Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Luigi De Gennaro, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy

REVIEWED BY Caterina Leitner, Vita-Salute San Raffaele University, Italy Loida Camargo, University of Cartagena, Colombia

CORRESPONDENCE Chee H. Ng ☑ cng@unimelb.edu.au Yu-Tao Xiang ☑ xyutly@gmail.com Gang Wang ☑ gangwangdoc@ccmu.edu.cn

[†]These authors have contributed equally to this work

RECEIVED 16 May 2025 ACCEPTED 26 June 2025 PUBLISHED 16 July 2025

CITATION

Si TL, Wang Y-Y, Li J-X, Bai W, Sun H-L, Rao S-Y, Zhu H-Y, Ungvari GS, Su Z, Cheung T, Ng CH, Xiang Y-T and Wang G (2025) Poor sleep quality among patients with Parkinson's disease: a metaanalysis and systematic review. *Front. Psychiatry* 16:1606743. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2025.1606743

COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Si, Wang, Li, Bai, Sun, Rao, Zhu, Ungvari, Su, Cheung, Ng, Xiang and Wang. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Poor sleep quality among patients with Parkinson's disease: a meta-analysis and systematic review

Tong Leong Si^{1,2†}, Yue-Ying Wang^{2,3†}, Jia-Xin Li^{3†}, Wei Bai^{4†}, He-Li Sun^{2,3}, Shu-Ying Rao², Han-Yu Zhu², Gabor S. Ungvari^{5,6}, Zhaohui Su⁷, Teris Cheung⁸, Chee H. Ng^{9*}, Yu-Tao Xiang^{2,3*} and Gang Wang^{10*}

¹Macao Observatory for Social Development, University of Saint Joseph, Macao, Macao SAR, China,
²Unit of Psychiatry, Department of Public Health and Medicinal Administration, Institute of Translational Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Macau, Macao, Macao SAR, China,
³Centre for Cognitive and Brain Sciences, University of Macau, Macao, Macao SAR, China,
⁴Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Jilin University, Changchun, China, ⁵Section of Psychiatry, University of Notre Dame Australia, Fremantle, WA, Australia, ⁶Division of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, University of Western Australia, Perth, WA, Australia, ⁷School of Public Health, Southeast University, Nanjing, China, ⁸School of Nursing, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China, ⁹Department of Psychiatry, The Melbourne Clinic and St Vincent's Hospital, University of Melbourne, Richmond, VIC, Australia,
⁶Beijing Key Laboratory of Mental Disorders, Beijing Anding Hospital, Capital Medical University, Beijing, China

Objective: Poor sleep quality is common among patients with Parkinson's disease (PD), although the reported prevalence rates vary between studies. This meta-analysis examined the overall prevalence of poor sleep quality in patients with PD and identified potential factors contributing to the differences in prevalence across studies.

Methods: Both PRISMA and MOOSE guidelines were applied in this metaanalysis. A systematic search was conducted in PubMed, EMBASE, PsycINFO, Web of Science, CNKI and Wangfang from their inception to November 4, 2023. Studies were selected based on predefined PICOS criteria (i.e., PD patients, prevalence of poor sleep quality, cross-sectional/cohort designs). Study quality/ risk of bias was assessed using a standardized 8-item tool. Pooled prevalence was calculated sources of heterogeneity (e.g., age, sex, depression, anxiety, cognition scores, disease severity, and medication dose) were explored via subgroup and meta-regression analyses. A random-effects model was utilized to calculate the overall prevalence and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs).

Results: In total, 63 studies involving 9,382 PD patients were included. The overall prevalence of poor sleep quality was 58.07% (95% CI: 54.26–61.88%). Higher rates were related to various factors including studies from Europe & Central Asia, Upper middle income countries, mixed patient sources, lower diagnostic cutoffs, and use of Movement Disorder Society PD criteria. Meta-regression analysis showed that late onset PD was associated with poorer sleep quality in patients with PD.

Conclusion: Poor sleep quality is common in PD patients. Regular monitoring of sleep quality and promotion of sleep hygiene should be prioritized in the management of patients with PD. Additionally, further research on sleep and PD is warranted in low- and middle-income countries to ensure the applicability of findings across diverse populations.

Systematic Review Registration: https://inplasy.com/inplasy-2023-10-0022/, identifier INPLASY2023100022.

KEYWORDS

Parkinson's disease, sleep quality, meta-analysis, prevalence, epidemiology

1 Introduction

Parkinson's disease (PD) is a progressive neurological disorder that interferes with the initiation and execution of voluntary movement, resulting in difficulty performing basic activities of daily living (1). PD is an age-related condition as its prevalence steadily increases with age (2). Although the cause is still unknown, many researchers believe that the disease is determined by the interaction between genetic and environmental factors, leading to a gradual degeneration of neurons in susceptible areas of the brain (2). Apart from the typical motor symptoms, non-motor symptoms in patients with PD, including sleep problems, autonomic dysfunction and sensory abnormalities (3), also have a significant impact on quality of life and overall health (4, 5).

