

The Efficacy and Safety of Diyushengbai Tablet on Preventing and Treating Leukopenia Caused by Radiotherapy and Chemotherapy Against Tumor: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Jun Wang⁴*

Masaki Yasukawa, Ehime University, Japan

Reviewed by:

Mohammad Safiqul Islam, Noakhali Science and Technology University, Bangladesh Qi Wu, Xuzhou Medical University, China

*Correspondence:

Kaiyong Xie xky300@163.com Jun Wang junchundi@163.com

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

Specialty section:

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

Received: 02 December 2021 Accepted: 30 May 2022 Published: 19 July 2022

Citation:

Xu X, Li H, Hu X, Liu J, Zhao F, Xie K and Wang J (2022) The Efficacy and Safety of Diyushengbai Tablet on Preventing and Treating Leukopenia Caused by Radiotherapy and Chemotherapy Against Tumor: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Front. Pharmacol. 13:827710. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2022.827710 ¹Department of Oncology, Affiliated Hospital of Shandong University of Traditional Chinese Medicine (Shandong Provincial Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine), Jinan, China, ²Oncology Center, Sichuan Academy of Medical Sciences and Sichuan Provincial People's Hospital, Chengdu, China, ³Chengdu Di'ao Group Tianfu Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Chengdu, China,

Xiaoqing Xu^{1†}, Hongmin Li^{2†}, Xiwen Hu¹, Juan Liu³, Fang Zhao³, Kaiyong Xie^{3*} and

⁴Department of TCM Pharmacy, Chengdu Integrated TCM and Western Medicine Hospital, Chengdu, China

Background: Leukopenia is one of the side effects of radiotherapy and chemotherapy. Diyushengbai tablet (DYT) is used to prevent and treat leukopenia caused by various reasons. A meta-analysis was performed to systematically analyze the therapeutic effects of DYT on preventing and treating leukopenia caused by radiotherapy and chemotherapy.

Objectives: This study aimed to systematically evaluate the efficacy and safety of DYT in preventing and treating leukopenia caused by radiotherapy and chemotherapy.

Methods: We performed a comprehensive literature search of electronic databases such as PubMed, The Cochrane Library, China Knowledge Network (CNKI), China Biomedical Literature Database (CBM), Wanfang Data Knowledge Service Platform, and VIP, through November of 2021. The scanning reports deadline is until November 2021. The bias risk evaluation criteria developed by the Cochrane collaborative organization were used to evaluate the literature quality of the included studies. The RevMan5.4 software was used to analyze the data, and the Stata16.0 was used to perform the Egger test.

Results: After selecting all the databases, a total of 41 reports which involved 3,793 cases were analyzed. Meta-analysis showed that DYT could significantly reduce the white blood cell (WBC) suppression caused by radiotherapy and chemotherapy and improve the patients' WBC counts and neutrophils, compared with the efficacy of other oral WBC-elevating drugs such as Leucogen tablets and Batilol tablets and additional utilization of granulocyte colony-stimulating factor (G-CSF). The results of meta-analysis showed that for preventive medication purpose, the overall incidence of leukocyte suppression was [RR = 0.74, 95%CI (0.59, 0.92), p = 0.006], and the white blood cell count was [MD = 1.12, 95%CI (0.95, 1.29), p < 0.00001]; while for therapeutic purpose, the incidence of overall leukocyte suppression was [RR = 0.61, 95%CI (0.38, 0.95), p = 0.03], and the white blood

1

cell count was [MD = 1.20, 95%Cl (0.77, 1.62), ρ < 0.00001]. More importantly, the additional use of DYT can reduce the application amount of G-CSF. The results showed that the application of G-CSF can be reduced by an average of 1.57 from the beginning of treatment to return normal white blood cells around 2.23 in two cycles of chemotherapy.

Conclusion: DYT is more effective in preventing and treating leukopenia caused by radiotherapy and chemotherapy than other oral WBC-elevating drugs, which have a high clinical value.

Keywords: Diyushengbai tablet, tumor, radiotherapy and chemotherapy, meta-analysis, systematic review

1 INTRODUCTION

Malignant tumor is a common disease that can be harmful to people's health. Radiotherapy and chemotherapy are the effective as well as primary treatment methodologies. At the same time, there are many side effects during radiotherapy and chemotherapy due to the use of radiation and chemotherapeutic drugs (Chen et al., 2014; Tian et al., 2018). Leukopenia is one of the most common side effects, with a high incidence of 30%–50% (Li et al., 2015). It can affect the normal progress of treatment and even lead to failure because patients can be infected seriously.

Diyushengbai tablet (DYT) produced by Chengdu Di'ao Group Tianfu Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. is used to prevent and treat leukopenia caused by various reasons. Its main active ingredient is Sanguisorbae Radix recorded in Chinese Pharmacopoeia as the dry roots of Sanguisorba officinalis L. or Sanguisorba officinalis L. var. longifolia (Bert.) Yü et Li (Pharmacopoeia Commission Chinese, 2020). Many studies described that DYT could be used to prevent and treat myelosuppression caused by radiotherapy and chemotherapy in recent years. Also, it could raise the WBC counts as well as reduce the application amount of G-CSF effectively with no significant toxicity and side effects (Shi et al., 2018; Zhang and Shuai, 2019). A systematic review and meta-analysis were conducted to further figure out the efficacy and safety of DYT for preventing and treating leukopenia and provide more credible proof of evidence-based medicine.

2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Search Strategy

A search of PubMed, EMBASE, The Cochrane Library, China Knowledge Network (CNKI), China Biomedical Literature Database (CBM), WanFang Data Knowledge Service Platform, and VIP Database for Chinese Technical Periodicals (VIP) for trials up to November 2021 was conducted. We used full-text search keywords; the Chinese search terms included "Diyushengbai tablet (地榆升白片)" while the English term was "Diyushengbai tablet" or "Diyushengbaipian."

2.2 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion criteria: 1) Chinese or English studies of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with subjects receiving radiotherapy and/

or chemotherapy. The treatment group took DYT or combined with G-CSF, while the control group received placebo, other WBC-elevating drugs, G-CSF alone, or no treatment. 2) Studies were reported with specific and intact data including basic information of each group, number of cases, interventions, treatment courses, clinical outcomes, etc. 3) Clinical outcomes included white blood cells (or neutrophils) or suppression rate. Both WBC and blood platelet suppression rate refer to WHO adverse events degree criteria, while the WBC effective rate refers to the criteria in Guideline for Traditional Chinese Medicine Clinical Practice enacted by Ministry of Health of the People's Republic of China, which are as follow: marked effectiveness, for the total amount of WBC >4.0 \times 10⁹/L and last for a week after the withdrawal with remarkable remission or disappearance of clinical symptoms; general effectiveness, for the total amount of WBC $<4.0 \times 10^{9}$ /L, but increase (0.5–1.0) $\times 10^{9}$ /L compared to before, and last for a week after the withdrawal with the improvement of clinical symptoms. Ineffectiveness, for the increment of WBC $<0.5 \times 10^9$ /L. It is also feasible to refer to other criteria in accordance with the above.

Exclusion criteria: 1) Cases complicated with any serious internal diseases, such as cardiac, cerebral, and renal injury; 2) the design of the research was combined with other WBC-elevating treatments; 3) there was no control group or self-control only; 4) articles were about cohort study, animal experiment, clinical experience, etc.; 5) conference articles; 6) graduation papers.

The intervention was split into three subgroups according to different treatments of the control group: Subgroup 1, no application of any other WBC-elevating drug in the control group; Subgroup 2, application of at least one WBC-elevating drug except DYT; Subgroup 3, application of G-CSF or G-CSF as needed. The purpose of medication was divided into preventive and therapeutic, according to the intervention time of DYT therapy. For preventive medication, the treatment intervened before or at the same time of the radiotherapy and chemotherapy with WBC within the normal range, while as for therapeutic medication, the treatment intervened after the radiotherapy and chemotherapy with WBC under the normal range. The diagnostic criterion of leukopenia was that the WBC count was less than $4.0 \times 10^9/L$ continuously for at least 2 weeks.

2.3 Risk Assessment and Data Extraction

Studies were assessed, and data were extracted by two researchers, respectively. Once disagreements were aroused, the third

researcher would get into the discussion and make the final decision. According to the well-designed data extraction form, information of studies was collected, which included authors, year of publication, number of cases, interventions, clinical outcomes, allocation methods, etc.

The Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool was used to evaluate the literature quality of the included studies, including randomization, allocation concealment, blinding, withdrawal, and loss to follow-up. Two researchers cross-checked the evaluation results, and once their opinions did not meet, the third researcher would help make the final call. Original authors were contacted to obtain the missing data in necessity.

2.4 Analysis Methods

RevMan5.4 was used to analyze the data and draw the funnel plots. Risk ratio (RR) was the effect size of binary variables, while mean difference (MD) was the effect size of continuous variables. 95% confidence interval was calculated as well. Heterogeneity among studies was assessed using the Q test and the I^2 value to determine the degree of heterogeneity. The fixed effected model was adopted when studies showed a high homogeneity (p > 0.05, $I^2 < 50\%$); otherwise, meta-regression was used to analyze the sources of between-study heterogeneity, and a random-effects model was adopted. Sensitivity analysis was conducted to verify the stability of results by eliminating each study individually. Egger's test was used to evaluate whether each study had a publication bias. Egger's test, sensitivity analysis, and meta-regression analysis were completed with Stata SE 16.0.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Study Selection and Study Characteristics

A total of 598 articles were retrieved. Overall, 342 articles remained after deleting duplicate literature. Based on the titles and abstracts, an additional 273 studies were excluded for they were either non-clinical research, irrelevant research direction, combined with other drugs of raising leukocyte, animal experiments, graduation papers, or review. There were 69 fulltext articles left, from which we excluded 28 trials because they were not randomized, had irrelevant outcomes, had inconsistent interventions, or were duplicate publications. Therefore, a final total of 41 studies (Wang et al., 2003; Xu et al., 2003; Li et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2003; Ma, 2005; Xu et al., 2005; Zhu, 2005; Chen et al., 2006; Chen2 et al., 2006; Wang et al., 2006; Wang2 et al., 2006; Xu et al., 2006; Xu, 2006; Yin amd Kang, 2006; Li and Yang., 2007; Zeng et al., 2007; Zhao et al., 2007; Dong and Huang, 2010; Gong and Duan, 2010; Hu et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2010; Hui et al., 2011; Li et al., 2011; Liu, 2011; Wu, 2011; Yin et al., 2011; Li and Yang, 2012; Feng et al., 2013; Wang, 2013; Fu, 2014; Zhang, 2014; Jiang et al., 2015; Ming and Zhang, 2015; Weng et al., 2015; Chen, 2016; Zhao et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2017; Deng et al., 2018; Shi et al., 2018; Mou et al., 2019; Weng and Zeng, 2019) were included in our research (4-43), 19 of which were for therapeutic and the rest of which were for preventive (Figure 1)-involving 3,793 cases, among which 1,954 were allocated to the treatment group while the other 1,839 were in the control group. The names of the studies, first authors, years of publication, numbers of enrolled patients, experimental intervention and control groups, treatment time, and outcome data were extracted (**Table 1**).

3.2 Literature Quality

The risk of bias graph of included studies is shown in **Figure 2**. Among all 41 included RCT studies, 8 of them described the method for random sequence generation, in which 6 trials (Wang et al., 2006; Feng et al., 2013; Fu, 2014; Chen, 2016; Deng et al., 2018; Mou et al., 2019) used the random number table, 2 trails (Gong and Duan., 2010; Hu et al., 2010) adopted the sealed envelopes method, and 1 trail (Shi et al., 2018) used lottery, while the rest did not mention the randomization method. None of the researchers reported the method to conduct allocation concealment and blinding. In addition, withdrawal and loss to follow-up did not happen in any study.

