.51 [4.37, 5.89] Xueliaol thong2020 30.06 5.93 34 28.39 7.15 33 6.7% 1.67 [-1.48, 4.82] YiWen Ke2021 51.09 5.84 33 42.56 5.7 34 6.9% 8.53 [5.77, 11.29] ZiBo Shi2018 56.12 7.63 26 68.72 6.72 29 6.3% -12.60 [-1.42, -8.78] Wet Ke2021 51.09 5.84 33 42.56 5.7 34 6.9% 8.53 [5.77, 11.29] ZiBo Shi2018 56.12 7.63 26 68.72 6.72 29 6.3% -12.60 [-1.42, -8.78] Subtatal (95% CI) 57.4 5.48 (-9.00001); P = 95% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.68 ($P = 0.000$) Total (95% CI) 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; Chi ^p = 316.17, df = 16 ($P < 0.00001$); P = 95% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 ($P < 0.00001$) Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 ($P < 0.00001$) Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 ($P < 0.00001$) Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 ($P < 0.00001$) Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 ($P < 0.00001$) Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 ($P < 0.00001$) Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 ($P < 0.00001$) Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 ($P < 0.00001$) Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 ($P < 0.00001$) Test for overall effect: | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 | ths 0 45 | an s .4 12 | .2 | 70 3: | an 2.6 1 | 4.5 | 80 6.1 | ht IV. Random. 95% % 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 | CI IV. Random. 95% CI |
| Yeh, G. Y. 2011 23.0617 29.7689 50 12.1851 17.556 50 3.4% 10.88 $\begin{bmatrix} 1.30, 20.46 \end{bmatrix}$ Subtotal (95% CI) 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 40.66 26.25 30 30.08 24.57 33 2.4% 10.58 $\begin{bmatrix} -2.01, 23.17 \end{bmatrix}$ Hongule Liu2017 32.18 2.07 33 23.15 1.75 33 7.5% 9.03 [8.11, 9.95] Liang Zheng 2017 32.18 2.07 33 23.15 1.75 33 7.5% 9.03 [8.11, 9.95] Liang Zheng 2017 38 11.57 7 17.33 1.87 9 3.8% 20.67 [12.01, 23.3] MinHui Tang2019 35.39 3.425 28 28.43 2.987 28 7.3% 6.96 [5.28, 8.64] QianYu Li2022 28.26 15.01 50 23.68 11.46 50 6.55% 4.58 $\begin{bmatrix} -0.65, 9.81 \end{bmatrix}$ Wei Qi et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 8.50 [7.58, 9.42] XinangHui Xiong et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 8.50 [7.58, 9.42] XinangHui Xiong et al2021 11.38 0.62 36 6.25 2.16 33 7.6% 5.13 [4.37, 5.89] Xuealao Hong2020 30.06 5.93 34 22.58 7.71 33 6.7% 1.67 [-1.48, 4.82] Wei Qi et al2022 11.38 0.62 36 6.25 2.16 33 7.6% 5.13 [4.37, 5.89] XiueJiao Hong2020 30.06 5.93 34 22.56 5.7 34 6.9% 8.53 [5.77, 11.29] ZiBo Shi2018 56.12 7.63 26 68.72 6.72 29 6.3% -12.60 [-16.42, 1.8.78] Subtotal (95% CI) 375 338 7.10% 338 7.10% 332 [1.05, 6.79] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; Ch ² = 316.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 95% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) Test for suboroup differences: Chi ² = 5.57, df = 1 (P = 0.02), I ² = 82.1% | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 | ths 0 45 40.9 | an <u>s</u> .4 12 98 8. ⁻ | .2 | 70 33 40 31 | an 2.6 1 39 7 | 4.5 .21 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 | ht IV. Random. 95% % 12.80 [8.53, 17.0] % 9.59 [6.07, 13.1] | CI IV. Random. 95% CI |
| Subtotal (95% CI) 239 251 29.0% 9.33 [5.88, 12.79] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10.17; Chi ² = 13.76, df = 4 (P = 0.008); l ² = 71% Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.50$ (P < 0.00001) 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 40.66 26.25 30 30.08 24.57 33 2.4% 10.58 [-2.01, 23.17] Chen, X.2021 14.2628 16.25 18 13.0825 20.1114 18 2.6% 1.18 [-10.76, 13.12] HongJie Liu2017 32.18 2.07 33 23.15 1.75 33 7.5% 9.03 [8.11, 9.95] Liang Zheng 2017 38 11.57 7 17.33 1.87 9 3.8% 20.67 [12.01, 29.33] MinHui Tang2019 35.39 3.425 28 28.43 2.987 28 7.3% 6.96 [5.28, 8.64] QianYu Li202 28.26 15.01 50 23.68 11.46 50 5.5% 4.58 [-0.65, 9.81] Wei Qi et al2020 27.1 7 50 36.7 7.7 50 6.8% -9.60 [-12.48, -6.72] XiangHui Xiong et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 8.50 [7.58, 9.42] XinTing Wang et al2020 13.0.6 5.93 34 28.39 7.15 33 6.7% 1.67 [-1.48, 4.82] YiWen Ke2021 51.09 5.64 33 42.56 5.77 34 6.9% 8.53 [5.77, 11.29] ZiBo Shi2018 56.12 7.63 26 68.72 6.72 29 6.5% -12.60 [-16.42, -8.78] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20.18; Chi ² = 298.51, df = 11 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 95% Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.68$ (P < 0.007) Total (95% CI) 614 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; Chi ² = 316.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 95% Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.60$ (P < 0.00001) Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.60$ (P < 0.00001) Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.60$ (P < 0.00001) Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.60$ (P < 0.00001) Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.60$ (P < 0.00001) Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.60$ (P < 0.00001) Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.60$ (P < 0.00001) Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.60$ (P < 0.00001) Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.60$ (P < 0.00001) Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.60$ (P < 0.00001) Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.60$ (P < 0.00001) Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.60$ (P < 0.00001) Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.60$ (P < 0.00001) Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.60$ (P < 0.00001) Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.57$, df = 1 (P = 0.02), l ² = 82.1% | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 | ths 0 45 40.9 35.9 | an 5 .4 12 98 8. 96 9.4 | .2 77 58 | 70 33 40 31 28 25 | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 | 4.5 .21 .97 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 | ht IV. Random. 95% % 12.80 [8.53, 17.0] % 9.59 [6.07, 13.1] % 10.74 [6.45, 15.0] | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl |
| Test for overall effect: $Z = 5.30$ (P < 0.00001) 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 40.66 26.25 30 30.08 24.57 33 2.4% 10.58 [-2.01, 23.17] Chen, X.2021 14.2628 16.25 18 13.0825 20.1114 18 2.6% 1.18 [-10.76, 13.12] HongJie Liu2017 32.18 2.07 33 23.15 1.75 33 7.5% 9.03 [8.11, 9.95] Liang Zheng 2017 38 11.57 7 17.33 1.87 9 3.8% 20.67 [12.01, 29.33] MinHui Tang2019 35.39 3.425 28 28.43 2.987 28 7.3% 6.96 [5.28, 8.64] QianYu Li2022 28.26 15.01 50 23.68 11.46 50 5.5% 4.58 [-0.65, 9.81] Wei Qi et al2020 27.1 7 50 36.7 7.7 50 6.8% -9.60 [-12.48, -6.72] XiangHui Xiong et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 8.50 [7.58, 9.42] XinTing Wang et al2021 1.38 0.62 36 6.25 2.16 33 7.5% 8.50 [7.58, 9.42] XiuagHui Xiong et al2022 11.38 0.62 36 6.25 7 34 6.9% 8.53 [5.77, 11.29] ZiBo Shi2018 56.12 7.63 26 66.72 29 6.3% -12.60 [-16.42, -8.78] Subtotal (95% Cl) 375 383 71.0% 3.92 [1.05, 6.79] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20.18; Chi ² = 298.51, df = 11 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 95% Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.68$ (P < 0.007) Total (95% Cl) 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; Chi ² = 316.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 95% Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.60$ (P < 0.00001) Test for suboroub differences: Chi ² = 5.57, df = 1 (P = 0.02), l ² = 82.1% | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 | ths 0 45 40.9 35.9 52.2 | an 5 .4 12 98 8. 96 9. 26 7. | .2 77 58 35 | 70 3: 40 31 28 25 51 47 | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 | 4.5 21 .97 .83 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 | IV. Random. 95% % 12.80 [8.53, 17.0] % 9.59 [6.07, 13.1] % 10.74 [6.45, 15.0] % 4.68 [2.09, 7.2] | CI IV. Random, 95% CI |
| 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 40.66 26.25 30 30.08 24.57 33 2.4% 10.58 [-2.01, 23.17] Chen, X.2021 14.2628 16.25 18 13.0825 20.1114 18 2.6% 1.18 [-10.76, 13.12] HongJie Liu2017 32.18 2.07 33 23.15 1.75 33 7.5% 9.03 [8.11, 9.95] Liang Zheng 2017 38 11.57 7 17.33 1.87 9 3.8% 20.67 [12.01, 29.33] MinHui Tang2019 35.39 3.425 28 28.43 2.987 28 7.3% 6.96 [5.28, 8.64] QianYu Li2022 28.26 15.01 50 23.68 11.46 50 5.5% 4.58 [-0.65, 9.81] Wei Qi et al2020 27.1 7 50 36.7 7.7 50 6.8% -9.60 [-12.48, -6.72] XiangHui Xiong et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 8.50 [7.58, 9.42] XinTing Wang et al2022 11.38 0.62 36 6.25 2.16 33 7.6% 5.13 [4.37, 5.89] XueJiao Hong2020 30.06 5.93 34 28.39 7.15 33 6.7% 1.67 [-1.48, 4.82] YiWen Ke2021 51.09 5.84 33 42.56 5.7 34 6.9% 8.53 [5.77, 11.29] ZiBo Shi2018 56.12 7.63 26 68.72 6.72 29 6.3% -12.60 [-16.42, -8.78] Subtotal (95% CI) 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20.18; Chi ² = 298.51, df = 11 ($P < 0.00001$); $I2 = 96\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 2.68 ($P = 0.007$) Total (95% CI) 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; Chi ² = 316.17, df = 16 ($P < 0.00001$); $I2 = 95\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 ($P < 0.00001$) Test for subtoroud differences: Chi ² = 5.57, df = 1 ($P = 0.02$). $I2 = 82.1\%$ | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 | ths 0 45 40.9 35.9 52.2 | an 5 .4 12 98 8. 96 9. 26 7. | .2 77 58 35 39 | 70 3: 40 31, 28 25, 51 47, 50 12,18 | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 | 4.5 21 97 83 56 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.88 [1.30, 20.4 | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) | ths 0 45 40.9 35.9 52.2 23.06 | an \$.4 12 98 8. 96 9. 26 7. 17 29.76 | .2 77 58 35 39 2: | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25. 51 47. 50 12.18 39 | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 | 4.5 21 97 83 56 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.88 [1.30, 20.4 | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 | ths 0 45 40.9 35.9 52.2 23.06 ⁻¹ .17; Chi ² = | an 5 .4 12 .98 8. .96 9. .26 7. .17 29.76 13.76, df = | .2 77 58 35 39 2: | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25. 51 47. 50 12.18 39 | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 | 4.5 21 97 83 56 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.88 [1.30, 20.4 | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl |
| HongJie Liu2017 32.18 2.07 33 23.15 1.75 33 7.5% 9.03 [8.11, 9.95] Liang Zheng 2017 38 11.57 7 17.33 1.87 9 3.8% 20.67 [12.01, 29.33] MinHui Tang2019 35.39 3.425 28 28.43 2.987 28 7.3% 6.96 [5.28, 8.64] QianYu Li2022 28.26 15.01 50 23.68 11.46 50 5.5% 4.58 [-0.65, 9.81] Wei Qi et al2020 27.1 7 50 36.7 7.7 50 6.8% -9.60 [-12.48, -6.72] XiangHui Xiong et al20216 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 8.50 [7.58, 9.42] XinTing Wang et al2022 11.38 0.62 36 6.25 2.16 33 7.6% 5.13 [4.37, 5.89] XueJiao Hong2020 30.06 5.93 34 28.39 7.15 33 6.7% 1.67 [-1.48, 4.82] YiWen Ke2021 51.09 5.84 33 42.56 5.7 34 6.9% 8.53 [5.77, 11.29] ZiBo Shi2018 56.12 7.63 26 68.72 6.72 29 6.3% -12.60 [-16.42, -8.78] Subtotal (95% Cl) 575 342 (5.67) 383 71.0% 3.92 [1.05, 6.79] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20.18; Chi ² = 298.51, df = 11 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.68 (P = 0.007) Total (95% Cl) 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; Chi ² = 316.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 95% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) Test for suboroud differences: Chi ² = 5.57, df = 1 (P = 0.02). l ² = 82.1% | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less | ths 0 45 40.9 52.2 23.06 .17; Chi ² = = 5.30 (P < 1) | an 5 .4 12 98 8. 96 9. 26 7. 17 29.76 13.76, df = 0.00001) | .2 77 58 35 39 2: = 4 (P = | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25. 51 47. 50 12.18 39 • 0.008); F | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 2 = 71% | 4.5 21 97 83 56 2 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.88 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.75 | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl |
| Liang Zheng 2017 38 11.57 7 17.33 1.87 9 3.8% 20.67 [12.01, 29.33] MinHui Tang2019 35.39 3.425 28 28.43 2.987 28 7.3% 6.96 [5.28, 8.64] QianYu Li2022 28.26 15.01 50 23.68 11.46 50 5.5% 4.58 [-0.65, 9.81] Wei Qi et al2020 27.1 7 50 36.7 7.7 50 6.8% -9.60 [-12.48, -6.72] XiangHui Xiong et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 8.50 [7.58, 9.42] XinTing Wang et al2022 11.38 0.62 36 6.25 2.16 33 7.6% 5.13 [4.37, 5.89] XueJiao Hong2020 30.06 5.93 34 28.39 7.15 33 6.7% 1.67 [-1.48, 4.82] YiWen Ke2021 51.09 5.84 33 42.56 5.7 34 6.9% 8.53 [5.77, 11.29] ZiBo Shi2018 56.12 7.63 26 68.72 6.72 29 6.3% -12.60 [-16.42, -8.78] Subtotal (95% CI) 375 383 71.0% 3.92 [1.05, 6.79] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20.18; Chi ² = 298.51, df = 11 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.68 (P = 0.007) Total (95% CI) 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; Chi ² = 316.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 95% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) Test for suborou differences: Chi ² = 5.57, df = 1 (P = 0.02). I ² = 82.1% | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 | ths 0 45 40.9 52.2 23.06 ² .17; Chi ² = = 5.30 (P < 10 40.6 | an 5 .4 12 98 8. 96 9. 26 7.: 17 29.76 13.76, df = 0.00001) 66 26.: | .2 77 58 35 39 2: 4 (P = | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25. 51 47. 50 12.18 39 • 0.008); F | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 $2^2 = 71\%$ 08 24 | 4.5 21 97 83 56 2 57 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.88 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.75 10.58 [-2.01, 23.1 | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, X.2021 | ths 0 45 35. 52. 23.06 .17; Chi ² = = 5.30 (P < 1 40.6 14.262 | an 5 .4 12 98 8. 96 9. 126 7. 17 29.76 13.76, df = 0.00001) 66 26. 28 16. | .2 77 58 35 39 2: 25 25 | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25. 51 47. 50 12.18 39 0.008); F 30 30. 18 13.08 | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 $2^2 = 71\%$ 08 24 25 20.11 | 4.5 21 97 83 56 2 57 14 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 18 2.6 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0] 9.59 [6.07, 13.1] 10.74 [6.45, 15.0] 4.68 [2.09, 7.2] 10.86 [1.30, 20.4] 9.33 [5.88, 12.79] 10.58 [-2.01, 23.1] 1.18 [-10.76, 13.1] | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, X.2021 HongJie Liu2017 | ths 0 45 40.3 52.2 23.06 .17; Chi ² = = 5.30 (P < 1) 40.0 14.266 32.1 | an S .4 12 38 8. 36 9. 26 7. 17 29.76i 13.76, df = 0.00001) 56 26. 28 161 18 2.1 | .2 77 58 35 39 2: 25 25 25 07 | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25. 51 47. 50 12.18 39 6 0.008); F 30 30. 18 13.08 33 23. | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 $^2 = 71\%$ 08 24 25 20.11 15 1 | 4.5 21 97 83 56 2 57 14 75 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 18 2.6 33 7.5 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.86 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.75 10.58 [-2.01, 23.11 11.18 [-10.76, 13.1; 9.03 [8.11, 9.9 | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl |
| Wei Qi et al2020 27.1 7 50 36.7 7.7 50 6.8% -9.60 [-12.48, -6.72] XiangHui Xiong et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 8.50 [7.58, 9.42] XinTing Wang et al2022 11.38 0.62 36 6.25 2.16 33 7.6% 5.13 [4.37, 5.89] XueJiao Hong2020 30.06 5.93 34 28.39 7.15 33 6.7% 1.67 [-1.48, 4.82] YiWen Ke2021 51.09 5.84 33 42.56 5.7 34 6.9% 8.53 [5.77, 11.29] ZiBo Shi2018 56.12 7.63 26 68.72 6.72 29 6.3% -12.60 [-16.42, -8.78] Subtotal (95% Cl) 375 383 71.0% 3.92 [1.05, 6.79] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20.18; Chi ² = 298.51, df = 11 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.68 (P = 0.007) Total (95% Cl) 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; Chi ² = 316.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 95% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) Test for suboroud differences: Chi ² = 5.57, df = 1 (P = 0.02). l ² = 82.1% | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, X.2021 HongJie Liu2017 Liang Zheng 2017 | ths 0 45 40.9 35.9 52.2 23.06 ⁻¹ .17; Chi ² = = 5.30 (P < - 40.6 14.262 32 ; | an 5 .4 12 .98 8. .96 9. .926 7. .17 29.764 13.76, df = 0.000001) .66 262 .28 161 .28 162 .18 23 .38 113 | .2 77 58 35 39 22 5 25 25 25 07 57 | 70 3; 40 31, 28 25, 51 47, 50 12,18 39 • 0.008); F 30 30, 18 13,08 33 23, 7 17, | an 22.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 ≥ 71% 08 24 25 20.11 15 1 33 1 | 4.5 21 97 83 56 2 57 14 75 87 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 18 2.6 33 7.5 9 3.8 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.88 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.76 10.58 [-2.01, 23.1° 1.18 [-10.76, 13.1 9.30 [8.11, 9.9 20.67 [12.01, 29.3° | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] |
| XiangHui Xiong et al2016 19.7 1.9 30 11.2 1.8 33 7.5% 8.50 [7.58, 9.42] XinTing Wang et al2022 11.38 0.62 36 6.25 2.16 33 7.6% 5.13 [4.37, 5.89] XueJiao Hong2020 30.06 5.93 34 28.39 7.15 33 6.7% 1.67 [-1.48, 4.82] YiWen Ke2021 51.09 5.84 33 42.56 5.7 34 6.9% 8.53 [5.77, 11.29] ZiBo Shi2018 56.12 7.63 26 68.72 6.72 29 6.3% -12.60 [-16.42, -8.78] Subtotal (95% CI) 375 383 71.0% 3.92 [1.05, 6.79] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20.18; Chi ² = 298.51, df = 11 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.68 (P = 0.007) Total (95% CI) 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; Chi ² = 316.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 95% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) Test for suboroup differences: Chi ² = 5.57, df = 1 (P = 0.02), l ² = 82.1% | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, X.2021 HongJie Liu2017 Liang Zheng 2017 MinHui Tang2019 | ths 0 45 40.3 52.2 23.06 ⁻ .17; Chi ² = = 5.30 (P < 1 40.6 14.266 32 35.3 35.3 | an \$.4 12 38 8.3 96 9.26 7 29.76i 13.76, df = 0.00001) 66 26.28 18 2.38 38 11.39 | .2 77 58 35 39 22 25 25 25 07 57 25 | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25. 51 47 50 12.18 39 0.008); F 30 30. 18 13.08 33 23. 7 17. 28 28. | $\begin{array}{c} an \\ 2.6 & 1 \\ 39 & 7 \\ 22 & 6 \\ 58 & 5 \\ 51 & 17.5 \\ 2 = 71\% \\ 08 & 24 \\ 25 & 20.11 \\ 15 & 1 \\ 33 & 1 \\ 43 & 2.5 \end{array}$ | 4.5 21 97 83 56 2 57 14 75 87 87 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0. 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 18 2.6 33 7.5 9 3.8 28 7.3 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.88 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.79 10.58 [-2.01, 23.1] 1.18 [-10.76, 13.1] 9.03 [8.11, 9.9 20.67 [12.01, 23.3] 6.96 [5.28, 8.6 | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, X.2021 HongJie Liu2017 Liang Zheng 2017 MinHui Tang2019 QianYu Li2022 | ths 0 45 40. 35. 52. 23.06 .17; Ch] ² = 5.30 (P < 40.0 14.262 32. ; 35.5 28.2 | an \$.4 12 .8 .3 .96 9 .96 9 .96 9 .96 9 .97 29.76 13.76, df = 0.000001) .96 26 .98 16 .18 2 .38 11 .39 .4.4 .26 15 | .2 77 58 35 39 2: 25 25 25 57 25 01 | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25. 51 47. 50 12.18 39 0.008); F 30 30. 18 13.08 33 23. 7 17. 28 28. 50 23. | an 2.6 1 3.9 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 ² = 71% 08 24 25 20.11 15 1 33 1 43 2.5 68 11 | 4.5 21 97 83 56 2 57 14 75 87 87 87 46 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 18 2.6 33 7.5 9 3.8 28 7.3 50 5.5 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.86 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.75 10.58 [-2.01, 23.17 11.18 [-10.76, 13.12 9.03 [8.11, 9.9 20.67 [12.01, 29.3 6.96 [5.28, 8.6 4.58 [-0.65, 9.8 | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] |
