Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Hongbo Li, Shaanxi University of Science and Technology, China

REVIEWED BY Germain Sotoing Taiwe, University of Buea, Cameroon Yunhui Chen, Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, China Xianyu Zeng, Wuhan Hospital of Traditional and Western Medicine, China

*CORRESPONDENCE Yuanwen Li, ⊠ 15810104902@163.com Lingling Cai, ⊠ lingling89159166@126.com

¹These authors have contributed equally to this work

RECEIVED 30 October 2024 ACCEPTED 10 March 2025 PUBLISHED 31 March 2025

CITATION

Deng Y, Feng R, Hu B, Ren X, Zhang F, Feng H, Wang X, Li Y, Liu T, Cai L and Li Y (2025) Efficacy and safety of Tanshinone capsule in Acne vulgaris: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front. Pharmacol.* 16:1520039. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2025.1520039

COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Deng, Feng, Hu, Ren, Zhang, Feng, Wang, Li, Liu, Cai and Li. 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.

Efficacy and safety of Tanshinone capsule in Acne vulgaris: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Yutong Deng^{1†}, Ruli Feng^{1†}, Bo Hu², Xuewen Ren³, Fengchuan Zhang², Huishang Feng^{2,4}, Xuewan Wang¹, Yatong Li¹, Tangyunni Liu¹, Lingling Cai²* and Yuanwen Li²*

¹Beijing University of Chinese Medicine, Beijing, China, ²Department of Dermatology, Dongfang Hospital, Beijing University of Chinese Medicine, Beijing, China, ³Department of Dermatology, Shanxi Traditional Chinese Medical Hospital, Shanxi, China, ⁴Department of Dermatology, Dongzhimen Hospital, Beijing University of Chinese Medicine, Beijing, China

Objectives: To evaluate the efficacy and safety of Tanshinone capsule as a complementary therapy in managing of Acne Vulgaris.

Methods: A systematic search of six databases was conducted to identify relevant randomized controlled trials (RCTs) from each database for nearly 20 years (from 1 Jan 2004, to 1 June 2024). The Cochrane Handbook was used to evaluate the risk of bias. Meta-analysis was performed using Review Manager 5.4.1, and publication bias was assessed the Stata SE 12.0 software. GRADEpro was used to assess the quality of the evidence.

Results: A total of 2,969 participants from 28 studies were included. We found that Tanshinone capsules can reduce acne recurrence rates [risk ratio (RR) 0.44, 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.34 to 0.57, p < 0.00001; downregulate levels of necrosis factor-alpha (TNF-α) [mean difference (MD) 0.44, -10.18, 95% CI: -13.57 to -8.04, p < 0.00001, interleukin (IL) 4 (MD -6.46, 95%CI: -7.14 to -5.77, p < 0.00001), IL-6 (MD -16.14, 95%CI: -30.10 to -2.18, p = 0.02), IL-8 (MD -4.48, 95%CI: -8.30 to -0.65, p = 0.02) and testosterone (MD -14.50, 95%CI: -17.59 to -11.40, p < 0.00001); lower Global Acne Grading System (GAGS) score (MD -4.71, 95%CI: -7.62 to -1.80, p = 0.002); decrease sebum secretion rates (*MD* -0.29, 95%CI: -0.49 to -0.10, p = 0.003), but the regulation of Luteinizing hormone (LH), Follicle-stimulating hormone (FSH), Estradiol (E₂) is not obvious. In terms of safety, the incidence of adverse events in the experimental group was less than that in the control group (RR 0.70, 95%CI: 0.56 to 0.87, p = 0.001). The Begg test and Egger test results indicated no publication bias. Furthermore, the levels of evidence ranged from very low to moderate due to risk of bias and heterogeneity.

Conclusion: Tanshinone capsules can relieve the symptoms of acne vulgaris, regulate inflammatory cytokines and hormone levels in patients, and reduce recurrence. However, due to the limitations of this study, more multi-center and large-sample studies are needed to confirm these conclusions.

Systematic Review Registration: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42024562320, identifier CRD42024562320.

KEYWORDS

Tanshinone capsule, Acne vulgaris, meta-analysis, systematic review, randomized controlled trial

1 Introduction

Acne vulgaris is a inflammatory dermatological disease that commonly occurs in areas rich in sebaceous glands, such as the face, chest, and back. The characteristic clinical features of acne include comedones, papules, pustules, nodules, cysts and scarring (Williams et al., 2012; Oon et al., 2019). The Global Burden of Disease Project estimates that acne affects approximately 9.4% of the global population, ranking it as the 8th most prevalent disease worldwide (Vos et al., 2012; Hay et al., 2014). Besides skin lesions, acne vulgaris can also cause a severe psychological burden and be associated with metabolic comorbidities, significantly affecting patients' quality of life while increasing both individual and societal burdens (Stamu-O'Brien et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2022).

The current management of acne vulgaris is based on acne severity assessment and laboratory testing (Reynolds et al., 2024). Common treatments include topical retinoids, benzoyl peroxide, antibiotics, isotretinoin, contraceptives, and physical modalities, etc (Oon et al., 2019; Reynolds et al., 2024). However, increasing antibiotic resistance of *Cutibacterium acnes* (*C. acnes*) and the potential risk for adverse reactions remain significant challenges (Fox et al., 2016; Habeshian and Cohen, 2020). Therefore, complementary and alternative medicines (CAM) for acne treatment may be essential.

Tanshinone capsule is a traditional Chinese patent medicine made from the ethanol extract of Danshen (dried roots and rhizomes of Salvia miltiorrhiza), approved by the Chinese State Food and Drug Administration, the main active ingredients are tanshinone IIA (Tan IIA) and cryptotanshinone (CPT). The traditional Chinese medicine properties and therapeutic effects of Danshen are provided in Supplementary Table S3. According to Chinese pharmacopoeia standards, each capsule (0.25 g) contains no less than 16 mg of Tan IIA and 12 mg of CPT (State Food and Drug Administration of China, 2010). In vitro studies show that CPT and Tan IIA have antibacterial activity against C. acnes, Staphylococcus epidermidis and Staphylococcus aureus, which are acne-related pathogenic microorganisms (Zhu et al., 2022; Li and Zhou, 2018). Tan IIa can inhibit the expression of toll-like receptor 2 (TLR2), nuclear factor-kappa B (NF-kB), and intercellular cell adhesion molecule-1 (ICAM-1), thereby suppressing C. acnesinduced inflammation and reducing the levels of inflammatory cytokines such as interleukin-1 beta (IL-1β), IL-8, and tumor necrosis factor-alpha (TNF-a) (Li and Zhou, 2018). CPT treatment alleviate acne inflammation, improve follicular keratinization and regulate the expression of IL-1a and androgen receptors (AR), demonstrating strong antiinflammatory and anti-androgenic activities (Zuo et al., 2016).

In recent years, numerous clinical studies have explored the use of Tanshinone capsules for acne vulgaris. Therefore, we conducted a

meta-analysis and systematic review of the past 2 decades to assess their efficacy and safety as a complementary therapy, providing evidence to guide clinical practice.

2 Methods

2.1 Study registration and ethics statements

The methods employed in this study were registered in PROSPERO (registration number: CRD42024562320), and strictly adhered to the PRISMA statement (Page et al., 2021).

2.2 Literature search

We performed a comprehensive search across 6 databases, including PubMed, the Cochrane Library, Embase, the Chinese Biomedical Literature Database (CBM), China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), Wanfang Databases (WF) and VIP, with no language restrictions, covering the 20-year period from 1 Jan 2004, to 1 June 2024. Two independent reviewers (DYT and FRL) conducted the search process. The search strategy integrated both Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and free-text words. The language restriction was set to English and Chinese. The search terms included "acne vulgaris," "acne," and "Tanshinone capsule," and related terms; the Chinese subject terms "Cuochuang" and "Danshentong" and related terms were used. The search strategies were adjusted according to the characteristics of different databases. Details of the search strategies are shown in Supplementary Materiale S4.

2.3 Inclusion criteria

2.3.1 Types of studies

This study focused on randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

2.3.2 Types of participants

Patients with Acne vulgaris diagnosed by a clinician or according to recognized diagnostic criteria. There were no restrictions on age, gender, race, or disease duration.

2.3.3 Types of interventions

The control group received conventional therapies for acne vulgaris, including topical retinoids, topical antimicrobial therapy, oral antibiotics, oral isotretinoin, Hormonal therapy, other treatments and adjunctive therapies, etc. The experimental group received Tanshinone capsules used alone or in combination with the control group treatment.

2.3.4 Outcome measures

The relapse rate after treatment was set as primary outcome, and the levels of inflammatory factors, hormone levels, sebum secretion rate and Global Acne Grading System (GAGS) score were set as secondary outcomes. The adverse events (AEs) was set as safety outcome.

2.4 Exclusion criteria

Studies meeting any of the following criteria were excluded: (1) studies focusing on other diseases accompanied by acneiform lesions, such as rosacea, SAPHO syndrome, polycystic ovary syndrome. (2) the treatment in control group or experiment group included unconventional therapy, such as acupuncture and moxibustion. (3) studies lacking mention of randomization (5) Studies lacking the specified outcome measures or reporting only AEs. (6) duplicate studies or those without full-text availability.

2.5 Literature screening and risk of bias

First, the primary literature retrieved from different databases was imported into the NoteExpress 3.8 software. After sequentially reading the titles, abstracts, and full texts, the final included studies were determined based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Second, two reviewers independently engaged in the screening of studies and extraction of data. Third, each included study was categorized, and Relevant data was extracted and recorded primarily including authors, publication years, sample sizes, gender ratios, intervention details, and outcome indicators. Fourth, the Cochrane Handbook (version 5.1.0) was used to evaluate the risk of bias according to the required items. Two independent reviewers (DYT and FRL) performed these tasks and if any discrepancies arose, they were resolved by a third researcher (LYW).

2.6 Data analysis and GRADE assessment

Meta-analysis was conducted using Review Manager (version 5.4). Continuous variables were expressed as mean difference (MD), while binary variables were expressed as risk ratio (RR), both with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Heterogeneity was assessed using the I^2 test. A fixed-effects model was adopted when I^2 was <50%, indicating a low heterogeneity. Otherwise, a random-effects model was used. Subgroup analysis was conducted to investigate the potential influence of treatment duration and intervention methods for the experimental groups. Sensitivity analysis was conducted by excluding individual studies to assess the stability of the results. Publication bias was evaluated using Begg test and Egger test, facilitated by Stata SE 12.0 software. The quality of evidence for the outcome indicators was assessed using the GRADEpro system, which includes 5 downgrade factors and 3 upgrade factors.

3 Result

3.1 Literature screening

Initially, we retrieved and identified 1,523 articles that met the study period criteria, and then 822 duplicate studies were removed. After screening the titles and abstracts, 573 articles were excluded. Following a detailed evaluation of the full texts, an additional 100 studies were excluded (reasons for exclusion are shown in Supplementary Table S2). Consequently, a total of 28 studies (Chen and Li, 2023; Ma, 2023; Gu et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2022; Zou, 2022; Pei and Shang, 2022; Zhang et al., 2021; Luo and Liu, 2021; Cai et al., 2011; Song, 2020; Lan, 2019; Kang and Yang, 2019; Kang et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2018; Yang T. et al., 2018; Xia, 2018; Wu, 2018; Peng, 2017; Zhou et al., 2017; Yan and Dong, 2016; Chen et al., 2015; Qin et al., 2015; He et al., 2015; Jiang and Sheng, 2015; Zhao and Yan, 2015; Lin et al., 2009; Chen and Liu, 2007; Cong et al., 2019) were included in the analysis. Details of the screening process are shown in Figure 1.

3.2 Characteristics of included studies

The analysis included 28 studies with a total of 2,969 participants with acne vulgaris. There was a total of participants in the experimental group 1,599 and 1,370 participants in the control group. The age of participants ranged from 14 to 65 years old. The duration of acne ranged from 0.5 to 144 months. All trials were conducted in China and published in Chinese from 2007 to 2023. Among the 28 studies, 3 studies (Zhou et al., 2017; Lin et al., 2009; Chen and Liu, 2007) had experimental groups that received only Tanshinone capsules (Hebei xinglong Xili Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd) treatment, twenty one studies (Liu and Ma, 2023; Chen and Li, 2023; Ma, 2023; Gu et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2022; Zou, 2022; Pei and Shang, 2022; Zhang et al., 2021; Luo and Liu, 2021; Cai et al., 2021; Song, 2020; Lan, 2019; Kang and Yang, 2019; Kang et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2018; Yang T. et al., 2018; Xia, 2018; Wu, 2018; Peng, 2017; Yan and Dong, 2016; Zhao and Yan, 2015) had treatment groups that received Tanshinone capsules treatment in addition to the control group's treatment, and the remaining 4 studies (Chen et al., 2015; Qin et al., 2015; He et al., 2015; Jiang and Sheng, 2015) were three-arm studies that included both of these scenarios. The control group received one or more conventional treatments for acne vulgaris, including topical retinoids, topical antimicrobial therapy, oral antibiotics, oral isotretinoin, hormonal therapy, chemical peels and physical treatments. The characteristics of the included trials are shown in Table 1.

3.3 Risk of bias assessment

Regarding selection bias, fifteen studies (Liu and Ma, 2023; Chen and Li, 2023; Ma, 2023; Pei and Shang, 2022; Zhang et al., 2021; Luo and Liu, 2021; Song, 2020; Lan, 2019; Yang T. et al., 2018; Wu, 2018; Peng, 2017; Zhou et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2015; Qin et al., 2015; He et al., 2015) used the random number table method and 1 study (Gu et al., 2023) used random drawing



method, which was rated as low. One study (Zhang et al., 2022) was considered high risk due to random grouping based on the order of patient visits. The remaining 11 studies (Zou, 2022; Cai et al., 2021; Kang and Yang, 2019; Kang et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2018; Xia, 2018; Yan and Dong, 2016; Jiang and Sheng, 2015; Zhao and Yan, 2015; Lin et al., 2009; Chen and Liu, 2007) did not report the method for generating random sequences and were rated as unclear risk. None of the studies explained the randomization method in detail, which was considered to be an unclear risk of bias. Due to the significant differences in the formulation of treatments between the treatment and control groups, performance bias was rated as high. For detection bias, one study (He et al., 2015) was considered low risk as outcome data collection and assessment was conducted under blinding. All studies had no patients fell off, all studies reported test indicators as planned, and there was no selective reporting of research results. It is unclear whether there were other examples of bias. The Risk of bias graph is shown in Figure 2.

3.4 Effectiveness and safety of Tanshinone capsules

3.4.1 Primary outcome

A total of 15 studies (including two three-arm studies) (Ma, 2023; Zou, 2022; Zhang et al., 2021; Lan, 2019; Kang and Yang, 2019; Kang et al., 2019; Yang T. et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2017; Yan and Dong, 2016; Qin et al., 2015; He et al., 2015; Lin et al., 2009; Chen and Liu, 2007) evaluated the relapse rate, involving 1,289 patients. The fixed-effects model was used for subsequent meta-analysis because of the low heterogeneity among the studies (p = 0.72, $I^2 = 0\%$). We found that the recurrence rate in the experimental group was lower than the control group (RR = 0.44, 95%CI 0.34 to 0.57, p < 0.00001) (Figure 3). The sensitivity analysis demonstrated low sensitivity, indicating that the results were robust against the exclusion of any single study (Supplementary Figure S1A). Although Chen and Liu (2007) contributed a heavy weight (22.3%) to the analysis, the sensitivity analysis results remained consistent after its

TABLE 1 Characteristics of the included trials.