3.3 Meta-Analysis Results of Preventive Medication

3.3.1 White Blood Cell Count

A total of 13 trials were included, of which five were with control group not receiving any treatment (Subgroup 1), two were exposed to other WBC-elevating drugs (Subgroup 2), and the rest were with G-CSF (Subgroup 3). The number of cases in treatment group and control group were 532 and 518, respectively. The heterogeneity differed in different groups for p < 0.0001, $I^2 = 70\%$ in total; p = 0.02, $I^2 = 67\%$ in Group 1. Metaregression showed that the heterogeneity of group 1 was not significantly related to the years of publication (p = 0.451), the duration of medication (p = 0.831), the number of case (p = 0.831)0.102), anti-tumor treatment (p = 0.359), the dose of DYT (p =0.109), study region (p = 0.491), hospital grade (p = 0.383); p =0.88, $I^2 = 0\%$ in Group 2; p = 0.34, $I^2 = 12\%$ in Group 3. The results of meta-analysis showed that [MD = 1.12, 95% CI (0.95, 1.29)], Z = 12.92 (p < 0.00001) in total; [MD = 1.23, 95%CI (1.06, 1.40)], Z = 14.05 (p < 0.00001) in Group 1. Sensitivity analysis showed that the results were stable, and the removal of each study had little effect on the overall results (Figure 17A), and Egger's test (p = 0.247) showed that the included studies were without significant publication bias; [MD = 0.88, 95%CI (0.71, 1.05)], $Z = 10.28 \ (p < 0.00001)$ in Group 2; [MD = 1.09, 95%CI (0.78, 1.39)], Z = 7.01 (p < 0.00001) in Group 3. Sensitivity analysis showed that the results were stable, and the removal of each study had little effect on the overall results (Figure 17B), and Egger's test (p = 0.687) showed that the included studies had no significant publication bias. The results implied that for preventive medication, the efficacy of DYT in improving WBC count was superior to the control group, the difference between two groups was statistically significant. The forest plot of metaanalysis is depicted in Figure 3.

3.3.2 Neutrophile Count

There were 3 trials involved in the analysis, two of them were studies in which no intervention was applied to the control



group (Subgroup 1), and the other one was the control group used with other drugs (Subgroup 2). The number of cases included was 130 and 118 in the treatment and control groups, respectively. The heterogeneity results revealed that no matter in total or in Subgroup 1, the heterogeneity was quite high (p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 99\%$ in total; p < 0.00001, $I^2 =$ 100% in Subgroup 1). Besides, for the overall effect in total, the meta-analysis result was [MD = 0.57, 95%CI (0.26, 0.88)], Z = 3.64 (p = 0.00003), while the result was [MD = 0.58, 95% CI (0.23, 0.92)], Z = 3.29 (p = 0.001) in Subgroup 1. All the results above hinted that for preventive medication, DYT performed better than the control group in raising neutrophile count, with statistically significant difference between the two groups. **Figure 4** shows the forest plot of the meta-analysis.

3.3.3 Platelet Count

Figure 5 depicts vividly that 6 trials were enrolled in total, of which three belonged to Subgroup 1 (no intervention applied in control group), one pertained to Subgroup 2 (using other WBC-elevating drugs), and the other two were in Subgroup 3 (using G-CSF as needed). The number of cases in the treatment group were 245, while there were 239 cases in the control group. It was hinted that the total heterogeneity was p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 98\%$, and the heterogeneity of Subgroup 1 was p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 95\%$, while that of Subgroup 3 was p = 0.45, $I^2 = 0\%$. The results of meta-analysis were as listed, [MD = 32.29, 95%CI (13.38, 51.20)], Z = 3.35 (p = 0.0008) in total, [MD = 53.56, 95%CI (5.37, 101.74)], Z = 2.18 (p = 0.03) in Subgroup 1, [MD = 1.85, 95%CI (-1.14, 4.85)], Z = 1.21 (p = 0.23) in Subgroup 3. Overall, the efficacy of DYT was significantly superior to the control group in improving platelet count.

TABLE 1 | Information of included studies.

Included studies	No.(T/C)	Treatment group	Control group	Course of treatment	Dose of DYT	Antitumor interventions	Clinical outcomes	Medication purpose	Subgroup
Xiangbo Wang et al. (2003)	35/34	DYT	_	4 weeks	0.3 g tid	radical RT	134	Preventive	1
Ninghong Xu et al. (2003)	66/62	DYT	Leucogen tablets	Till WBC level back to normal	0.2–0.4 g tid	RT and/or CT	6	Therapeutic	2
Youming Li et al. (2004)	33/30	DYT	G-CSF as needed	Till WBC level ≥5 × 10 ⁹ /L	0.4 g tid	CT	1345	Preventive	3
Shijin Wang (2004)	72/48	DYT	_	3 weeks	0.3 g tid	CT	16	Therapeutic	1
Qiang Ma (2005)	90/90	DYT	Batilol tablets	Same as the chemoradiotherapy	0.3 g tid	RT and/or CT	134	Preventive	2
Xinhua Xu et al. (2005)	58/49	DYT	Vitamin B4 + Leucogen tablets	6 weeks	0.2 g tid	radical RT	1245	Preventive	2
Yu Zhu (2005)	62/58	DYT	Vitamin B4	20 days	0.3 g tid	radical RT	1	Therapeutic	2
Yong Chen et al. (2006)	50/46	DYT	Leucogen tablets	60 days	0.4 g tid	CT	6	Therapeutic	2
Zhiming Chen (2006)	28/32	DYT	G-CSF as needed	Till WBC level ≥5 × 10 ⁹ /L	0.4 g tid	CT	157	Preventive	3
Wei Wang (2006)	40/38	DYT	Leucogen Tablets	4 months	0.3 g tid	СТ	6	Preventive	2
Zhongsu Wang (2006)	65/40	DYT	Leucogen tablets	6 weeks	0.4 g tid	RT and/or CT	56	Therapeutic	2
Xiaodong Xu (2006)	72/86	DYT	Leucogen tablets + Batilol tablets	Same as the chemoradiotherapy	0.4 g tid	RT	5	Preventive	2
Hong Xu (2006)	45/40	DYT	Batilol tablets	60 days	0.3 g tid	CT	6	Therapeutic	2
Liang Yin and Kang (2006)	55/55	DYT	Leucogen tablets + Batilol tablets	3 weeks	0.2–0.4 g tid	CT	6	Therapeutic	2
Hong Li and Yang, (2007)	46/42	DYT	Leucogen tablets + Batilol tablets	40 days	0.4 g tid	CT	0	Preventive	2
Zhaoyu Zeng (2007)	32/37	DYT	G-CSF as needed	Till WBC level ≥5 × 10 ⁹ /L	0.4 g tid	CT	190	Preventive	3
Weiyong Zhao (2007)	30/30	DYT + G-CSF	Leucogen tablets + G-CSF	Same as the chemoradiotherapy	0.4 g tid	RT	6	Therapeutic	3
Ying Dong and Huang, (2010)	33/30	DYT	G-CSF as needed	Till WBC level ≥10 × 10 ⁹ /L	0.4 g tid	CT	147	Preventive	3
Jianyi Gong (2010)	47/45	DYT	G-CSF as needed	3 weeks	0.4 g tid	CT	5	Preventive	3
Qian Hu (2010)	17/16	DYT	G-CSF as needed	Till WBC level back to normal	0.4 g tid	СТ	134	Preventive	3
Fei Wang (2010)	120/100	DYT	Leucogen tablets	2 months	0.3 g tid	СТ	6	Therapeutic	2
Hui Shuang (2011) Zhigang Li	40/40	DYT	G-CSF as needed	6 weeks	0.4 g tid	СТ СТ	50	Preventive	3
Zhigang Li (2011) Yangfan Liu	36/34 65/68	DYT	G-CSF as needed Leucogen	Till WBC level back to normal Same as the	0.4 g tid 0.4 g tid	RT	60 6	Therapeutic Preventive	3 2
(2011) Yangdong Wu	35/33	DYT	tablets G-CSF as	chemoradiotherapy Till WBC level ≥5 ×	0.4 g tid	CT	05	Preventive	3
(2011) Xiaodong Yin	45/45	DYT	needed Leucogen	10 ⁹ /L Till WBC level back to	0.4 g tid	СТ	6	Preventive	2
(2011) Qiumei Li (2012)	45/45	DYT	Tablets	normal Same as the	0.4 g tid	RT and/or CT	000	Preventive	2
Chun Feng	26/22	DYT	— G-CSF as	chemoradiotherapy 16 weeks	NR	CT	00	Therapeutic	3
(2013) Renxiao Wang	20/22	DYT + G-CSF	needed G-CSF as	63 days	NR	СТ	00	Therapeutic	3
(2013) Liran Fu (2014)	35/32	DYT	needed Batilol tablets +	21 days	0.3 g tid	RT	06	Therapeutic	2
	60/60	DYT	Vitamin B4	60 days	0.3 g tid	СТ	6	Therapeutic	2
	60/60	DYT	Vitamin B4	60 days	0.3 g tid	СТ		Therapeutic ontinued on follo	

TABLE 1 | (Continued) Information of included studies.

Included studies	No.(T/C)	Treatment group	Control group	Course of treatment	Dose of DYT	Antitumor interventions	Clinical outcomes	Medication purpose	Subgroup
Jingjing Zhang (2014)			Leucogen tablets						
Danxian Jiang (2015)	30/29	DYT	_	21 weeks	0.4 g tid	CT	134	Preventive	1
Bangchun Ming (2015)	45/45	DYT	G-CSF as needed	2–3 weeks	0.3 g tid	RT and/or CT	156	Therapeutic	3
Yijie Weng (2015)	32/29	DYT	_	18 weeks	0.4 g tid	CT	28	Preventive	1
Yuanqian Chen (2016)	37/41	DYT + G-CSF	G-CSF as needed	21 days	0.4 g tid	RT and/or CT	12	Therapeutic	3
Hong Qiao (2017)	50/50	DYT	Batilol tablets	60 days	0.3 g tid	CT	6	Therapeutic	2
Wenjuan Wang (2017)	100/84	DYT + G-CSF	G-CSF as needed	Till WBC level back to normal	0.2 g tid	CT	1	Therapeutic	3
Bo Deng (2018)	40/40	DYT	_	5 weeks	0.4 g tid	adjuvant RT	28	Preventive	1
Shi et al. (2018)	56/56	DYT	_	4 weeks	0.4 g tid	RT	19	Preventive	1
Daying Mou (2019)	40/40	DYT	_	9 weeks	0.4 g tid	CT	13459	Preventive	1
Jianfeng Weng (2019)	21/21	DYT + G-CSF as needed	G-CSF as needed	21 days	0.2–0.3 g tid	CT	1	Therapeutic	3

Note: No., number of participants; T, treatment group; C, control group; DYT, Diyushengbai tablet; RT, radiotherapy; CT, chemotherapy; NR, not reported. Outcome Indicators: ① white blood cell count; ② neutrophil count; ③ blood platelet count; ④ hemoglobin count; ⑤ white blood cell suppression rate; ⑥ white blood cell effective rate; ⑦ application number of G-CSF; ⑧ immune factor; ⑨ tumor effective rate.