| XueJiao Hong2020 30.06 5.93 34 28.39 7.15 33 6.7% 1.67 [-1.48, 4.82] YiWen Ke2021 51.09 5.84 33 42.56 5.7 34 6.9% 8.53 [5.77, 11.29] ZiBo Shi2018 56.12 7.63 26 68.72 6.72 29 6.3% -12.60 [-16.42, -8.78] Subtotal (95% CI) 375 383 71.0% 3.92 [1.05, 6.79] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20.18; Chi ² = 298.51, df = 11 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; Chi ² = 316.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 95% 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, X.2021 HongJie Liu2017 Liang Zheng 2017 MinHui Tang2019 QianYu Li2022 Wei Qi et al2020 | ths 0 45 40.4 35.5 23.06 .17; Chi ² = 5.30 (P < 40.0 14.26 32. ; 35.3 28.8 27 | an \$.4 12 28 8.3. 96 9.26 7.7 29.763 13.76, df = 0.000001) 56 26 28 16 18 2.1. 36 24 38 11 39 3.4.2 26 15 .1 1 | .2 77 58 35 39 2: 25 25 25 07 57 25 01 7 | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25: 51 47. 50 12.18 39 6 0.008); F 30 30. 18 13.08 33 23. 7 17. 28 28. 50 33. 50 31 | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 ² = 71% 08 24 25 20.11 15 1 33 1 43 2.5 68 11 3.7 | 4.5 21 97 83 56 2 57 14 75 87 87 46 7.7 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 18 2.6 33 7.5 9 3.8 28 7.3 50 5.5 50 6.8 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.88 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.79 10.58 [-2.01, 23.11 1.18 [-10.76, 13.12 9.03 [6.11, 9.9 20.67 [12.01, 29.3 6.96 [5.28, 8.6 4.56 [5.06, 9.68 -9.60 [-12.48, -6.7 | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] |
| ZiBo Shi2018 56.12 7.63 26 68.72 6.72 29 6.3% $-12.60 [-16.42, -8.78]$ Subtotal (95% Cl) 375 383 71.0% 3.92 [1.05, 6.79] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20.18; Chi ² = 298.51, df = 11 (P < 0.0001); I ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.68 (P = 0.007) Total (95% Cl) 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; Chi ² = 316.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 95% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) Test for suboroup differences: Chi ² = 5.57, df = 1 (P = 0.02). I ² = 82.1% | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, X.2021 HongJie Liu2017 Liang Zheng 2017 MinHui Tang2019 QianYu Li2022 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2012 | ths 0 45 40.0 35.3 52.2 23.06 .17; Ch] ² = 5.30 (P < 40.0 14.26 32. ; 35.5 28.2 27 5 19 11.1 | an \$.4 12 38 8. 36 9. 36 9. 36 9. 36 9. 36 7. 17 29.76 13.76, df = 0.00001) 36 26. 38 11. 39 34.4 26 15. .1 .7 .7 1 .7 0. 38 0. | .2 77 58 35 39 2: 25 25 25 07 57 25 01 7 .9 62 | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25. 51 47. 50 12.18 39 6 0.008); F 6 0.008); F 8 13.08 33 23. 7 17. 28 28. 50 23. 50 33. 30 1 | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 ² = 71% 08 24 25 20.11 15 1 15 1 133 1 43 2.9 68 11 3.7 1.2 | 4.5 21 97 83 56 2 57 14 75 87 87 87 887 46 7.7 1.8 16 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 18 2.6 33 7.5 9 3.8 28 7.3 50 5.5 50 6.8 33 7.5 33 7.5 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.86 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.75 10.58 [-2.01, 23.1 1.18 [-10.76, 13.1 9.03 [8.11, 9.9 20.67 [12.01, 29.3 6.96 [5.28, 8.6 4.58 [-0.65, 9.8 9.9.60 [-12.48, -6.7 8.50 [7.58, 9.4 5.13 [4.37, 5.8 | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] |
| Subtotal (95% Cl) 375 383 71.0% 3.92 [1.05, 6.79] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20.18; Chi ² = 298.51, df = 11 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% 3.92 [1.05, 6.79] Test for overall effect: Z = 2.68 (P = 0.007) 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; Chi ² = 316.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 95% 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, X.2021 HongJie Liu2017 Liang Zheng 2017 MinHui Tang2019 QianYu Li2022 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2020 | ths 0 45 40.0 35.0 52.2 23.06' 17; Chi ² = 5.30 (P < 1 40.0 14.26' 32.2 ; 35.3 28.8 27 5 19 11.1 30.0 19 11.1 30.0 19 11.1 30.0 19 19 11.1 30.0 19 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 | an \$.4 12 38 8.3. 36 9.26 7.7 29.763 13.76, df = 0.000001) 36 26.18 2.8 16.3. 38 11.3. 39 3.42 26 15.1. .1 .7 .1 .38 .0.006 5.5. | .2 77 58 35 39 2: 25 25 25 25 07 57 25 07 57 25 01 7 .9 32 33 | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25. 51 47. 50 12.18 39 6 0.008); F 30 30. 18 13.08 33 23. 7 17. 28 28. 50 23. 50 34. 30 1: 36 6. 36 6. 34 28. | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 2 71% 08 24 25 20.11 33 1 43 2.5 68 11 3.7 1.2 25 2 39 7 | 4.5 21 97 83 56 2 57 14 75 87 87 87 87 87 1.8 1.8 16 15 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 18 2.6 33 7.5 50 5.8 50 6.8 33 7.5 50 6.8 33 7.6 33 6.7 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.85 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.75 10.58 [-2.01, 23.1] 11.18 [-10.76, 13.1] 9.03 [8.11, 9.9 20.67 [12.01, 29.3] 6.96 [5.28, 8.6 4.58 [-6.55, 9.4] 5.13 [4.37, 5.8] 1.67 [-1.48, 4.8] | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20.18; Chi ² = 298.51, df = 11 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.68 (P = 0.007) Total (95% Cl) 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; Chi ² = 316.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 95% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) Test for suboroup differences: Chi ² = 5.57, df = 1 (P = 0.02). I ² = 82.1% Favours [control] Favours [TCE] | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, X.2021 HongJie Liu2017 Liang Zheng 2017 MinHui Tang2019 QianYu Li2022 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2022 XueJiao Hong2020 YiWen Ke2021 | ths 0 45 40.3 35.6 52.7 23.06 .17; Chi ² = = 5.30 (P < 40.0 14.26 32.2 35.5 28.2 27 5 19 11.3 30.0 51.0 | an \$.4 12 38 8. 396 9.9 326 7. 17 29.76 13.76, df = 0.00001) 56 26. 28 16. 18 2. 38 11. 39 3.4 26 15. .1 38 .7 1 38 0.0 06 5. 09 5.4 | .2 77 58 35 39 2: 25 25 25 07 57 25 01 7 .9 32 33 | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25. 51 47. 50 12.18 39 6 0.008); I 30 30. 18 13.08 33 23. 7 17. 28 28. 50 23. 50 33. 30 1 36 6. 33 428. 33 42. | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 ² = 71% 08 24 25 20.11 15 1 33 1 43 2.5 68 11 3.7 1.2 25 2 39 7 56 | 4.5 21 97 83 56 2 57 14 75 87 87 887 46 7.7 1.8 16 15 5.7 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 18 2.6 33 7.5 9 3.8 28 7.3 50 5.5 50 6.8 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 6.7 34 6.7 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.88 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.75 10.58 [-2.01, 23.1] 1.18 [-10.76, 13.1] 9.03 [8.11, 9.9 20.67 [12.01, 29.3] 6.96 [5.28, 8.6 4.58 [-0.65, 9.8 9.60 [-12.48, 6.7] 8.50 [7.58, 9.4] 5.13 [4.37, 5.8] 1.67 [-1.48, 4.8] 8.53 [5.77, 11.2] | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] |
| Total (95% Cl) 614 634 100.0% 5.52 [3.17, 7.88] Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; Chi ² = 316.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 95% -10 -5 0 5 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, X.2021 HongJie Liu2017 Liang Zheng 2017 MinHui Tang2019 QianYu Li2022 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2012 XinTing Wang et al2022 XueJiao Hong2020 YiWen Ke2021 ZIBO Shi2018 | ths 0 45 40.3 35.6 52.7 23.06 .17; Chi ² = = 5.30 (P < 40.0 14.26 32.2 35.5 28.2 27 5 19 11.3 30.0 51.0 | an \$.4 12 38 8. 396 9.9 326 7. 17 29.76 13.76, df = 0.00001) 56 26. 28 16. 18 2. 38 11. 39 3.4 26 15. .1 38 .7 1 38 0.0 06 5. 09 5.4 | .2 77 58 35 35 22 25 57 77 7 7 9 9 25 57 7 7 9 9 32 33 34 4 33 | 70 3: 40 31.1 28 25. 51 47. 50 12.18 39 0.008); F 30 30. 18 13.08 33 23. 7 17. 28 28. 50 23. 50 33 30 1 36 6. 34 28. 33 42. 26 68. | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 ² = 71% 08 24 25 20.11 15 1 33 1 43 2.5 68 11 3.7 1.2 25 2 39 7 56 | 4.5 21 983 556 2 57 44 75 87 75 87 75 87 75 77 1.8 16 15 5.7 72 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 18 2.6 33 7.5 9 3.8 28 7.3 50 5.5 50 6.8 33 7.5 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 34 6.9 29 6.3 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.86 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.75 10.58 [-2.01, 23.1" 1.18 [-10.76, 13.1" 9.03 [8.11, 9.9 20.67 [12.01, 29.3" 6.96 [5.28, 8.6 4.58 [-0.65, 9.8 9.60 [-12.48, -6.7" 8.50 [7.58, 9.4" 5.13 [4.37, 5.8" 1.67 [-14.8, 4.8" 8.53 [5.77, 11.2" -12.60 [-16.42, -8.7" | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 18.91; Chi ² = 316.17, df = 16 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 95% -1 -1 -1 Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, X.2021 HongJie Liu2017 Liang Zheng 2017 MinHui Tang2019 QianYu Li2022 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTig Wang et al2022 Yiwen Ke2021 ZiBo Shi2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20 | ths 0 45 40.4 35.5 22.3.06 .17; Chi ² = = 5.30 (P < 40.0 14.26 32.2 ; 35.3 27 9 11.3 30.0 51.0 56. .18; Chi ² = | an \$.4 12 38 8. 