Study ID	Sample size (Female %) T/C	Intervention		Treatment duration	Outcome
		т	С		
Liu and Ma (2023)	50(40)/50(38)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + OA + OR	OA + OR	1 m	06
Chen and Li (2023)	43(58)/42(55)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + OR	OR	6w	26
Ma (2023)	43(42)/43(49)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + OR	OR	6w	126
Gu et al. (2023)	45(53)/45(58)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + OR	OR	8w	256
Zou (2022)	50(44)/50(48)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + OR	OR	8w	06
Pei and Shang (2022)	20(50)/20(45)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + TA + PT	TA + PT	4w	46
Zhang et al. (2021)	52(54)/52(48)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + PT	РТ	3 m	06
Luo and Liu (2021)	69(49)/68(44)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + OA + OR	OA + OR	l m	26
Cai et al. (2021)	41(46)/39(49)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + OA	OA	4w	0
Song (2020)	44(57)/44(52)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + TR + TA + PT	TR + TA + PT	8w	0
Lan (2019)	89(44)/89(43)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + OR	OR	6w	06
Kang and Yang (2019)	60(53)/60(58)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + OA + TA	OA + TA	12w	16
Kang et al. (2019)	30(47)/30(40)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + OR	OR	6w	16
Cai et al. (2021)	41(46)/39(49)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + OA	OA	4w	0
Liu et al. (2018)	25(44)/26(46)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + PT	РТ	2 m	236
Yang et al. (2018a)	44(41)/44(43)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + OA	OA	6w	026
Xia (2018)	40(53)/40(55)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + CP	СР	NR	3
Wu (2018)	60(38)/60(40)	Tanshinone capsules 1-0.75g tid + TR + TA	TR + TA	8w	0
Peng (2017)	60(58)/60(63)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + OA	OA	8w	35
Zhou et al. (2017)	31(100)/31(100)	Tanshinone capsules 0.75g tid	HT	4w	006
Yan and Dong (2016)	52(NR)/50(NR)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + OR	OR	6w	16
Chen et al. (2015)	82(100)/83(100)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid	HT	6w	66
Chen et al. (2015)	86(100)/83(100)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + HT	HT	6w	56
Qin et al. (2015)	32(NR)/32(NR)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid	ТА	8w	16
Qin et al. (2015)	34(NR)/32(NR)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + TA	TA	8w	16
He et al. (2015)	52(46)/54(39)	Tanshinone capsules 1g qid	СР	8w	16
He et al. (2015)	55(44)/54(39)	Tanshinone capsules 1g qid + CP	СР	8w	16
Jiang and Sheng (2015)	30(40)/30(47)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid	OR	8w	26
Jiang and Sheng (2015)	30(43)/30(47)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + OA	OR	8w	26
Zhao and Yan (2015)	30(53)/30(60)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid + TA + PT	TA + PT	8w	0
Lin et al. (2009)	42(40)/34(41)	Tanshinone capsules 1g tid	OA	6w	16
Chen and Liu (2007)	85(47)/71(51)	Tanshinone capsules 1-0.75g tid	OA	8w	06

T, treatment group; C, control group; tid, thrice daily; qid, four times daily; w,week; m, month; TA, topical antimicrobial; TR, topical retinoids; OA, oral antibiotics; OI, oral isotretinoin; CP, chemical peels; HT, hormonal therapy; PT, physical treatment; NR: not report; ① Relapse rate; ② Inflammatory factors levels; ③ Sebum secretion rate; ④ GAGS, scores; ⑤ Hormone levels; ⑥ AEs.

exclusion (RR $_{\rm exclusion \ Chen \ W \ 2007} = 0.42,\,95\%$ CI: 0.31 to 0.56, $p < 0.00001, \ I^2 = 0).$

At the same time, to avoid the influence of different intervention methods on the analysis results, we conducted a subgroup analysis based on treatment durations (≤ 6 weeks, > 6 weeks) and different intervention methods for the experimental group (combining systemic therapies, combining non-systemic therapies, combining both systemic and non-systemic therapies, and Tanshinone capsules only). The results suggested that regardless of whether the treatment period exceeded 6 weeks the recurrence rate in the experimental group was lower than that in the control group ($RR_{\leq 6 \text{ weeks}} = 0.28$, 95%CI: 0.16 to 0.49, p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 0\%$; $RR_{>6 \text{ weeks}} = 0.51$, 95%CI: 0.39 to 0.68, p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 0\%$) (Figure 4A). Additionally the results of the different intervention methods subgroup analysis were



consistent with the overall results (RR _{Combining systemic therapies} = 0.25, 95%CI: 0.13 to 0.46, p < 0.00001; RR _{Combining non systemic therapies} = 0.43, 95%CI: 0.23 to 0.82, p = 0.01; RR _{Combining systemic and non systemic therapies} = 0.48, 95%CI: 0.26 to 0.87, p = 0.02; RR _{Tanshinone capsules only} = 0.59, 95%CI: 0.41 to 0.83, p = 0.002) (Figure 4B).

3.4.2 Secondary outcomes

3.4.2.1 Levels of inflammatory factors

3.4.2.1.1 TNF-α. A total of 14 studies (including one three-arm study) (Liu and Ma, 2023; Chen and Li, 2023; Ma, 2023; Gu et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2022; Luo and Liu, 2021; Cai et al., 2021; Song, 2020; Liu et al., 2018; Yang T. et al., 2018; Wu, 2018; Jiang and Sheng, 2015; Zhao and Yan, 2015) evaluated TNF-α levels, involving 1,261 patients. The random-effects model was used for subsequent meta-analysis because of the high heterogeneity among the studies (p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 94\%$). We found that TNF-α levels in the experimental group were lower than in the control group (MD = -10.18, 95%CI: -13.57 to -8.04, p < 0.00001) (Figure 5A). Sensitivity analysis demonstrated low sensitivity, indicating that the results were robust against the exclusion of any single study (Supplementary Figure S1B).

Subgroup analysis showed that regardless of treatment duration or intervention method, TNF- α levels in the treatment group were consistently lower than in the control group, aligning with the overall results (MD $_{\leq 6}$ weeks = -9.75, 95%CI: -14.15 to -5.36, p < 0.00001; MD $_{\geq 6}$ weeks = -11.67, 95%CI: -15.65 to -7.69, p < 0.00001; MD $_{\rm Combining systemic therapies} = -9.82$, 95%CI: -13.40 to -6.24, p < 0.00001; MD $_{\rm Combining non systemic therapies} = -12.60$, 95%CI: -16.05 to -9.14, p < 0.00001; MD $_{\rm Tanshinone capsules only} = -10.80$, 95%CI: -13.57 to -8.04, p < 0.00001) (Figures 5B,C).

3.4.2.1.2 IL-4. A total of 3 studies (Ma, 2023; Luo and Liu, 2021; Yang T. et al., 2018) evaluated the IL-4 levels, involving 311 patients. The fixed-effects model was used for subsequent meta-analysis because of the low heterogeneity among the studies (p = 0.97, $I^2 = 0\%$). The results indicated that after treatment, the level of IL-4 in the experimental group was lower than in the control group after treatment (MD = -6.46, 95%CI: -7.14 to -5.77, p < 0.00001) (Figure 6). And the sensitivity analysis demonstrated low sensitivity, indicating that the results were robust against the exclusion of any single study (Supplementary Figure S1C). Since all three studies had treatment durations of less than 6 weeks and the



treatment groups combined systemic therapies, subgroup analysis was not conducted.

3.4.2.1.3 IL-6. A total of 4 studies (Liu and Ma, 2023; Song, 2020; Wu, 2018; Zhou et al., 2017) evaluated the IL-6 levels, involving 370 patients. The random-effects model was used for subsequent meta-analysis because of the high heterogeneity among the studies (p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 99\%$). The results showed that after treatment, the level of IL-6 in the experimental group was lower than the control group (MD = -16.14, 95%CI: -30.10 to -2.18, p = 0.02) (Figure 7A). In the sensitivity analysis, no single study remarkably affected the effect sizes of IL-6 levels. However, after removing the studies Liu and Ma (2023), Song (2020), Wu (2018), the result was no longer significant (MD _{exclusion Liu KY 2023} = -10.18, 95%CI: -26.24 to 4.64, p = 0.17; MD _{exclusion Song SJ 2020 = -12.21, 95%CI: -29.63 to 5.22, p = 0.17; MD _{exclusion Wu WY 2018} = -17.16, 95%CI: -36.82 to 2.49, p = 0.09) (Supplementary Figure S1D).}

Subgroup analysis results showed that When the treatment duration was ≤6 weeks, there was no significant difference in the level of IL-6 between the two groups (MD $\leq_{6 \text{ weeks}} = -11.56, 95\%$ CI: -51.49 to 28.37, p = 0.57). However, when the treatment duration exceeded 6 weeks, IL-6 levels in the experimental group were significantly lower (MD $_{>6}$ weeks = -20.19, 95%CI: -34.96 to -5.41, p = 0.007) (Figure 7B). In the subgroup analysis of different intervention methods, the results for "Combining systemic therapies" and "Combining non-systemic therapies" were consistent with the overall findings (MD Combining systemic therapies = -31.80, 95%CI: -33.45 to -30.15, p < 0.00001; MD Combining non systemic therapies = -20.19, 95%CI: -34.96 to -5.41, p < 0.00001). However, the "Tanshinone capsules only" subgroup showed opposite results compared to the overall findings (MD Tanshinone capsules only = 8.95, 95%CI: 2.22 to -8.04, p <0.00001) (Figure 7C).

A total of 9 studies (including one three-arm 3.4.2.1.4 IL-8. study) (Chen and Li, 2023; Gu et al., 2023; Song, 2020; Liu et al., 2018; Wu, 2018; Zhou et al., 2017; Jiang and Sheng, 2015; Zhao and Yan, 2015) evaluated the IL-8 levels, involving 646 patients. The randomeffects model was used for subsequent meta-analysis because of the high heterogeneity among the studies (p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 93\%$). The results showed that after treatment, the IL-8 levels in the experimental group was lower than the control group (MD = -4.48, 95%CI: -8.30 to -0.65, p = 0.02) (Figure 8A). In the sensitivity analysis, no single study remarkably affected the effect sizes of IL-8 levels. However, after excluding the studies Chen and Li, (2023), Gu et al. (2023), Lan, (2019), Wu (2018), Jiang and Sheng (2015), the result was no longer significant (MD exclusion Chen QY 2023 = -4.06, 95%CI: -8.66 to 0.53, p = 0.08; MD _{exclusion Gu DL 2023} = -4.08, 95%CI: -8.54 to 0.37, p = 0.07; MD _{exclusion Song SJ 2020} = -3.07, 95%CI: -6.53 to 0.39, p = 0.08; MD _{exclusion Wu WY 2018} = -4.32, 95%CI: -9.03 to 0.40, p = 0.07; MD _{exclusion Jiang L 2015b} = -4.04, 95%CI: -8.31 to 0.24, p =0.06) (Supplementary Figure S1E).

Subgroup analysis results showed that When the treatment duration was ≤ 6 weeks, there was no significant difference in the IL-8 levels between the two groups (MD \leq_{6} weeks = -0.01, 95%CI: -14.49 to 14.46, p = 1.00). However, when the treatment duration exceeded 6 weeks, IL-6 levels in the experimental group were significantly lower (MD $_{> 6}$ weeks = -5.69, 95%CI: -9.92 to -1.47, p = 0.008) (Figure 8B). In the subgroup analysis of different intervention methods, the results for "Combining systemic therapies" and "Combining non-systemic therapies" were consistent with the overall findings (MD _{Combining} systemic therapies = -7.35, 95%CI: -8.97 to -5.91, p < 0.00001; MD _{Combining non systemic therapies = -7.78, 95%CI: -13.55 to -2.01, p = 0.008), while the "Tanshinone capsules only" subgroup showed opposite results compared to the overall findings (MD _{Tanshinone} capsules only = 7.19, 95%CI: 4.10 to 10.28, p < 0.00001) (Figure 8C).}

₽ 1. Li M Ya Ya Ya Ya	Etudy or Subgroup E 1.1 course of treatme ang K 2019 an YP 2019	xperime <u>vents</u> ent≤ 6W	ntal Total Ev	Control	1			
3 K Li Li Ya Ya	1.1 course of treatme ang K 2019 an YP 2019	ent≤6W	I ULCH LY	onte 1	otal I	Moight	Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio M H Eixed 95% Cl
K Li M Ya Ya Za	ang K 2019 an YP 2019			lents i		weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	
Li Li M Ya Ya	an YP 2019	2	30	6	30	3.8%	0.33 [0.07, 1.52]	
Li M Ya Ya	- 140 0000	1	89	7	89	4.5%	0.14 [0.02, 1.14]	
Y: Y: Y:	n MG 2009	4	15	5	42	4.6%	0.32 [0.13, 0.80]	
Ya	an 2023 and TR 2018	2	42	0 6	42	3,9%	0.25 [0.06, 1.11]	
71	an Q 2016	3	52	11	50	7.2%	0.26 [0.08, 0.88]	
21	nou T 2017	2	31	2	31	1.3%	1.00 [0.15, 6.66]	
St	ubtotal (95% CI)		303		292	30.3%	0.28 [0.16, 0.49]	◆
Te	otal events	15		45				
H Ti	eterogeneity: Chi² = 2.: est for overall effect: Z :	55, df = 6 = 4.47 (P	(P = 0.86 < 0.0000); I² = 0% 1)	6			
1.	1.2 course of treatme	ent> 6w						
C	hen W 2007	20	85	32	71	22.3%	0.52 [0.33, 0.83]	
н	e CF 2015a	8	52	9	54	5.6%	0.92 [0.39, 2.21]	
H	e CF 2015b	2	55	9	54	5.8%	0.22 [0.05, 0.96]	
K	ang L 2019	11	42	18	33	12.9%	0.48 [0.26, 0.87]	
Q	in XF 2015a	5	32	8	32	5.1%	0.63 [0.23, 1.71]	
Q	IN XF 2015b	6	34	8	32	5.3%	0.71 [0.28, 1.81]	
Zł	nang ZY 2021	4	52	10	52	6.4%	0.40 [0.13, 1.19]	
Z	utotal (95% Cl)	3	402	10	50 378	69.7%	0.30 [0.09, 1.03]	
5	ntal evente	50	402	104	510	33.170	0.01 [0.09, 0.08]	•
H	eterogeneity: Chi ² = 4.1	59, df = 7 = 4 71 (P	(P = 0.71); I ² = 09 1)	6			
т	otal (95% CI)	4.0 C (1*	705	.,	670	100.0%	0.44 [0.34, 0.57]	•
Tr	otal events	74	.05	149	510		0.11 [0.04, 0.07]	Ţ
н	eterogeneity: Chi ² = 10	0.59, df =	14 (P = 0.	72); 2=	0%		1	
Te Ti	est for overall effect: Ζ est for subαroup differ	= 6.44 (P ences: Ch	< 0.0000 ni² = 3.60.	1) df=1 (P = 0.0	6). I² = 72		Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
В		Evnorim	ontal	Contra	ol		Risk Ratio	Rick Ratio
1	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total I	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
	1.1.1 Combining syste	mic ther	apies					
1	Kang K 2019	2	30	6	30	3.8%	0.33 [0.07, 1.52]	
	Lan YP 2019	1	89	7	89	4.5%	0.14 [0.02, 1.14]	
1	Ma H 2023	2	42	8	42	5.1%	0.25 [0.06, 1.11]	
	Yang TR 2018	1	44	6	44	3.8%	0.17 [0.02, 1.33]	
	Yan Q 2016	3	52	11	50	7.2%	0.26 [0.08, 0.88]	
	Zou YQ 2022	3	50	10	50	6.4%	0.30 [0.09, 1.03]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)	10	307	40	305	30.8%	0.25 [0.13, 0.46]	•
!	Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0 Test for overall effect: 7).66, df = 7 = 4 49 (f	5 (P = 0.9 P < 0 000	40 19); I² = (01)	1%			
	1.1.2 Combining non s	vstemic	therapies	5				
,	He CF 2015b	2	55	9	54	5.8%	0.22 (0.05. 0.96)	
j.	Qin XF 2015b	6	34	8	32	5.3%	0.71 [0.28, 1.81]	+
7	Zhang ZY 2021	4	52	10	52	6.4%	0.40 [0.13, 1.19]	
1	Subtotal (95% CI)		141		138	17.5%	0.43 [0.23, 0.82]	◆
-	Total events	12		27				
1	Heterogeneity: Chi² = 1	1.88, df =	2 (P = 0.3	9); I² = 0)%			
-	Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 2.59 (I	P = 0.010)				
	1 1 3 Combining evet	mic and	non evet	emic the	aranie	8		
	Kang 2019	11	47	18	33	12 9%	0.48 (0.26, 0.97)	_ _
	Subtotal (95% CI)		42		33	12.9%	0.48 [0.26, 0.87]	◆
	Total events	11	10.00	18		1110000000		
ſ	Heterogeneity: Not app	olicable						
	Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 2.41 (I	P = 0.02)					
	1.1.4 Tanshinone can	sules onl	v					
2	Chen W 2007	20	85	32	71	22.3%	0.52 (0.33, 0.83)	
i	He CF 2015a	8	52	9	54	5.6%	0.92 [0.39, 2.21]	
	Lin MG 2009	4	15	5	6	4.6%	0.32 [0.13. 0.80]	
	Qin XF 2015a	5	32	8	32	5.1%	0.63 [0.23, 1.71]	_
1	Zhou T 2017	2	31	2	31	1.3%	1.00 [0.15, 6.66]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)		215		194	38.9%	0.59 [0.41, 0.83]	◆
	Total events	39		56				
-	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3	3.29, df = Z = 3.04 (I	4 (P = 0.5 P = 0.002	i1); I² = ())%			
	restion overall effect. 2				670	100.0%	0.44 [0.34, 0.57]	◆
	Total (95% CI)		705					
	Total (95% CI) Total events	74	705	149	0.04			
	Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	74 10.59, df=	705 = 14 (P =	149 0.72); I ²	= 0%			
	Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2	74 10.59, df= Z = 6.44 (1	705 = 14 (P = P < 0.000 Chi2 = 5 0	149 0.72); I² 01) 9. df = ⊃	= 0% (P = 0	12) 12 - 4	19 1 %	0.02 0.1 1 10 50 Favours (experimental) Favours (control)
	Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ^z = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Test for subgroup diffe	74 10.59, df= Z = 6.44 (b erences: (705 = 14 (P = P < 0.000 Chi² = 5.8	149 0.72); I² 01) 9. df = 3	= 0% (P = 0.	.12). I² = 4	9.1%	0.02 0.1 1 10 50 Favours (experimental) Favours (control)
	Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: J Test for subαroup diffe	74 10.59, df= Z = 6.44 (I erences: (705 = 14 (P = P < 0.000 Chi ² = 5.8	149 0.72); I² 01) 9. df = 3	= 0% (P = 0.	.12). I² = 4	19.1%	0.02 0.1 1 10 50 Favours (experimental) Favours (control)