Sleep problems in PD patients, such as poor sleep quality, are among the most prominent non-motor symptoms that considerably impact on the quality of life in both patients and caregivers (6, 7). The causes of sleep problems in PD patients involve disease-related factors such as dopaminergic medications, co-morbid mood disorders, and other related factors (8), as well as the associated symptoms and treatments of PD (9).

Poor sleep quality is one of the major sleep problems experienced by PD patients (10). Sleep quality is defined as one's satisfaction with sleep experience, encompassing aspects such as sleep onset, sleep maintenance, subjective sleep quality, and mental state upon awakening (11). Both subjective and objective methods can be employed to assess sleep quality. Objective techniques usually have a high reliability in collecting sleep parameter data, such as using actigraphy and polysomnography (12). However, these objective sleep quality tests are costly, time-consuming, not easily accessible by most practitioners, and unsuitable for use in epidemiological studies and clinical practice (13). As such, subjective measures on sleep quality have been developed for such purposes, for instance, the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI). The PSQI is the most utilized subjective measurement of sleep quality across different populations, providing scores that allow for categorization as "good" or "poor" (14, 15). In addition, the Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale (PDSS) is another widely used visual analog scale that addresses several symptoms associated with sleep disorders in PD, including sleep quality (16).

Previous studies on the prevalence of poor sleep quality in patients with PD have reported rates ranging from 20% to 88% (17– 19). In addition, poor sleep quality in PD patients has been found to be associated with more severe comorbid depressive and anxiety symptoms, reduced cognitive performance, and more severe PD symptoms (20). Therefore, to address the negative impact of poor sleep quality on PD patients, it is important to understand the epidemiological patterns of poor sleep quality and its associated factors in this population.

To date, no systematic review and meta-analysis have been published on the prevalence estimates of poor sleep quality in PD patients. To address this gap, this meta-analysis aimed to assess the global prevalence of poor sleep quality in PD patients and identify potential factors contributing to the differences in prevalence in this population.

2 Method

2.1 Search strategy

The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines and Meta-analyses Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) checklist were followed in conducting this meta-analysis (21). Three investigators (TLS, YYW and JXL) systematically and independently searched literature in the PubMed, EMBASE, PsycINFO, Web of Science, China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI) and Wangfang databases from their inception date until November 4, 2023, using the following search items: "Parkinson disease " AND ("Sleep Quality" OR "Qualities, Sleep" OR "Quality, Sleep" OR "Sleep Qualities" OR "quality of sleeping" OR "sleeping quality" OR "Pittsburgh sleep quality index" OR "PSQI") AND ("prevalence" OR "epidemiology" OR "rate"). The study protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-analysis Protocols (INPLASY; registration number: INPLASY2023100022).

2.2 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The same three investigators (TLS, YYW and JXL) independently reviewed the titles and abstracts of relevant publications and then read the full texts of to assess eligibility. The inclusion criteria were developed using the PICOS acronym: Participants (P): patients with PD according to study-defined diagnostic criteria, such as the UK PD Society Brain Bank criteria (22) and the Movement Disorder Society (MDS) clinical diagnostic criteria for PD (23); Intervention (I): not applicable; Comparison (C): NR; Outcome (O): prevalence of poor sleep quality or having information that could generate an estimation of that prevalence, using standard tools, such as the PSQI, to measure the quality of the sleep; Study design (S): cross-sectional and cohort studies (only baseline data were analyzed in cohort studies) with accessible data published in English or Chinese journals. Exclusion criteria included reviews, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, case studies, and commentaries. Further, studies conducted specifically on PD samples with a primary sleep disorder (e.g., PD patients recruited from sleep clinics who suffered from insomnia disorder or obstructive sleep apnea (OSA)) were excluded to avoid the risk of overrepresenting sleep disturbances and selection bias in PD samples (24, 25). Only the study with the most detailed information was included in the meta-analysis if a dataset was utilized in more than one study (26).

2.3 Data extraction and quality assessment

Participant and study data, such as the first author, publication year, sampling method, sleep quality measures, number of PD patients, cut-off value, illness duration, number of participants with poor sleep quality, and sleep quality scores, mean age and male proportion of study sample, diagnostic criteria, were extracted. Additionally, to characterize the multidimensional aspects of sleep, we extracted specific components from standardized sleep tools (e.g., the PSQI domains: subjective sleep quality, sleep latency, sleep duration, habitual sleep efficiency, sleep disturbance, use of sleep medications, and daytime dysfunction).