396 9. 26 7. 17 29.766 13.76, df = 0.0.00001) 56 26. 28 16. 18 2.1 39 3.4 26 15.1 .1 13 .7 1 39 3.4 20 5.1 1.1 2.1 .1 2.1 .1 2.1 .1 2.2 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 3.3 .1 | .2 77 58 55 59 22 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25. 51 47. 50 12.18 39 6 0.008); F 30 30. 31 47. 33 23. 7 17. 28 28. 50 23. 50 3: 30 1: 36 6. 34 28. 33 42. 26 68. 75 | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 2 = 71% 08 24 25 20.11 15 1 33 1 43 2.5 68 11 5.7 1.2 25 2 39 7 56 7 72 6 | 4.5 21 97 83 56 2 57 14 75 887 887 46 7.7 1.8 16 15 5.7 72 3 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 18 2.6 33 7.5 9 3.8 28 7.3 50 5.5 50 6.8 33 7.5 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.6 34 6.9 29 6.3 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.86 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.75 10.58 [-2.01, 23.1" 1.18 [-10.76, 13.1" 9.03 [8.11, 9.9 20.67 [12.01, 29.3" 6.96 [5.28, 8.6 4.58 [-0.65, 9.8 9.60 [-12.48, -6.7" 8.50 [7.58, 9.4" 5.13 [4.37, 5.8" 1.67 [-14.8, 4.8" 8.53 [5.77, 11.2" -12.60 [-16.42, -8.7" | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 4.60 (P < 0.00001) | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, X.2021 HongJie Liu2017 Liang Zheng 2017 MinHui Tang2019 QianYu Li2022 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2012 XiaJion Hong2020 YiWen Ke2021 Zilo Shi2018 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20 Test for overall effect: Z = | ths 0 45 40.4 35.5 22.3.06 .17; Chi ² = = 5.30 (P < 40.0 14.26 32.2 ; 35.3 27 9 11.3 30.0 51.0 56. .18; Chi ² = | an \$.4 12 38 8. 396 9. 26 7. 17 29.766 13.76, df = 0.0.00001) 56 26. 28 16. 18 2.1 39 3.4 26 15.1 .1 13 .7 1 39 3.4 20 5.1 1.1 2.1 .1 2.1 .1 2.1 .1 2.2 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 2.3 .1 3.3 .1 | .2 77 78 88 35 39 22 25 55 57 7 7 9 32 33 33 33 33 3 3 4 4 33 33 3 3 4 4 | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25. 51 47 50 12.18 39 6 0.008); F 30 30. 31 47. 33 23. 7 17. 28 28. 50 23. 50 33. 33 1. 33 1. 28 28. 50 23. 50 3. 33 42. 28 26. 68. 75 | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 2 = 71% 08 24 25 20.11 15 1 33 1 43 2.5 68 11 5.7 1.2 25 2 39 7 56 7 72 6 | 4.5 21 997 883 556 2 557 14 755 87 75 87 75 87 446 7.77 1.8 116 15 5.7 72 3 3% | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 18 2.6 33 7.5 9 3.8 28 7.3 50 5.5 50 6.8 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.5 33 7.6 33 7.5 33 7.6 33 7.10 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.86 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.75 10.58 [-2.01, 23.17 11.18 [-10.76, 13.17 9.03 [8.11, 9.9 20.67 [12.01, 29.37 6.96 [5.28, 8.6 4.58 [-0.65, 9.8 9.53 [5.89, 44 5.13 [4.37, 5.8 1.67 [-1.48, 4.8 8.53 [5.77, 11.2 9.392 [1.05, 6.75 | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl |
| Test for subaroup differences: Chi ² = 5.57, df = 1 (P = 0.02), l ² = 82.1% Pavous [control] Pavous [1CE] | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, X.2021 HongJie Liu2017 Liang Zheng 2017 MinHui Tang2019 QianYu Li2022 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2020 YiWen Ke2021 ZiBo Shi2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20 Test for overall effect: Z = | ths 0 45 40.4 35.5 23.06' .17; Chi ² = = 5.30 (P < 1 40.0 14.26' 32. ; 35. 28.8 27 5 19 11.3 30.0 51.4 | an \$.4 12 38 8. 36 9. 26 7. 17 29.76 13.76, df = 0.0.0001) 56 26. 28 16. 18 2. 38 11. .7 1 39 3.4 26 5. .1 .6 .1 .7 .1 .1 .20 5. .12 7. 228.51, df 0.007) | .2 77 78 88 85 99 22 52 52 57 77 77 57 57 57 57 77 7 7 82 23 33 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 6 6 | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25. 51 47. 50 12.18 39 6 0.008); I 30 30. 18 13.08 32 33. 7 17. 28 28. 50 23. 30 1 33 23. 50 31. 36 6. 34 28. 36 68. 34 28. 36 68. 34 28. 36 68. 37 5 | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 ² = 71% 08 24 25 20.11 15 1 33 1 43 2.5 68 11 5.7 1.2 25 2 39 7 56 72 6 01); I ² = 90 | 4.5 21 997 883 556 2 557 14 75 887 887 887 1.8 87 1.8 15 5.7 7.2 3 3% 6 6 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 18 2.6 33 7.5 9 3.8 28 7.3 50 5.5 50 6.8 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.5 33 7.6 33 7.5 33 7.6 33 7.10 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.86 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.75 10.58 [-2.01, 23.17 11.18 [-10.76, 13.17 9.03 [8.11, 9.9 20.67 [12.01, 29.37 6.96 [5.28, 8.6 4.58 [-0.65, 9.8 9.53 [5.89, 44 5.13 [4.37, 5.8 1.67 [-1.48, 4.8 8.53 [5.77, 11.2 9.392 [1.05, 6.75 | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl |
| | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, X.2021 HongJie Liu2017 Liang Zheng 2017 MinHui Tang2019 QianYu Li2022 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2022 XueJiao Hong2020 YiWen Ke2021 ZiBo Shi2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 20 Test for overall effect: Z = | ths 0 45 40.0 35.1 52.2 23.06 .17; Chi ² = = 5.30 (P < 40.1 14.26 32.2 35.3 28.2 27 5 19 11.3 30.0 51.1 56. .18; Chi ² = 2.68 (P = | an \$.4 12 28 8. 26 9. 26 7. 17 29.76i 13.76, df = 0.00001) 56 26. 28 16. 18 2. 38 11. 39 3.4 26 7. 13 0.00001) 56 26. 13 0.1 38 11. 39 3.4 29 5. 12 7.1 298.51, df 0.0007) 316.17, df | .2 77 78 88 85 99 22 52 52 57 77 77 57 57 57 57 77 7 82 23 33 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 6 6 | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25. 51 47. 50 12.18 39 6 0.008); I 30 30. 18 13.08 32 33. 7 17. 28 28. 50 23. 30 1 33 23. 50 31. 36 6. 34 28. 36 68. 34 28. 36 68. 34 28. 36 68. 37 5 | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 ² = 71% 08 24 25 20.11 15 1 33 1 43 2.5 68 11 5.7 1.2 25 2 39 7 56 72 6 01); I ² = 90 | 4.5 21 997 883 556 2 557 14 75 887 887 887 1.8 87 1.8 15 5.7 7.2 3 3% 6 6 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 18 2.6 33 7.5 9 3.8 28 7.3 50 5.5 50 6.8 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.5 33 7.6 33 7.5 33 7.6 33 7.10 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.86 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.75 10.58 [-2.01, 23.17 11.18 [-10.76, 13.17 9.03 [8.11, 9.9 20.67 [12.01, 29.37 6.96 [5.28, 8.6 4.58 [-0.65, 9.8 9.53 [5.13 [4.37, 5.6] 1.67 [-1.48, 4.8 8.53 [5.7, 11.2 9.392 [1.05, 6.75 | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] |
| JRE 8 | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, A.2021 HongJie Liu2017 Liang Zheng 2017 MinHui Tang2019 QianYu Li2022 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2022 XueJiao Hong2020 YiWen Ke2021 ZiBo Shi2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = | ths 0 45 40.0 35.3 52.2 23.06 17; Chi ² = 5.30 (P < 1 40.0 14.26 32. ; 35.5 28.3 275 19 11.3 30.0 51.0 51.0 51.2 52.2 28.3 275 19 11.3 30.0 51.2 | an \$.4 12 38 8. 36 9. 26 7. 17 29.76i 13.76, df = 0.00001) 36 26. 28 16. 28 16. 38 11. 39 3.4. 26 15. .1 33 .28 15. .12 7.1 298.51, df 0.0007) 316.17, df 0.00001) | .2 77 78 88 95 22 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 ² = 71% 08 24 25 20.11 15 1 33 1 43 2.5 68 11 3.7 25 2 39 7 56 72 6 01); I ² = 9: 01); I ² = 9: | 4.5 21 997 883 556 2 557 14 75 887 887 887 1.8 87 1.8 15 5.7 7.2 3 3% 6 6 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 18 2.6 33 7.5 9 3.8 28 7.3 50 5.5 50 6.8 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.5 33 7.6 33 7.5 33 7.6 33 7.10 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.86 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.75 10.58 [-2.01, 23.17 11.18 [-10.76, 13.17 9.03 [8.11, 9.9 20.67 [12.01, 29.37 6.96 [5.28, 8.6 4.58 [-0.65, 9.8 9.53 [5.13 [4.37, 5.6] 1.67 [-1.48, 4.8 8.53 [5.7, 11.2 9.392 [1.05, 6.75 | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] |
| | 11.1.2 More than 3 mon ChengDong Yao et al201 Li Ye et al2021 WenJun Feng2017 XiangFeng Deng2019 Yeh, G. Y. 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = 11.1.3 3 months or less Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, Dai-Mei2018 Chen, A.2021 HongJie Liu2017 Liang Zheng 2017 MinHui Tang2019 QianYu Li2022 Wei Qi et al2020 XiangHui Xiong et al2016 XinTing Wang et al2022 XueJiao Hong2020 YiWen Ke2021 ZiBo Shi2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 10 Test for overall effect: Z = | ths 0 45 40.0 35.3 52.2 23.06 17; Chi ² = 5.30 (P < 1 40.0 14.26 32. ; 35.5 28.3 275 19 11.3 30.0 51.0 51.0 51.2 52.2 28.3 275 19 11.3 30.0 51.2 | an \$.4 12 38 8. 36 9. 26 7. 17 29.76i 13.76, df = 0.00001) 36 26. 28 16. 28 16. 38 11. 39 3.4. 26 15. .1 33 .28 15. .12 7.1 298.51, df 0.0007) 316.17, df 0.00001) | .2 77 78 88 95 22 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 | 70 3: 40 31. 28 25. 51 47. 50 12.18 39 6 0.008); F 30 30. 31 47. 50 23. 50 24. 50 24. | an 2.6 1 39 7 22 6 58 5 51 17.5 ² = 71% 08 24 25 20.11 15 1 33 1 43 2.5 68 11 3.7 25 2 39 7 56 72 6 01); I ² = 9: 01); I ² = 9: | 4.5 21 997 883 556 2 557 14 75 887 887 887 1.8 87 1.8 15 5.7 7.2 3 3% 6 6 | 80 6.1 40 6.5 32 6.1 49 7.0 50 3.4 51 29.0 33 2.4 18 2.6 33 7.5 9 3.8 28 7.3 50 5.5 50 6.8 33 7.6 33 7.6 33 7.5 33 7.6 33 7.5 33 7.6 33 7.10 | IV. Random. 95% 12.80 [8.53, 17.0 9.59 [6.07, 13.1 10.74 [6.45, 15.0 4.68 [2.09, 7.2 10.86 [1.30, 20.4 9.33 [5.88, 12.75 10.58 [-2.01, 23.17 11.18 [-10.76, 13.17 9.03 [8.11, 9.9 20.67 [12.01, 29.37 6.96 [5.28, 8.6 4.58 [-0.65, 9.8 9.53 [5.13 [4.37, 5.6] 1.67 [-1.48, 4.8 8.53 [5.7, 11.2 9.392 [1.05, 6.75 | Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] 7] |