3.4.2.2 Sebum secretion rate

A total of 3 studies (Liu et al., 2018; Xia, 2018; Peng, 2017) evaluated the sebum secretion rate, involving 251 patients. The random-effects model was used for subsequent meta-analysis

because of the high heterogeneity among the studies (p = 0.0010, $I^2 = 86\%$). The results showed that after treatment, the sebum secretion rate in the experimental group was lower than the control group (MD = -0.29, 95%CI:

	Experimenta Mean SD T	l Contr otal Mean S	ol D Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Mean Differen IV, Random, 95	nce 5% Cl
Cai XT 2021	22.12 3.17	41 43.02 6.	6 39	7.4%	20.90 [-23.19, -18.61]	-	
Chen QY 2023	25.49 3.47	43 32.25 3.5	1 42	7.0%	-b./b[-8.24, -5.28] -6.67[-0.59]-3.75]		
Jiang L 2015a	44.29 7.1	30 56.95 9	5 30	6.6%	-12.66 [-16.90, -8.42]		
Jiang L 2015b	36.69 6.67	30 56.95 9.	5 30	6.6%	-20.26 [-24.41, -16.11]		
Liu KY 2023	28.55 4.48	50 36.49 5.8	2 50	7.5%	-7.94 [-9.98, -5.90]		
Luo HF 2021	28.67 4.52	25 40.38 8.3 69 36.28 5.4	9 20 6 68	7.6%	-7.61 [-9.29, -5.93]	-	
Ma H 2023	38.28 5.9	43 42.36 7.8	2 43	7.2%	-4.08 [-7.01, -1.15]		
Song SJ 2020	30.71 7.57	44 43.96 8.7	5 44	7.0%	-13.25 [-16.67, -9.83]		
You WY 2018 Yang TR 2018	40.05 6.82	60 48.62 7.0	5 60 1 44	7.4%	-8.57 [-11.05, -6.09] -11 30 [-14 88 -7 72]		
Zhang H 2022	16.56 4.41	93 20.55 5.4	5 93	7.7%	-3.99 [-5.41, -2.57]	+	
Zhao J 2015	29.32 7.34	30 45.26 8.5	3 30	6.7%	15.94 [-19.97, -11.91]		
Total (95% CI)		647	644	100.0%	-10 80 [-13 57 -8 04]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 25.46; Chi ² = 23	0.79, df = 13 (P <	0.00001	; I ² = 94%	- 10.00 [- 10.01, -0.04]		10 10
Test for overall effect	t: Z = 7.66 (P < 0.0	0001)				Favours (experimental) Favo	urs (control)
						, arears (substantistical) , are	
В							
	Experimenta	l Contr	ol		Mean Difference	Mean Differen	ice
Study or Subgroup	Mean SD T	otal Mean S	D Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95	% CI
Cai XT 2021	22.12 3.17	41 43.02 6	6 39	7.4%	20.90 [-23.19, -18.61]		
Chen QY 2023	25.49 3.47	43 32.25 3.5	1 42	7.6%	-6.76 [-8.24, -5.28]	+	
Gu DL 2023	36.45 6.87	45 43.12 7.2	4 45	7.2%	-6.67 [-9.59, -3.75]		
Liu KY 2023	28 55 4 48	50 36 49 58	5 30 2 50	0.0%	-20.26 [-24.41, -16.11] -7.94 [-9.98 -5.90]		
Luo HF 2021	28.67 4.52	69 36.28 5.4	6 68	7.6%	-7.61 [-9.29, -5.93]	-	
Ma H 2023	38.28 5.9	43 42.36 7.8	2 43	7.2%	-4.08 [-7.01, -1.15]		
Yang TR 2018 Zhang H 2022	33.25 8.12	44 44.55 9.0	1 44	6.9%	-11.30 [-14.88, -7.72]		
Subtotal (95% CI)	10.50 4.41	458	454	65.8%	-9.82 [-13.40, -6.24]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 28.25; Chi ² = 19	9.87, df = 8 (P <	0.00001);	l² = 96%			
Test for overall effec	t: Z = 5.37 (P < 0.0	.0001)					
2.2.2 Combining no	n systemic therap	oies					
Liu W 2018	32.79 7.14	25 46.38 8.3	9 26	6.6%	-13.59 [-17.86, -9.32]		
Song SJ 2020	30.71 7.57	44 43.96 8.7	5 44 5 60	7.0%	-13.25 [-16.67, -9.83]		
Zhao J 2015	29.32 7.34	30 45.26 8.5	3 30	6.7%	-15.94 [-19.97, -11.91]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		159	160	27.6%	-12.60 [-16.05, -9.14]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 9.16; Chi ² = 11.9	31, df = 3 (P = 0.0	08); I ² = 7	5%			
restion overall ellec	I. Z = 7.14 (P < 0.0	0001)					
2.2.3 no combining	therapy						
Jiang L 2015a Subtotal (95% CI)	44.29 7.1	30 56.95 9. 30	5 30	6.6%	-12.66 [-16.90, -8.42]	•	
Heterogeneity: Not a	applicable	50	50	0.076	- 12.00 [- 10.90, -8.42]		
Test for overall effec	t: Z = 5.85 (P < 0.0	0001)					
Total (95% CI)		647	644	100.0%	-10.80 [-13.578.04]	•	
10(11(55% Cl)	= 25.46; Chi ² = 23	0.79, df = 13 (P <	0.00001	; I ² = 94%	-10.00[-10.01,-0.04]		10 10
Heterogeneity: Tau ²		00041				-20 -10 0 Favours (experimental) Favo	urs (control)
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec	t: Z = 7.66 (P < 0.0	0001)		196		· ····································	and feeting all
Heterogeneity: Tau² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d	t: Z = 7.66 (P < 0.0 fferences: Chi ² = 1	1.51. df = 2 (P = 0	.47). * = (
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for suboroup d	t: Z = 7.66 (P < 0.0 ifferences: Chi ² = 1	1.51. df = 2 (P = 0	.47). * = (
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C	t: Z = 7.66 (P < 0.0 ifferences: Chi ² = 1	1.51. df = 2 (P = C	.47). * = 1				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C	t: Z = 7.66 (P < 0.0 ifferences: Chi ² = Experimenta Moon SP 7	1.51. df = 2 (P = 0	01	Mointet	Mean Difference	Mean Differei	1Ce
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C Study or Subgroup 2.1.1 course of treat	t: Z = 7.66 (P < 0.0 ifferences: Chi ^a = Experimenta <u>Mean SD 1</u> tment≲ 6W	1.51. df = 2 (P = (I Contr <u>'otal Mean S</u>	.47), * = (ol <u>D Total</u>	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Mean Differe IV, Random, 95	nce % Cl
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C Study or Subgroup 2.1.1 course of treat Cai XT 2021	t: Z = 7.66 (P < 0.0 ifferences: Chi ² = <u>Experimenta</u> <u>Mean SD 1</u> trment ≤ 6W 22.12 3.17	1.51. df = 2 (P = (I Contr <u>'otal Mean S</u> 41 43.02 6.	ol <u>D Total</u> 6 39	Weight 7.4%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -20.90 [-23.19, -18.61]	Mean Differe IV, Random, 95	nce % Cl
Heterogeneity: Tau' Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C Study or Subgroup 2.1.1 course of tree Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023	t: Z = 7.66 (P < 0.0 ifferences: Chi [≥] = <u>Experimenta</u> <u>Mean SD 1</u> trunent ≤ 6W 22.12 3.17 25.49 3.47	1.51. df = 2 (P = (i Contr <u>iotal Mean S</u> 41 43.02 6. <u>43</u> 32.25 3.5	ol <u>D Total</u> 6 39 1 42	Weight 7.4% 7.6%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -20.90 [-23.19, -18.61] -6.76 [-8.24, -5.28]	Mean Differer IV. Random, 95	nce % Cl
Heterogeneilt: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C Study or Subgroup 2.1.1 course of trea Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2023	t: Z = 7.66 (P < 0.0 ifferences: Chi [≈] = 1 Experimenta <u>Mean SD 1</u> truent≪ 6W 22.12 3.17 25.49 3.47 26.55 4.48 20.65	1.51. df = 2 (P = (Contr <u>otal Mean S</u> 41 43.02 6. 43 32.25 3.5 50 36.49 5.8	ol D Total 6 39 1 42 2 50	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.5%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -20.90 [-23.19, -18.61] -6.76 [-8.24, -5.28] -7.94 [-9.98, -5.90] -8.410.00	Mean Differe IV, Random, 95	ісе % СІ
Heterogeneity: Tau' Test for overall effec Test for subaroud d C Study or Subgroup 2.1.1 course of trea Cai XT 2021 Chen GY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu F 2021	t: Z = 7.66 (P < 0.0 ifferences: Chi ^p = 1 Experimenta <u>Mean SD 1</u> truent ≤ 6W 22.12 3.17 25.49 3.47 28.55 4.48 28.67 4.52 29.29 5.0	I.51. df = 2 (P = (Contr <u>otal Mean S</u> 41 43.02 6. 43 32.25 3.5 50 36.49 5.8 69 36.28 5.4 42 42 8.78 7.8	ol <u>D Total</u> 6 39 1 42 2 50 6 68 2 43	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.5% 7.6% 7.2%	Mean Difference <u>IV. Random, 95% Cl</u> -0.90 [-23.19, -18.61] -6.76 [-8.24, -5.28] -7.94 [-9.28, -5.90] -7.61 [-9.29, -5.93] -4.09 (-71, -1.16]	Mean Differer IV, Random, 95 	nce % Cl
Heterogeneily: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C 2.1.1 course of trea Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2021 Ma H 2023 Yang TR 2018	t Z = 7.66 (P < 0.1 ifferences: Chi [™] = ' Experimenta <u>Mean SD 1</u> trunent ≪ 6W 22.12 3.17 28.55 4.48 28.67 4.52 38.28 5.9 33.25 8.12	ILSI.df = 2 (P = (i Contr <u>otal Mean S</u> 41 43.02 6. 43 32.25 3.5 50 36.49 5.8 69 36.28 5.4 43 42.36 7.8 44 44.55 9.0	ol <u>D Total</u> 6 39 1 42 2 50 6 68 2 43 1 44	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.5% 7.6% 7.2% 6.9%	Mean Difference <u>N. Random, 95% Cl</u> -0.00 [-23.19, -18.61] -6.76 [+9.24, -5.20] -7.61 [-9.29, -5.93] -4.08 [-7.01, -1.15] -1.30 [+1.48, -7.72]	Mean Differer IV. Random, 95 	nce % Cl
Heterogeneily: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C 2.1.1 course of trea Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Luo HF 2021 Ma H 2023 Yang TR 2018 Subtotal (95% CI)	t Z = 7.66 (P < 0.0 fferences: Chi ^a = · <u>Experimenta</u> <u>Mean SD 1</u> tranent≪ 6W 22.12 3.17 25.49 3.47 28.57 4.48 28.67 4.52 38.28 5.9 33.25 8.12	I.51. df = 2 (P = (Contr otal Mean S 41 43.02 6. 43 32.25 3.5 50 36.4.9 5.8 50 36.4.9 5.8 43 42.36 7.8 44 44.55 9.0 290	ol D Total 6 39 1 42 2 50 6 68 2 43 1 44 286	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.5% 7.6% 7.2% 6.9% 44.3%	Mean Difference M. Random, 95% Cl -20.90 [+23.19, -18.61] -6.76 [+8.24, -5.28] -7.8 [+9.29, -5.30] -4.08 [-7.01, -1.15] -11.30 [+4.88, -7.72] -3.75 [-14.15, -5.36]	Mean Differer N. Random, 95	ıce % Cl
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C Study or Subgroup 2.1.1 course of trea Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu HF 2021 Ma H 2023 Yang TR 2018 Subtotal (6% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ²	t Z = 7,86 (P < 0.0 ifferences: Chi ² =	I.51. df = 2 (P = (I.51. df	ol <u>D</u> Total 6 39 1 42 2 50 6 68 2 43 1 44 286 0.00001);	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.5% 7.6% 7.2% 6.9% 44.3%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 20.90 (-23.19, -18.61) -7.94 (-9.98, -5.20) -7.94 (-9.98, -5.30) -7.61 (-9.29, -5.30) -4.08 (-7.01, -1.15) -11.30 [-14.88, -7.72] -9.75 [-14.15, -5.36]	Mean Differe IV, Random, 95 	10e % CI
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect Test for subaround d C Study or Subgroup 2.1.1 course of trea Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Yang TR 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect	t Z = 7,86 (P < 0.0 ifferences: Chi [™] = : <u>Mean SD 1</u> 22,12 3,17 25,49 3,47 28,55 4,48 28,67 4,52 38,28 5,9 38,28 5,9 38,29 5,9 48,29 5,9 48,49 5,9 48,	I.51. df = 2 (P = (I Contr I Contr 41 43.02 43 32.25 50 36.49 69 36.24 43 44.55 90 8.79, df = 5 (P <	ol <u>D Total</u> 6 39 1 42 2 50 6 68 2 43 1 44 286 0.00001);	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 7.2% 6.9% 44.3%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl 20.90 [-23.19, -18.61] -6.76 [-8.24, -5.29] -7.64 [-9.36, -5.30] -7.61 [-9.29, -5.30] -7.61 [-9.29, -5.33] -4.08 [-7.01, -1.15] -11.30 [-14.88, -7.72] -9.75 [-14.15, -5.36]	Mean Differer IV, Random, 95	ice % Cl
Heterogeneilt: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C 2.1.1 course of trea Cai XT 2021 Chen GY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2021 Ma H 2023 Yang TR 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneilt: Tau ² Test for overall effec 2.1.2 course of trea	t Z = 7.86 (P < 0.0 ifferences: Chi [™] = : trment≤ 6W 22.12 3.17 28.55 4.452 38.28 5.9 33.25 8.12 = 28.66; Chi [™] = 12 t Z = 4.35 (P < 0.0 trment> 6W	1.51. df = 2 (P = (1 Contr 1 Adam 41 43.02 43 32.25 50 36.49 50 36.49 43 42.26 43 42.36 44 44.55 290 8.79, df = 5 (P <	ol <u>D Total</u> 6 39 1 42 2 50 6 68 2 43 1 44 286 0.00001);	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.5% 7.6% 7.2% 6.9% 44.3% ² = 96%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl 20.90 [+23.19, -18.61] -6.76 [+8.24, -5.28] -7.94 [+9.38, -5.90] -7.61 [+9.29, -5.39] -7.61 [+9.29, -5.36] -11.30 [+1.48, -7.72] -9.75 [-14.15, -5.36]	Mean Differer IV, Random, 95	1Ce % Cl
Heterogeneilt: Tau" Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C 2.1.1 course of trea Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2021 Ma H 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneilt: Tau" Test for overall effec 2.1.2 course of trea Gu DL 2023	t Z = 7.66 (P < 0.0 ifferences: Chi ² = · Experimenta <u>Mean SD 1</u> tranet ≪ 6W 22.12 3.17 28.55 4.48 28.67 4.52 38.28 5.9 33.25 8.12 = 28.66; Chi ² = 12 t Z = 4.35 (P < 0.0 tranet> 6W 36.45 6.87	1.51.0f=2 (P = (I Contri 41 43.02 6. 43 32.25 3.5 50 36.49 5.8 69 36.28 5.4 44.55 9.0 290 8.79, df=5 (P < 001)	ol <u>D Total</u> 6 39 1 42 2 50 6 68 2 43 1 44 286 0.00001); 4 45	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.5% 7.2% 6.9% 44.3% ² = 96%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 20.90 [-23.19, -18.61] -6.76 [+9.24, -5.80] -7.84 [+9.89, -5.90] -7.81 [+9.29, -5.93] -4.08 [-7.01, -1.15] -1.130 [-14.86, -7.2] -9.75 [-14.15, -5.36] -6.87 [+9.59, -3.75]	Mean Differer IV. Random, 95	1Ce % Cl
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C 2.1.1 course of trea Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Yang TR 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec 2.1.2 course of trea Gu DL 2023 Jiang L 2015a Liang L 2015a	Experimenta Mean SD 1 transt & 6W 22.12 3.17 25.49 3.47 28.55 4.48 28.67 4.52 38.28 5.9 33.25 8.12 = 28.66; Chi ² = 12 t Z = 4.35 (P < 0.0 tment>6w 36.45 6.87 44.29 7.1 36.69 6.67	1.51. df = 2 (P = (1 Contri 1 Contri 41 43.02 43 32.25 50 36.49 50 36.49 43 42.36 43 42.36 43 42.36 43 42.36 43 42.36 43 42.36 43 42.36 44 45.5 90 66.85 879, df = 5 (P <	ol <u>D</u> Total 6 39 1 42 2 50 6 68 2 43 1 44 286 0.00001); 4 45 5 30 5 20	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.5% 7.2% 6.9% 44.3% ² = 96% 6.6% €.6%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -0.76 [+0.24, -5.28] -7.61 [+0.29, -5.30] -7.61 [+0.29, -5.33] -4.08 [7.01, -1.15] -11.30 [-14.88, -7.72] -9.75 [-14.15, -5.36] -6.67 [+9.59, -3.76] -12.66 [+16.90, -8.42] -0.06 [-2.44, 4.44]	Mean Differe IV, Random, 95	1CE % CI
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C 2.1.1 course of trea CaiXT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (6% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec 2.1.2 course of trea Giu DL 2023 Jiang L 2015a Jiang L 2015b Liu W 2018	$\begin{array}{c} t \ Z = 7, 86 \ (P < 0.0; \\ \text{ifferences: Chi2} = : \\ \hline \ $	1.51. df = 2 (P = (I Contr 1 A3.02 41 43.02 43 32.25 50 36.49 50 36.49 43 42.36 43 42.36 44 44.55 90 290 1001) 30 45 43.12 30 56.95 30 56.95 30 56.95 30 56.95 30 56.95 30 56.95 30 56.95 30 56.95 30 56.95 30 36.93 30 36.93	ol D Total 6 39 1 42 2 50 6 68 2 43 1 44 286 0.00001); 4 45 5 30 5 30 9 26	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.5% 7.6% 7.2% 6.9% 44.3% 1 ² = 96% 7.2% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6%	Mean Difference M. Random, 95% Cl 20.90 (-23.19, -18.61) -8.76 (+8.24, -5.28) -7.94 (-9.98, -5.90) -7.94 (-9.98, -5.90) -7.94 (-9.98, -5.90) -1.03 (-14.88, -7.72) -9.75 (-14.15, -5.36) -6.67 (-9.59, -3.75) -1.2.66 (-16.90, -8.42) 20.26 (-24.41, -16.11) -1.359 (-17.86, -9.32)	Mean Differer IV, Random, 95	ice % Cl