Such components including sleep medication use could enable the evaluation of naturally occurring sleep within broadly representative PD cohorts, rather than selective studies that focused on sleep comorbidities and effects of treatment.

Study quality was assessed using a standardized instrument for epidemiological studies (27, 28) with the following eight items: (1) target population was defined clearly; (2) probability sampling or entire population surveyed; (3) response rate was \geq 80%; (4) nonresponders were clearly described; (5) sample was representative of the target population; (6) data collection methods were standardized; (7) validated criteria were used to diagnose PD; and (8) prevalence estimates were given with confidence intervals (CIs) and detailed by subgroups. The total score ranged from 0 to 8. Studies with a total score of "7–8" were considered as "high quality," "4–6" as "moderate quality," and "0–3" as "low quality" based on previous studies (25, 29, 30).

2.4 Statistical analyses

All the statistical analyses were conducted using R program (31). A random-effects model was used to synthesis the pooled prevalence of poor sleep quality and its 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) (32). I^2 statistics were used to determine the degree of study heterogeneity, with 25%, 50%, and 75% tentatively indicating low, moderate, and high heterogeneity, respectively (33). Subgroup analyses for categorical variables (e.g., study regions, countries by economic status according to the World Bank's criteria (34), study design, cut-off value signifying poor sleep quality, and patients resources), and meta-regression analysis for continuous variables (mean age, proportions of male, depression, anxiety and cognitive dysfunction respectively, mean scores of MoCA, mean scores of MMSE and mean scores of Hoehn and Yahr Staging, mean levodopa equivalent daily dose and quality assessment score) were conducted to explore the sources of potential heterogeneity. The Egger's test was used to evaluate publication bias, and a visual funnel plot for asymmetry was also provided. If there was publication bias (P<0.05), a trim-and-fill analysis was used. Sensitivity analyses were carried out to assess the stability of results by individually eliminating each study. The significance level was set at 0.05 (two-tailed).

3 Results

3.1 Search results and study characteristics

Out of a total of 5,514 publications initially retrieved, 1,220 were excluded. The remaining 4,294 studies were screened for eligibility. By screening the titles and abstracts, we identified 451 potentially eligible studies. After screening the full text of these studies, we ultimately included 63 studies in this meta-analysis (see Figure 1).

As shown in Table 1, 63 studies covering a total of 9,382 participants were included, with the sample sizes ranging from 40 to 938. The mean age of participants ranged from 51.42 to 74.97 years, the mean disease duration ranged from 0.56 to 9 years, and the mean age at onset ranged from 48.49 to 64.57 years. Regarding the use of scales for sleep quality in the PD patients, 58 studies used the PSQI, 2 studies used the PDSS, 2 studies used the PDSS-1 (the first entry in the Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale), and 2 studies used the PDSS-2 (Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale-2). We applied quality assessment on all 63 studies, where one was rated "low quality" (1.89%), while 62 studies were rated as "moderate quality" (98.41%), with study quality assessment scores ranging from 3 to 6 (See Supplementary Table S1).

3.2 Pooled prevalence of poor sleep quality, PSQI global scores and PSQI component scores in Parkinson's disease patients

Based on the 63 studies, the pooled prevalence of poor sleep quality in PD patients was 58.07% (95% CI: 54.26-61.88%)



(Figure 2). As shown in Table 2, 28 studies with 3,369 participants reported PSQI global scores among PD patients, with a pooled PSQI total score of 8.6 (95% CI: 7.66-9.55). The seven PSQI sleep component scores were reported in 6 studies (N=540). The pooled PSQI component scores ranged from 0.73 (95% CI: 0.31-1.16) for "sleep medication use" to 1.76 (95% CI: 1.38-2.14) for "daytime dysfunction" (see Table 2).

3.3 Subgroup and meta-regression analyses

Subgroup analysis by comparing means showed that study site was significantly associated with the prevalence of poor sleep quality (p < 0.01). Specifically, the highest prevalence of poor sleep quality in PD patients was reported in studies conducted in Europe & Central Asia (59.65% 95%CI: 37.63-81.68%), while the lowest figure was reported in North America (47.88%, 95%CI: 40.26–55.50%). There was also a significant subgroup difference in prevalence of poor sleep quality between countries by income (P < 0.01): the highest prevalence was reported in upper-middle income countries