traditional exercises such as Taijiquan can make cardiomyocytes compensately thickened, resulting in the overall enhancement of myocardial contractility, so that the stroke volume and ejection fraction are correspondingly increased (34). In a subgroup analysis of LVEF, a possible source of heterogeneity was found in the study (15, 18–21), and the reason for this was that the TCEs used in the study were Ba Duan Jin, whereas the exercises used in the other included studies were Taijiquan, Yi Jin Jing, and Liu Zi Jue. The reasons for this need to be discussed further. In terms of improving myocardial contractility in heart failure patients, the use

| | | CE | _ | | ontrol | _ | | Mean Difference | Mean Difference |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| Study or Subgroup | Mean | SD | Total | Mean | SD | Total | Weight | IV, Random, 95% CI | IV, Random, 95% CI |
| 2.1.2 All literature involving | - | | | | | | | | |
| ChengDong Yao et al2010 | 554 | 94 | 80 | 461 | 102 | 70 | | 93.00 [61.45, 124.55] | |
| HanXuan Yang et al2021 | 465.79 | 91.33 | 47 | 420.47 | 79.09 | 47 | 3.8% | 45.32 [10.78, 79.86] | |
| longJie Liu2017 | 314.56 | 7.82 | 33 | 277.4 | 4.96 | 33 | 15.9% | 37.16 [34.00, 40.32] | |
| iang Zheng 2017 | 445.77 | 46.67 | 9 | 352.8 | 85.02 | 7 | 1.1% | 92.97 [23.00, 162.94] | |
| /inHui Tang2019 | 383.36 | 5.049 | 28 | 340.82 | 5.092 | 28 | 16.0% | 42.54 [39.88, 45.20] | |
| QianYu Li2022 | 330.14 | 97.66 | 50 | 287.5 | 90.5 | 50 | 3.5% | 42.64 [5.73, 79.55] | |
| angFeng Deng2019 | 359.85 | 21.7 | 49 | 330.86 | 24.01 | 51 | 13.4% | 28.99 [20.03, 37.95] | |
| iangHui Xiong et al2016 | 512.5 | 50.2 | 33 | 436.2 | 49.8 | 30 | 6.1% | 76.30 [51.58, 101.02] | |
| inTing Wang et al2022 | 340.7 | 20.04 | 33 | 313.13 | 14.09 | 36 | 13.7% | 27.57 [19.33, 35.81] | |
| ueJiao Hong2020 | 427.97 | 23.07 | 33 | 420.65 | 23.76 | 34 | 12.1% | 7.32 [-3.89, 18.53] | |
| eh, G. Y.2016 | 376.1362 | 160.294 | 50 | 383.1525 | 156.4774 | 50 | 1.4% | -7.02 [-69.11, 55.07] | |
| ïWen Ke2021 | 311.41 | 38.49 | 34 | 280.12 | 36.84 | 33 | 8.6% | 31.29 [13.25, 49.33] | |
| ubtotal (95% CI) | | | 479 | | | 469 | 100.0% | 36.83 [29.11, 44.56] | • |
| eterogeneity: Tau ² = 95.38 est for overall effect: Z = 9. | | | (P < 0. | 00001); I² = | 86% | | | | |
| otal (95% CI) | | | 479 | | | 469 | 100.0% | 36.83 [29.11, 44.56] | • |
| leterogeneity: Tau ² = 95.38 | Chi ² = 76 0 | 1 df = 11 | | 00001) 12 = | 86% | | | | H + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + |
| est for overall effect: Z = 9. | | | (| 00001,1 | 0070 | | | | -100 -50 0 50 100 |
| est for subaroup difference | | | | | | | | | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | CE | | | Control | | | Mean Difference | Mean Difference |
| | T Mean | | Total | C Mean | | Total | Weight | | |
| 3.1.1 3 months or less | Mean | SD | | Mean | SD | | | IV. Random. 95% Cl | |
| 3.1.1 3 months or less longJie Liu2017 | | | Total 33 9 | | | Total 33 7 | <u>Weight</u> 15.9% 1.1% | | |
| 3.1.1 3 months or less ongJie Liu2017 ang Zheng 2017 linHui Tang2019 | Mean 314.56 445.77 383.36 | 7.82 46.67 5.049 | 33 9 28 | Mean 277.4 352.8 340.82 | 4.96 85.02 5.092 | 33 7 28 | 15.9% 1.1% 16.0% | IV. Random. 95% Cl 37.16 [34.00, 40.32] 92.97 [23.00, 162.94] 42.54 [39.88, 45.20] | |
| 3.1.1 3 months or less longJie Liu2017 iang Zheng 2017 linHui Tang2019 tianYu Li2022 | Mean 314.56 445.77 383.36 330.14 | 7.82 46.67 5.049 97.66 | 33 9 28 50 | Mean 277.4 352.8 340.82 287.5 | 4.96 85.02 5.092 90.5 | 33 7 28 50 | 15.9% 1.1% 16.0% 3.5% | IV. Random. 95% Cl 37.16 [34.00, 40.32] 92.97 [23.00, 162.94] 42.54 [39.88, 45.20] 42.64 [5.73, 79.55] | |
| 3.1.1 3 months or less longJie Liu2017 iang Zheng 2017 linHui Tang2019 ianYu Li2022 iangHui Xiong et al2016 | Mean 314.56 445.77 383.36 330.14 512.5 | 7.82 46.67 5.049 97.66 50.2 | 33 9 28 50 33 | Mean 277.4 352.8 340.82 287.5 436.2 | 4.96 85.02 5.092 90.5 49.8 | 33 7 28 50 30 | 15.9% 1.1% 16.0% 3.5% 6.1% | IV. Random. 95% Cl 37.16 [34.00, 40.32] 92.97 [23.00, 162.94] 42.54 [39.88, 45.20] 42.64 [5.73, 79.55] 76.30 [51.58, 101.02] | |
| 3.1.1 3 months or less ongJie Liu2017 lang Zheng 2017 linHui Tang2019 lianYu Li2022 langHui Xiong et al2016 inTing Wang et al2022 | Mean 314.56 445.77 383.36 330.14 512.5 340.7 | 7.82 46.67 5.049 97.66 50.2 20.04 | 33 9 28 50 33 33 | Mean 277.4 352.8 340.82 287.5 436.2 313.13 | 4.96 85.02 5.092 90.5 49.8 14.09 | 33 7 28 50 30 36 | 15.9% 1.1% 16.0% 3.5% 6.1% 13.7% | IV. Random, 95% Cl 37.16 [34.00, 40.32] 92.97 [23.00, 162.94] 42.54 [39.88, 45.20] 42.64 [5.73, 79.55] 76.30 [51.58, 101.02] 27.57 [19.33, 35.81] | |
| 3.1.1 3 months or less long Jie Liu 2017 jang Zheng 2017 lin Hui Tang 2019 lian Yu Li 2022 jang Hui Xiong et al 2016 jin Ting Wang et al 2022 jue Jiao Hong 2020 | Mean 314.56 445.77 383.36 330.14 512.5 340.7 427.97 | 7.82 46.67 5.049 97.66 50.2 | 33 9 28 50 33 | Mean 277.4 352.8 340.82 287.5 436.2 | 4.96 85.02 5.092 90.5 49.8 | 33 7 28 50 30 | 15.9% 1.1% 16.0% 3.5% 6.1% | IV. Random. 95% Cl 37.16 [34.00, 40.32] 92.97 [23.00, 162.94] 42.54 [39.88, 45.20] 42.64 [5.73, 79.55] 76.30 [51.58, 101.02] 27.57 [19.33, 35.84] 7.32 [-3.89, 18.53] | |
| 3.1.1 3 months or less ongJie Liu2017 lang Zheng 2017 linHui Tang2019 lianYu Li2022 langHui Xiong et al2016 inTing Wang et al2022 ueJiao Hong2020 eh, G. Y.2016 Wen Ke2021 | Mean 314.56 445.77 383.36 330.14 512.5 340.7 | 7.82 46.67 5.049 97.66 50.2 20.04 23.07 | 33 9 28 50 33 33 33 50 34 | Mean 277.4 352.8 340.82 287.5 436.2 313.13 420.65 | 4.96 85.02 5.092 90.5 49.8 14.09 23.76 | 33 7 28 50 30 36 34 50 33 | 15.9% 1.1% 16.0% 3.5% 6.1% 13.7% 12.1% 1.4% 8.6% | IV. Random. 95% Cl 37.16 [34.00, 40.32] 92.97 [23.00, 162.94] 42.54 [39.88, 45.20] 42.64 [5.73, 79.55] 76.30 [51.58, 101.02] 27.57 [19.33, 35.81] 7.32 [-3.89, 18.53] -7.02 [-69.11, 55.07] 31.29 [13.25, 49.33] | |
| 3.1.1 3 months or less ongJie Liu2017 ling Zheng 2017 linHui Tang2019 lianYu Li2022 ueJiao Hong2020 eh, G. Y.2016 lWen Ke2021 ubtotal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Tau ² = 85.65 | Mean 314.56 445.77 383.36 330.14 512.5 340.7 427.97 376.1362 311.41 5; Chi ² = 60.0 | 7.82 46.67 5.049 97.66 50.2 20.04 23.07 160.294 38.49 0, df = 8 (| 33 9 28 50 33 33 33 50 34 303 | Mean 277.4 352.8 340.82 287.5 436.2 313.13 420.65 383.1525 280.12 | 5D 4.96 85.02 5.092 90.5 49.8 14.09 23.76 156.4774 36.84 | 33 7 28 50 30 36 34 50 | 15.9% 1.1% 16.0% 3.5% 6.1% 13.7% 12.1% 1.4% | IV. Random. 95% Cl 37.16 [34.00, 40.32] 92.97 [23.00, 162.94] 42.64 [39.88, 45.20] 42.64 [5.73, 79.55] 76.30 [51.58, 101.02] 27.57 [19.33, 35.81] 7.32 [-3.89, 18.53] -7.02 [-69.11, 55.07] | |
| 3.1.1 3 months or less ongJie Liu2017 lang Zheng 2017 linHui Tang2019 lianYu Li2022 iangHui Xiong et al2016 inTing Wang et al2022 ueJiao Hong2020 eh, G. Y.2016 liWen Ke2021 ubtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 85.65 est for overall effect: Z = 8. | Mean 314.56 445.77 383.36 330.14 5; Chi ² = 60.0 .08 (P < 0.00 | 7.82 46.67 5.049 97.66 50.2 20.04 23.07 160.294 38.49 0, df = 8 (| 33 9 28 50 33 33 33 50 34 303 | Mean 277.4 352.8 340.82 287.5 436.2 313.13 420.65 383.1525 280.12 | 5D 4.96 85.02 5.092 90.5 49.8 14.09 23.76 156.4774 36.84 | 33 7 28 50 30 36 34 50 33 | 15.9% 1.1% 16.0% 3.5% 6.1% 13.7% 12.1% 1.4% 8.6% | IV. Random. 95% Cl 37.16 [34.00, 40.32] 92.97 [23.00, 162.94] 42.54 [39.88, 45.20] 42.64 [5.73, 79.55] 76.30 [51.58, 101.02] 27.57 [19.33, 35.81] 7.32 [-3.89, 18.53] -7.02 [-69.11, 55.07] 31.29 [13.25, 49.33] | |
| itudy or Subgroup 3.1.1 3 months or less tongJie Liu2017 iang Zheng 2017 iinHui Tang2019 bianYu Li2022 GiangHui Xiong et al2016 iinTing Wang et al2022 (weJiao Hong2020 'eh, G. Y.2016 (Wen Ke2021 iubtotal (95% CI) teterogeneity: Tau ² = 85.65 est for overail effect: Z = 8. 3.1.3 More than 3 months chengDong Yao et al2010 | Mean 314.56 445.77 383.36 330.14 5; Chi ² = 60.0 .08 (P < 0.00 | 7.82 46.67 5.049 97.66 50.2 20.04 23.07 160.294 38.49 0, df = 8 (| 33 9 28 50 33 33 33 50 34 303 | Mean 277.4 352.8 340.82 287.5 436.2 313.13 420.65 383.1525 280.12 | 5D 4.96 85.02 5.092 90.5 49.8 14.09 23.76 156.4774 36.84 | 33 7 28 50 30 36 34 50 33 | 15.9% 1.1% 16.0% 3.5% 6.1% 13.7% 12.1% 1.4% 8.6% 78.4% | IV. Random. 95% Cl 37.16 [34.00, 40.32] 92.97 [23.00, 162.94] 42.54 [39.88, 45.20] 42.64 [5.73, 79.55] 76.30 [51.58, 101.02] 27.57 [19.33, 35.81] 7.32 [-3.89, 18.53] -7.02 [-69.11, 55.07] 31.29 [13.25, 49.33] | |