Heterogeneily: Tau" Test for overall effect Test for subaroup di C 2.1.1 course of trea Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2021 Ma H 2023 Yang TR 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau" Test for overall effect 2.1.2 course of trea Gu DL 2023 Jiang L 2015a Jiang L 2015b Liu W 2018 Song SJ 2020	$\begin{array}{c} t \ Z = 7, \dot{s}6 \ (P < 0.0;\\ \mbox{ifferences: Chi^2} =: \\ \hline \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$	I.51. df = 2 (P = (I Contr I Contr 41 43.02 6. 43 32.25 3.5 50 36.24 5.8 69 36.28 5.4 43 42.65 9.0 290 8.79, df = 5 (P ≤ 0001) 45 43.12 7.2 30 56.95 9. 30 56.95 9. 30 56.95 9. 30 56.95 9. 44 43.96 8.7 44 43.96 8.7	ol D Total 6 39 1 42 2 50 6 68 2 43 1 44 286 0.00001); 4 45 5 30 5 30 9 26 5 44	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.6% 7.2% 6.9% 44.3% 1 ² = 96% 7.2% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 7.0%	Mean Difference N. Random, 95% Cl 20.90 [-23.19, -18.61] -8.76 [-8.24, -5.28] -7.94 [-9.36, -5.30] -7.61 [-9.29, -5.30] -4.08 [-7.01, -1.15] -11.30 [-14.88, -7.72] -9.75 [-14.15, -5.36] -12.66 [-16.90, -8.42] 20.26 [-16.67, -9.83] -13.26 [-16.67, -9.83]	Mean Differer IV, Random, 95	1CE % CI
Heterogeneity: Tau' Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C 2.1.1 course of tread Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2021 Ma H 2023 Yang TR 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau' Test for overall effec 2.1.2 course of tread Gu DL 2023 Jiang L 2015b Liu W 2018 Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2018	t Z = 7.66 (P < 0.0. ifferences: Chi ² = : term t= : term t= 6 W 22.12 3.17 25.49 3.47 28.55 4.48 28.67 4.52 38.28 5.9 33.25 8.12 = 28.66; Chi ² = 12 t Z = 4.35 (P < 0.0 term t> 6w 36.45 6.87 4.29 7.1 36.59 6.67 32.79 7.14 30.71 7.57	L.51. df = 2 (P = (I Contr 1 Contr 41 43.02 43 32.25 50 36.49 58 36.28 41 42.36 43 42.26 50 36.49 50 36.49 50 36.59 290	ol <u>D</u> Total 6 39 1 42 2 50 6 68 2 43 1 44 286 0.00001); 4 45 5 30 9 26 5 44 5 60	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.5% 6.9% 44.3% ₽ 96% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 7.0% 7.4%	Mean Difference W. Random, 95% CI -0.00 [-23.19, -18.61] -6.76 [+8.24, -5.28] -7.8 [+9.29, -5.30] -4.08 [-7.01, -1.15] -11.30 [-14.88, -7.72] -9.75 [-14.15, -5.36] -6.67 [-9.59, -3.75] -12.66 [-16.90, -8.42] -0.26 [-24.41, -16.11] -13.59 [-16.67, -9.33] -8.57 [-1.05, -6.09]	Mean Differer IV. Random, 95	1CE % CI
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C 2.1.1 course of trea Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Vang TR 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec 2.1.2 course of trea Gu DL 2023 Jiang L 2015 Liu Y 2018 Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2018 Zhang H 2022 Zhao L 2015	$\begin{array}{c} t \ Z = 7, 86 \ (P < 0.0; \\ \text{ifferences: Chi2} = : \\ \hline \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$	L.51. df = 2 (P = (I Contri I Contri I Contri I A3.02 6. I A3.42.6 7.0 I A3.12 7.2 I A3.06 9. I A4.43.5 9.0 I A3.06 9. I A3.06 9. I A3.06 8.3 I A3.06 2.5 I A4.43.06 8.3 I A3.06 2.7 I A3.06 2.6 2.6 I A3.06 2.	ol D Total 6 39 1 42 2 50 6 68 2 43 1 44 286 0.00001); 4 45 5 30 9 26 5 44 5 60 5 93 3 30	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.6% 7.6% 6.9% 44.3% 6.9% 44.3% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 7.2% 6.6% 7.0% 7.4% 7.7%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 20.90 [-23.19, -18.61] -6.76 [-8.24, -5.28] -7.61 [-9.29, -5.33] -4.08 [7.01, -1.15] -11.30 [-14.88, -7.72] -9.75 [-14.15, -5.36] -6.67 [-9.59, -3.75] -12.66 [-16.90, -8.42] 20.26 [-24.41, -16.11] -1.359 [-17.86, -9.32] -1.359 [-17.86, -9.32] -1.359 [-15.6.60] -3.99 [-5.41, -2.57]	Mean Differe N, Random, 95	100 % CI
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C 2.1.1 course of trea Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec 2.1.2 course of trea Gu DL 2023 Jiang L 2015b Liu W 2018 Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2018 Song SJ 2022 Zhao J 2015 Subtotal (95% C)	$\begin{array}{c} Experimenta\\ \hline Mean & SD \\ 12122 & 3.17\\ 25.49 & 3.47\\ 22.12 & 3.17\\ 25.49 & 3.47\\ 28.55 & 4.48\\ 28.67 & 4.52\\ 38.28 & 5.9\\ 33.25 & 8.12\\ = 28.66; Chi^2 = 12\\ t Z = 4.35 (P < 0.0\\ \hline ment2 & 6w\\ 36.45 & 6.87\\ 44.29 & 7.1\\ 36.69 & 6.87\\ 44.29 & 7.1\\ 36.69 & 6.87\\ 44.29 & 7.1\\ 30.71 & 7.57\\ 40.05 & 6.82\\ 10.56 & 6.41\\ 29.32 & 7.34\\ \hline \end{array}$	uouon contr 1.51.df=2 (P = 0 1 Contr 141 43.02 6. 41 43.02 5. 50 36.49 5.8 69 36.28 5.4 43 42.26 7.5 90 5.8 6.4 290 .8.79, df=5 9.0 30 56.95 9. 30 56.95 9. 30 56.95 9. 30 56.95 9. 30 56.95 9. 30 56.95 9. 30 25.5 5.4 30 44.3.9.8 8.7 44.4.9.96 8.7 30 32.0.55 5.4 30 45.26 8.5 357 357	ol D Total 6 39 1 42 2 50 6 68 2 43 1 44 286 0.00001); 4 45 5 30 5 30 9 26 5 30 9 26 5 44 5 60 9 26 5 93 3 30 358	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.5% 7.2% 6.9% 44.3% P = 96% 7.2% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 7.4% 7.7% 6.7%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 20.90 [-23.19, -18.61] - 6.76 [+8.24, -5.28] - 7.94 [-9.98, -5.90] - 7.61 [+9.29, -5.83] - 4.08 [-7.01, -1.15] - 11.30 [-14.88, -7.72] - 9.75 [-14.15, -5.36] - 12.66 [-16.90, -8.42] 20.26 [-24.41, -16.11] - 13.59 [-17.86, -9.32] - 13.59 [-7.86, -9.32] - 3.29 [-5.41, -2.57] 15.94 [+19.97, -11.81]	Mean Differen	ice % Cl
Heterogeneity: Tau" Test for overall effec Test for subaroup di C 2.1.1 course of trea Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau" Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau"	$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{t} \ \mathbf{z} = 7, \mathbf{\hat{s}6} \ (\mathbf{P} < 0.0,\\ \text{ifferences: Chi2} = :\\ \hline \mathbf{Mean} \mathbf{SD} \ 1\\ \hline \mathbf{Ment} \ll \mathbf{SD} \ 1\\ \hline \mathbf{Ment} \ll \mathbf{SD} \ 1\\ \hline \mathbf{Z}2, 12 3, 17 \\ 28, 55 4, 48 \\ 28, 67 4, 52 \\ 38, 28 5, 9 \\ 33, 25 8, 12 \\ \hline \mathbf{z} = 4, 35 \ (\mathbf{P} < 0.0\\ \hline \mathbf{tment} = \mathbf{6w} \\ 36, 45 6, 87 \\ 33, 25 8, 12 \\ \hline \mathbf{z} = 4, 35 \ (\mathbf{P} < 0.0\\ \hline \mathbf{tment} \mathbf{SD} \ 0\\ \hline \mathbf{tment} \mathbf{SD} \ 0\\ \hline \mathbf{tment} \mathbf{SD} \ 0\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ \mathbf{5D} \ 0\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\\ \mathbf{5D} \ 1\\ \mathbf$	J.51. df = 2 (P = (I Contr I Contr I Contr I Al.02 6. I Go al.9 5. I Go al.9 5. I Go al.9 5. I Go al.2 5.4 I Go al.2 5.5	ol D Total 6 39 1 42 2 50 6 68 2 43 1 44 286 5 30 5 30 9 26 5 44 5 60 5 93 3 30 358 00001); F	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.6% 7.2% 6.6% 44.3% I² = 96% 7.2% 6.6% 6.6% 7.4% 6.6% 7.4% 6.7% 55.7% 55.7%	Mean Difference M. Random, 95% Cl 20.90 [-23.19, -18.61] -8.76 [+8.24, -5.29] -7.94 [-9.38, -5.90] -7.81 [+9.29, -5.30] -1.130 [-14.88, -7.72] -9.75 [-14.15, -5.36] -6.67 [-9.59, -3.75] -12.66 [-16.90, -8.42] 20.26 [-24.41, -16.11] -13.59 [-7.86, -9.32] -13.55 [-7.68, -9.32] -3.39 [-5.41, -2.57] 15.94 [-19.97, -11.91] -11.67 [-15.65, -7.69]	Mean Differen	ice % Cl
Heterogeneily: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C 2.1.1 course of trea Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2021 Ma H 2023 Yang TR 2018 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneily: Tau ² Test for overall effec Subtotal (95% C) Liu W 2018 Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2018 Zhang H 2022 Zhao J 2015 Subtotal (95% C)	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Experimenta} \\ \hline \text{Experimenta} \\ \hline \text{Mean SD } \\ \text{Itment \leqslant 6W} \\ 22.12 & 3.17 \\ 24.49 & 3.47 \\ 28.55 & 4.48 \\ 28.67 & 4.52 \\ 33.25 & 8.12 \\ 28.66 & 4.59 \\ 33.25 & 8.12 \\ 28.66 & 1.53 \\ 42.65 \\ 43.65 & 6.87 \\ 44.29 & 7.34 \\ 42.9 & 6.67 \\ 32.79 & 7.14 \\ 30.71 & 7.57 \\ 40.05 & 6.82 \\ 16.65 & 4.41 \\ 29.32 & 7.34 \\ 29.34 & 7.34 \\ 29.34 & 7.34 \\ 29.34 & 7.34 $	L.51. df = 2 (P = (I Contri I Contri A1 A3.02 6. A3 32.25 3.5 50 36.49 5.8 69 36.28 5.4 43 42.26 7.2 80 36.28 5.4 43 42.36 7.8 90 5.69 36.28 5.4 44 43.62 7.0 30.45 5.6 30 56.95 9. 25 46.38 8.3 30 56.95 9. 25 46.38 8.3 30 45.26 8.5 357 367 377 30 45.26 8.5 357 357 397 37 70 90.0011	a y) P = 1 b Total a b Total a c 39 1 42 2 50 a a 2 4 45 a 2 30 286 a 3 30 5 90 5 93 3358 a 3 300 358 000011; F	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.5% 7.6% 7.2% 6.9% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 6.7.2% 6.7.3% 7.2% 6.9% 6.9% 6.9% 6.9% 6.9% 6.9% 6.9% 6.9% 7.2% 7.2% 7.3% 7.2% 7.3%	Mean Difference W. Random, 95% CI -0.90 [-23.19, -18.61] -6.76 [+8.24, -5.28] -7.8 [+9.29, -5.93] -4.08 [-7.01, -1.15] -11.30 [-14.88, -7.72] -9.75 [-14.15, -5.36] -6.67 [-9.59, -3.75] -12.66 [-16.90, -8.42] -0.20 [-24.41, -16.11] -13.29 [+16.67, -9.83] -8.57 [+11.05, -6.09] -3.99 [-5.41, -2.57] 15.94 [+1.92, -11.91] -11.67 [-15.65, -7.69]	Mean Differen	1CE % CI
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subgroup d C 2.1.1 course of tread Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Jiang L 2016 Chen QY 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec	t Z = 7.66 (P < 0.0 ifferences: Chi ² = : transformatic field of the second secon	L.51. df = 2 (P = (I.51. d	4,47), P = 1 0 1 0 1 2 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.6% 7.2% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 7.2% 6.6% 6.6% 7.2% 6.6% 7.2% 6.6% 7.2% 6.6% 7.2% 6.6% 7.2% 6.5% 7.2% 1.2	Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI -0.90 [-23.19, -18.61] -6.76 [+8.24, -5.28] -7.84 [+9.38, -5.30] -7.84 [+9.38, -5.30] -7.84 [+9.28, -5.33] -1.1.30 [-14.88, -7.72] -9.75 [-14.15, -5.36] -6.67 [-9.59, -3.75] -12.66 [-16.90, -8.42] -3.25 [-16.67, -9.83] -3.57 [-10.5, -6.09] -3.99 [-5.41, -2.57] 15.94 [-19.37, -11.31] -11.67 [-15.65, -7.69]	Mean Differen	1CE % CI
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C 2.1.1 course of trea Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Vang TR 2018 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec 2.1.2 course of trea Gu DL 2023 Jiang L 2015 Liu Y 2018 Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2018 Zhao J 2015 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Total (95% Cl)	$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{t} \ \mathbf{z} = 7, \mathbf{\hat{s}6} \ (\mathbf{P} < 0.0;\\ \text{ifferences: Chi2} = :\\ \hline \mathbf{Mean} \mathbf{SD} \ 1\\ \hline \mathbf{Mean} \mathbf{SD} \ 1\\ \hline \mathbf{Mean} \ \mathbf{SD} \ 1\\ \hline \mathbf{Mean} \ \mathbf{SD} \ 1\\ \hline \mathbf{Mean} \ \mathbf{SD} \ 1\\ \hline \mathbf{SD} \ \mathbf{SD} \ \mathbf{SD} \ \mathbf{SD} \ \mathbf{SD}\\ \hline \mathbf{SD} \ \mathbf{SD} \ \mathbf{SD} \ \mathbf{SD}\\ \hline \mathbf{SD} \ \mathbf{SD} \ \mathbf{SD}\\ \hline \mathbf{SD} \ \mathbf{SD} \ \mathbf{SD} \ \mathbf{SD}\\ \hline \mathbf{SD} \ S$	L.51. df = 2 (P = (I.51. df = 3 (P <	ol D Total 6 9 1 2 00 1 2 0 1 2 0 0 0 1 2 0	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.8% 6.9% 8.6% 6.6% 6.6% 7.2% 6.6% 6.6% 7.2% 6.6% 7.2% 6.6% 7.2% 5.5% 7.55.7% 100.0% 100.0%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 20.90 [-23.19, -18.61] -6.76 [-8.24, -5.28] -7.61 [-9.29, -5.33] -4.08 [7.01, -1.15] -11.30 [-14.88, -7.72] -9.75 [-14.15, -5.36] -6.67 [-9.59, -3.75] -12.66 [-16.90, -8.42] 20.26 [-24.41, -16.11] -1.359 [-17.86, -9.32] -1.359 [-17.86, -9.32] -1.359 [-15.6, -6.09] -3.99 [-5.41, -2.57] -15.94 [-19.97, -11.31] -11.67 [-15.65, -7.69] -10.80 [-13.57, -8.04]	Mean Differen	100 % CI
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Test for subaroup d C 2.1.1 course of trea Cai XT 2021 Chen QY 2023 Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec	$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{t} \ \mathbf{z} = 7, \mathbf{\hat{s}6} \ (\mathbf{P} < 0. 0, \\ \text{ifferences: Chi2} = : \\ \hline \mathbf{Mean} \mathbf{SD} \ 1 \\ \hline \mathbf{trand SD} \ 1 \\ \hline \mathbf{trand SD} \ 1 \\ \hline \mathbf{trand SD} \ 1 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}2, 12 \ 3, 17 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}5, 49 \ 3, 47 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}8, 55 \ 4, 48 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}8, 67 \ 4, 52 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}2, 8, 52 \ 8, 12 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}2, 8, 56 \ 4, 42 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}3, 25 \ 8, 12 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}2, 8, 56 \ 6, 87 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}4, 29 \ 5, 74 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}3, 27 \ 8, 74 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}3, 27 \ 7, 17 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}5, 69 \ 6, 67 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}2, 79 \ 7, 14 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}9, 32 \ 7, 34 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}9, 92, \mathbf{Chi^2} = 32 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}2, 5, 74 \ (\mathbf{P} < 0, 0 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}2, 5, 74 \ (\mathbf{P} < 0, 0 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}2, 66 \ \mathbf{chi^2} = 32 \\ \hline \mathbf{t} \ \mathbf{z} = 7, 86 \ (\mathbf{P} < 0, 0 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}2, 66 \ \mathbf{chi^2} = 32 \\ \hline \mathbf{z} \ \mathbf{z}, 7, 66 \ (\mathbf{z} < 0, 0 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}2, 66 \ \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{chi^2} = 32 \\ \hline \mathbf{z} \ \mathbf{z}, 7, 86 \ (\mathbf{z} < 0, 0 \\ \hline \mathbf{z}3, 86 \ \mathbf{z}4, \mathbf{z}4$	1.51. df = 2 (P = (I Contr fold Contr 41 43.02 6. 43 32.25 35 50 36.49 58 69 36.28 5.4 43 42.36 7.8 44 4.55 9.0 290 (8.79, df = 5 (P <)	ol D. Total 6 39 1 42 2 50 6 68 2 50 6 68 2 43 1 44 286 6 5 30 9 26 5 90 5 93 358 30 358 00001); F 644 644	Weight 7.4% 7.6% 7.5% 6.9% 6.9% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 6.6% 7.7% 6.7% 7.7% 55.7% *= 93% 100.0%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 20.90 (-23.19, -18.4 - 5.28) - 8.76 [+8.24, -5.28] - 7.94 [+9.98, -5.90] - 7.91 [+9.29, -5.83] - 4.08 [-7.01, -1.16] - 11.30 [-14.88, -7.72] - 9.75 [-14.15, -5.36] - 12.66 [-16.90, -8.42] 20.26 [-24.41, -16.11] - 13.59 [-17.86, -9.32] - 13.59 [-17.86, -9.32] - 3.29 [-5.41, -2.57] 15.94 [-19.97, -11.31] - 11.67 [-15.65, -7.69] - 10.80 [-13.57, -8.04]	Mean Differen N. Random, 95 	100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100