(58.37%, 95%CI: 54.35-62.39%), while the lowest prevalence was reported in high income countries (56.40%, 95%CI: 40.51-72.28%). There were significant subgroup differences between PD diagnostic criteria (P < 0.01); the pooled prevalence of poor sleep quality was 59.04% (95% CI: 54.18-63.89%) in studies using the UK Parkinson's Disease Society Brain Bank Diagnostic Criteria (UKPDS), 59.11% (95% CI: 40.65-77.57%) in studies using the Movement Disorder Society Clinical Diagnostic Criteria for Parkinson's disease (MDS-PD), 57.20% (95% CI: 49.03-65.37%) in studies using the Diagnostic criteria of Chinese Parkinson's Disease & Movement Disorders Society, Society for Neurology, Chinese Medical Association (Diagnostic criteria for PD in China) and 52.83% (95% CI: 42.44-63.22%) in studies using the diagnostic criteria for Parkinson's disease established by the National Extrapyramidal Disorders Conference (PD criteria by NEDC). Furthermore, the pooled prevalence rates of poor sleep quality were 60.57% (95% CI: 50.23-70.91%) in inpatients, 53.66% (95% CI: 45.21-62.11%) in outpatients, and 62.86% (95% CI: 53.72-72.00%) in the mixed group. Moreover, there were significant differences (p < 0.01) between studies using different measures on sleep quality; the prevalence of poor sleep quality was 59.14% (95% CI: 55.19TABLE 1 Characteristics of studies included in the meta-analysis.

Author and Reference Number	Study site	Study design	Sample size	Scale	Cut- off	Mean age <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Mean disease duration <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Mean onset age <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Diagnostic criteria	Mean MoCA total scores <u>+</u> SD	Mean MMSE total scores <u>+</u> SD	Mean UPDRS-3 scores <u>+</u> SD	Mean LEDD <u>+</u> SD (mg/d)	Mean H&Y stage <u>+</u> SD	Study quality score
Ma and Ren (76)	China	cross- sectional	110	PSQI	>4	63.2	4.1	NR	UKPDS	21.22 ± 4.22	NR	NR	NR	NR	5
Chen, Zhang, Zhou, Yang and Feng (77)	China	cross- sectional	60	PSQI	>4	63.08 ± 11.93	6.33 ± 3.73	NR	UKPDS	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	4
Chen, Hu, Han, Zhang and Zhang (78)	China	cross- sectional	48	PSQI	>5	NR	NR	NR	PD criteria by NEDC	26.54 ± 3.85	NR	33.93 ± 19.82	NR	4.17	4
Chen, Hong and Chen (79)	China	cross- sectional	265	PSQI	>7	63.1 ± 8.8	4.35 ± 2.12	NR	UKPDS	24.53 ± 3.64	NR	20.51 ± 10.01	NR	NR	4
Guo, Yu, Zuo, Liu, Li, Pu, Hu, Lian, Wang, Yu, Jin, Zhu and Zhang (80)	China	cross- sectional	94	PSQI	>4	65.08 ± 2.23	5.15 ± 1.3	59.93 ± 2.01	UKPDS	21.58 ± 1.18	26.55 ± 0.94	19.09 ± 2.33	NR	NR	4
Guo (81)	China	cross- sectional	100	PSQI	>7	74.97 ± 6.84	8.87 ± 4.3	NR	UKPDS	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	4
Yuan, Hu, Zhao, Wang, Zhang and Li (82)	China	cross- sectional	83	PSQI	>7	69.04 ± 9.69	5.05 ± 3.4	63.99 ± 9.69	Diagnostic criteria for PD in China	NR	NR	27.94 ± 18.17	NR	NR	4
Xue (83)	China	cross- sectional	50	PSQI	>6	72.36 ± 5.69	NR	NR	Diagnostic criteria for PD in China	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	4
Hu and Zhang (84)	China	cross- sectional	170	PSQI	>6	65.78 ± 9.1	4.08 ± 3.34	NR	UKPDS	NR	28.47 ± 1.64	16.3 ± 8.48	400 ± 210	2.12 ± 1.25	4
Cheng, Yu and Wu (85)	China	cross- sectional	95	PSQI	>7	52.53 ± 14.71	NR	NR	Diagnostic criteria for PD in China	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	4
Wang, Feng, Gu, Liu and Chen (86)	China	cross- sectional	486	PSQI	>6	62.52 ± 10.03	4.42 ± 3.69	58.18 ± 10.41	UKPDS	NR	27.33 ± 2.89	NR	NR	NR	5
Wang, Feng, Gu, Liu, Zhang and Chen (87)	China	cross- sectional	535	PSQI	>6	64.24 ± 8.05	4.39 ± 3.86	59.91 ± 8.76	UKPDS	NR	27.17 ± 2.89	21.01 ± 12.27	NR	2.04 ± 1.84	5