3.3.4 Hemoglobin Count

The meta-analysis of hemoglobin count (shown in **Figure 6**) took altogether seven trials into account with 336 cases in treatment group and 318 cases in control

group. Among all 7 trials, 3 were categorized in Subgroup 1, 2 belonged to Subgroup 2, and the rest 3 trials belonged to Subgroup 3. The heterogeneity results were p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 94\%$ in total, p = 0.01, $I^2 =$

	Exp	eriment	al	C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl
1.1.1 No intervention									
Wang et al.,2003	4.4	0.39	35	3	0.28	34	14.5%	1.40 [1.24, 1.56] 2003	•
Li et al.,2012	4.35	1.17	45	3.03	1.38	42	6.2%	1.32 [0.78, 1.86] 2012	
Jiang et al.,2015	3.6	0.6	30	2.6	0.4	29	12.0%	1.00 [0.74, 1.26] 2015	-
Shi et al.,2018	4.32	0.26	56	2.98	0.17	56	16.0%	1.34 [1.26, 1.42] 2018	
Mu et al.,2019	4.53	1.031	40	3.69	0.861	40	8.3%	0.84 [0.42, 1.26] 2019	
Subtotal (95% CI)			206			201	56.9%	1.23 [1.06, 1.40]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.02; Ch	i ² = 12.	11, df =	4 (P =	0.02); 1	2 = 67%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 14.0	5 (P < 0	.00001)					
1.1.2 other oral medi			1.00		1.5				
Xu et al.,2005	3.57	2.76	58	2.62	1.8	49	3.1%	0.95 [0.08, 1.82] 2005	
Ma,2005	4.32	0.82	90	3.44	0.13	90	14.2%	0.88 [0.71, 1.05] 2005	
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =			148			139	17.3%	0.88 [0.71, 1.05]	•
			.00001						
1.1.3 G-CSF				<i>.</i>					
1.1.3 G-CSF _i et al.,2004	5.34	1.47	33	4.6	1.16	30	4.8%	0.74 [0.09, 1.39] 2004	
_i et al.,2004					1.16 1.73	30 32	4.8% 3.1%		- <u>-</u>
	5.34	1.47	33	4.6				0.74 [0.09, 1.39] 2004 1.45 [0.59, 2.31] 2006 1.28 [0.53, 2.03] 2007	
Li et al.,2004 Chen2 et al.,2006 Zeng et al.,2007	5.34 5.33	1.47 1.68	33 28	4.6 3.88	1.73	32	3.1%	1.45 [0.59, 2.31] 2006	
Li et al.,2004 Chen2 et al.,2006 Zeng et al.,2007 Hu et al.,2010	5.34 5.33 5.21	1.47 1.68 1.47	33 28 32	4.6 3.88 3.93	1.73 1.71	32 37	3.1% 3.9%	1.45 [0.59, 2.31] 2006 1.28 [0.53, 2.03] 2007	
∟i et al.,2004 Chen2 et al.,2006	5.34 5.33 5.21 5.34	1.47 1.68 1.47 1.47	33 28 32 17	4.6 3.88 3.93 4.6	1.73 1.71 1.16	32 37 16	3.1% 3.9% 2.9%	1.45 [0.59, 2.31]20061.28 [0.53, 2.03]20070.74 [-0.16, 1.64]2010	
Li et al.,2004 Chen2 et al.,2006 Zeng et al.,2007 Hu et al.,2010 Dong et al.,2010 Wu,2011	5.34 5.33 5.21 5.34 5.34	1.47 1.68 1.47 1.47 1.47	33 28 32 17 33	4.6 3.88 3.93 4.6 4.6	1.73 1.71 1.16 1.16	32 37 16 30	3.1% 3.9% 2.9% 4.8%	1.45 [0.59, 2.31]20061.28 [0.53, 2.03]20070.74 [-0.16, 1.64]20100.74 [0.09, 1.39]2010	
Li et al.,2004 Chen2 et al.,2006 Zeng et al.,2007 Hu et al.,2010 Dong et al.,2010	5.34 5.33 5.21 5.34 5.34 5.21	1.47 1.68 1.47 1.47 1.47 1.23	33 28 32 17 33 35 178	4.6 3.88 3.93 4.6 4.6 3.73	1.73 1.71 1.16 1.16 1.07	32 37 16 30 33 178	3.1% 3.9% 2.9% 4.8% 6.1%	1.45 [0.59, 2.31] 2006 1.28 [0.53, 2.03] 2007 0.74 [-0.16, 1.64] 2010 0.74 [0.09, 1.39] 2010 1.48 [0.93, 2.03] 2011	
_i et al.,2004 Chen2 et al.,2006 Zeng et al.,2007 Hu et al.,2010 Dong et al.,2010 Mu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI)	5.34 5.33 5.21 5.34 5.34 5.21 0.02; Ch	1.47 1.68 1.47 1.47 1.47 1.23	33 28 32 17 33 35 178 7, df = 5	4.6 3.88 3.93 4.6 4.6 3.73 5 (P = 0	1.73 1.71 1.16 1.16 1.07	32 37 16 30 33 178	3.1% 3.9% 2.9% 4.8% 6.1%	1.45 [0.59, 2.31] 2006 1.28 [0.53, 2.03] 2007 0.74 [-0.16, 1.64] 2010 0.74 [0.09, 1.39] 2010 1.48 [0.93, 2.03] 2011	
Li et al.,2004 Chen2 et al.,2006 Zeng et al.,2007 Hu et al.,2010 Dong et al.,2010 Mu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	5.34 5.33 5.21 5.34 5.34 5.21 0.02; Ch	1.47 1.68 1.47 1.47 1.47 1.23	33 28 32 17 33 35 178 7, df = 5	4.6 3.88 3.93 4.6 4.6 3.73 5 (P = 0	1.73 1.71 1.16 1.16 1.07	32 37 16 30 33 178 = 12%	3.1% 3.9% 2.9% 4.8% 6.1% 25.8%	1.45 [0.59, 2.31] 2006 1.28 [0.53, 2.03] 2007 0.74 [-0.16, 1.64] 2010 0.74 [0.09, 1.39] 2010 1.48 [0.93, 2.03] 2011 1.09 [0.78, 1.39] 2011	
Li et al.,2004 Chen2 et al.,2006 Zeng et al.,2007 Hu et al.,2010 Dong et al.,2010 Mu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI)	5.34 5.33 5.21 5.34 5.34 5.21 0.02; Ch Z = 7.01	1.47 1.68 1.47 1.47 1.23 ii ² = 5.65 (P < 0.0	33 28 32 17 33 35 178 7, df = 5 00001) 532	4.6 3.88 3.93 4.6 4.6 3.73 5 (P = 0	1.73 1.71 1.16 1.16 1.07 .34); I ²	32 37 16 30 33 178 = 12% 518	3.1% 3.9% 2.9% 4.8% 6.1% 25.8%	1.45 [0.59, 2.31] 2006 1.28 [0.53, 2.03] 2007 0.74 [-0.16, 1.64] 2010 0.74 [0.09, 1.39] 2010 1.48 [0.93, 2.03] 2011	• •
Li et al.,2004 Chen2 et al.,2006 Zeng et al.,2007 Hu et al.,2010 Dong et al.,2010 Mu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	5.34 5.33 5.21 5.34 5.34 5.21 0.02; Ch Z = 7.01	1.47 1.68 1.47 1.47 1.47 1.23 $ii^2 = 5.6i$ (P < 0.0) $ii^2 = 40.1$	33 28 32 17 33 35 178 7, df = { 00001) 532 59, df =	4.6 3.88 3.93 4.6 4.6 3.73 5 (P = 0	1.73 1.71 1.16 1.16 1.07 .34); I ²	32 37 16 30 33 178 = 12% 518	3.1% 3.9% 2.9% 4.8% 6.1% 25.8%	1.45 [0.59, 2.31] 2006 1.28 [0.53, 2.03] 2007 0.74 [-0.16, 1.64] 2010 0.74 [0.09, 1.39] 2010 1.48 [0.93, 2.03] 2011 1.09 [0.78, 1.39] 2011	→ → → → → → → → → → → → → →
Li et al.,2004 Chen2 et al.,2006 Zeng et al.,2007 Hu et al.,2010 Dong et al.,2010 Mu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI)	5.34 5.33 5.21 5.34 5.34 5.21 0.02; Ch Z = 7.01 0.05; Ch Z = 12.9	1.47 1.68 1.47 1.47 1.23 $ii^2 = 5.6i$ (P < 0.0) $ii^2 = 40.9$ 2 $(P < 0)$	33 28 32 17 33 35 178 7, df = 5 00001) 532 59, df =	4.6 3.88 3.93 4.6 4.6 3.73 5 (P = 0	1.73 1.71 1.16 1.16 1.07 .34); I ²	32 37 16 30 33 178 = 12% 518 1); l ² = 7	3.1% 3.9% 2.9% 4.8% 6.1% 25.8%	1.45 [0.59, 2.31] 2006 1.28 [0.53, 2.03] 2007 0.74 [-0.16, 1.64] 2010 0.74 [0.09, 1.39] 2010 1.48 [0.93, 2.03] 2011 1.09 [0.78, 1.39] 2011	-4 -2 0 2 4 Favours [control] Favours [experimental]

Mean Difference Experimental Control Mean Difference Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI Year IV. Random, 95% CI 1.2.1 No intervention Weng et al.,2015 1.4 0.06 32 1 0.05 29 40.5% 0.40 [0.37, 0.43] 2015 Deng et al.,2018 2.4 0.05 40 1.65 0.06 40 40.6% 0.75 [0.73, 0.77] 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) 72 69 81.1% 0.58 [0.23, 0.92] Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.06; Chi² = 348.80, df = 1 (P < 0.00001); l² = 100% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.29 (P = 0.001) 1.2.2 other oral medicines Xu et al.,2005 2.38 1.5 58 1.82 1.23 49 18.9% 0.56 [0.04, 1.08] 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) 0.56 [0.04, 1.08] 58 49 18.9% Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 2.12 (P = 0.03) Total (95% CI) 118 100.0% 0.57 [0.26, 0.88] 130 Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.06; Chi² = 348.82, df = 2 (P < 0.00001); l² = 99% -2 2 0 -4 Test for overall effect: Z = 3.64 (P = 0.0003) Favours [control] Favours [experimental] Test for subaroup differences: $Chi^2 = 0.00$. df = 1 (P = 0.96). $I^2 = 0\%$ FIGURE 4 | The forest plot of neutrophil count in preventive medication.