| 3.1.1 3 months or less long Jie Liu2017 lang Zheng 2017 flinHui Tang2019 VianYu Li2022 GiangHui Xiong et al2016 GinTing Wang et al2022 (weliao Hong2020 feh, G. Y.2016 Wen Ke2021 Subtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 85.65 fest for overall effect: Z = 8. 3.1.3 More than 3 months ChengDong Yao et al2021 | Mean 314.56 445.77 383.36 330.14 512.5 340.7 427.97 376.1362 311.41 5; Chi ² = 60.00 5 554 465.79 | SD 7.82 46.67 5.049 97.66 50.2 20.04 23.07 160.294 38.49 0, df = 8 (001) 94 91.33 | 33 9 28 50 33 33 33 50 34 303 P < 0.0 80 47 | Mean 277.4 352.8 340.82 287.5 436.2 313.13 420.65 383.1525 280.12 00001); I ² = 8 461 420.47 | SD 4.96 85.02 5.092 90.5 49.8 14.09 23.76 156.4774 36.84 37% | 33 7 28 50 36 34 50 33 301 70 47 | 15.9% 1.1% 16.0% 3.5% 6.1% 13.7% 12.1% 1.4% 8.6% 78.4% 3.8% | IV. Random, 95% Cl 37.16 [34.00, 40.32] 92.97 [23.00, 162.94] 42.54 [39.88, 45.20] 42.64 [5.73, 79.55] 76.30 [51.58, 101.02] 27.57 [19.33, 35.81] 7.32 [-3.89, 18.53] -7.02 [-69.11, 55.07] 31.29 [13.25, 49.33] 34.51 [26.14, 42.89] 93.00 [61.45, 124.55] 45.32 [10.78, 79.86] | |
| 3.1.1 3 months or less long Jie Liu2017 lang Zheng 2017 linHui Tang2019 lianYu Li2022 liangHui Xiong et al2016 inTing Wang et al2022 ueJiao Hong2020 leh, G. Y.2016 iWen Ke2021 lubtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 85.65 est for overall effect: Z = 8. 3.1.3 More than 3 months thengDong Yao et al2010 lanXuan Yang et al2021 iangFeng Deng2019 | Mean 314.56 445.77 383.36 330.14 512.5 340.7 427.97 376.1362 311.41 5; Chi ² = 60.0 0.08 (P < 0.00 554 | SD 7.82 46.67 5.049 97.66 50.2 20.04 23.07 160.294 38.49 0, df = 8 (001) 94 | 33 9 28 50 33 33 33 50 34 303 P < 0.00 80 47 49 | Mean 277.4 352.8 340.82 287.5 436.2 313.13 420.65 383.1525 280.12 00001); I ² = 8 461 | SD 4.96 85.02 5.092 90.55 49.8 14.09 23.76 156.4774 36.84 37% | 33 7 28 50 30 36 34 50 33 301 70 47 51 | 15.9% 1.1% 16.0% 3.5% 6.1% 13.7% 1.4% 8.6% 78.4% 4.4% 3.8% 13.4% | IV. Random, 95% Cl 37.16 [34.00, 40.32] 92.97 [23.00, 162.94] 42.54 [39.88, 45.20] 42.64 [5.73, 79.55] 76.30 [51.58, 101.02] 27.57 [19.33, 35.81] 7.32 [-3.89, 18.53] -7.02 [-69.11, 55.07] 31.29 [13.25, 49.33] 34.51 [26.14, 42.89] 93.00 [61.45, 124.55] 45.32 [10.78, 79.86] 28.99 [20.03, 37.95] | |
| 3.1.1 3 months or less longJie Liu2017 liang Zheng 2017 linHui Tang2019 JianYu Li2022 liangHui Xiong et al2016 linTing Wang et al2022 lueJiao Hong2020 (eh, G. Y.2016 fWen Ke2021 lubtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 85.65 est for overall effect: Z = 8. 3.1.3 More than 3 months chengDong Yao et al2010 | Mean 314.56 445.77 383.36 330.14 512.5 340.7 427.97 376.1362 311.41 5; Chi ² = 60.0 0.08 (P < 0.00 554 465.79 359.85 .67; Chi ² = 15 | SD 7.82 46.67 5.049 97.66 50.2 20.04 160.294 38.49 0, df = 8 (001) 94 91.33 21.7 5.04, df = 5 | 33 9 28 50 33 33 33 50 34 303 P < 0.0 80 47 49 176 | Mean 277.4 352.8 340.82 287.5 436.2 313.13 420.65 383.1525 280.12 00001); I ² = { 461 420.47 330.86 | SD 4.96 85.02 5.092 90.5 49.8 14.09 23.76 156.4774 36.84 37% | 33 7 28 50 36 34 50 33 301 70 47 | 15.9% 1.1% 16.0% 3.5% 6.1% 13.7% 1.4% 8.6% 78.4% 4.4% 3.8% 13.4% | IV. Random, 95% Cl 37.16 [34.00, 40.32] 92.97 [23.00, 162.94] 42.54 [39.88, 45.20] 42.64 [5.73, 79.55] 76.30 [51.58, 101.02] 27.57 [19.33, 35.81] 7.32 [-3.89, 18.53] -7.02 [-69.11, 55.07] 31.29 [13.25, 49.33] 34.51 [26.14, 42.89] 93.00 [61.45, 124.55] 45.32 [10.78, 79.86] | |
| 3.1.1 3 months or less long Jie Liu2017 lang Zheng 2017 dinHui Tang2019 JianYu Li2022 GiangHui Xiong et al2016 GinTing Wang et al2022 (weliao Hong2020 feh, G. Y.2016 TiWen Ke2021 Jubtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 85.65 fest for overall effect: Z = 8. 3.1.3 More than 3 months ShengDong Yao et al2010 lanXuan Yang et al2021 diangTeng Deng2019 Jubtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 1019. fest for overall effect: Z = 2. fotal (95% CI) | Mean 314.56 445.77 383.36 330.14 512.5 340.7 427.97 376.1362 311.41 5; Chi ² = 60.0 .08 (P < 0.00 554 465.79 359.85 .67; Chi ² = 15 .70 (P = 0.00 | SD 7.82 46.67 5.049 97.66 50.2 20.04 23.07 160.294 38.49 0, df = 8 (001) 94 91.33 21.7 5.04, df = 7 7) | 33 9 28 50 33 33 30 34 303 P < 0.0 47 49 176 2 (P = C 479 | Mean 277.4 352.8 340.82 287.5 436.2 383.1525 280.12 00001); I ² = 6 461 420.47 330.86 0.0005); I ² = | SD 4.96 85.02 5.092 90.5 49.8 14.09 23.76 156.4774 36.84 37% 102 79.09 24.01 87% | 33 7 8 50 30 36 34 50 33 301 70 47 51 168 | 15.9% 1.1% 16.0% 3.5% 6.1% 13.7% 1.4% 8.6% 78.4% 3.8% 13.4% 21.6% | IV. Random, 95% Cl 37.16 [34.00, 40.32] 92.97 [23.00, 162.94] 42.54 [39.88, 45.20] 42.64 [5.73, 79.55] 76.30 [51.58, 101.02] 27.57 [19.33, 35.81] 7.32 [-3.89, 18.53] -7.02 [-69.11, 55.07] 31.29 [13.25, 49.33] 34.51 [26.14, 42.89] 93.00 [61.45, 124.55] 45.32 [10.78, 79.86] 28.99 [20.03, 37.95] | |
| 3.1.1 3 months or less long Jie Liu2017 liang Zheng 2017 linHui Tang2019 lianYu Li2022 liangHui Xiong et al2016 inTing Wang et al2022 lueJiao Hong2020 leh, G. Y.2016 iWen Ke2021 lubtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 85.65 est for overall effect: Z = 8. 3.1.3 More than 3 months hengDong Yao et al2010 lanXuan Yang et al2021 liangFeng Deng2019 lubtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 1019. est for overall effect: Z = 2. | Mean 314.56 445.77 383.36 330.14 512.5 340.7 427.97 376.1362 311.41 5; Chi ² = 60.0 0.08 (P < 0.00 5 554 465.79 359.85 .67; Chi ² = 15 .70 (P = 0.00 3; Chi ² = 76.0 .35 (P < 0.00 | SD 7.82 46.67 5.049 97.66 50.2 20.04 23.07 160.294 38.49 0, df = 8 (001) 94 91.33 21.7 5.04, df = 11 001) | 33 9 28 50 33 33 33 50 34 303 P < 0.00 80 47 49 176 2 (P = 0 479 (P < 0.0 | Mean 277.4 352.8 340.82 287.5 436.2 313.13 420.65 383.1525 280.12 00001); l ² = { 461 420.47 330.86 0.0005); l ² = | SD 4.96 85.02 5.092 90.5 49.8 14.09 23.76 156.4774 36.84 37% 102 79.09 24.01 87% | 33 7 8 50 30 36 34 50 33 301 70 47 51 168 | 15.9% 1.1% 16.0% 3.5% 6.1% 13.7% 1.4% 8.6% 78.4% 3.8% 13.4% 21.6% | IV. Random, 95% Cl 37.16 [34.00, 40.32] 92.97 [23.00, 162.94] 42.64 [39.88, 45.20] 42.64 [5.73, 79.55] 76.30 [51.58, 101.02] 27.57 [19.33, 35.81] 7.32 [-3.89, 18.53] 7.02 [-69.11, 55.07] 31.29 [13.25, 49.33] 34.51 [26.14, 42.89] 93.00 [61.45, 124.55] 45.32 [10.78, 79.86] 28.99 [20.03, 37.95] 53.98 [14.74, 93.22] | |
| 3.1.1 3 months or less ong Jie Liu2017 liang Zheng 2017 linHui Tang2019 lianYu Li2022 lanyUu Li2022 ueJiao Hong2020 eh, G. Y.2016 iWen Ke2021 ubtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 85.65 est for overall effect: Z = 8. 3.1.3 More than 3 months thengDong Yao et al2010 anXuan Yang et al2021 jangFeng Deng2019 ubtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 1019. est for overall effect: Z = 2. otal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 95.38 est for overall effect: Z = 9. | Mean 314.56 445.77 383.36 330.14 512.5 340.7 427.97 376.1362 311.41 5; Chi ² = 60.0 0.08 (P < 0.00 5 554 465.79 359.85 .67; Chi ² = 15 .70 (P = 0.00 3; Chi ² = 76.0 .35 (P < 0.00 | SD 7.82 46.67 5.049 97.66 50.2 20.04 23.07 160.294 38.49 0, df = 8 (001) 94 91.33 21.7 5.04, df = 11 001) | 33 9 28 50 33 33 33 50 34 303 P < 0.00 80 47 49 176 2 (P = 0 479 (P < 0.0 | Mean 277.4 352.8 340.82 287.5 283.1525 280.12 00001); l ² = { 461 420.47 330.86 0.0005); l ² = | SD 4.96 85.02 5.092 90.5 49.8 14.09 23.76 156.4774 36.84 37% 102 79.09 24.01 87% | 33 7 8 50 30 36 34 50 33 301 70 47 51 168 | 15.9% 1.1% 16.0% 3.5% 6.1% 13.7% 1.4% 8.6% 78.4% 3.8% 13.4% 21.6% | IV. Random, 95% Cl 37.16 [34.00, 40.32] 92.97 [23.00, 162.94] 42.64 [39.88, 45.20] 42.64 [5.73, 79.55] 76.30 [51.58, 101.02] 27.57 [19.33, 35.81] 7.32 [-3.89, 18.53] 7.02 [-69.11, 55.07] 31.29 [13.25, 49.33] 34.51 [26.14, 42.89] 93.00 [61.45, 124.55] 45.32 [10.78, 79.86] 28.99 [20.03, 37.95] 53.98 [14.74, 93.22] | IV. Random. 95% Cl |