Author and Reference Number	Study site	Study design	Sample size	Scale	Cut- off	Mean age <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Mean disease duration <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Mean onset age <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Diagnostic criteria	Mean MoCA total scores <u>+</u> SD	Mean MMSE total scores <u>+</u> SD	Mean UPDRS-3 scores <u>+</u> SD	Mean LEDD <u>+</u> SD (mg/d)	Mean H&Y stage <u>+</u> SD	Study quality score
Wang and Wang (88)	China	cross- sectional	45	PSQI	>4	64.07 ± 10.1	2.66 ± 2.22	61.41 ± 10.18	UKPDS	22.66 ± 5.53	NR	NR	NR	NR	5
Wang, Sun, Ma, Shi, Li, Huang, Hu and Zheng (89)	China	cross- sectional	359	PSQI	>6	62.84 ± 7.81	6.25 ± 4.56	NR	Diagnostic criteria for PD in China	NR	NR	38.19 ± 28.9	NR	NR	4
Mao and Zhang (90)	China	cross- sectional	112	PSQI	>7	65.06 ± 6.49	6.39 ± 3.09	NR	Diagnostic criteria for PD in China	21.83 ± 4.86	NR	40.05 ± 14.21	NR	1.67	4
Mao, Dai and Liu (91)	China	cross- sectional	53	PSQI	>5	62.17 ± 9.26	4.91 ± 3.78	57.7 ± 8.43	UKPDS	NR	NR	NR	NR	1.8 ± 0.4	4
Mao and Saimaiti (92)	China	cross- sectional	46	PSQI	>5	NR	NR	NR	PD criteria by NEDC	28.11 ± 2.91	NR	32.91 ± 16.13	NR	NR	3
Liang, Cui, Wu, Yu and Chen (93)	China	cross- sectional	120	PSQI	>6	62.73 ± 8.85	5.87 ± 2.87	NR	UKPDS	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	4
Zhu, Zheng and Yang (94)	China	cross- sectional	58	PSQI	>5	65.07 ± 8.1	5.26 ± 2.5	NR	PD criteria by NEDC	NR	NR	NR	NR	1.6 ± 1.02	5
Cao, Liu, Ma, Chen, Ren, Zhang and Xu (95)	China	cross- sectional	75	PSQI	>6	63.2 ± 10.26	3.11 ± 2.92	58.24 ± 12.58	MDS-PD	19.53 ± 5.69	24.41 ± 4.80	31.93 ± 14.05	NR	1.85 ± 1.20	4
Cao, Yu, Su and Guo (96)	China	cross- sectional	93	PSQI	>5	67.58 ± 8.14	3.01 ± 2.74	64.57 ± 8.67	UKPDS	NR	26.44 ± 1.03	NR	NR	2.47 ± 0.98	4
Zhang, Gao and Wei (97)	China	cross- sectional	68	PSQI	>6	61.23 ± 7.1	3.78 ± 3.12	NR	UKPDS	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	4
Zhang, Zhang, Zhu, Jiang and Wu (98)	China	cross- sectional	253	PSQI	>6	68.84 ± 11.11	4.75 ± 4.2	63.95 ± 11.18	UKPDS	20.77 ± 5.02	25.31 ± 4.10	27.88± 16.64	333.76 ± 327.31	NR	4
Zhang, Liu, Wang, Liu and Gu (99)	China	cross- sectional	127	PSQI	>5	66.38 ± 9.4	5.02 ± 3.6	NR	MDS-PD	NR	NR	NR	NR	2.44 ± 0.52	5