-0.49 to -0.10, p = 0.003) (Figure 9). Sensitivity analysis revealed that heterogeneity significantly decreased (p = 0.86, $I^2 = 0\%$) after excluding the study Peng LL 2017 (Peng, 2017),

which had a lower initial sebum secretion rate and may have contributed to methodological heterogeneity (Supplementary Figure S1F).



3.4.2.3 GAGS score

A total of 2 studies (Zhang et al., 2022; Pei and Shang, 2022) evaluated the GAGS score, involving 226 patients. The randomeffects model was used for subsequent meta-analysis because of the high heterogeneity among the studies (p < 0.0001, $I^2 = 94\%$). The results showed that after treatment, the GAGS score in the treatment group was lower than the control group (MD = -4.71, 95%CI: -7.62 to -1.80, p = 0.002) (Figure 10). Sensitivity analysis demonstrated low sensitivity, indicating that the results were robust against the exclusion of any single study (Supplementary Figure S1G).

3.4.2.4 Levels of hormone

3.4.2.4.1 Luteinizing hormone. A total of 3 studies (including one three-arm study) (Peng, 2017; Chen et al., 2015) evaluated luteinizing hormone (LH) levels, involving 371 patients. The fixed-effects model was used for subsequent meta-analysis because of the low heterogeneity among the studies (p = 0.90, $I^2 = 0\%$). The results showed no statistically significant difference in LH levels between the experimental and control groups after treatment (MD = -0.01, 95%CI: -1.68 to 1.66, p = 0.99) (Figure 11A). The sensitivity analysis demonstrated low sensitivity, indicating that the results were robust against the exclusion of any single study (Supplementary Figure S1H).

3.4.2.4.2 Follicle-stimulating hormone. A total of 3 studies (including one three-arm study) (Peng, 2017; Chen et al., 2015) evaluated follicle-stimulating hormone (FSH) levels, involving 371 patients. The fixed-effects model was used for subsequent meta-analysis because of the low heterogeneity among the studies (p = 0.28, $I^2 = 21\%$). The results showed no statistically significant difference in the level of FSH between the experimental and control groups after treatment (MD = 0.12, 95%CI: -0.60 to 0.85, p = 0.74) (Figure 11B). The sensitivity analysis demonstrated that no single study had a significant impact on the overall results and the effect sizes of the FSH levels after treatment. However, after excluding Chen HY 2015b (Chen et al., 2015), the heterogeneity increased (p = 0.11, $I^2 = 60\%$) (Supplementary Figure S1I).

3.4.2.4.3 Testosterone. A total of 4 studies (including one threearm study) (Gu et al., 2023; Peng, 2017; Chen et al., 2015) evaluated the testosterone (T) levels, but the study Gu DL 2023 (Gu et al., 2023) employed a different detection method, resulting in significant variations in the values. Consequently, only 3 studies (Peng, 2017; Chen et al., 2015) were ultimately combined (including one threearm study), involving 371 patients. The fixed-effects model was used for subsequent meta-analysis because of the low heterogeneity among the studies (p = 0.52, $I^2 = 0\%$). The results showed that after treatment, T levels in the experimental group was lower than the control group (MD = -14.50, 95%CI: -17.59 to -11.40, p < -11.400.00001) (Figure 11C). In the sensitivity analysis, after excluding Peng LL 2017 (Peng, 2017), the result exceeded the original 95% confidence interval (MD exclusion Peng LL 2017 = -11.0, 95%CI: -21.49 to -0.25, p = 0.04) (Supplementary Figure S1J). This indicates that Peng LL 2017 (Peng, 2017) had a significant impact on the overall results and may be a key source of potential heterogeneity. Consequently, the meta-analysis results appear to be sensitive to this particular study, suggesting potential instability in the overall findings. We speculate that may arise from differences in patient demographics, as the majority of participants in other studies were female, potentially influencing the sensitivity analysis outcome.

3.4.2.4.4 Estradiol. A total of 4 studies (including one threearm study) (Gu et al., 2023; Peng, 2017; Chen et al., 2015) evaluated the Estradiol (E2) levels after treatment, but the study Gu DL 2023 (Gu et al., 2023) employed a different detection method, resulting in significant variations in reported values. Consequently, only 3 studies (Peng, 2017; Chen et al., 2015) were ultimately combined (including one three-arm study), involving 371 patients. The fixed-effects model was used for subsequent meta-analysis because of the low heterogeneity among the studies (p = 0.96, $I^2 = 0\%$). The results indicated no statistically significant difference in E₂ levels between the experimental and control groups after treatment (MD = 1.43, 95%CI: -6.88 to 9.74, p = 0.74) (Figure 11D). The sensitivity analysis demonstrated low sensitivity, indicating that the results were robust against the exclusion of any single study (Supplementary Figure S1K).

3.4.2.5 Adverse events

A total of 27 studies (including four three-arm studies) (Liu and Ma, 2023; Chen and Li, 2023; Ma, 2023; Gu et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2022; Zou, 2022; Pei and Shang, 2022; Zhang et al., 2021; Luo and Liu, 2021; Cai et al., 2021; Lan, 2019; Kang and Yang, 2019; Kang et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2018; Yang T. et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2017; Yan and Dong, 2016; Chen et al., 2015; Qin et al., 2015; He et al., 2015; Jiang and Sheng, 2015; Lin et al., 2009; Chen and Liu, 2007) reported the occurrence of AEs during treatment. However, Cai XT 2021 (Cai et al., 2021) reported no observed adverse reactions in either the