77% in Subgroup 1, p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 98\%$ in Subgroup 2, p = 1.00, and $I^2 = 0\%$ in Subgroup 3, respectively. The metaanalysis result of total was [MD = 3.88, 95%CI (-1.57, 9.33)], Z = 1.40 (p = 0.16), and that of Subgroup 1 was [MD = 5.04, 95%CI (-0.48, 10.57)], Z = 1.79 (p = 0.07). The results of Subgroup 2 and Subgroup 3 were [MD = 3.00, 95%CI (-14.12, 20.12)], Z = 0.34 (p = 0.73) and [MD = 2.10, 95%CI (-4.79, 8.99)], Z = 0.60 (p = 0.55), respectively. DYT performed better in raising hemoglobin count, but not statistically significant.

		erimenta			ontrol			Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV. Random, 95% Cl
1.3.1 No intervention										
Wang et al.,2003	230	71.34	35	102	63.35	34	12.9%	128.00 [96.19, 159.81]	2003	
Jiang et al.,2015	202	25	30	188	23	29	18.7%	14.00 [1.75, 26.25]	2015	-
Mu et al.,2019	150.14	38.691	40	123.36	34.391	40	17.7%	26.78 [10.74, 42.82]	2019	
Subtotal (95% CI)			105			103	49.3%	53.56 [5.37, 101.74]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	1695.32;	Chi ² = 43	3.00, df	= 2 (P <	0.00001); ² = 9	5%			
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 2.18	(P = 0.03)							
1.3.2 other oral medic	ines									
Ma,2005	127.65	11.34	90	96.73	10.22	90	20.2%	30.92 [27.77, 34.07]	2005	
Subtotal (95% CI)			90			90	20.2%	30.92 [27.77, 34.07]		•
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable									
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 19.22	2 (P < 0.0	0001)							
1.3.4 G-CSF when nee	eded									
Li et al.,2004	16.58	6.02	33	14.81	6.13	30	20.2%	1.77 [-1.24, 4.78]	2004	•
Hu et al.,2010	165.8	60.2	17	148.1	61.2	16	10.3%	17.70 [-23.75, 59.15]	2010	
Subtotal (95% CI)			50			46	30.5%	1.85 [-1.14, 4.85]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Chi	² = 0.56,	df = 1 (P = 0.45); l ² = 0%	5				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.21	(P = 0.23)							
Total (95% CI)			245			239	100.0%	32.29 [13.38, 51.20]		◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	458.27; 0	Chi ² = 221	1.50, df	= 5 (P <	0.00001); ² = 9	8%		-200	-100 0 100 200
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 3.35	(P = 0.00	(80						-200	Favours [control] Favours [experimental]
	rences: C	$Chi^2 = 173$	3.82. df	= 2 (P <	0.00001). $ ^2 = 9$	8.8%			r avours [control] Favours [experimental]
Test for subaroup diffe										



	Experime	ental	Contr	ol		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H. Random, 95% CI
1.5.1 No intervention								
Li et al.,2012	8	45	25	42	5.3%	0.30 [0.15, 0.59]	2012	
Mu et al.,2019	20	40	19	40	7.5%	1.05 [0.67, 1.65]	2019	-
Subtotal (95% CI)		85		82	12.8%	0.57 [0.16, 2.05]		
Total events	28		44					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.76; Chi ² =	= 9.83, 0	f = 1 (P =	0.002); l ² = 90%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.85 (P	= 0.39)						
1.5.2 Other oral medi	cines							
Xu et al.,2005	33	58	35	49	9.2%	0.80 [0.60, 1.06]	2005	-
Xu et al.,2006	15	72	44	86	7.0%	0.41 [0.25, 0.67]	2006	
Liu,2011	11	65	12	68	4.8%	0.96 [0.46, 2.02]	2011	
Yin et al.,2011	18	45	32	45	8.0%	0.56 [0.38, 0.84]	2011	
Subtotal (95% CI)		240		248	29.0%	0.64 [0.45, 0.90]		•
Total events	77		123					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.07; Chi ² =	= 7.22, 0	df = 3 (P =	0.07);	l ² = 58%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.57 (P	= 0.01)						
1.5.3 G-CSF								
Li et al.,2004	16	33	24	30	8.1%	0.61 [0.41, 0.90]	2004	
Chen2 et al.,2004	27	28	31	32	10.7%	1.00 [0.91, 1.09]		+
0110112 01 01.,2000		20	01		10.7%	0.96 [0.87, 1.07]		4
Zena et al 2007		32	36	37			2001	
	30	32	36	37 45			2010	
Gong et al.,2010	30 23	47	36	45	8.8%	0.61 [0.44, 0.85]		-
Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011	30 23 25	47 40	36 32	45 40	8.8% 9.2%	0.61 [0.44, 0.85] 0.78 [0.59, 1.04]	2011	-
Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011 Wu,2011	30 23	47 40 35	36	45 40 33	8.8% 9.2% 10.8%	0.61 [0.44, 0.85] 0.78 [0.59, 1.04] 1.00 [0.92, 1.09]	2011	-
Zeng et al.,2007 Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011 Wu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	30 23 25 34	47 40	36 32 32	45 40	8.8% 9.2%	0.61 [0.44, 0.85] 0.78 [0.59, 1.04]	2011	•
Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011 Wu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	30 23 25 34 155	47 40 35 215	36 32 32 191	45 40 33 217	8.8% 9.2% 10.8% 58.3%	0.61 [0.44, 0.85] 0.78 [0.59, 1.04] 1.00 [0.92, 1.09] 0.85 [0.70, 1.03]	2011	•
Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011 Wu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI)	30 23 25 34 155 0.04; Chi ² =	47 40 35 215 = 48.66,	36 32 32 191 df = 5 (P	45 40 33 217	8.8% 9.2% 10.8% 58.3%	0.61 [0.44, 0.85] 0.78 [0.59, 1.04] 1.00 [0.92, 1.09] 0.85 [0.70, 1.03]	2011	
Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011 Mu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	30 23 25 34 155 0.04; Chi ² =	47 40 35 215 = 48.66,	36 32 32 191 df = 5 (P	45 40 33 217 < 0.00	8.8% 9.2% 10.8% 58.3%	0.61 [0.44, 0.85] 0.78 [0.59, 1.04] 1.00 [0.92, 1.09] 0.85 [0.70, 1.03]	2011	•
Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011 Nu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Fest for overall effect:	30 23 25 34 155 0.04; Chi ² =	47 40 35 215 = 48.66, = 0.09)	36 32 32 191 df = 5 (P	45 40 33 217 < 0.00	8.8% 9.2% 10.8% 58.3% 001); l ² = 9	0.61 [0.44, 0.85] 0.78 [0.59, 1.04] 1.00 [0.92, 1.09] 0.85 [0.70, 1.03]	2011	•
Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011 Nu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Fest for overall effect: . Fotal (95% CI) Fotal events	30 23 25 34 155 0.04; Chi ² = Z = 1.70 (P 260	47 40 35 215 = 48.66, = 0.09) 540	36 32 32 191 df = 5 (P 358	45 40 33 217 < 0.00 547	8.8% 9.2% 10.8% 58.3% 001); I ² = 9 100.0%	0.61 [0.44, 0.85] 0.78 [0.59, 1.04] 1.00 [0.92, 1.09] 0.85 [0.70, 1.03] 00% 0.74 [0.59, 0.92]	2011	
Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011 Mu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Fest for overall effect: . Fotal (95% CI)	30 23 25 34 155 0.04; Chi ² = Z = 1.70 (P 260 0.11; Chi ² =	47 40 35 215 = 48.66, = 0.09) 540 = 142.3 ⁻	36 32 32 191 df = 5 (P 358 1, df = 11	45 40 33 217 < 0.00 547	8.8% 9.2% 10.8% 58.3% 001); I ² = 9 100.0%	0.61 [0.44, 0.85] 0.78 [0.59, 1.04] 1.00 [0.92, 1.09] 0.85 [0.70, 1.03] 00% 0.74 [0.59, 0.92]	2011	O.005 O.1 T T Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

3.3.5 White Blood Cell Suppression Rate *3.3.5.1 White Blood Cell Suppression Rate*

As shown in Figure 7, a total of 12 trials (2 in Subgroup 1, 4 in Subgroup 2, and 6 in Subgroup 3) were included in the metaanalysis of white blood cell suppression rate with the number of cases in treatment group and control group of 540 and 547, respectively. The heterogeneity results were as follows: p <0.00001, $I^2 = 92\%$ in total, p = 0.002, $I^2 = 90\%$ in Subgroup 1, p = 0.07, $I^2 = 58\%$ in Subgroup 2. Meta regression showed that the heterogeneity of group 2 was not significantly related to the publication years (p = 0.297), the duration of medication (p = 0.238), the number of case (p = 0.939), anti-tumor treatment (p = 0.760), the dose of DYT (p = 0.431), study region (p = 0.123), and hospital grade (p = 0.207); p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 90\%$ in Subgroup 3. Meta regression showed that there was no significant correlation between the heterogeneity of group 3 and the years of publication (p = 0.543), the duration of medication (p = 0.102), the number of case (p = 0.134), study region (p = 0.982), and hospital grade (p = 0.442). While the meta-analysis results were [RR = 0.74, 95%CI (0.59, 0.92)],Z = 2.73 (*p* = 0.006) in total, [RR = 0.57, 95%CI (0.16, 2.05)],

Z = 0.85 (p = 0.39) in Subgroup 1, [RR = 0.64, 95%CI (0.45, 0.90)], Z = 2.57 (p = 0.01) in Subgroup 2, sensitivity analysis showed that the results were stable, and the removal of each study had little effect on the overall results (**Figure 17C**), and Egger's test (p = 0.739) showed that the included studies had no significant publication bias: [RR = 0.83, 95%CI (0.70, 1.03)], Z = 1.70 (p = 0.09) in Subgroup 3. Sensitivity analysis showed that the results were stable, and the removal of each study had little effect on the overall results (**Figure 17D**), and Egger's test (p = 0.173) showed that there was no significant publication bias in the included studies. Overall, the efficacy of DYT was significantly superior to the control group in improving white blood cell suppression rate.

3.3.5.2 III-IV Degree White Blood Cell Suppression Rate

As shown in **Figure 8**, a total of 13 trials (2 in Subgroup 1, 5 in Subgroup 2, and 6 in Subgroup 3) were included in the metaanalysis of white blood cell suppression rate with the number of cases in treatment group and control group of 548 and 534, respectively. All the subgroups showed a low heterogeneity with p = 0.80, $I^2 = 0\%$ in total, p = 0.72, $I^2 = 0\%$ in Subgroup 1, p = 0.75,