TABLE 1 Continued

Author and Reference Number	Study site	Study design	Sample size	Scale	Cut- off	Mean age <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Mean disease duration <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Mean onset age <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Diagnostic criteria	Mean MoCA total scores <u>+</u> SD	Mean MMSE total scores <u>+</u> SD	Mean UPDRS-3 scores ± SD	Mean LEDD <u>+</u> SD (mg/d)	Mean H&Y stage <u>+</u> SD	
Zhang, Luo and Liao (100)	China	cross- sectional	95	PSQI	>6	NR	6.38 ± 4.38	61.51 ± 7.48	UKPDS	18.33 ± 3.40	20.75 ± 2.94	35.44 ± 17.05	NR	NR	
Cui, Qing, Liu and Chen (101)	China	cross- sectional	138	PSQI	>4	NR	NR	NR	UKPDS	26.87 ± 1.83	NR	NR	NR	NR	
song, Zhao, Li and Yin (102)	China	cross- sectional	40	PSQI	>7	63.85 ± 8.65	4.91 ± 3.51	NR	Diagnostic criteria for PD in China	NR	48.46 ± 23.25	NR	NR	2.84 ± 1.29	
Song, Sun, Ma, Lu, Fan, Wang, Wang and Wang (103)	China	cross- sectional	80	PSQI	9 or above	66.82 ± 7.65	NR	NR	UKPDS	NR	NR	22.81 ± 4.19	NR	NR	
Sun, Gao, Mo and Gong (104)	China	cross- sectional	56	PSQI	>6	55.77 ± 11.01	3.52 ± 2.86	51.86 ± 10.88	UKPDS	NR	NR	25.68 ± 13.96	NR	1.94	
Lv, Wang, Zhu, Zhao and Guo (18)	China	cross- sectional	135	PSQI	>6	51.42 ± 14.63	2.35 ± 1.03	NR	Diagnostic criteria for PD in China	NR	NR	18.91 ± 5.21	NR	3.69 ± 0.53	
Lu (105)	China	cross- sectional	70	PSQI	>7	64 ± 4	9 ± 4	NR	UKPDS	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	
Liu and Chen (106)	China	cross- sectional	82	PSQI	>5	64.21 ± 11.24	3.24 ± 1.45	NR	UKPDS	NR	NR	15.03 ± 8.61	NR	1.85 ± 0.97	
Liu, Li, Fang, Qin and Wei (107)	China	cross- sectional	97	PSQI	>4	61.7 ± 9.2	2.1 ± 0.7	62.1 ± 9.7	PD criteria by NEDC	NR	NR	22.7 ± 8.9	432.3 ± 207.2	2.1 ± 0.6	
Liu, Chou, Ma, Zhang, Wang and Gu (108)	China	cross- sectional	71	PSQI	>5	66.5 ± 8.66	6.11 ± 4.05	NR	UKPDS	22.03 ± 5.06	26.56 ± 3.10	NR	NR	2.4 ± 0.8	
Liu, Wang, Wang, Mao and Wang (109)	China	cross- sectional	502	PSQI	>7	NR	NR	NR	UKPDS	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	
YU, PENG, LUO, HUANG	China	cross- sectional	100	PSQI	>7	60.3 ± 8.26	4.24 ± 1.26	NR	Diagnostic criteria for PD	21.89 ± 4.70	NR	NR	NR	NR	

in China

Si et al.

Study quality score

4

5

4

5

4

5

4

4

4

5

4

4

(Continued)

and

WANG (110)

TABLE 1 Continued

Author and Reference Number	Study site	Study design	Sample size	Scale	Cut- off	Mean age <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Mean disease duration <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Mean onset age <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Diagnostic criteria	Mean MoCA total scores ± SD	Mean MMSE total scores <u>+</u> SD	Mean UPDRS-3 scores <u>+</u> SD	Mean LEDD <u>+</u> SD (mg/d)	Mean H&Y stage <u>+</u> SD	Study quality score
Yi, Yu-Peng, Jiang-Ting, Jing- Yi, Qi-Xiong, Dan-Lei, Jing- Wei, Zhi-Juan, Yong-Jie, Zhe and Zheng (111)	China	cross- sectional	328	PSQI	9 or above	60.5 ± 10.1	4.78 ± 4.27	55.53 ± 10.34	MDS-PD	NR	25.19 ± 4.83	32.23 ± 17.30	575.78 ± 245.08	2.16 ± 0.99	5
Wang, Xiong, Chao, Zhuang, Li and Liu (112)	China	cross- sectional	938	PSQI	>5	NR	NR	NR	UKPDS	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	5
Tang, Yang, Zhu, Gong, Sun, Chen, Guan, Yu, Wang, Zhang, Li, Ma and Wang (113)	China	cross- sectional	61	PSQI	>5	66.6 ± 6.10	4.5 ± 3.63	61.6 ± 7	UKPDS	26.38 ± 3.33	28.75 ± 2.22	22.63 ± 10	409.23 ± 249.56	2.45 ± 0.89	5
Song, Gu, An and Chan (114)	China	cohort	284	PSQI	>5	NR	NR	NR	UKPDS	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	4
Shulman, Taback, Bean and Weiner (115)	United States	cross- sectional	99	PSQI	>5	67.4 ± 8	6.9 ± 5.7	NR	UKPDS	NR	NR	22 ± 9	NR	2.3 ± 0.8	6
Santos García, Cabo López, Labandeira Guerra, Yáñez Baña, Cimas Hernando, Paz González, Alonso Losada, Gonzalez Palmás, Cores Bartolomé and Martínez Miró (19)	Spain	cross- sectional	47	PSQI	>5	NR	NR	NR	UKPDS	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	4
Sahebzadeh, Farsi Baf and Homam (116)	Iran	cross- sectional	120	PSQI	>5	65.9 ± 11.7	2.6 ± 2.7	NR	UKPDS	17.39 ± 5.20	NR	NR	NR	NR	6