of Bada Duan Jin may be superior to Taijiquan, and more clinical studies are needed to prove the specific mechanism. Ba Duanjin emphasized keeping gentle and steady lower limb movements, which increased the endurance of lower limb skeletal muscles, enhanced the strength and strength of muscle fibers, improved muscle perfusion and metabolism, and increased the total volume density of mitochondria and the capacity density of cytochrome c oxidase in muscle fiber cells (35, 36). In future clinical practice, healthcare providers can carry out training of TCEs to improve myocardial contractility during the rehabilitation phase according to the condition of heart failure patients. However, owing to the small sample size and heterogeneity of the studies included in this analysis, more clinical trials are needed to corroborate the results in the future.

6.2. Enhancement of exercise capacity

Meta-analysis results showed that TCM methods could effectively enhance patients' maximal oxygen consumption,

| | | ontrol | | | TCE | | | Mean Difference | Mean Difference |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Study or Subgroup | | | | | and a state of the | | • | IV, Random, 95% CI | IV. Random, 95% Cl |
| KiangFeng Deng2019 | 2.03 | | 51 | 1.83 | | 49 | 34.9% | 0.20 [-0.00, 0.40] | · |
| KinTing Wang et al2022 | | 0.61 | 36 | 0.45 | | 33 | 33.2% | 1.35 [1.00, 1.70] | |
| /iWen Ke2021 | 1.57 | 0.83 | 33 | 0.76 | 0.98 | 34 | 31.9% | 0.81 [0.38, 1.24] | |
| Total (95% CI) | | | 120 | | | 116 | 100.0% | 0.78 [0.03, 1.53] | ◆ |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.41 | ; Chi² = | 32.68, | df = 2 | (P < 0.0 | 0001) | ² = 94 | % | · · · · | -4 -2 0 2 4 |
| est for overall effect: Z = : | 2.03 (P = | = 0.04) | | | | | | | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| | | | | | | | | N | N |
| Study or Subgroup | | ontrol | | | TCE | Total | Weight | Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI | Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI |
| Study or Subgroup | | | | | | | | | |
| KiangFeng Deng2019 | | 0.58 | 51 | | 0.47 | 49 | 75.2% | and the second sec | |
| KinTing Wang et al2022 | | 0.78 | 36 | | 0.97 | 33 | 18.4% | | |
| /iWen Ke2021 | 1.5 | 1.83 | 33 | 0.76 | 0.98 | 34 | 6.4% | 0.74 [0.03, 1.45] | |
| Total (95% CI) | | | 120 | | | 116 | 100.0% | 0.44 [0.26, 0.62] | • |
| leterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.58 | df = 2 | (P = 0) | | = 0% | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect: Z = | A 100 A A 100 A | • | | 070 | | | | | -2 -1 0 1 2 |
| | | | , | | | | | | Favours [control] Favours [TCE] |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| KiangFeng Deng2019 KinTing Wang et al2022 | Mean 2.47 1.9 | 0.5 0.78 | 51 36 | <u>Mean</u> 2.24 1.28 | 0.43 1.07 | 49 33 | 49.9% 27.6% | Mean Difference <u>IV, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.23 [0.05, 0.41] 0.62 [0.17, 1.07] 0.68 [0.15, 1.21] | Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl |
| Study or Subgroup KiangFeng Deng2019 KinTing Wang et al2022 ⁄iWen Ke2021 | Mean 2.47 1.9 | SD 0.5 | 51 | <u>Mean</u> 2.24 | SD 0.43 1.07 | 49 | 49.9% | IV, Random, 95% CI 0.23 [0.05, 0.41] | |
| KiangFeng Deng2019 KinTing Wang et al2022 /iWen Ke2021 Fotal (95% CI) | Mean 2.47 1.9 1.09 | SD 0.5 0.78 1.33 | 51 36 33 120 | Mean 2.24 1.28 0.41 | SD 0.43 1.07 0.82 | 49 33 34 116 | 49.9% 27.6% | IV, Random, 95% Cl 0.23 [0.05, 0.41] 0.62 [0.17, 1.07] | |
| KiangFeng Deng2019 KinTing Wang et al2022 /ïWen Ke2021 Fotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.04 | Mean 2.47 1.9 1.09 | SD 0.5 0.78 1.33 4.44, c | 51 36 33 120 If = 2 (F | Mean 2.24 1.28 0.41 | SD 0.43 1.07 0.82 | 49 33 34 116 | 49.9% 27.6% 22.5% | IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.23 [0.05, 0.41] 0.62 [0.17, 1.07] 0.68 [0.15, 1.21] | |
| KiangFeng Deng2019 KinTing Wang et al2022 /iWen Ke2021 Fotal (95% CI) | Mean 2.47 1.9 1.09 | SD 0.5 0.78 1.33 4.44, c | 51 36 33 120 If = 2 (F | Mean 2.24 1.28 0.41 | SD 0.43 1.07 0.82 | 49 33 34 116 | 49.9% 27.6% 22.5% | IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.23 [0.05, 0.41] 0.62 [0.17, 1.07] 0.68 [0.15, 1.21] | IV. Random, 95% CI |
| KiangFeng Deng2019 KinTing Wang et al2022 /ïWen Ke2021 Fotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.04 | Mean 2.47 1.9 1.09 | SD 0.5 0.78 1.33 4.44, c | 51 36 33 120 If = 2 (F | Mean 2.24 1.28 0.41 | SD 0.43 1.07 0.82 | 49 33 34 116 | 49.9% 27.6% 22.5% | IV. Random, 95% Cl 0.23 [0.05, 0.41] 0.62 [0.17, 1.07] 0.68 [0.15, 1.21] | IV. Random. 95% CI |
| KiangFeng Deng2019 KinTing Wang et al2022 (iWen Ke2021 Fotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.04 Fest for overall effect: Z = 5 | Mean 2.47 1.9 1.09 | SD 0.5 0.78 1.33 4.44, c = 0.007 | 51 36 33 120 If = 2 (F 7) | Mean 2.24 1.28 0.41 | <u>SD</u> 0.43 1.07 0.82); I ² = | 49 33 34 116 55% | 49.9% 27.6% 22.5% 100.0% | <u>IV, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.23 [0.05, 0.41] 0.62 [0.17, 1.07] 0.68 [0.15, 1.21] 0.44 [0.12, 0.76] | IV, Random, 95% CI |
| KiangFeng Deng2019 KinTing Wang et al2022 (iWen Ke2021 Fotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.04 Fest for overall effect: Z = 3 Study or Subgroup | Mean 2.47 1.9 1.09 4; Chi ² = 2.69 (P = | SD 0.5 0.78 1.33 4.44, c = 0.007 | 51 36 33 120 If = 2 (F ') | Mean 2.24 1.28 0.41 P = 0.11 | <u>SD</u> 0.43 1.07 0.82); I ² = | 49 33 34 116 55% | 49.9% 27.6% 22.5% 100.0% | IV, Random, 95% CI 0.23 [0.05, 0.41] 0.62 [0.17, 1.07] 0.68 [0.15, 1.21] 0.44 [0.12, 0.76] | IV, Random, 95% CI |
| KiangFeng Deng2019 KinTing Wang et al2022 (iWen Ke2021 Fotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.04 Fest for overall effect: Z = 3 Study or Subgroup XiangFeng Deng2019 | <u>Mean</u> 2.47 1.9 1.09 4; Chi ² = 2.69 (P = 2.69 (P = 2.43 | <u>SD</u> 0.5 0.78 1.33 4.44, c = 0.007 Contro <u>n SE</u> 3 0.53 | 51 36 33 120 if = 2 (f ')) <u>Tota</u> 5 5 | <u>Mean</u> 2.24 1.28 0.41 P = 0.11 P = 0.11 | SD 0.43 1.07 0.82); I ² = TCE <u>SI</u> 1 0.75 | 49 33 34 116 555% | 49.9% 27.6% 22.5% 100.0% | IV, Random, 95% CI 0.23 [0.05, 0.41] 0.62 [0.17, 1.07] 0.68 [0.15, 1.21] 0.44 [0.12, 0.76] Hean Difference IV, Random, 95% Ci 0.33 [0.07, 0.59] | IV, Random, 95% CI |
| KiangFeng Deng2019 KinTing Wang et al2022 (iWen Ke2021 Fotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.04 Fest for overall effect: Z = 5 Study or Subgroup | Mean 2.47 1.9 1.09 ; Chi ² = 2.69 (P = 2.69 (P = 2.43 1.3 | SD 0.5 0.78 1.33 4.44, c = 0.007 | 51 36 33 120 if = 2 (f ')) <u>Tota</u> 57 36 | Mean 2.24 1.28 0.41 P = 0.11 P = 0.11 I Mean I 2.7 5 0.7 | SD 0.43 1.07 0.82); I ² = | 49 33 34 116 555% | 49.9% 27.6% 22.5% 100.0% | IV, Random, 95% CI 0.23 [0.05, 0.41] 0.62 [0.17, 1.07] 0.68 [0.15, 1.21] 0.44 [0.12, 0.76] IV, Random, 95% CI 0.33 [0.07, 0.59] 1.20 [0.73, 1.67] | IV, Random, 95% CI |
| KiangFeng Deng2019 KinTing Wang et al2022 FiWen Ke2021 Fotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.04 Fest for overall effect: Z = 5 Study or Subgroup XiangFeng Deng2019 XinTing Wang et al2022 YiWen Ke2021 | Mean 2.47 1.9 1.09 ; Chi ² = 2.69 (P = 2.69 (P = 2.43 1.3 | $\frac{SD}{0.5} = 0.78$ 1.33 4.44, c = 0.007 Control SE 3 0.53 9 1.01 | 51 36 33 120 if = 2 (f ')) <u>Tota</u> 57 36 | Mean 2.24 1.28 0.41 P = 0.11 P = 0.11 1 2.7 3 0.76 | SD 0.43 1.07 0.82); I ² = TCE <u>SI</u> 1 0.79 7 0.95 | 49 33 34 116 555% | 49.9% 27.6% 22.5% 100.0% | IV, Random, 95% CI 0.23 [0.05, 0.41] 0.62 [0.17, 1.07] 0.68 [0.15, 1.21] 0.44 [0.12, 0.76] IV, Random, 95% CI 0.33 [0.07, 0.59] 1.20 [0.73, 1.67] 0.57 [0.05, 1.09] | IV, Random, 95% CI |
| KiangFeng Deng2019 KinTing Wang et al2022 (iWen Ke2021 Fotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.04 Fest for overall effect: Z = 3 <u>Study or Subgroup</u> XiangFeng Deng2019 XinTing Wang et al2022 | Mean 2.47 1.9 1.09 ; Chi ² = 2.69 (P = 2.69 (I = 2.43 1.33 18; Chi ² | $\frac{\text{SD}}{0.5}$ 0.78 1.33 4.44, c = 0.007 | 51 36 33 120 if = 2 (f) Tota 57 36 37 36 37 36 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 | Mean 2.24 1.28 0.41 P = 0.11 P = 0.11 1 2.7 3 0.76 0 | SD 0.43 1.07 0.82); I ² = TCE <u>SI</u> 1 0.75 7 0.97 3 0.98 | 49 33 34 116 555% 555% 49 49 33 34 116 | 49.9% 27.6% 22.5% 100.0% 38.2% 31.8% 30.0% | IV, Random, 95% CI 0.23 [0.05, 0.41] 0.62 [0.17, 1.07] 0.68 [0.15, 1.21] 0.44 [0.12, 0.76] IV, Random, 95% CI 0.33 [0.07, 0.59] 1.20 [0.73, 1.67] 0.57 [0.05, 1.09] | IV, Random, 95% CI |
| KiangFeng Deng2019 KinTing Wang et al2022 (iWen Ke2021 Fotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.04 Fest for overall effect: Z = 5 XiangFeng Deng2019 XinTing Wang et al2022 YiWen Ke2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. | Mean 2.47 1.9 1.09 ; Chi ² = 2.69 (P = 2.69 (I = 2.43 1.33 18; Chi ² | $\frac{SD}{0.5}$ 0.78 1.33 4.44, c = 0.007 Control SE 3 0.53 9 1.01 3 1.19 = 10.0 | 51 36 33 120 if = 2 (f) Tota 57 36 37 36 37 36 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 | Mean 2.24 1.28 0.41 P = 0.11 P = 0.11 1 2.7 3 0.76 0 | SD 0.43 1.07 0.82); I ² = TCE <u>SI</u> 1 0.75 7 0.97 3 0.98 | 49 33 34 116 555% 555% 49 49 33 34 116 | 49.9% 27.6% 22.5% 100.0% 38.2% 31.8% 30.0% | IV, Random, 95% CI 0.23 [0.05, 0.41] 0.62 [0.17, 1.07] 0.68 [0.15, 1.21] 0.44 [0.12, 0.76] IV, Random, 95% CI 0.33 [0.07, 0.59] 1.20 [0.73, 1.67] 0.57 [0.05, 1.09] | IV, Random, 95% CI |

anaerobic threshold level, and 6MWD, both of which represented an increase in patients' exercise endurance and intensity. This may be because abdominal breathing in some movements of gong methods such as Yi Jin Jing and Taijiquan can regulate parasympathetic activity and heart rate variability, thus improving cardiopulmonary function (37). At the same time, abdominal breathing will increase the range of diaphragm movement, increase the maximum ventilation and reduce the residual volume, improve the hypoxia state during exercise and increase exercise endurance (38). Of interest is that in the subgroup analysis of 6MWD, the results showed that those with ≤ 3 months of intervention were more statistically significant compared to those with >3 months of intervention. However, since there were only three studies with an intervention period >3 months, there may be a bias in the results, and more long-period intervention trial studies are needed to support this result in the future.