	Experime	ental	Contr	ol		Risk Ratio			Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Year	M-	H. Fixed, 95% Cl
1.6.1 No intervention									
Li et al.,2012	1	45	4	42	3.2%	0.23 [0.03, 2.00]	2012		·
Mu et al.,2019	5	40	14	40	10.9%	0.36 [0.14, 0.90]	2019	-	-
Subtotal (95% CI)		85		82	14.2%	0.33 [0.14, 0.77]		•	
Total events	6		18						
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = ().13, df = 1	(P = 0.7	72); l ² = 0	%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.57 (P	° = 0.01)	1						
1.6.2 Other oral medie	cines								
Xu et al.,2005	0	58	2	49	2.1%	0.17 [0.01, 3.45]	2005		
Xu et al.,2006	1	72	6	68	4.8%	0.16 [0.02, 1.27]	2006		
Wang et al.,2006	0	40	0	38		Not estimable	2006		
Liu,2011	0	33	0	33		Not estimable	2011		
Yin et al.,2011	0	45	10	45	8.2%	0.05 [0.00, 0.79]	2011		
Subtotal (95% CI)		248		233	15.1%	0.10 [0.02, 0.43]			
Total events	1		18						
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 3.11 (P	' = 0.002	2)						
Li et al.,2004	3	33	9	30	7.4%	0.30 [0.09, 1.02]	2004		-
Chen2 et al.,2006	6	28	15	32	10.9%	0.46 [0.21, 1.02]			
Zeng et al.,2007	8	32	21	37	15.2%	0.44 [0.23, 0.85]	2007		
Zeng et al., 2007									
	5	47	12	47	9.4%	0.42 [0.16, 1.09]		-	
Gong et al.,2010	5 10		12 18	47 40			2010	-	
Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011		47			9.4%	0.42 [0.16, 1.09]	2010 2011	-	÷
Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011 Wu,2011	10	47 40	18	40	9.4% 14.1%	0.42 [0.16, 1.09] 0.56 [0.29, 1.05]	2010 2011		•
Gong et al.,2007 Hui et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011 Wu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	10	47 40 35	18	40 33	9.4% 14.1% 13.7%	0.42 [0.16, 1.09] 0.56 [0.29, 1.05] 0.55 [0.30, 1.03]	2010 2011	-	•
Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011 Wu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	10 10 42	47 40 35 215	18 17 92	40 33 219	9.4% 14.1% 13.7%	0.42 [0.16, 1.09] 0.56 [0.29, 1.05] 0.55 [0.30, 1.03]	2010 2011	-	•
Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011 Mu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	10 10 42 1.14, df = 5	47 40 35 215 5 (P = 0.9	18 17 92 95); I ² = 0	40 33 219	9.4% 14.1% 13.7%	0.42 [0.16, 1.09] 0.56 [0.29, 1.05] 0.55 [0.30, 1.03]	2010 2011	-	•
Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011 Wu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2	10 10 42 1.14, df = 5	47 40 35 215 5 (P = 0.9	18 17 92 95); I ² = 0	40 33 219 %	9.4% 14.1% 13.7%	0.42 [0.16, 1.09] 0.56 [0.29, 1.05] 0.55 [0.30, 1.03]	2010 2011	-	•
Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011 Wu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Total (95% CI)	10 10 42 1.14, df = 5	47 40 35 215 5 (P = 0.9 P < 0.000	18 17 92 95); I ² = 0	40 33 219 %	9.4% 14.1% 13.7% 70.7%	0.42 [0.16, 1.09] 0.56 [0.29, 1.05] 0.55 [0.30, 1.03] 0.47 [0.35, 0.64]	2010 2011	-	•
Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011 Wu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI)	10 10 42 1.14, df = 5 Z = 4.80 (P 49	47 40 35 215 5 (P = 0.9 2 < 0.000 548	18 17 92 95); I ² = 0 001) 128	40 33 219 % 534	9.4% 14.1% 13.7% 70.7%	0.42 [0.16, 1.09] 0.56 [0.29, 1.05] 0.55 [0.30, 1.03] 0.47 [0.35, 0.64]	2010 2011	-	•
Gong et al.,2010 Hui et al.,2011 Wu,2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Total (95% CI) Total events	10 10 42 1.14, df = 5 Z = 4.80 (P 49 6.21, df = 1	47 40 35 215 6 (P = 0.9 9 < 0.000 548 10 (P = 0	18 17 92 95); I ² = 0' 001) 128 0.80); I ² = 1	40 33 219 % 534	9.4% 14.1% 13.7% 70.7%	0.42 [0.16, 1.09] 0.56 [0.29, 1.05] 0.55 [0.30, 1.03] 0.47 [0.35, 0.64]	2010 2011		1 10 500 ental) Favours [control]

 $I^2 = 0\%$ in Subgroup 2, and p = 0.95, $I^2 = 0\%$ in Subgroup 3, while the meta-analysis results were [RR = 0.39, 95%CI (0.30, 0.52)], Z = 6.42 (p < 0.00001) in total, [RR = 0.33, 95%CI (0.14, 0.77)], Z = 2.57 (p = 0.01) in Subgroup 1, [RR = 0.10, 95%CI (0.02, 0.43)], Z = 3.11 (p = 0.002) in Subgroup 2, and [RR = 0.47, 95%CI (0.35, 0.64)], Z = 4.80 (p < 0.00001) in Subgroup 3. Sensitivity analysis showed that the results were stable, and the removal of each study had little effect on the overall results (**Figure 17E**), and Egger's test (p = 0.023) showed that the included studies may have some publication bias. Overall, the efficacy of DYT was significantly superior to the control group in improving III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate.

3.3.6 Application Amount of Granulocyte Colony-Stimulating Factor

All the studies enrolled in the analysis were studied with a control group provided with G-CSF when needed and a treatment group using additional DYT based on the control group. In total, 4 trials were included for the outcome of WBC backing to the normal range, with 129 cases in the treatment group and 133 cases in the control group, while 2 trials were included for the outcome of 2 chemoradiotherapy periods with 86 and 82 cases in the treatment and control groups, respectively. The heterogeneity test and meta-analysis results are demonstrated in **Figure 9**. The result of the former outcome was p = 0.0005, $I^2 = 92\%$ and [MD = -2.23, 95%CI (-3.65, -0.82)], Z = 3.10 (p = 0.002), while the latter one was p = 0.88, $I^2 = 0\%$ and [MD = -1.57, 95% CI (-1.92, -1.21)], Z = 8.82 (p < 0.00001), sensitivity analysis showed that the results were stable, and each study had little effect on the overall results after removal (**Figure 17F**), and Egger's test (p = 0.910) showed that the included studies had no significant publication bias. All the results above implied that further use of DYT can reduce the application amount of G-CSF by 1.57 and 2.23, respectively, according to two different treatment periods.

3.3.7 CD3+ and CD4+

A total of 2 trials were included without any WBC-elevating drugs (Subgroup 1), the number of cases in the treatment group and

	Expe	rimen	tal	C	ontrol			Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV. Random, 95% CI
1.7.1 Two cycles										
Li et al.,2007	2.68	1.04	46	4.21	1.28	42	20.4%	-1.53 [-2.02, -1.04]	2007	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Hui et al.,2011	2.35	1.08	40	5.32	1.76	40	17.9%	-2.97 [-3.61, -2.33]	2011	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			86			82	38.3%	-2.23 [-3.65, -0.82]		◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.95; Ch	i² = 12	.26, df :	= 1 (P =	0.000	5); l ² =	92%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.10	(P = 0)	.002)							
1.7.2 Return to norm	al									
Li et al.,2004	0.58	1.99	33	1.93	3.62	30	7.9%	-1.35 [-2.81, 0.11]	2004	
Chen2 et al.,2006	2.89	1.08	28	4.38	1.32	32	18.4%	-1.49 [-2.10, -0.88]	2006	; · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Zeng et al.,2007	2.98	1.67	32	4.82	1.56	37	15.8%	-1.84 [-2.61, -1.07]	2007	
Wu,2011	2.68	1.04	36	4.21	1.28	34	19.5%	-1.53 [-2.08, -0.98]	2011	T
Subtotal (95% CI)			129			133	61.7%	-1.57 [-1.92, -1.22]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Ch	i² = 0.6	65, df =	3 (P =	0.88);	2 = 0%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 8.82	(P < 0	.00001)						
Total (95% CI)			215			215	100.0%	-1.82 [-2.31, -1.32]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.25; Ch	i² = 16	.31, df :	= 5 (P =	0.006); ² = 6	69%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 7.19	(P < 0	.00001)						-10 -5 0 5 1
Test for subaroup diffe	rences:	Chi ² =	0.80. df	= 1 (P	= 0.37). ² = ()%			Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

	Exper	rimen	tal	Co	ontro	1		Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI
1.8.1 CD3+										
Weng et al.,2015	707	30	32	589	36	29	50.1%	118.00 [101.28, 134.72] 2	2015	
Deng et al.,2018	1,062	49	40	774	44	40	49.9%	288.00 [267.59, 308.41] 2	2018	
Subtotal (95% CI)			72			69	100.0%	202.90 [36.30, 369.49]		◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	14359.38	; Chi ²	= 159.	46, df =	1 (P	< 0.00	001); l ² =	99%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.39	(P = 0	.02)							
1.8.2 CD4+										
Weng et al.,2015	460	26	32	336	16	29	50.4%	124.00 [113.27, 134.73] 2	2015	
Deng et al.,2018	774	44	40	507	77	40	49.6%	267.00 [239.52, 294.48] 2	2018	
Subtotal (95% CI)			72			69	100.0%	194.92 [54.78, 335.05]		◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	10111.21	; Chi ²	= 90.2	5, df = '	1 (P •	< 0.000	01); l ² = 9	9%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.73	(P = 0	.006)							
										<u> </u>
										-1000 -500 0 500 1000
Test for subaroup diffe	erences: C	Chi ² =	0.01. d	f = 1 (P	= 0.9	94), l ² =	0%			Favours [control] Favours [experimental]
JRE 10 The forest p	olot of CE)3⁺ ai	nd CD4	1 ⁺ in pr	even	tive me	edication.			

control group were 72 and 69, respectively. The heterogeneity test and meta-analysis results of CD3⁺ were p = 0.0005, $I^2 = 92\%$ and [MD = 202.90, 95%CI (36.30, 369.49)], Z = 2.39 (p = 0.02), while that of CD4⁺ were p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 99\%$ and [MD = 194.92, 95% CI (54.78, 335.05)], Z = 2.73 (p = 0.006), which inferred that DYT may help improve body immunity for preventive medication purpose. All the results and the forest plot are displayed in **Figure 10**.

3.3.8 ORR and DCR

There were 2 trials enrolled (depicted in **Figure 11**), which belonged to Subgroup 1, with 96 cases in both the treatment and control groups. The heterogeneity test of DCR was p = 0.01, $I^2 = 85\%$ and its meta-analysis result showed that [RR = 1.25,

95%CI (0.81, 1.93)], Z = 1.00 (p = 0.32), which indicated that DYT can ameliorate the efficacy in solid tumor while without statistical significance. As a result, more pertinent researches remain to be included to verify the results.

3.4 Meta-Analysis Results of Therapeutic Medication

3.4.1 White Blood Cell Count

A total of 9 trials were included, of which 2 were with notreatment control group (Subgroup 1), another 2 were control group with other WBC-elevating drugs (Subgroup 2), and the rest were with G-CSF (Subgroup 3). The number of cases in treatment group and control group were 418 and 371, respectively. The

	Experim	ental	Contr	ol		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H. Random, 95% CI
1.9.1 ORR								
Shi et al.,2018	50	56	44	56	44.9%	1.14 [0.96, 1.34]	2018	
Mu et al.,2019	40	40	40	40	55.1%	1.00 [0.95, 1.05]	2019	
Subtotal (95% CI)		96		96	100.0%	1.06 [0.83, 1.35]		•
Total events	90		84					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.03; Chi2 :	= 8.31, 0	df = 1 (P =	0.004); l ² = 88%	,		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.46 (P	9 = 0.65)						
1.9.2 DCR								
Shi et al.,2018	45	56	29	56	47.2%	1.55 [1.17, 2.06]	2018	-
Mu et al.,2019	34	40	33	40	52.8%	1.03 [0.85, 1.25]	2019	
Subtotal (95% CI)		96		96	100.0%	1.25 [0.81, 1.93]		•
Total events	79		62					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.08; Chi2 :	= 6.50, 0	df = 1 (P =	= 0.01);	l ² = 85%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.00 (P	P = 0.32)						
								0.01 0.1 1 10 100
Test for subaroup diffe	erences: Ch	ni² = 0.42	2. df = 1 (l	P = 0.5	2). I ² = 0%			Favours [control] Favours [experimental]