Frontiers in Psychiatry

10.3389/fpsyt.2025.1606743

Author and Reference Number	Study site	Study design	Sample size	Scale	Cut- off	Mean age <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Mean disease duration <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Mean onset age <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Diagnostic criteria	Mean MoCA total scores <u>+</u> SD	Mean MMSE total scores <u>+</u> SD	Mean UPDRS-3 scores <u>+</u> SD	Mean LEDD <u>+</u> SD (mg/d)	Mean H&Y stage <u>+</u> SD	Study quality score
Qiu, Gu, Liu and Li (117)	China	cross- sectional	101	PSQI	9 or above	61.25 ± 7.83	7.82 ± 1.34	NR	Diagnostic criteria for PD in China	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	4
Qin, Li, Chen, Chen, Shi, Liu, Li, Xin and Gao (118)	China	cross- sectional	110	PSQI	>7	66.82 ± 8.23	3.67 ± 4.03	61.25 ± 10.38	MDS-PD	NR	NR	20.68 ± 18.02	447.32 ± 230.35	2.01 ± 0.87	4
Pandey, Bajaj, Wadhwa and Anand (17)	India	cross- sectional	100	PSQI	>5	59.2 ± 9.06	3.74 ± 3.67	55.5 ± 9.68	UKPDS	NR	NR	21.16 ± 6.98	367.53 ± 300.16	2.26 ± 0.64	4
Mahale, Yadav and Pal (119)	India	cross- sectional	156	PSQI	>5	52.47 ± 14.63	5.65 ± 4.64	48.49 ± 13.8	UKPDS	NR	27.73 ± 2.21	28.81 ± 10.77	602.73 ± 353.30	2.23 ± 0.51	4
Louter, van der Marck, Pevernagie, Munneke, Bloem and Overeem (120)	China	cross- sectional	153	PSQI	>5	65.9 ± 9.7	7.7 ± 5.7	NR	UKPDS	NR	NR	NR	468.4 ± 336.5	2.17	4
Lin, Chen, Lu, Huang, Weng, Yeh, Lin and Hung (121)	Taiwan	cross- sectional	225	PSQI	>5	65.7 ± 8.88	8.18 ± 5.2	57.5 ± 9.9	UKPDS	NR	NR	22.77 ± 10.8	425.84 ± 324.92	NR	5
Havlikova, van Dijk, Nagyova, Rosenberger, Middel, Dubayova, Gdovinova and Groothoff (122)	Slovak Republic	cross- sectional	93	PSQI	>4	68 ± 9.5	6.1 ± 5.9	NR	UKPDS	NR	NR	15.88 ± 10.43	NR	2 ± 1.2	5
Gao, Huang, Cai and Li (123)	China	cross- sectional	88	PSQI	>5	64.03 ± 10.5	5.41 ± 3.75	NR	MDS-PD	NR	25.59 ± 2.99	24.63 ± 7.58	510.85 ± 224.61	2.57 ± 1	4
Duncan, Khoo, Yarnall, O'Brien, Coleman, Brooks, Barker and Burn (124)	United Kingdom	cohort	158	PSQI	>5	66.5 ± 10.3	0.56 ± 0.49	NR	UKPDS	25.1 ± 3.6	28.6 ± 1.4	27.1 ± 12	NR	1.78	4

Si et al.