6.3. Reducing symptom clusters and improving QOL

A previous study Huang et al. (39) has shown that patients' symptoms and quality of life are closely related. Meta-analysis results showed that fatigue, shortness of breath, swelling of the face and limbs, and palpitations improved in the individual TCM symptom scores of patients; however, since only three studies were included for each outcome, there may be false negatives. TCEs can stimulate yang, regulate qi and blood, regulate vital qi of human meridians and viscera, reduce heart burden, improve the ability of transporting and utilizing oxygen in human blood circulation, thus reducing oxygen consumption of myocardium, alleviating dyspnea symptoms of heart failure and improving quality of life (40). TCEs like Tai Ji can effectively promote the excitement of the right hemisphere, inhibit the activity of the left hemisphere, increase the α brain waves, endorphins and catecholamines of practitioners, make practitioners feel pleasant and enhance their quality of life (41, 42). The results suggest that TCEs can be effective in improving the QOL, and the timing of the intervention may be a source of heterogeneity; however, further discussion is needed.

7. Limitations of the study

Slight differences in the intervention protocols and sample population characteristics due to the included studies may lead to increased heterogeneity of the results. In the case of physiological index measurements, the use of different instruments may lead to differences in the results and bias in measurement. In terms of QOL, single TCM symptom scores and subjective research instruments were mostly used, and the lack of uniform criteria may have affected the reliability of the results. In addition, flaws in the included studies, such as the inability to perform hidden allocation, failure to elaborate on whether measurement bias was performed, and follow-up bias may have affected the reliability of the results.

8. Summary

The present study clarified the beneficial effects of subjecting patients with CHF to TCEs on their recovery, mainly by enhancing LVEF, VO₂max, anaerobic threshold, quality of life, and singleitem TCM scores (fatigue, shortness of breath, floating limbs, and palpitations) in patients with CHF. However, the source of heterogeneity in the quality of life is unclear. Future research can be compared according to patients' different cardiac function grades, so as to provide more specific exercise recommendations for patients with heart failure. Also more high-quality, largesample RCTs are needed to specifically analyse the above outcome indicators for further quantitative clinical promotion of TCEs in the rehabilitation of patients with CHF.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Author contributions

MD and ZL: conceptualization and methodology. MD: data curation and analysis and original writing. SH and HC: review and editing. JY, DG, and WL: data curation and validation. All authors have made substantive contributions to this study in regard to design and implementation, read, and approved the final manuscript.

Conflict of interest

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.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Supplementary material

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2023. 1139483/full#supplementary-material

References

1. Heart Failure Group of Chinese Society of Cardiology of Chinese Medical Association, Chinese Heart Failure Association of Chinese Medical Doctor Association, Editorial Board of Chinese Journal of Cardiology. Chinese guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of heart failure 2018. *Chin J Cardiol.* (2018) 46:760–89. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.0253-3758.2018. 10.004

2. Peng Y, Jinlei Q, Yunning L, Jiangmei L, Jie L, Xinying Z, et al. 2005~2017 China burden of disease research report. *Chin Circulation J.* (2019) 34:1145–54.

3. Bragazzi NL, Zhong W, Shu J, Much AA, Lotan D, Grupper A, et al. Burden of heart failure and underlying causes in 195 countries and territories from 1990 to 2017. *Eur J Prev Cardiol.* (2021) 28:1682–90. doi: 10.1093/eurjpc/zwaa147

4. Ades PA, Keteyian SJ, Balady GJ, Houston-Miller N, Kitzman DW, Mancini DM, et al. Cardiac rehabilitation exercise and self-care for chronic heart failure. *JACC Heart Fail*. (2013) 1:540–7. doi: 10.1016/j.jchf.2013.09.002

5. Knuuti J, Wijns W, Saraste A, Capodanno D, Barbato E, Funck-Brentano C, et al. 2019 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of chronic coronary syndromes. *Eur Heart J.* (2020) 41:407–77. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehz425

6. Mian J, Zheng Zhen W, et al. The origin and development of TCM exercise prescription. *J Sport sci.* (2017) 37:65–71+89.

7. Lei Y, Mingjie C. Influence of traditional guided health care on physical quality and physiological function of the elderly. *Chin J Gerontol.* (2012) 32:834–5.

8. Song Y, Li J, István B, Xuan R, Wei S, Zhong G, et al. Current evidence on traditional chinese exercises for quality of life in patients with essential hypertension: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* (2021) 7:627518. doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2020.627518

9. Chen BL, Guo JB, Liu MS, Li X, Zou J, Chen X, et al. Effect of traditional Chinese exercise on gait and balance for stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE.* (2015) 10:e0135932. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone. 0135932

10. Wu YH, He WB, Gao YY, Han XM. Effects of traditional Chinese exercises and general aerobic exercises on older adults with sleep disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Integr Med.* (2021) 19:493–502. doi: 10.1016/j.joim.2021. 09.007

11. Xiuqin Z, Jun H. Application of traditional exercises in early cardiac rehabilitation with chronic cardiac insufficiency. J Shanghai Univ Traditional Chin. (2018) 32:92–96. doi: 10.16306/j.1008-861x.2018.05.020

12. Chen X, Jiang W, Olson TP, Lundborg CS, Wen Z, Lu W, et al. Feasibility and preliminary effects of the besmile-hf program on chronic heart failure patients: a pilot randomized controlled trial. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* (2021) 8:715207. doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2021.715207

13. Hongjie L. Clinical efficacy of tai chi exercise in the treatment of chronic heart failure in coronary heart disease (MA thesis). Guangzhou University of Chinese Medicine (2017).

14. Chengdong Y, Fu L, Yibing M. The effect of tai chi exercises on the rehabilitation of patients with chronic heart failure. *Chinese J Cardiovasc Rehabil Med.* (2010) 19:364–7.

15. Lei Z, Yanrong X, Qiao Z, Yanxia C. Clinical study on the effects of Baduan Jin on cardiac function and psychology in patients with heart failure. *Contin Med Educ.* (2022) 36:137–40. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1004-6763.2022.01.035

16. Hanxuan Y, Dongmei Y, Shiheng Z, Xuejun D. Effects of Tai Chi rehabilitation exercise on cardiac function and blood lipid levels in elderly patients with congestive heart failure. *Chinese J Cardiovasc Rehab Med.* (2021) 30:382–7. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1008-0074.2021.04.03

17. Yiwen K. Clinical efficacy of Yiji Jing in patients with chronic heart failure (MA thesis). Fujian University of Chinese Medicine (2021).

18. Xuejiao H. Baduan Jin is used in the clinical study of patients with chronic heart failure with coronary heart disease (MA thesis). Fujian University of Chinese Medicine (2020).

19. Xianghui X, Xu D. Efficacy of Baduan Jin in patients with chronic heart failure with coronary heart disease. *Modern Med J China.* (2016) 18:55–6. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1672-9463.2016.05.016

20. Wei Q, Liping S, Zhiting L, Lei C, Huijun Z. Effects of eight dan jin on cardiac function and quality of life in patients with chronic heart failure. *BMJ*. (2020) 42:263–5.

21. Xiangfeng D. A clinical study of Baduan Jin on the rehabilitation of patients with chronic heart failure (MA thesis). Yunnan University of Chinese Medicine (2019).

22. Xinting W, Meijun J, Yongming L. Clinical efficacy of tai chi in patients with heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: a randomized controlled study. *Chin J Integr Traditional Western*. (2022) 42:961–7. doi: 10.7661/j.cjim.20210819.057

23. Qianyu L. Study on the effect of eight dan jin on the quality of life of heart failure patients in the vulnerable period (MA thesis). Guangxi University of Chinese Medicine (2022).

24. Huimin T. Clinical study of Baduan Nishiki exercise adjuvant therapy for chronic heart failure (MA thesis). Guangzhou University of Chinese Medicine (2019).

25. Liang Z, Chi Z, Xiankui W, Hongmei L, Xian W. The effect of fitness qigong six words on heart function in patients with chronic heart failure. *Chin J Evid Based Cardiovasc.* (2017) 9:659–62. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1674-4055.2017.06.05

26. Wenjun F. Effects of Tai Chi on cardiopulmonary function in patients with chronic heart failure (MA thesis). Liaoning University of Traditional Chinese Medicine (2017). doi: 10.3969/j.issn.0411-8421.2021.06.017

27. Li Y, Jiye J, et al. Study on the effect of Baduan Jin on cardiopulmonary rehabilitation in patients with chronic heart failure. *Zhejiang J Tradit Chin Med.* (2021) 56:423.

28. Yeh GY, Mu L, Davis RB, Wayne PM. Correlates of exercise self-efficacy in a randomized trial of mind-body exercise in patients with chronic heart failure. *J Cardiopulm Rehabil Prev.* (2016) 36:186–94. doi: 10.1097/HCR.000000000000170

29. Zibo S. Clinical study of the efficacy of Baduan Jin on rehabilitation in patients with chronic heart failure (MA thesis). Liaoning University of Traditional Chinese Medicine (2018).

30. Yeh GY, McCarthy EP, Wayne PM, Stevenson LW, Wood MJ, Forman D, et al. Tai chi exercise in patients with chronic heart failure: a randomized clinical trial. *Arch Intern Med.* (2011) 171:750–7. doi: 10.1001/archinternmed.2011.150

31. Cheng J-H, Wang Y-J, Chou S-S, Yeh M-L. [Chan-chuang qigong improves exercise capacity, depression, and quality of life in patients with heart failure]. *Hu Li Za Zhi*. (2018) 65:34–44. doi: 10.6224/JN.201810_65(5)0.06

32. Chen DM, Yu WC, Hung HF, Tsai JC, Wu HY, Chiou AF. The effects of Baduanjin exercise on fatigue and quality of life in patients with heart failure: a randomized controlled trial. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs.* (2018) 17:456-66. doi: 10.1177/1474515117744770

33. Ren X, Li Y, Yang X, Li J, Li H, Yuan Z, et al. The effects of tai chi training in patients with heart failure: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Physiol*. (2017) 8:989. doi: 10.3389/fphys.2017.00989

34. LinShu F, Tongqing Yao, et al. Effect of baduanjin on quality of life and exercise tolerance of elderly patients with heart failure and weakness. *Chinese J Rehab Med.* (2022) 37:108–11.

35. Youping H, Pin L. Mechanism of action of tai chi exercise on essential hypertension. J Anhui Normal Univ. (2012) 35:83-7.

36. Yufeng H. The effect of qigong on cardiac function in patients with ischemic stroke (MA thesis). Fujian University of Chinese Medicine (2022).

37. Kim E, Lee H. The effects of deep abdominal muscle strengthening exercises on respiratory function and lumbar stability. *J Phys Ther Sci.* (2013) 25:663–5. doi: 10.1589/jpts.25.663

38. Jiansheng W, Min S, et al. Study on physiological effects of tai ji chuan's reverse abdominal breathing. *J Beijing Sport Univ.* (2012) 35:67–70.

39. Huang TY, Moser DK, Hwang SL. Identification, associated factors, and prognosis of symptom clusters in taiwanese patients with heart failure. *J Nurs Res.* (2018) 26:60–7. doi: 10.1097/JNR.000000000000199

40. Xiong X, Wang P, Li S, Zhang Y, Li X. Effect of Baduanjin exercise for hypertension:a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Maturitas*. (2015) 80:370–8. doi: 10.1016/j.maturitas.2015.01.002

41. Hu L, Ping L. Meta-analysis of physical exercise in the treatment of depression. J Tianjin Univ Sport. (2018) 33:500–7.

42. Yang G, Li W, Cao H, Klupp N, Liu J, Bensoussan A, et al. Does Tai Chi improve psychological well being and quality of life in patients with cardiovascular disease and/or cardiovascular risk factors a systematic review protocol. *BMJ Open.* (2017) 7:1–7. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014507