	Expe	rimen	tal	C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI Year	IV. Random, 95% CI
2.1.1 No intervention									
Wang et al.,2004	5.95	1.63	72	4.35	1.56	48	11.3%	1.60 [1.02, 2.18] 2004	
Feng et al.,2013	5.69	1.76	26	4.12	1.35	22	8.8%	1.57 [0.69, 2.45] 2013	
Subtotal (95% CI)			98			70	20.1%	1.59 [1.11, 2.08]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Ch	ni² = 0.0	00, df =	1 (P =	0.96);	l ² = 0%			
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 6.44	(P < 0	.00001)					
2.1.2 other oral medic	ines								
Zhu.2005	4.5	0.8	62	3.6	0.5	58	13.7%	0.90 [0.66, 1.14] 2005	
Fu.2014		1.02	35	2.98	1.2	32	11.7%	0.68 [0.14, 1.22] 2014	
Subtotal (95% CI)			97			90	25.4%	0.86 [0.65, 1.08]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00: Ch	$i^2 = 0.5$	54. df =	1 (P =	0.46):	$l^2 = 0\%$			
Test for overall effect: 2									
2.1.3 G-CSF									
Wang,2013		0.55	20		0.51	20	13.2%	0.25 [-0.08, 0.58] 2013	
Ming et al.,2015		1.56	45			45	11.2%	1.42 [0.83, 2.01] 2015	
Chen,2016	5.67	1.86	37	3.19	1	41	10.5%	2.48 [1.81, 3.15] 2016	
Wang et al.,2017	5.15	3.1	100	4.32	2.9	84	8.9%	0.83 [-0.04, 1.70] 2017	10 C 10
Weng et al.,2019	6.71	1.14	21	5.32	1.03	21	10.6%	1.39 [0.73, 2.05] 2019	
Subtotal (95% CI)			223			211	54.5%	1.26 [0.42, 2.10]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	0.80; Ch	$hi^2 = 41$.34, df	= 4 (P <	< 0.000	001); l ²	= 90%		
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 2.95	(P = 0	.003)						
Total (95% CI)			418			371	100.0%	1.20 [0.77, 1.62]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.32; Ch	ni ² = 49	.38, df	= 8 (P <	< 0.000	001); l²	= 84%		-4 -2 0 2 4
Test for overall effect: 2	z = 5.56	(P < 0	.00001)					-4 -2 0 2 4 Favours [control] Favours [experimental]
Test for subaroup diffe	rences:	Chi ² =	7.60. d	f = 2 (P	= 0.02	2). $ ^2 = 7$	3.7%		

heterogeneity varied in different groups for p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 84\%$ in total; p = 0.96, $I^2 = 0\%$ in Group 1; p = 0.46, $I^2 = 0\%$ in Group 2; p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 90\%$ in Group 3, meta regression showed that the heterogeneity of Group 3 was not significantly correlated with the publication years (p = 0.576), the duration of

medication (p = 0.352), the number of cases (p = 0.397), antitumor treatment (p = 0.432), the dose of DYT (p = 0.426), and study region (p = 0.358). The results of meta-analysis showed that [MD = 1.20, 95%CI (0.77, 1.62)], Z = 5.56 (p < 0.00001) in total; [MD = 1.59, 95%CI (1.11, 2.08)], Z = 6.44 (p < 0.00001) in Group



FIGURE 13 | The forest plot of neutrophile count in therapeutic medication.

	Experim	ental	Contr	ol		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M-H. Random, 95% CI
2.3.2 Other oral medi	cines							
Wang et al.,2006	23	65	10	40	18.0%	1.42 [0.75, 2.66]	2006	
Subtotal (95% CI)		65		40	18.0%	1.42 [0.75, 2.66]		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Total events	23		10					
Heterogeneity: Not app	olicable							
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.08 (P	= 0.28)						
2.3.3 G-CSF								
Zhao et al.,2007	10	30	22	30	19.6%	0.45 [0.26, 0.79]	2008	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Li et al.,2011	10	36	23	34	19.1%	0.41 [0.23, 0.73]	2011	
Feng et al.,2013	18	26	19	22	24.5%	0.80 [0.59, 1.09]	2013	
Ming et al.,2015	10	45	27	45	18.7%	0.37 [0.20, 0.67]	2015	
Subtotal (95% CI)		137		131	82.0%	0.50 [0.32, 0.81]		•
Total events	48		91					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.16; Chi2 :	= 10.95,	df = 3 (P	= 0.01); l ² = 73%)		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.85 (P	= 0.004	4)					
Total (95% CI)		202		171	100.0%	0.61 [0.38, 0.95]		•
Total events	71		101					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.19; Chi ² :	= 15.68,	df = 4 (P	= 0.00	3); l ² = 74	%		- $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.17 (P	= 0.03)						Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for subaroup diffe	rences: Ch	i² = 6.62	2. df = 1 (F	P = 0.0	1). I ² = 84.	9%		

1; [MD = 0.86, 95%CI (0.65, 1.08)], Z = 7.81 (p < 0.00001) in Group 2; [MD = 1.26, 95%CI (0.42, 2.10)], Z = 2.95 (p = 0.003) in Group 3. Sensitivity analysis showed that the results were stable, and the removal of each study had little effect on the overall results (**Figure 17G**). Also, Egger's test (p = 0.141) showed that the included studies had no significant publication bias. The results implied that for therapeutic medication, the efficacy of DYT in improving WBC count was superior to the control group. The forest plot is shown in **Figure 12**.

3.4.2 Neutrophile Count

As shown in **Figure 13**, there were 2 trials involved in the analysis, which were parts of Subgroup 3, with 57 and 61 number of cases in the treatment group and control group, respectively. The heterogeneity (p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 96\%$) and meta-analysis results [MD = 0.93, 95%CI (-0.82, 2.69), Z = 1.04 (p = 0.30)] revealed that for therapeutic medication, DYT was better than other therapies in raising neutrophile count while without statistical significance.

3.4.3 White Blood Cell Suppression Rate 3.4.3.1 White Blood Cell Suppression Rate

A total of 5 trials (1 in Subgroup 1, 4 in Subgroup 3) were included in the meta-analysis of white blood cell suppression rate with 202 and 171 number of cases in the treatment group and control group, respectively. The heterogeneity results were p = 0.003, $I^2 =$ 74% in total, while that of Subgroup 3 were p = 0.01, $I^2 = 73\%$, meta-regression showed that the heterogeneity of group 3 was not significantly in correlation with the years of publication (p =0.880), the duration of medication (p = 0.888), the number of cases (p = 0.146), anti-tumor treatment (p = 0.359), the dose of DYT (p = 0.109), and study region (p = 0.945). Besides, the metaanalysis results (shown in Figure 14) were [RR = 0.61, 95%CI (0.38, 0.95)], Z = 2.17 (p = 0.03) in total and [RR = 0.50, 95%CI (0.32, 0.82)], Z = 2.85 (p = 0.004) in Subgroup 3. Sensitivity analysis showed that the results were stable, and the removal of each study had little effect on the overall results (Figure 17H), and Egger's test (p = 0.003) showed that the included studies may have some publication bias. Overall, for therapeutic medication



FIGURE 15 | The forest plot of III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate in therapeutic medication.

	Experime	ental	Contr	ol		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	Year	r M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
2.5.1 No intervention								
Wang et al.,2004	62	72	25	48	7.3%	1.65 [1.24, 2.20]	2004	4
Subtotal (95% CI)		72		48	7.3%	1.65 [1.24, 2.20]		★
Total events	62		25					
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable							
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 3.44 (P	= 0.000	06)					
2.5.2 Other oral medie	cines							
Xu et al.,2003	48	66	41	62	10.3%	1.10 [0.87, 1.39]	2003	3
Xu,2006	41	45	30	40	7.7%	1.21 [0.99, 1.49]	2006	6
Chen et al.,2006	42	50	30	46	7.6%	1.29 [1.01, 1.64]	2006	5
Yin et al.,2006	51	55	48	55	11.6%	1.06 [0.94, 1.20]	2006	3
Wang et al.,2010	109	120	76	100	20.1%	1.20 [1.06, 1.35]	2010)
Fu,2014	31	35	20	32	5.1%	1.42 [1.06, 1.90]	2014	4
Zhang,2014	56	60	45	60	10.9%	1.24 [1.06, 1.46]	2014	4
Qiao,2017	47	50	41	50	9.9%	1.15 [0.99, 1.33]	2017	
Subtotal (95% CI)		481		445	83.3%	1.19 [1.12, 1.27]		•
Total events	425		331					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5	5.93, df = 7	(P = 0.	55); l ² = 0	%				
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 5.40 (P	< 0.000	001)					
2.5.4 G-CSF								
Ming et al.,2015	42	45	39	45	9.5%	1.08 [0.94, 1.24]	2015	5
Subtotal (95% CI)		45		45	9.5%	1.08 [0.94, 1.24]		•
Total events	42		39					
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable							
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 1.05 (P	= 0.29)						
Total (95% CI)		598		538	100.0%	1.21 [1.14, 1.29]		•
Total events	529		395					a a a
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	14.28, df =	9 (P = 0).11); l ² =	37%				
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 6.44 (P	< 0.000	001)					Favours [control] Favours [experimental]
rest for overall effect.								

purpose, the efficacy of DYT was significantly superior to the control group in improving the white blood cell suppression rate.

3.4.3.2 III-IV Degree White Blood Cell Suppression Rate

All 4 trials enrolled in the analysis were studied with the control group provided with G-CSF (Subgroup 3) with 137 and 131 number of cases in the treatment group and control

group, respectively. The heterogeneity and meta-analysis results are shown in **Figure 15**, which were p = 0.90, $I^2 = 0\%$ and [RR = 0.29, 95%CI (0.12, 0.73)], Z = 2.62 (p = 0.009). Sensitivity analysis showed that the results were stable, and the removal of each study had little effect on the overall results (**Figure 17I**), and Egger's test (p = 0.285) showed that the included studies had no significant publication bias. In



(E): III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate of subgroup 3 in preventive medication, (I): III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate of subgroup 3 in preventive medication, (I): III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate of subgroup 3 in therapeutic medication, (I): III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate of subgroup 3 in therapeutic medication, (I): III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate of subgroup 3 in therapeutic medication, (I): III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate of subgroup 3 in therapeutic medication, (I): III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate of subgroup 3 in therapeutic medication, (I): III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate of subgroup 3 in therapeutic medication, (I): III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate of subgroup 3 in therapeutic medication, (I): III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate of subgroup 3 in therapeutic medication, (I): III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate of subgroup 3 in therapeutic medication, (I): III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate of subgroup 3 in therapeutic medication, (I): III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate of subgroup 3 in therapeutic medication, (I): III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate of subgroup 3 in therapeutic medication.

general, for therapeutic medication purpose, the efficacy of DYT was significantly superior to the control group in improving III-IV degree white blood cell suppression rate.

3.4.4 White Blood Cell Effective Rate

A total of 10 trials (1 in Subgroup 1, 8 in Subgroup 2, and the rest in Subgroup 3) were included with 598 and 538 number of cases in the treatment group and control group, respectively.. A low heterogeneity showed both in total (p = 0.11, $I^2 = 37\%$) and in Subgroup 2 (p = 0.55, $I^2 = 0\%$), while the meta-analysis results were [RR = 1.21, 95%CI (1.14, 1.29)], Z = 6.44 (p < 0.00001) in total and [RR = 1.19, 95%CI (1.12, 1.27)], Z = 5.40 (p < 0.00001) in Subgroup 2 (shown in **Figure 16**). Sensitivity analysis showed that the results were stable, and the removal of each study had little effect on the overall results (**Figure 17J**), and Egger's test (p = 0.126) showed that the included studies had no significant publication bias, which inferred that DYT was better than the control group in raising white blood cell effective rate with statistically significant difference between the two groups.

3.5 Occurrence of Adverse Events

Among all the 41 trials, there were 26 trials which failed to report the occurrence of adverse events, while another 11 reported no obvious adverse events. Hong Xu et al.'s research (Xu, 2006) reported 2 cases of mild stomach discomfort, and the same adverse events appeared in 3 patients in the study of Zhaoyu Zeng et al. (2007); The study of Jianyi Gong et al. (Gong and Duan, 2010) reported 13 cases of upper abdominal discomfort and 5 of acid reflux; In Daying Mou et al.'s study (Mou et al., 2019), there were 22 and 20 cases of different gastrointestinal reactions, respectively, 9 and 10 cases of hepatic impairment as well as 3 and 4 cases of renal impairment.