	Exp	eriment	al	С	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Liu KY 2023	40.87	3.28	50	72.67	4.95	50	25.5%	-31.80 [-33.45, -30.15]	+
Song SJ 2020	34.02	12.74	44	61.91	10.08	44	24.9%	-27.89 [-32.69, -23.09]	
Wu WY 2018	30.05	5.47	60	42.86	5.83	60	25.5%	-12.81 [-14.83, -10.79]	+
Zhou T 2017	30.37	14.5	31	21.42	12.45	31	24.2%	8.95 [2.22, 15.68]	
Total (95% CI)			195			185	100.0%	16 14 [30 10 2 19]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	198.17:	Chi ² = 2	297.52	. df = 3 (P < 0.00	0001); 1	² = 99%	-10.14 [-50.10, -2.10]	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.27	(P = 0.0	02)						-20 -10 0 10 20 Favours (experimental) Favours (control)
_									
В									
	Exp	eriment	al	С	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
2.4.1 course of treat	ment≤	6 W							
Liu KY 2023	40.87	3.28	50	72.67	4.95	50	25.5%	-31.80 [-33.45, -30.15]	•
Zhou T 2017	30.37	14.5	31	21.42	12.45	31	24.2%	8.95 [2.22, 15.68]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		01.7	81			81	49.7%	-11.56 [-51.49, 28.37]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	824.04;	$Chi^2 = 1$ $(P = 0)^2$	132.98 57)	, df = 1 (0.01 × ۲	JUU1); I	*= 99%		
. South of orerain energy	2 - 0.37	v = 0.v							
2.4.2 course of treat	ment> 6	w							
Song SJ 2020	34.02	12.74	44	61.91	10.08	44	24.9%	-27.89 [-32.69, -23.09]	
WU WY 2018	30.05	5.47	60	42.86	5.83	60	25.5%	-12.81 [-14.83, -10.79]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	110 17	Chiz-	104	df = 1 /D	~ 0.000	104	- 07%	-20.19[-54.90, -5.41]	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.68	P = 0.0	32.20, 307)	ui = 1 (F	< 0.000	JUT), I [_]	- 97 %		
Total (95% CI)	400.47		185			185	100.0%	-16.14 [-30.10 -2.18]	
Heterogeneity: I au-=	19817	AL:2 /	07 20	10 0 1		0041	2 0000	-10.114[-00.10,-2.10]	
LOOTTOR OVOROLL OTTOOT	7-2.27	$Chi^2 = 2$	297.52	, df = 3 (P < 0.00	0001);1	²= 99%		-50 -25 0 25
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff	Z = 2.27 erences	; Chi² = 2 ' (P = 0.0 :: Chi² =	297.52 02) 0.16. c	,df=3(lf=1(P∶	P < 0.0(= 0.69).)001); I I² = 0%	²= 99%		-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff	Z = 2.27 erences	: Chi² = : ' (P = 0.(:: Chi² =	297.52 02) 0.16. c	,df=3(lf=1(P∶	P < 0.01 = 0.69).)001); ² = 0%	²= 99%		-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff	Z = 2.27 erences	; Chi ^z = ; ' (P = 0.(:: Chi ^z =	297.52 02) 0.16. c	,df=3(lf=1(P:	P < 0.0(= 0.69).)001); ² = 0%	²= 99%		-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff	Z = 2.27 erences	: Chi ² = : ' (P = 0.(:: Chi ² = eriment	297.52 02) 0.16. c al	,df=3(lf=1(P: C	P < 0.0(= 0.69). ontrol)001); ²= 0%	²= 99%	Mean Difference	-50 -25 0 25 Favours (experimental) Favours (control) Mean Difference
l est for overall effect: Fest for suboroup diff C Study or Subgroup	Z = 2.27 erences Expe Mean	: Chi ² = 2 ? (P = 0.(:: Chi ² = :: Chi ² = sD	297.52)2) 0.16. c al <u>Total</u>	, df = 3 (lf = 1 (P = C <u>Mean</u>	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD)001); ² = 0% <u>Total</u>	* = 99%	Mean Difference	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI
lest for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff C Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Combining syst	Z = 2.27 erences Exp Mean emic the	Chi ² = 2 ? (P = 0.(:: Chi ² = eriment <u>SD</u> erapies	297.52)2) 0.16. c al <u>Total</u>	,df=3(lf=1(P: C <u>Mean</u>	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD	0001); ² = 0% <u>Total</u>	² = 99% Weight	Mean Difference	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
lest for overall effect. Fest for subaroup diff Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023	Z = 2.27 erences <u>Mean</u> emic the 40.87	Chi ² = 2 (P = 0.(Chi ² = Chi ² = eriment <u>SD</u> erapies 3.28	297.52)2) 0.16. c al <u>Total</u> 50	, df = 3 (if = 1 (P = C <u>Mean</u> 72.67	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD 4.95	0001); ² = 0% <u>Total</u> 50	² = 99% Weight 25.5%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
l est for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI)	Z = 2.27 erences <u>Exp</u> <u>Mean</u> emic the 40.87	: Chi ² = ; : (P = 0.(: Chi ² = eriment <u>SD</u> erapies 3.28	297.52 02) al <u>Total</u> 50 50	, df= 3 (lf= 1 (P C <u>Mean</u> 72.67	P < 0.01 = 0.69). ontrol <u>SD</u> 4.95	0001); ² = 0% <u>Total</u> 50 50	² = 99% Weight 25.5% 25.5%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
lest for overall effect. Test for subgroup diff <u>Study or Subgroup</u> 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect	Exp Exp Mean emic the 40.87 pplicable Z = 37 8	: Chi ² = : : (P = 0.(: Chi ² = eriment <u>SD</u> erapies 3.28 37 (P < 0	297.52 02) 0.16. c al <u>Total</u> 50 50	, df = 3 (If = 1 (P <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 72.67	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD 4.95	0001); ² = 0% <u>Total</u> 50 50	² = 99% Weight 25.5% 25.5%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff <u>Study or Subaroup</u> 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ag Test for overall effect:	Expo erences Mean emic the 40.87 oplicable Z = 37.8	: Chi ² = 2 : (P = 0.(: Chi ² = eriment <u>SD</u> erapies 3.28 :7 (P < 0	297.52)2) 0.16. d al <u>Total</u> 50 50	, df = 3 (if = 1 (P <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 72.67	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD 4.95	0001); ² = 0% <u>Total</u> 50 50	² = 99% Weight 25.5% 25.5%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff <u>Study or Subaroup</u> 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Combining non	Exp Exp Mean emic the 40.87 pplicable Z = 37.8 systemic	: Chi ² = : (P = 0.(: Chi ² = eriment <u>SD</u> erapies 3.28 i7 (P < 0 ic theraj	297.52 02) 0.16. c al <u>Total</u> 50 50 .00001 pies	, df = 3 (if = 1 (P <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 72.67 I)	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD 4.95	0001); ² = 0% <u>Total</u> 50 50	² = 99% Weight 25.5% 25.5%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff C. Study or Subgroup 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ag Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Combining non Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2019	Exp erences Exp Mean emic the 40.87 pplicable Z = 37.8 systemi 34.02	: Chi ² = 2 : (P = 0.0 : Chi ² = eriment SD erapies 3.28 37 (P < 0 ic theral 12.74 5.47	297.52 02) 0.16. c al <u>Total</u> 50 .00001 pies 44	, df = 3 (if = 1 (P <u>Mean</u> 72.67	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD 4.95	0001); ² = 0% <u>Total</u> 50 50	² = 99% Weight 25.5% 25.5% 24.9%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
Est for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ag Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Combining non Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2018 Subtotal (95% CI)	Z = 2.27 erences <u>Exp</u> <u>Mean</u> emic the 40.87 oplicable Z = 37.8 systemi 34.02 30.05	: Chi ² = 2 : (P = 0.0 : Chi ² = eriment <u>SD</u> erapies 3.28 37 (P < 0 ic thera 12.74 5.47	297.52 0.16. c al <u>Total</u> 50 50 .00001 pies 44 60 104	, df = 3 (if = 1 (P <u>Mean</u> 72.67 1) 61.91 42.86	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD 4.95 10.08 5.83	0001); ² = 0% <u>Total</u> 50 50 44 60 104	² = 99% <u>Weight</u> 25.5% 25.5% 24.9% 25.5% 50.3%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -27.89 [-32.69, -23.09] -12.81 [-14.83, -10.79] -20.19 [-34.95, -5.41]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ag Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Combining non Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	Z = 2.27 erences <u>Exp</u> <u>Mean</u> emic the 40.87 oplicable Z = 37.8 systemi 34.02 30.05	<pre>Chi² = 0 (P = 0.0 : Chi² = eriment <u>SD</u> erapies 3.28 7 (P < 0 ic theraj 12.74 5.47 Chi² = 1</pre>	297.52 22) 0.16. c al <u>Total</u> 50 50 .00001 pies 44 60 104 32.20	, df = 3 (if = 1 (P) <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 72.67 1) 61.91 42.86 df = 1 (P	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD 4.95 10.08 5.83 < 0.000	0001); ² = 0% <u>Total</u> 50 50 44 60 104	Z = 99% Weight 25.5% 24.9% 25.5% 50.3% 97%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -27.89 [-32.69, -23.09] -12.81 [-14.83, -10.79] -20.19 [-34.96, -5.41]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ag Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Combining non Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Fest for overall effect:	Z = 2.27 erences emic the 40.87 oplicable Z = 37.8 systemi 34.02 30.05 110.17; Z = 2.68	<pre>Chi² = 2 (P = 0.0 : Chi² = eriment <u>SD</u> erapies 3.28 17 (P < 0 ic theraj 12.74 5.47 Chi² = 3 (P = 0.0</pre>	297.52 20) 0.16. c al Total 50 50 .00001 .0000000000	, df = 3 (if = 1 (P <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 72.67 1) 61.91 42.86 df = 1 (P	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD 4.95 10.08 5.83 < 0.000	0001); ² = 0% <u>Total</u> 50 50 44 60 104 001); ²	² = 99% Weight 25.5% 24.9% 25.5% 50.3% = 97%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -27.89 [-32.69, -23.09] -12.81 [-14.83, -10.79] -20.19 [-34.96, -5.41]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ag Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Combining non Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.3 no combining the	Z = 2.27 erences emic the 40.87 plicable Z = 37.8 systemii 34.02 30.05 110.17; Z = 2.68	$Chi^{2} = 0$ (P = 0.0) $(Chi^{2} = 0.0)$ erapies 3.28 7 (P < 0) 12.74 5.47 $Chi^{2} = 0.0$ (P = 0.0)	297.52 22) 0.16. c al Total 50 50 .00007 pies 44 60 104 32.20, 307)	, df = 3 (if = 1 (P) <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 72.67 1) 61.91 42.86 df = 1 (P	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD 4.95 10.08 5.83 < 0.000	0001); ² = 0% <u>Total</u> 50 50 44 60 104 101); ²	² = 99% Weight 25.5% 24.9% 25.5% 50.3% = 97%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -27.89 [-32.69, -23.09] -12.81 [-14.83, -10.79] -20.19 [-34.96, -5.41]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ag Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Combining non Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.3 no combining tl Zhou T 2017	Z = 2.27 erences emic the 40.87 plicable Z = 37.8 systemii 34.02 30.05 110.17; Z = 2.68 herapy 30.37	$ Ch ^2 = 0$ (P = 0.0) $ (Ch ^2 = 0.0) $ $ (Ch ^2 = 0.0) $ (Ch	297.52 20) 0.16. c al Total 50 50 0.00001 pies 44 60 104 32.20, 307) 31	, df = 3 (if = 1 (P) <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 72.67 1) 61.91 42.86 df = 1 (P 21.42	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD 4.95 10.08 5.83 < 0.000	0001); ² = 0% <u>Total</u> 50 50 44 104 104 101); ² 31	 Z = 99% Weight 25.5% 25.5% 24.9% 25.5% 50.3% = 97% 24.2% 	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -27.89 [-32.69, -23.09] -12.81 [-14.83, -10.79] -20.19 [-34.96, -5.41]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Combining non Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.3 no combining tl Zhou T 2017 Subtotal (95% CI)	Z = 2.27 erences emic the 40.87 plicable Z = 37.8 systemi 34.02 30.05 110.17; Z = 2.68 herapy 30.37	$Chi^{2} = 0$ (P = 0.0) $(Chi^{2} = 0.0)$ erapies 3.28 17 (P < 0) 12.74 5.47 $Chi^{2} = 0.0$ 14.5	297.52 22) 0.16. c al Total 50 50 00001 00000 104 32.20, 007) 31 31	, df = 3 (if = 1 (P) <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 72.67 1) 61.91 42.86 df = 1 (P 21.42	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD 4.95 10.08 5.83 < 0.000 12.45	0001); * = 0% Total 50 50 44 60 104 101); *; 31 31 31	Z = 99% Weight 25.5% 24.9% 50.3% 97% 24.2% 24.2%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -27.89 [-32.69, -23.09] -12.81 [-14.83, -10.79] -20.19 [-34.96, -5.41] 8.95 [2.22, 15.68] 8.95 [2.22, 15.68]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ag Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Combining non Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.3 no combining tl Zhou T 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ac	Z = 2.27 erences <u>Expe</u> emic the 40.87 oplicable Z = 37.8 systemi 34.02 30.05 110.17; Z = 2.68 erency 30.37 oplicable	Chi ² = 2 ($P = 0.0$: Chi ² = eriment SD erapies 3.28 17 ($P < 0$ 12.74 5.47 Chi ² = 3 ($P = 0.0$ 14.5	297.52 22) 0.16. c al Total 50 50 00007 pies 44 40 32.20, 007) 31	, df = 3 (if = 1 (P) <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 72.67 1) 61.91 42.86 df = 1 (P 21.42	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD 4.95 10.08 5.83 < 0.000 12.45	0001); [*] = 0% <u>Total</u> 50 50 104 104 101); [*] 31 31	Z = 99% Weight 25.5% 24.9% 25.5% 50.3% = 97% 24.2% 24.2%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -27.89 [-32.69, -23.09] -12.81 [-14.83, -10.79] -20.19 [-34.96, -5.41] 8.95 [2.22, 15.68] 8.95 [2.22, 15.68]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Not ag Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Combining non Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2018 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.3 no combining tl Zhou T 2017 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Not ag Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.27 erences <u>Expe</u> emic the 40.87 oplicable Z = 37.8 systemi 34.02 30.05 110.17; Z = 2.68 nerapy 30.37 oplicable Z = 2.61	$Chi^{2} = 0$ (P = 0.0) $(Chi^{2} = 0.0)$ erapies 3.28 17 (P < 0) 12.74 5.47 $Chi^{2} = 0.0$ 14.5 (P = 0.0)	297.52 22) 0.16. c al Total 50 50 00000 104 32.20, 007) 31 31 009)	, df = 3 (if = 1 (P = <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 72.67 1) 61.91 42.86 df = 1 (P 21.42	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD 4.95 10.08 5.83 < 0.000 12.45	0001); ² = 0% 50 50 104 001); ² ; 31 31	Z = 99% Weight 25.5% 24.9% 25.5% 50.3% 97% 24.2%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -27.89 [-32.69, -23.09] -12.81 [-14.83, -10.79] -20.19 [-34.96, -5.41] 8.95 [2.22, 15.68] 8.95 [2.22, 15.68]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff C Study or Subaroup 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ag Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Combining non Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.3 no combining tl Zhou T 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ag Test for overall effect: Test for overall effect: Test for overall effect: Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.27 erences Mean emic the 40.87 oplicable Z = 37.8 systemii 34.02 30.05 110.17; Z = 2.68 nerapy 30.37 oplicable Z = 2.61	$Chi^{2} = 0$ (P = 0.0) (P = 0.0) $(Chi^{2} = 0)$ (P = 0.0) (P = 0.0) (P < 0) $(Chi^{2} = 0.0)$ (P = 0.0) (P = 0.0)	297.52 20) 0.16. c al Total 50 50 00000 104 32.20, 107) 31 31 31 009) 195	, df = 3 (if = 1 (P) <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 72.67 1) 61.91 42.86 df = 1 (P 21.42	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD 4.95 10.08 5.83 < 0.000 12.45	0001); ² = 0% <u>Total</u> 50 50 44 60 104 001); ² 31 31	Z = 99% Weight 25.5% 25.5% 25.5% 25.5% 24.9% 25.5% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -27.89 [-32.69, -23.09] -12.81 [-14.83, -10.79] -20.19 [-34.96, -5.41] 8.95 [2.22, 15.68] 8.95 [2.22, 15.68]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff C Study or Subaroup 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ag Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Combining non Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.3 no combining tI Shou T 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ag Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tou ² =	Z = 2.27 erences <u>Expe</u> emic the 40.87 oplicable Z = 37.8 systemi 34.02 30.05 110.17; Z = 2.68 erapy 30.37 oplicable Z = 2.61	$ Ch ^2 = 0$ (P = 0.0) $ (Ch ^2 = 0.0) $ $ (Ch ^2 = 0.0) $	297.52 20) 0.16. c al Total 50 50 00000 104 32.20, 007) 31 31 009) 185 207 50 185 185 185 185 185 185 185 185	, df = 3 (if = 1 (P) <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 72.67 i) 61.91 42.86 df = 1 (P 21.42 df = 2.4	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol <u>SD</u> 4.95 10.08 5.83 < 0.000 12.45 P < 0.00	10001); 1 ⁷ = 0% <u>Total</u> 50 50 44 60 104 101); ² ; 31 31 185	Z = 99% Weight 25.5% 25.5% 25.5% 25.5% 24.9% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 200.0%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -27.89 [-32.69, -23.09] -12.81 [-14.83, -10.79] -20.19 [-34.96, -5.41] 8.95 [2.22, 15.68] 8.95 [2.22, 15.68] -16.14 [-30.10, -2.18]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup 2.4.1 Combining syst Liu KY 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Combining non Song SJ 2020 Wu WY 2018 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2.4.3 no combining tI Zhou T 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Fotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Fotal (95% CI)	Z = 2.27 erences <u>Exp</u> emic the 40.87 oplicable Z = 37.8 systemi 34.02 30.05 110.17; Z = 2.68 erapy 30.37 oplicable Z = 2.61 (198.17; Z = 2.27	$Chi^{2} = 0$ (P = 0.0) (P = 0.0) $(Chi^{2} = 0)$ (P = 0.0) (P = 0.0) (P < 0) $(Chi^{2} = 0)$ (P = 0.0) (P = 0.0	297.52 20) 0.16. c al Total 50 50 00007 007) 31 31 009) 185 297.52 12)	, df = 3 (if = 1 (P = <u>C</u> <u>Mean</u> 72.67 1) 61.91 42.86 df = 1 (P 21.42 , df = 3 ()	P < 0.00 = 0.69). ontrol SD 4.95 10.08 5.83 < 0.000 12.45 P < 0.00	0001); ² = 0% 50 50 104 001); ² 31 31 31 185 1001);	Z = 99% Weight 25.5% 24.9% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 100.0% ≈ 99%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -31.80 [-33.45, -30.15] -27.89 [-32.69, -23.09] -12.81 [-14.83, -10.79] -20.19 [-34.96, -5.41] 8.95 [2.22, 15.68] 8.95 [2.22, 15.68] 8.95 [2.22, 15.68] -16.14 [-30.10, -2.18]	-50 -25 0 25 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

treatment course. (C) Subgroup analysis forest plot of different intervention methods for the experimental groups.