4 DISCUSSION

Sanguisorbae Radix has a long history of medicinal use, which was first recorded in "Shen Nong's Herbal Classic" (Wu, 2011): "Bitter taste and slightly cold in nature, it has a marked effect in treating women with spasms and cramps during childbirth, various debilitating diseases, and collateral diseases. It has the effects of relieving pain, removing carrion, antiperspirant, and curing metal wounds," Though classified as blood-cooling and blood-stanching in modern Chinese medicine, it also has records of generating and nourishing blood in the ancient Chinese herbal classics, such as "New Compilation of Materia Medica" (Qing and Chen SD, 1996): "Some people feel confused that given its bloodcooling nature, how can Sanguisorbae Radix stop bleeding? They don't know it can also nourish blood ... " "A Readable Classic of Materia Medica" (Qiang and Wang RA, 1987)"Sanguisorbae Radix tastes bitter and sour and is slightly cold in nature...It can cure all kinds of blood loss...," "Annotation to Shen Nong's Herbal Classic" (Qiang and Zhang ZC, 1992): "Sanguisorbae Radix, also known as jade bean... can nourish the blood of liver."

Modern pharmacologic research found that active ingredients of Sanguisorbae Radix include saponin, flavone, tannin, etc., of which, Sanguisorbae Radix saponin is proven to promote the hematopoiesis of bone marrow. One mechanism is that it promotes the proliferation of bone marrow stromal cells and improves and stabilizes the hematopoietic microenvironment. The other attributes to its function of promoting hematopoietic cells' proliferation and differentiation by facilitating the production of hematopoietic growth factors (HGFs) as well as simultaneously enhancing the expression of HGFs' receptors (C-KIT, IL-3 receptors, TPO receptors, etc.) (Gao et al., 2006; Zou et al., 2012; Dai et al., 2014; Dai et al., 2016).

4.1 Main Findings

A total of 41 studies were enrolled in our research, involving 3,793 cases, ensuring sample size sufficiency. For raising white blood cell count, the efficacy of DYT for both preventive and therapeutic purposes was significantly superior to any other control group. The superiority over the control group with no treatment overshadowed the control group with other WBCelevating drugs or G-CSF when needed. Sensitivity analysis and Egger's test showed that the results were objective and stable. For the improvement of neutrophil count, it was found that the Divu Shengbai tablet was more effective than other WBC-elevating drugs or G-CSF when needed. However, with limited studies and cases being included, more high-quality studies are needed to verify the efficacy of neutrophil count. To improve the white blood suppression rate, additional use of DYT helps reduce the total suppression rate and III-IV degree suppression rate of WBC. The difference was statistically significant. As for blood platelet, DYT can increase the blood platelet count while decreasing the suppression rate with a superiority to the control group with no treatment and other WBC-elevating drugs. Similarly, its superiority to G-CSF when needed remains to be verified for limited studies and cases being included.

For the improvement of platelet and hemoglobin count, DYT had a certain effect on them. However, except for the control group without treatment, the superiorities to other therapies were not significant. In addition, using DYT can reduce the application amount of G-CSF, and the differences are statistically significant. Only 4 studies reported the occurrence of adverse events, which mainly concentrated on mild gastrointestinal and hepatorenal events that mostly can be diminished or relieved after clinical treatment. Due to patients being treated with radiotherapy or chemotherapy, the reason for the occurrence of adverse events cannot be identified.

4.2 Comparisons to the Previous Meta-Analysis

There are two previous studies about meta-analysis which have estimated the clinical efficacy of DYT being used for treating leukopenia induced by radiotherapy and chemotherapy. The research of Rui Zhang et al. took 8 studies into account and the clinical outcomes only involved the WBC suppression rate (Zhang et al., 2012), while the other research of Zefeng Zhao et al. included 12 studies in total with clinical outcomes of myelosuppression rate, WBC count, and the amount of G-CSF. It may have a negative impact on the reliability of the results for their limited number of literatures. and small sample size enrolled, as well as the low quality of included researches (randomized and quasi-randomized trials were included) and no subgroup analysis according to different treatment methods.

In contrast, a comprehensive retrieval was conducted, and strict criteria of inclusion and exclusion were set in our study. More importantly, we enrolled some recently published research and performed subgroup analysis in order to improve the methodology and strengthen the stability of the results. Also, we performed subgroup analysis according to different treatments of rising white blood cells and performed meta-regression and sensitivity analysis for the clinical outcomes with more considerable heterogeneity to find the source of heterogeneity, while we did not find it. But we discovered that outcomes with significant heterogeneity were obtained for the reason that there were few studies included (CD3⁺, CD4⁺, ORR, DCR, etc.). It might reduce heterogeneity test efficiency in meta-analysis. Besides, some clinical outcomes (platelet counts, hemoglobin counts, etc.) could usually be exaggerated statistical variations when evaluated as measurement data due to a larger range of average clinical values. So we speculated that the results of studies which showed the heterogeneity in statistics might be related to the clinical heterogeneity. It meant that different illness degrees (specific white blood cell counts) and other different clinical features (tumor types, pathological stages, etc.) might be one of the sources of heterogeneity in meta-analysis.

4.3 Limitations

Several limitations still exist in our study. First, only 8 of 41 literatures reported specific randomized methods. As the years of publication for some original studies were too early, and many studies did not report the use of allocation concealment and blinding, their quality was not high. However, this study aimed to discuss the effect of the Diyu Shengbai tablet on leukopenia. We chose objective outcomes of clinical laboratories, such as WBC counts and NEUT counts, with little influence from allocation concealment and blinding. Second, although the white blood cell counts of patients at the time of enrollment have been divided into preventive medication and therapeutic medication, there are still some differences in the white blood cell counts among the included studies. Third, the

REFERENCES

- Chen, W. Y., Quan, T. Y., and Zhou, Y. F. (2014). An Overview of Research on Traditional Chinese Medicine in the Treatment of Leukopenia Caused by Malignant Tumor. *Guangming J. Chin. Med.* 29 (11), 2456–2458.
- Chen, Y., Qiu, J. P., and Song, X. Y. (2006). Study on Diyushengbai Tablet in Treating Leukopenia in Patients with Malignant Tumor Chemotherapy. *China Med. Her.* 3 (36), 73–74. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1673-7210.2006.36.045
- Chen, Y. Q. (2016). Study on Clinical Efficacy of Diyushengbai Tablet Combining with rhG-CSF on Bone Marrow Suppression of Cervical Cancer after Radiotherapy and Chemotherapy. [master's thesis]Shenyang LiaonNing: Liaoning University of Traditional Chinese Medicine.
- Chen, Z. M., Qiu, X. H., Yang, Y. X., Zhuang, X. W., Jiang, Y., Zhang, S. Q., et al. (2006). Diyushengbai Tablet to Prevent Leukopenia Caused by NP Chemotherapy. *Cancer Res. Prev. Treat.* 33 (7), 527–528. doi:10.3971/j.issn. 1000-8578.2283

heterogeneity among studies could not be neglected owing to different interventions, drug doses, and therapy time applied to patients with different WBC levels in each trial. In our research, we conducted a subgroup analysis to diminish the heterogeneity to some extent. Finally, as for adverse events, due to the limited follow-up time of included studies and unstandardized reports of some research, no definite conclusions can be drawn about the adverse reactions of DYT.

5 CONCLUSION

DYT do have positive effect on preventing and treating leukopenia caused by radiotherapy and chemotherapy against malignant tumor. Its efficacy is superior to Leucogen tablets and Batilol tablets, and the application amount of G-CSF can also be diminished while using it. For some clinical outcomes, larger sample size and well-designed randomized controlled trials were still needed to validate our conclusions further. Some of the literatures we screened were published too early, and the average quality and numbers of included literatures were limited.

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 authors.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

JW and KX conceived and designed the study. XX and HL searched the database, reviewed the literature, and then cross-checked with XH. All literature and data in it obtained were confirmed by FZ and JL. XX completed the data analysis and wrote the first draft of the manuscript, and JL assisted in finishing them. HL completed the final version. JW and KX were responsible for the quality control of the study. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

- Dai, L. M., Xiong, Y. A., Fan, K., Lin, Y. Y., and Yang, M. (2016). Chemical Composition and Pharmacological Effect of Sanguisorba Radix. *Chin. J. Exp. Traditional Med. Formulae* 22 (20), 189–195. doi:10.13422/j.cnki.syfjx.2016200189
- Dai, Y. P., Gao, X. P., Wu, J. M., Li, X., Huang, F. H., and Zou, W. J. (2014). Effect of Total Saponins from Sanguisorba Officinalis on Megakaryocyte Progenitor Cells Proliferation, Differentiation and Relative Receptor Expression. *Zhongguo Zhong Yao Za Zhi* 39 (09), 1685–1689. doi:10.4268/cjcmm20140928
- Deng, B., Tao, Yi. Feng., Xie, J. J., and Shao, Z. X. (2018). Efficacy of Diyushengbai Tablet on Immune Function of Patients with Cervical Cancer During Adjuvant Radiotherapy. *Her. Med.* 37 (2), 193–195. doi:10.3870/j.issn.1004-0781.2018. 02.012
- Dong, Y., and Huang, J. J. (2010). Effect of Diyushengbai Tablet on Blood Cell Decreasing During Chemotherapy of Non-small Cell Lung Cancer. West China Med. J. 50 (43), 94–95.
- Feng, C., Zhang, P., and Huang, Z. (2013). Clinical Research on Leucopenia after Chemotherapy for Multiple Myeloma Treated by Diyushengbai Tablet. Acta Chin. Med. 28 (12), 1794–1795.