experimental or control group. Consequently, only 26 studies (including four three-arm studies) (Liu and Ma, 2023; Chen and Li, 2023; Ma, 2023; Gu et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2022; Zou, 2022; Pei and Shang, 2022; Zhang et al., 2021; Luo and Liu, 2021; Lan, 2019; Kang and Yang, 2019; Kang et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2018; Yang T. et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2017; Yan and Dong, 2016; Chen et al., 2015;

Qin et al., 2015; He et al., 2015; Jiang and Sheng, 2015; Lin et al., 2009; Chen and Liu, 2007) were ultimately combined, involving 2,421 patients. Three studies (Yan and Dong, 2016; Qin et al., 2015) (including one three-arm study) did not provide details of AEs. The main adverse reactions observed included gastrointestinal discomfort, skin flushing, and itching, among others. The fixed-



effects model was used for subsequent meta-analysis because of the low heterogeneity among the studies (p = 0.81, $I^2 = 0\%$). The results indicated that the incidence of AEs during treatment was

significantly lower in the experimental group compared to the control group (RR = 0.70, 95%CI: 0.56 to 0.87, p = 0.001) (Figure 12). The sensitivity analysis demonstrated low sensitivity,





indicating that the results were robust against the exclusion of any single study (Supplementary Figure S1L).

3.5 Publication bias

Regarding the relapse rate, the Begg test results were: z = 2.47 (continuity corrected), Pr > |z| = 0.013 (continuity corrected), thus we conducted trim-and-fill test analysis, the results showed that Q = 1.961, p = 1.000, IOR = 0.416, 95%CI: 0.086 to 0.746; and the Egger test results were: t = -1.72, P > |t| = 0.108. These results indicated the absence of statistical significance in terms of publication bias (Figure 13).

3.6 Evidence quality assessment

The quality of evidence was assessed using the GRADEpro. The quality of evidence ranged from very low to moderate. The primary reasons for downgrading were inconsistency (high heterogeneity and uneven gender ratio), imprecision (small sample size) and risk of bias (unclear blinding). This is illustrated in Figure 14.

4 Discussion

4.1 Summary of main findings

This study evaluated the efficacy and safety of Tanshinone capsules in treating acne vulgaris. A total of 28 trials involving 2,969 patients with acne vulgaris were included. The meta-analysis results demonstrated that Tanshinone capsules had a significant impact on reducing acne recurrence rates, lowering GAGS scores for

skin lesions, and decreasing sebum secretion rates, suggesting that Tanshinone capsules can offer a significant and long-lasting improvement in acne lesions and associated symptoms. Furthermore, analysis of inflammatory factor levels indicated that Tanshinone capsules significantly reduced TNF-a, IL-4, IL-6, and IL-8 levels. Suggesting that Tanshinone capsules can effectively alleviate inflammation and prevent the progression of inflammatory conditions. Given the close relationship between acne onset and patients' hormone levels, we also conducted a meta-analysis of hormone levels, the results showed that Tanshinone capsules effectively lowered testosterone levels, contributing to acne treatment. The effects of Tanshinone capsules on acne are attributable to multi-factors. However, although previous studies have reported that Tanshinone exhibits both anti-androgenic effects and estrogen-like activity, the meta-analysis did not find any significant differences in LH, FSH, or E₂ levels. In terms of safety, none of the included studies reported severe adverse events, and the meta-analysis results showed that Tanshinone capsules were associated with fewer adverse events compared to control groups. In summary, Tanshinone capsules effectively improve acne lesions, reduce excessive sebum secretion, regulate inflammatory markers and testosterone levels, and demonstrate long-lasting efficacy with a favorable safety profile.

4.2 Applicability of evidence

Tan IIA and CPT, the main active ingredients in Tanshinone capsules, show antibacterial activity against acne-related pathogenic microorganisms *in vitro* studies (Zhu et al., 2022; Li and Zhou, 2018). *C. acnes* activates the NF- κ B pathway through TLR2, resulting in elevated levels of IL-1 β , IL-6,IL-8, and TNF- α (Cong



et al., 2019). Tanshinone can reduce the levels of IL-8, IL-6, IL-1β, and TNF-a in acne model rats, as profiled by lipidomics, with the mechanism possibly related to sphingolipid and glycerophospholipid metabolism pathways (Chen et al., 2021). Tan IIA treatment inhibits the TLR2/NF-KB pathway and suppress the expression of inflammatory cytokines IL-1β, IL-8, and TNF-a (Li and Zhou, 2018). CPT contributes to reducing the levels of inflammatory cytokines IL-1β, IL-6, IL-8, and TNFa in acne model rats. This effect may be related to downregulating the expression of keratin, inhibiting glycolysis/gluconeogenesis and histidine metabolism, modulating lipid metabolism and altering sebum production, as well as downregulating the IL-17 signaling pathway, based on proteomics and metabolomics (Zhu et al., 2021). CPT helps restore the structure of skin microbiota, improve lipid metabolite composition and concentration, and negatively regulate the glycolysis pathway, thereby inhibiting excessive keratinocyte proliferation and reducing acne inflammation. (Zhu et al., 2022). Tan IIA and CPT can inhibit sebocyte proliferation and lipid synthesis, as well as downregulate AR expression (Ju et al., 2005). IL-4 expression is increased in acne hypertrophic scars, which is significantly importance for the prognosis of acne vulgaris (Yang J. H. et al., 2018). However, due to the unclear mechanism of Tanshinone's effect on IL-4 during the course of acne, these results should be interpreted with caution. Furthermore, other studies have found that Tanshinones exhibit both antiandrogenic and estrogen-like activity (Zhang et al., 2019; Siddique et al., 2012).

Overall, Tanshinones can intervene in the growth of pathogenic microorganisms, lower inflammatory cytokine levels to alleviate inflammatory responses, suppress sebaceous gland hyperplasia and excessive lipid secretion, and regulate hormone levels, thereby treating acne.

Cturks or Culture	Experim	Tetal	Contr	0I Tetel	Maint	KISK KATIO	RISK Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	lotal	Events	lotal	weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Chen HY 2015a	0	82	3	83	2.1%	0.14 [0.01, 2.76]	
Chen HY 2015b	4	86	3	83	1.8%	1.29 [0.30, 5.58]	
Chen QY 2023	6	43	5	42	3.0%	1.17 [0.39, 3.55]	
Chen W 2007	5	85	12	71	7.8%	0.35 [0.13, 0.94]	
Gu DL 2023	4	45	6	45	3.6%	0.67 [0.20, 2.20]	
He CF 2015a	1	52	4	54	2.4%	0.26 [0.03, 2.25]	
He CF 2015b	7	55	4	54	2.4%	1.72 [0.53, 5.53]	
Jiang L 2015a	4	30	4	30	2.4%	1.00 [0.28, 3.63]	
Jiang L 2015b	5	30	4	30	2.4%	1.25 [0.37, 4.21]	
Kang K 2019	5	30	6	30	3.6%	0.83 [0.28, 2.44]	
Kang L 2019	5	60	3	60	1.8%	1.67 [0.42, 6.66]	
Lan YP 2019	2	89	3	89	1.8%	0.67 [0.11, 3.89]	
Lin MG 2009	0	42	5	34	3.6%	0.07 [0.00, 1.29]	
Liu KY 2023	5	50	7	50	4.2%	0.71 [0.24, 2.10]	
Liu W 2018	2	25	3	26	1.8%	0.69 [0.13, 3.81]	
Luo HF 2021	7	69	6	68	3.6%	1.15 [0.41, 3.25]	
Ma H 2023	2	43	5	43	3.0%	0.40 [0.08, 1.95]	
Pei D 2022	2	20	3	20	1.8%	0.67 [0.12, 3.57]	
Qin XF 2015a	5	32	8	32	4.8%	0.63 [0.23, 1.71]	
Qin XF 2015b	6	34	8	32	4.9%	0.71 [0.28, 1.81]	
Yang TR 2018	10	44	12	44	7.2%	0.83 [0.40, 1.73]	
Yan Q 2016	9	52	10	50	6.1%	0.87 [0.38, 1.95]	
Zhang H 2022	13	93	26	93	15.6%	0.50 [0.27, 0.91]	
Zhang ZY 2021	5	52	4	52	2.4%	1.25 [0.36, 4.40]	
Zhou T 2017	0	31	1	31	0.9%	0.33 [0.01, 7.88]	
Zou YQ 2022	2	50	8	50	4.8%	0.25 [0.06, 1.12]	
Total (95% CI)		1324		1296	100.0%	0.70 [0.56, 0.87]	•
Fotal events	116		163				
Heterogeneity: Chi² =	18.67, df=	: 25 (P =	: 0.81); I ²	= 0%			
est for overall effect:	Z = 3.20 (F	P = 0.00	1)				Eavoure [experimental] Eavoure [control]
							Favours (experimental) Favours (control)

Forest plot for the AEs of Tanshinone capsules versus Control group.



4.3 Secondary findings

We assessed the impact of course of treatment and intervention methods in the experimental groups on the recurrence rate and levels of inflammatory factors (excluding IL-4), which are relevant to clinical practice. We found that in different treatment duration subgroups, Tanshinone capsules consistently reduced recurrence rates and TNF- α levels. This effect was also observed when Tanshinone capsules were used as a monotherapy or as an adjunctive therapy in combination treatments. Notably, results of

			Certainty as	sessment			N≘ of p	atients	Eff	ect	0	
Nº of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	(111)	(111)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty	Importa
The relap	ose rate											
15	randomised	seriousa	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	74/705	149/670	RR 0.44	125	$\Theta \Theta \Theta O$	CRITICA
	trials						(10.5%)	(22.2%)	(0.34 to 0.57)	fewer	Moderate ^a	
										1,000 (from		
										147 fewer to		
										96 fewer)		
Levels of	fTNF-α											
14	randomised	serious ^a	very serious ^b	not serious	not serious	none	647	644	•	MD 10.8	000€	IMPORTA
	citata									(13.57	Very low ^{a,b}	
										8.04 lower)		
Levels of	fil-4											
3	randomised	serious ^a	not serious	not serious	serious ^c	none	156	155	•	MD 6.46	⊕ ⊕00	IMPORTA
	trials									(7.14	Low ^{a,c}	
										5.77		
Levels of	fil-6									ioner)		
4	randomised	seriousa	very serious ^b	not serious	serious	none	185	185		MD	$\oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc$	IMPORT/
	trials	50.1003	sery serious		501003					16.14 lower	Very low ^{a,b,c}	
										(30.1 lower to		
										2.18 lower)		
Levels of	fiL-8											
9	randomised	serious ^a	very serious ^b	not serious	not serious	none	338	338		MD 4.48	€000	IMPORTA
	thats									(8.3	Very low ^{a,b}	
										0.65		
Sebum se	ecretion rate									lower)		
3	randomised	coriousa	uppy corious ^b	not serious	corious	none	125	126	•	MD 0.29	A000	IMPORT/
	trials	serious	very serious		senous					10wer (0.49	Very low ^{a,b,c}	
										lower to 0.1		
CACC -										lower)		
2	randomised	coriourà	uppreadauch	not serious	conternet	none	113	113		MD 4.71	A 0000	IMPORT/
	trials	seriousa	very serious ^b	not serious	senous	invite	115	115	· ·	lower (7.62	Verylow ^{a,b,c}	IN ON D
										lower to 1.8		
1.00										lower)		
2 cevels of	randomised	a a a la com		not seriour	and	none	228	226		MD 0.02	0000	IMPORT
-	trials	seriousa	very serious ^a	not serious	senous	none	220	120	· ·	lower (1.68	Very low ^{a,c,d}	In On DA
										lower to 1.66		
										higher)		
Levels of	randomised	a a slava a	in the second second	not serious	aad6	none	228	226		MD 0.12	A000	IMPORT
	trials	serious	very serious"	inter serious	senous		220			higher (0.6	Very low ^{a,c,d}	
										lower to 0.85		
2 20 1										higher)		
Levels of	T						200	22.5		-	0000	110 000-
3	trials	serious ^a	very serious ^d	not serious	serious ^c	none	2.28	226		MD 14.5	OOO Very lowacd	IMPORTA
										lower to	rely low	
										lower)		
Levels of	E2											
3	randomised trials	serious ^a	very serious ^d	not serious	serious ^c	none	228	226	•	MD 1.43 higher	000⊕	IMPORTA
										(6.88 lower to	Very low ^{ax,d}	
										9.74 higher)		
Adverse	events		•					•				
26	randomised	serious ^a	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	116/1324	163/1296	RR 0.70	38 fewer	⊕⊕⊕⊖	IMPORTA
	trials						(8.8%)	(12.6%)	0.87)	1,000	Moderatea	
										fewer to		
										fewer)		
: confid	ence interval;	MD: mean	difference; RR:	risk ratio								
xplanatio	ons											
Blinding	is unclear in for heterogen	most inclu neity.	ude studies.									
	ent sample siz	ze										
. Insuficio . The gen	der ratio of th	ne participa	ants was uneven									

the subgroup analyses were not entirely consistent. For IL-6 and IL-8 levels, Tanshinone capsules used as monotherapy were less effective than conventional treatments. Additionally, subgroup analysis

indicated that when the treatment duration was 6 weeks or less, there was no significant difference between the treatment and control groups in IL-6 and IL-8 levels. We speculate that these

discrepancies may be due to the limited number of included studies, as these subgroups typically consist of only one or two studies. Therefore, these findings should be interpreted with caution.

The sensitivity analysis showed that most results were stable. However, after excluding a single study, we observed instances where the outcomes for IL-6, IL-8, T, FSH, and sebum secretion rate exceeded the original 95% confidence interval, lost statistical significance, or exhibited increased heterogeneity. These findings indicate potential result instability, which should be interpreted with caution.

4.4 Limitations

Some limitations of this study need to be addressed. First, since all the included studies were conducted in China, the generalizability of the results to other ethnicities may be limited. Further research is needed to validate these findings across different ethnic groups. Second, the included studies often lack a randomized controlled trial framework and provide insufficient details on patient stratification criteria, leading to an increased risk of bias that reduces the credibility of the findings. Therefore, the conclusions should be interpreted with caution. Third, since the mechanism of Tanshinone's effect on inflammatory cytokines in acne has not been fully elucidated, the related results should be interpreted with caution. Fourth, the maximum treatment duration was 3 months (only 1 study). Due to the limited number of studies and follow-up data, the long-term clinical benefits and potential risks associated with extended treatment durations remain unclear. Finally, due to the varying criteria used to evaluate adverse events and interventions across studies, the results regarding AEs should be interpreted with caution.