- Fu, L. R. (2014). Diyushengbai Tablet in the Treatment of Malignant Tumors after Radiotherapy Leukopenia Randomized Parallel Controlled Study. J. Pract. Traditional Chin. Intern. Med. 28 (1), 71–73. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1671-7813. 2014.01.36
- Gao, X. P., Wu, J. P., Zou, W. J., Liu, Z. R., and Li, B. G. (2006). Screening of the Active Fractions from Sanguisorba Officinalis Promoting Hematopoiesis. *Chin. J. Nat. Med.* 4 (02), 137–140.
- Gong, J. Y., and Duan, P. (2010). Clinical Observation of Diyushengbai Tablet on Prevent Leucopenia of NSCLC Patients after Chemotherapy. *Chin. J. Clin. Ration. Drug Use* 3 (2), 25–26. doi:10.15887/j.cnki.13-1389/r.2010.02.077
- Hu, Q., Guan, X. H., Lian, Y., and Liu, X. X. (2010). Clinical Observation on Diyushengbai Tablet to Peripheral Hemogram of Malignant Lymphoma after Classical Chemotherapy. J. Chengdu Univ. Traditional Chin. Med. 33 (3), 33–35. doi:10.13593/j.cnki.51-1501/r.2010.03.033
- Hui, S., Zhang, C. H., Tong, Y. K., and Shi, X. L. (2011). Observation on Diyushengbai Tablet to Treat Myelosuppression in Patients Receiving Chemotherapy of Improved EOF Regimen. *China Med. Her.* 8 (9), 74–75. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1673-7210.2011.09.036
- Jiang, D. X., Weng, Y. J., Liang, C. X., Pang, Y. J., and Chen, G. Q. (2015). Function of Garden Burnet Root Leukopoietic Tablet to Prevent Myelosuppression Induced by FOLFOX Chemotherapy in Patients with Colorectal Cancer. *Clin. Med. Eng.* 22 (3), 286–288. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1674-4659.2015.03.0286
- Li, H., Ma, Q., Al, P., Zhang, H. M., and Li, M. (2015). Treatment of Chemotherapy-Induced Leucopenia in Patients with Malignant Tumor by Chinese Herbal Medicine: a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Clinical Trials. *Zhongguo Zhong Xi Yi Jie He Za Zhi* 35 (02), 157-166.
- Li, H., and Yang, F. (2007). Observation on Diyushengbai Tablet to Prevent Myelosuppression of Patients Treated by Chemotherapy. *China Med. Her.* 4 (27), 49–50. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1673-7210.2007.27.035
- Li, Q. M., and Yang, H. B. (2012). Observation of Diyushengbai Tablet in Preventing Peripheral Leukopenia Induced by Radiotherapy and Chemotherapy for Nasopharyngeal Carcinoma. *Shandong Med. J.* 52 (11), 63–64.
- Li, Y. M., Yue, F. H., Zou, Y. S., Tan, X. Y., and Li, J. C. (2004). Clinical Study on Diyushengbai Tablet to Prevent Blood Cell Reduction of NSCLC Patients with Chemotherapy. *Chin. J. Cancer Prev. Treat.* 11 (9), 964–966. doi:10.16073/j. cnki.cjcpt.2004.09.027
- Li, Z. G., Gu, N., and Wang, F. L. (2011). Clinical Observation on Diyushengbai Tablet in Treating 70 Cases of Leukopenia in Chemotherapy Patients. *Clin. Focus* 26 (8), 640+672–680.
- Liu, Y. F. (2011). Clinical Observation of Diyushengbai Tablet in Preventing Radiotherapy Leukopenia. *Chin. J. Mod. Drug Appl.* 5 (10), 88–89. doi:10. 14164/j.cnki.cn11-5581/r.2011.10.104
- Ma, Q. (2005). Diyushengbai Tablet Prevent Bone Marrow Suppression Caused by Radiotherapy and Chemotherapy: 90 Case Reports. *Shandong Med. J.* 45 (4), 37.
- Ming, B. C., and Zhang, S. F. (2015). Clinical Study on Diyushengbai Tablet to Prevent Peripheral Blood Leukocyte Reduction Caused by Chemoradiotherapy in Patients with Nasopharyngeal Carcinoma. J. Liaoning Univ. Traditional Chin. Med. 17 (7), 173–175. doi:10.13194/j.issn.1673-842x.2015.059
- Mou, D. Y., Huang, L., Lu, X. H., and He, D. Y. (2019). Effects of Diyushengbai Tablet in Preventing Myelosuppression Induced by TP Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy and on Peripheral Hemogram in Patients with Cervical Cancer. Eval. Analysis Drug-Use Hosp. China 19 (11), 1306–1308. doi:10. 14009/j.issn.16722124.2019.11.008
- Pharmacopoeia Commission Chinese (2020). Pharmacopoeia of the People's Republic of China. Beijing: China Medical Science Press.
- Qiao, H. (2017). Observation on the Efficacy of Diyushengbai Tablet in Treating Leukopenia Caused by Gynecological Tumors. *Guide China Med.* 15 (26), 136–137. doi:10.15912/j.cnki.gocm.2017.26.110
- Qing, D., and Chen, S. D. (1996). New Compilation of Materia Medica. Beijing: China Press of Traditional Chinese Medicine.
- Qing, D., and Wang, R. A. (1987). Chinese Materia Medica Easy for Reading. Beijing: People's Medical Publishing House.
- Qing, D., and Zhang, Z. C. (1992). *Quest for the Essence of Materia Medica*. Beijing: China Press of Traditional Chinese Medicine.
- Shi, Y. M., Wang, Q. L., Wang, Z. M., Tang, L., and Wang, C. Y. (2018). Effects of Diyushengbai Tablet on Elevating White Blood Cells in Patients with Lung

Cancer Treated by Radiotherapy and its Influence on Their Quality of Life. *Chin. J. Front. Med. Sci. Electron. Version*) 10 (7), 72–75. doi:10.12037/YXQY. 2018.07-12

- Tian, S. D., Dong, Q., Qi, S., Jia, Z., Hou, L., and Chen, X. Y. (2018). Expert Consensus on the Prevention and Treatment with Chinese Medicine of Leukopenia after Chemotherapy. *Mod. Chin. Clin. Med.* 25 (03), 1–6.
- Wang, F., Cha, Q., and Wang, Y. S. (2010). Effect of Diyushengbai Tablet on 120 Cases of Leukopenia During Chemotherapy of Gynecological Tumor. *Shandong Med. J.* 50 (43), 94–95. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1002-266X.2010.43.055
- Wang, S. J. (2004). Observation of the Efficacy of Diyushengbai Tablet on Leukopenia after Chemotherapy. *Med. J. West China* 16 (4), 341. doi:10. 1579/0044-7447-33.6.341
- Wang, W., Zang, Q., and Song, X. M. (2006). Clinical Study on Diyushengbai Tablet to Prevent Blood Cell Reduction of Postoperative NSCLC Elder Patients with Adjuvant Chemotherapy. *Cancer Res. Prev. Treat.* 33 (10), 763–764.
- Wang, W. J., Zhu, Z. Y., Zhong, W., Wang, Y. P., and Du, R. (2017). Evaluation on Efficacy and Cost of rhG-CSF Combined with Diyushengbai Tablet in Children with Leukopenia Induced by Chemotherapy. *Anti-Infection Pharm.* 14 (8), 1474–1476. doi:10.13493/j.issn.1672-7878.2017.08-006
- Wang, X. B., Jin, H. J., and He, J. (2003). Application of Qiangli Shengbai Tablets in Teletherapy. *Chin. J. Pract. Chin. Mod. Med.* 3 (16), 1299.
- Wang, X. R. (2013). The Positive Clinical Effect of the Diyushengbai Tablet Combined with Granulocyte Colony Stimulating Factor on Leukopenia Caused by Gynecological Chemotherapy. J. Regional Anat. Operative Surg. 22 (2), 165169–166166. doi:10.11659/jjssx.1672-5042.201302016
- Wang, Z. S., Hui, X., and Zhang, X. (2006). The Effect by Using Diyushengbai Tablet's Treating the Marrow Restraint in Radiotherapy and Chemotherapy. West China Med. J. 21 (1), 118–119. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1002-0179.2006.01.077
- Wei, D., and Wu, P. (1997). *Shennong's Classic Materia Medica Dictatin Editing*. Shenyang: Liaoning Science and Technology Publishing House.
- Weng, J. F., and Zeng, L. (2019). Analysis on the Treatment Effect of Leukocytopenia Caused by Chemotherapeutic Drugs with the Adjuvant Therapy of Diyushengbai Tablet. J. Jiangxi Univ. Traditional Chin. Med. 31 (2), 5361–5454.
- Weng, Y. J., Jiang, D. X., Liang, C. X., Pang, Y. J., and Chen, G. Q. (2015). Research of Diyushengbai Tablet in Prevention of Immune Function Decline after FOLFOX Chemotherapy for Patients with Colorectal Carcinoma. *China Pract. Med.* 10 (7), 25–27. doi:10.14163/j.cnki.11-5547/r.2015.07.012
- Wu, Y. D. (2011). Evaluation of Diyushengbai Tablet in Preventing Leukopenia in Patients with DP Chemotherapy. *Chin. Community Dr.* 13 (25), 182. doi:10. 3969/j.issn.1007-614x.2011.25.177
- Xu, H. (2006). Curative Effect of Burnet Root Leukopoietic Tablets on Leukopenia Elicited by Chemotherapy of Gynecological Tumor. *Med. J. West China* 18 (5), 565–566. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1672-3511.2006.05.014
- Xu, N. H., Tong, Y., and Cao, J. H. (2003). Comparison of Efficacy of Qiangli Shengbai Tablets in Treatment of Leukopenia after Chemotherapy and Radiotherapy. *Chin. Med. Pharm. J.* 2 (11), 78–79.
- Xu, X. D., Gao, J. F., and Yan, L. P. (2006). Clinical Observation of Diyushengbai Tablet in Preventing Leukocyte Decrease in Patients with Advanced Non-small Cell Lung Cancer by Three-Dimensional Conformal Radiotherapy. *Chin. J. Inf. Traditional Chin. Med.* 13 (12), 75–76.
- Xu, X. H., Li, S., Xue, F., Zhang, X. H., and Yang, S. B. (2005). Evaluation of the Efficacy of Diyushengbai Tablet in Preventing Leukopenia in Radiotherapy. *Clin. Focus* 20 (8), 458–459. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1004-583X.2005.08.018
- Yin, L., and Kang, X. D. (2006). Observation on the Therapeutic Effect of Diyushengbai Tablet on 110 Cases of Leukopenia in Chemotherapy Patients. *Med. J. West China* 18 (4), 430–431.
- Yin, X. D., Yao, Q., and Li, W. L. (2011). Study on the Clinical Effect of Diyushengbai Tablet on Anti-Bone Marrow Suppression Induced by Chemotherapy in Advanced Colon Cancer. Asia-Pacific Tradit. Med. 7 (1), 47–48.
- Zeng, Z. Y., Zhang, Xi., Wang, X. Y., and Wu, K. Y. (2007). Therapeutic Effect of Diyushengbai Tablet on Preventing Leukopenia Caused by Included Paclitaxel Chemotherapy. *Med. J. West China* 19 (4), 590–593. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1672-3511.2007.04.035
- Zhang, J. J. (2014). Clinical Analysis of Diyushengbai Tablet in Treating Leukopenia in Gynecological Tumor Chemotherapy. *China Pract. Med.* 9 (31), 179–180.
- Zhang, M., and Shuai, J. H. (2019). Study on Reduction Value of Granulocytes in Treatment of Breast Cancer Chemotherapeutic Cells by Combination of

Polyethylene Glycol Recombinant Human Granulocyte Stimulating Factor. *Chin. Archives Traditional Chin. Med.* 37 (05), 1201–1204. doi:10.13193/j.issn. 1673-7717.2019.05.042

- Zhang, R., Tang, Y., Yu, L., and Wu, B. (2012). A Systematic Review of Garden Burnet Root Leukopoietic Tablets Treatment and Prevention of Radiotherapy-Induced Leukopenia. *Chin. J. Hosp. Pharm.* 32 (09), 719–722.
- Zhao, W. Y., Zhang, L. Z., and Tian, J. H. (2007). Clinical Observation on Tumor Patients with Myelosuppression During Radiotherapy Treated by Sanguisorba Leucocyte Increasing Tablets. J. Mod. Oncol. 15 (2), 264–266. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1672-4992.2007.02.049
- Zhao, Z. F., He, X. R., Zhang, Q., Wei, X. Y., Bai, Y. J., and Zheng, X. H. (2017). Meta-analysis of Diyushengbai Tablet in the Treatment of Leukopenia Induced by Tumor Chemotherapy. *Northwest Pharm. J.* 32 (05), 648–652. doi:10.3969/J. ISSN.1004-2407.2017.05.029
- Zhu, Y. (2005). Clinical Observation of Diyushengbai Tablet in Treating Radiotherapy Leukopenia. *Chin. J. Inf. Traditional Chin. Med.* 12 (3), 72. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1005-5304.2005.03.043
- Zou, W. J., Liu, F., Wu, J. F., and Gao, X. P. (2012). Effects of Total Saponins from Sanguisorba Officinalis on Promoting Hematopoietic Cell Proliferation. *Chin. Traditional Herb. Drugs* 43 (05), 929–933.

Conflict of Interest: Author JL, FZ, and KX were employed by Chengdu Di'ao Group Tianfu Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd.

The remaining authors declare that the research was conducted without 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.

Copyright © 2022 Xu, Li, Hu, Liu, Zhao, Xie and Wang. 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.