4.5 Implications for practice

The findings of our study indicate that Tanshinone capsules have great potential for acne treatment. This medication could be considered as a complementary medicine and deserves further exploration. In terms of future clinical study designs, largesample, multicenter, long-term RCTs should be conducted, strictly adhering to the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) guidelines. At the same time, the quality could be improved by standardizing study protocols, unifying criteria, enhancing randomization, diagnostic allocation concealment, and blinding, as well as appropriately calculating sample sizes. In addition, it is essential to implement detailed long-term toxicity monitoring, create standardized patient followup protocols, select objective and scientific outcome indicators, and evaluate the impact on acne-related quality of life.

Furthermore, conducting comprehensive molecular and experimental pharmacological analysis, identifying potential biomarkers for predicting treatment response, and investigating the molecular mechanisms of Tan IIA and CPT in relation to their respective targets will enhance our understanding of the molecular characterization of Tanshinone. Simultaneously, applying advanced imaging and molecular tracking techniques, developing computational models to predict treatment response, and validating molecular mechanisms in clinical research will provide better guidance for clinical practice.

5 Conclusion

This study confirmed that Tanshinone capsules can alleviate acne lesions, reduce sebum secretion, lower recurrence rates, and regulate inflammatory factors and hormone levels. However, due to the low quality of evidence in the included studies, further well-designed, multicenter studies with large sample sizes and high methodological rigor are needed to validate these findings.

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

YD: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Project administration, Resources, Software. Validation, Writing-original draft. RF: Data curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Software, Validation, Writing-original draft. BH: Data curation, Investigation, Writing-original draft. XR: Data curation, Investigation, Writing-original draft. FZ: Funding acquisition, Supervision, Writing-review and editing. HF: Funding acquisition, Supervision, Validation, Writing-review and editing. XW: Data curation, Investigation, Writing-original draft. YL: Data curation, Investigation, Writing-original draft. TL: Data curation, Investigation, Writing-original draft. LC: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Supervision, Writing-review and editing, Project administration. YL: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Supervision, Writing-review and editing, Project administration.

Funding

The author(s) declare that financial support was received for the research and/or publication of this article. This study was supported by the Beijing's "14th Five-Year Plan" Key Specialty Project in Traditional Chinese Medicine (BJZKBC0015); the Beijing Natural Science Foundation Project (7,232,295); and Chinese Association of Chinese Medicine Chinese Herbal Formula Granules Standards Clinical Research Project (ZB_CACM_2024010).

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.

Generative AI statement

The author(s) declare that no Generative AI was used in the creation of this manuscript.

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,

References

Cai, X., Xu, C., Yang, D., Tang, X., Liang, S., and Gu, S. (2021). Research on clinical efficacy of tanshinone combined with doxycycline in the treatment of acne vulgaris and its effect on TNF-α. *Pharm. Today.* 31 (02), 157–160. doi:10.12048/i.issn.1674-229X. 2021.02.018

Chen, H., Han, C., Qiu, G., and Liu, Z. (2015). Effect of tanshinone capsules combined spironolactone on sexhormone expression of female patients with postadolescent acne. *Chin. J. Derm. Venereool.* 29 (05), 469–471. doi:10.13735/j.cjdv.1001-7089.201409127

Chen, Q., and Li, J. (2023). Efficacy analysis of isotretinoin soft capsules combined with tanshinone capsules in patients with acne vulgaris. *J. Huaihai. Med.* 41 (04), 397–400. doi:10.14126/j.cnki.1008-7044.2023.04.017

Chen, T., Zhu, Z., Du, Q., Wang, Z., Wu, W., Xue, Y., et al. (2021). A skin lipidomics study reveals the therapeutic effects of tanshinones in a rat model of acne. *Front. Pharmacol.* 12, 675659. doi:10.3389/fphar.2021.675659

Chen, W., and Liu, Q. Z. (2007). Efficacy of oral tanshinone capsules in the treatment of acne. Chin. J. Drug. Appl. Monit. 4 (6), 38–39. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1672-8157.2007.06.014

Cong, T. X., Hao, D., Wen, X., Li, X. H., He, G., and Jiang, X. (2019). From pathogenesis of acne vulgaris to anti-acne agents. *Arch. Dermatol. Res.* 311 (5), 337–349. doi:10.1007/s00403-019-01908-x

Fox, L., Csongradi, C., Aucamp, M., du Plessis, J., and Gerber, M. (2016). Treatment modalities for acne. *Molecules* 21 (8), 1063. doi:10.3390/molecules21081063

Gu, D., Xu, W., and Zhang, M. (2023). Effects of tanshinone combined with isotretinoin on sex hormone levels and serum IL-8 and TNF- α in patients with grade III/IV acne. *J. Harbin Med. Univ.* 57 (06), 664–668. doi:10.20010/j.issn.1000-1905.2023.06.0664

Habeshian, K. A., and Cohen, B. A. (2020). Current issues in the treatment of acne vulgaris. *Pediatrics* 145 (Suppl. 2), S225–S230. doi:10.1542/peds.2019-2056L

Hay, R. J., Johns, N. E., Williams, H. C., Bolliger, I. W., Dellavalle, R. P., Margolis, D. J., et al. (2014). The global burden of skin disease in 2010: an analysis of the prevalence and impact of skin conditions. *J. Invest. Dermatol.* 134 (6), 1527–1534. doi:10.1038/jid. 2013.446

He, C., Wang, H., Liu, W., Zhu, L., Yang, G., and Du, H. (2015). Efficacy of alpha hydroxy acids combined with tanshinone capsule in the treatment of moderate acne. *Chin. J. Lepr. Skin. Dis.* 31 (12), 723–725.

Jiang, L., and Sheng, G. (2015). Clinical observation of oral isotretinoin combined with tanshinone capsule in the treatment of 30 cases of acne and the effect on serum levers of IL-8 and TNF-a. *Chin. J. Derm. Venereol.* 29 (2), 213–216. doi:10.13735/i.cidv. 1001-7089.201404105

Ju, Q., Yin, X., Shi, J., Xin, Y., Kang, X., Chen, Y., et al. (2005). Effects of cryptotanshinone and tanshinone A on proliferation, lipid synthesis and expression of androgen receptor mRNA in human sebocytes *in vitro. Chin. J. Dermatol.* 38 (02), 98–101.

Kang, K., Liang, L., and Zhang, X. (2019). Observation of the therapeutic efficacy of isotretinoin capsules combined with tanshinone capsules in the treatment of severe acne. *Med. Diet. Health* 0 (2), 11.

Kang, L., and Yang, X. (2019). Clinical observation of tanshinone combined with minocycline in the treatment of inflammatory acne. *J. Clin. Dermatol.* 48 (07), 451–453. doi:10.16761/j.cnki.1000-4963.2019.07.018

Lan, Y. (2019). Observation of the effect of tanshinone combined with isotretinoin in the treatment of severe acne. *Dermatol. Venereol.* 41 (6), 832–833. doi:10.3969/j.issn. 1002-1310.2019.06.028

Li, Y., and Zhou, Y. (2018). The therapeutic effect of tanshinone IIA on Propionibacterium acnes-induced inflammation *in vitro*. *Derm. Ther.* 31 (6), e12716. doi:10.1111/dth.12716

Lin, M., Han, P., Dai, Y., Deng, B., and Zeng, H. (2009). Effect of tanshinone on serum testosterone and Estradiol levels in patients with acne vulgaris. *Shandong. Med. J.* 49 (48), 58–59.

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/fphar.2025.1520039/ full#supplementary-material

Liu, K., and Ma, S. (2023). Efficacy of tanshinone capsules combined with conventional western medicine in the treatment of acne vulgaris. *Clin. Med.* 43 (08), 120–122. doi:10.19528/j.issn.1003-3548.2023.08.038

Liu, W., Lu, X., and Wu, L. (2018). Impact of tanshinone capsules combined with aminolevulinic acid photodynamic therapy on serum IL-8, TNF- α , and sebum secretion in patients with acne. Chin. J. Derm. Venerol. Integr. Trad. West. Med. 17 (5), 426–428.

Luo, H., and Liu, Z. (2021). Effect of tanshinone capsule combined with conventional western medicine on acne vulgaris. *Chin. J. Gen. Pract.* 19 (11), 1858–1860+1867. doi:10.16766/j.cnki.issn.1674-4152.002185

Ma, H. (2023). The effect of danshinone capsule combined with isoretinoic acid on the skin lesions and serum inflammatory factors in acne patients. *Heilongjiang. Med. J.* 47 (05), 558–560.

Oon, H. H., Wong, S. N., Aw, D. C. W., Cheong, W. K., Goh, C. L., and Tan, H. H. (2019). Acne management guidelines by the dermatological society of Singapore. *J. Clin. Aesthet. Dermatol.* 12 (7), 34–50.

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 372, n71. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71

Pei, D., and Shang, G. (2022). Efficacy and safety of tanshinone capsule combined with red and blue light irradiation in treatment of acne vulgaris. *J. Med. Aesthet. Cosmetol.* 31 (12), 82–85. doi:10.3969/i.issn.1004-4949.2022.12.024

Peng, L. (2017). The influence of tanshinone on serum sex hormone level of patients with acne. *Henan Trad. Chin. Med.* 37 (06), 1062–1064. doi:10.16367/j.issn.1003-5028. 2017.06.0375

Qin, X., Guo, Z., and Gu, J. (2015). Observation on the effect of tanshinone capsules combined with benzoyl peroxide gel in the treatment of mild to moderate acne vulgaris. *J. Pract. Derm.* 8 (03), 188–190.

Reynolds, R. V., Yeung, H., Cheng, C. E., Cook-Bolden, F., Desai, S. R., Druby, K. M., et al. (2024). Guidelines of care for the management of acne vulgaris. J. Am. Acad. Dermatol. 90 (5), 1006.e1–1006.e30. doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2023.12.017

Siddique, H. R., Nanda, S., Parray, A., and Saleem, M. (2012). Androgen receptor in human health: a potential therapeutic target. *Curr. Drug. Targets* 13 (14), 1907–1916. doi:10.2174/138945012804545579

Song, S. (2020). Efficacy of LED red-blue light therapy, isotretinoin-clindamycin gel, and tanshinone capsules in the treatment of facial acne. *Henan. Med. Res.* 29 (5), 836–838. doi:10.3969/i.issn.1004-437X.2020.05.031

Stamu-O'Brien, C., Jafferany, M., Carniciu, S., and Abdelmaksoud, A. (2021). Psychodermatology of acne: psychological aspects and effects of acne vulgaris. J. Cosmet. Dermatol. 20 (4), 1080–1083. doi:10.1111/jocd.13765

State Food and Drug Administration of China (2010). Tanshinone capsules. Drug. Stand. Chin. Cas. (4), 309–310.

Vos, T., Flaxman, A. D., Naghavi, M., Lozano, R., Michaud, C., Ezzati, M., et al. (2012). Years lived with disability (YLDs) for 1160 sequelae of 289 diseases and injuries 1990-2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *Lancet* 380 (9859), 2163–2196. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61729-2

Wang, Y., Zhu, M., Wu, S., and Zheng, H. (2022). Acne comorbidities. Clin. Cosmet. Investig. Dermatol. 15, 2415–2420. doi:10.2147/CCID.S392165

Williams, H. C., Dellavalle, R. P., and Garner, S. (2012). Acne vulgaris. Lancet 379 (9813), 361-372. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60321-8

Wu, W. (2018). Clinical effect of tanshinone combined with isotretinoin on moderate acne vulgaris and its effect on serum TNF- α , IL-8 and IL-6. *Clin. Res. Pract.* 3 (17), 50–51. doi:10.19347/j.cnki.2096-1413.201817024

Xia, Q. (2018). Observation of the efficacy of tanshinone combined with fruit acid in the treatment of acne. J. Med. Aesthet. Cosmetol. 27 (7), 43.

Yan, Q., and Dong, X. (2016). Clinical efficacy of isotretinoin capsules combined with tanshinone capsules for moderate to severe acne. *Chin. J. Dis. Control. Prev.* 20 (07), 752–754. doi:10.16462/j.cnki.zhjbkz.2016.07.028

Yang, J. H., Yoon, J. Y., Moon, J., Min, S., Kwon, H. H., and Suh, D. H. (2018b). Expression of inflammatory and fibrogenetic markers in acne hypertrophic scar formation: focusing on role of TGF- β and IGF-1R. Arch. Dermatol. Res. 310 (8), 665–673. doi:10.1007/s00403-018-1856-2

Yang, T., Yi, P., and Cheng, M. (2018a). Efficacy of tanshinone capsules and minocycline hydrochloride capsules on patients with acne: impact on skin lesions and serum inflammatory factors. *J. Prev. Med. Chin. People's Lib. Army.* 36 (4), 510–512. doi:10.13704/j.cnki.jyyx.2018.04.025

Zhang, H., Lai, Y., Zhang, W., and Chen, J. (2022). Efficacy analysis of tanshinone capsules combined with viaminate capsules in the treatment of moderate acne. *Pract. J. Clin. Med.* 19 (05), 103–106.

Zhang, T., Zhong, S., Wang, Y., Dong, S., Guan, T., Hou, L., et al. (2019). *In vitro* and *in silico* perspectives on estrogenicity of tanshinones from Salvia miltiorrhiza. *Food. Chem.* 270, 281–286. doi:10.1016/j.foodchem.2018.07.098

Zhang, Z., Zhang, P., Wang, F., Wang, X., Zhao, S., and Wang, P. (2021). Effect of tanshinone capsule combined with 585 nm intense pulse photon on acne vulgaris. *J. Logist. Univ. CAPF, Med. Sci.* 30 (09), 75–76+79. doi:10.16548/j.2095-3720.2021. 09.055

Zhao, J., and Yan, X. (2015). Effect of Red-Blue Light combined Tanshinone on moderate or severe acne vulgaris and the effects on levels of IL-8 and TNF- α in peripheral blood. *Mod. J. Integr. Tradit. Chin. West. Med.* 24 (15), 1603–1605+1608. doi:10.3969/i.issn.1008-8849.2015.15.003

Zhou, T., Yang, L., Liu, Q., Zhao, C., and Zhang, F. (2017). The clinical effect of Qingfei-Jiedu decoction for the female patients with acne of lung and stomach heat type. *Int. J. Trad. Chin. Med.* 39 (7), 597–600. doi:10.3760/cma.j.issn.1673-4246.2017.07.006

Zhu, Z., Chen, T., Wang, Z., Xue, Y., Wu, W., Wang, Y., et al. (2021). Integrated proteomics and metabolomics link acne to the action mechanisms of cryptotanshinone intervention. *Front. Pharmacol.* 12, 700696. doi:10.3389/fphar.2021.700696

Zhu, Z., Zeng, Q., Wang, Z., Xue, Y., Chen, T., Hu, Y., et al. (2022). Skin microbiome reconstruction and lipid metabolism profile alteration reveal the treatment mechanism of Cryptotanshinone in the acne rat. *Phytomedicine* 101, 154101. doi:10.1016/j.phymed. 2022.154101

Zou, Y. (2022). Clinical efficacy of isotretinoin soft capsules combined with tanshinone capsules in the treatment of moderate to severe acne. *Med. Equip.* 35 (2), 105–106.

Zuo, T., Chen, H., Xiang, S., Hong, J., Cao, S., Weng, L., et al. (2016). Cryptotanshinone-loaded cerasomes formulation: *in vitro* Drug release, *in vivo* pharmacokinetics, and *in vivo* efficacy for topical therapy of acne. *Acs. Omega.* 1 (6), 1326–1335. doi:10.1021/acsomega.6b00232