Author and Reference Number	Study site	Study design	Sample size	Scale	Cut- off	Mean age <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Mean disease duration <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Mean onset age <u>+</u> SD (Year)	Diagnostic criteria	Mean MoCA total scores <u>+</u> SD	Mean MMSE total scores <u>+</u> SD	Mean UPDRS-3 scores <u>+</u> SD	Mean LEDD <u>+</u> SD (mg/d)	Mean H&Y stage <u>+</u> SD	Study quality score
Ding, Zhu, Lu, Shen, Dai and Zhu (125)	China	cross- sectional	75	PSQI	9 or above	64.46 ± 6.46	NR	NR	PD criteria by NEDC	NR	NR	23.70 ± 3.81	NR	NR	4
Shafazand, Wallace, Arheart, Vargas, Luca, Moore, Katzen, Levin and Singer (126)	United States	cross- sectional	66	PSQI	>5	64.00 ± 10.00	NR	NR	UKPDS	NR	NR	NR	363.20 ± 255.30	NR	4
Skorvanek, Nagyova, Rosenberger, Krokavcova, Saeedian, Groothoff, Gdovinova and van Dijk (127)	Slovenská republika	cross- sectional	165	PSQI	>6	69.59 ± 8.56	6.93 ± 4.80	NR	UKPDS	NR	NR	30.11 ± 13.62	NR	2.41 ± 0.89	4
Shi, Guan, Gao, Huang and Wang (128)	China	cross- sectional	120	PSQI	9 or above	58.02 ± 8.56	5.48 ± 1.72	NR	Diagnostic criteria for PD in China	NR	NR	27.94 ± 8.98	NR	3.12 ± 1.22	4
Dong and Tan (129)	China	cross- sectional	92	PSQI	>7	69.77 ± 9.80	2.89 ± 4.00	NR	Diagnostic criteria for PD in China	NR	NR	24.84 ± 18.67	333.70 ± 134.80	2.27 ± 0.74	4
Chang, Fan, Chang and Wu (130)	Taiwan	cross- sectional	134	PDSS-2	>16	64.98 ± 9.19	7.86 ± 5.55	57.29 ± 10.66	UKPDS	NR	27.44 ± 1.88	23.91 ± 11.92	647.39 ± 491.49	1.43 ± 0.64	4
Shi (131)	China	cross- sectional	95	PDSS-2	>12	67.81 ± 5.93	4.1 ± 0.71	NR	Diagnostic criteria for PD in China	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	4
Li, Yuan, Ye, Yuan, Gao and Hu (132)	China	cross- sectional	87	PDSS	<91	66.99 ± 7.18	5.75 ± 3.94	61.77 ± 7.84	Diagnostic criteria for PD in China	NR	27.58 ± 2.69	14.70 ± 5.25	490.78 ± 219.78	NR	4
Gui, Wang, Wu and Sun (133)	China	cross- sectional	178	PDSS	<91	61.81 ± 10.92	4.50 ± 3.48	56.53 ± 10.98	UKPDS	NR	26.61 ± 5.41	29.31 ± 14.66	441.26 ± 299.59	1.92 ± 0.75	4

Frontiers in Psychiatry

10.3389/fpsyt.2025.1606743

		1	H S
Study quality score	4	4	ostic Criteria fo tion; UPDRS-3 5-2, Parkinson'
Mean Н&Ү stage ± SD	2.34 ± 0.85	NR	inical Diagno state Examina ep Scale; PDS
Mean LEDD <u>+</u> SD (mg/d)	NR	NR	order Society Cl E, Mini-Mental S son's Disease Sle
Mean UPDRS-3 scores ± SD	NR	NR	D, Movement Dis Assessment; MMSI irst item of Parkins
Mean MMSE total scores ± SD	23.50 ± 5.45	NR	Criteria; MDS-P treal Cognitive / Scale; PDSS-1, F
Mean MoCA total scores ± SD	16.97 ± 6.18	NR	k Diagnostic (; MoCA, Mon Disease Sleep
Diagnostic criteria	PD criteria by NEDC	Diagnostic criteria for PD in China	ase Society Brain Ban Disorders Conference ex; PDSS, Parkinson's
Mean onset age <u>+</u> SD (Year)	NR	NR	č Parkinson's Dise al Extrapyramidal Sleep Quality Inde
Mean disease duration <u>+</u> SD (Year)	4.43 ± 4.74	2.27 ± 1.41	r stage; UKPDS, UH iation in the Nation se; PSQI, Pittsburgh
Mean age <u>+</u> SD (Year)	61.29 ± 9.71	62.20 ± 8.00	ge, Hoehn and Yahi nese Medical Assoc equivalent daily do
Cut- off	9>	≪6	: H&Y stag hed by Chii Levodopa
Scale	PDSS-1	PDSS-1	rd deviation teria establis tion); LEDD,
Study Sample Scale Cut- Mean design size off age± (Year)	207	131	ndex; SD, standa n's diagnostic cri (Motor Examina
Study design	cross- sectional	cross- sectional	leep Quality I DC, Parkinso g Scale part 3
Study site	China	China	ZI, Pittsburgh SI D criteria by NE i's Disease Rating
Author and Study Reference site Number	Hu, Sun, Lan, Wang, Li and Zhong (134)	Niu and Gou (135)	NR, not reported; PSQI, Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index; SD, standard deviation; H&Y stage, Hoehn and Yahr stage; UKPDS, UK Parkinson's Disease Society Brain Bank Diagnostic Criteria; MDS-PD, Movement Disorder Society Clinical Diagnostic Criteria for Parkinson's disease; PD criteria by NEDC, Parkinson's diagnostic criteria established by Chinese Medical Association in the National Extrapyramidal Disorders Conference; MOCA, Montreal Cognitive Assessment; MMSF, Mini-Mental State Examination; UPDRS-3, The Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale part 3 (Motor Examination); LEDD, Levodopa equivalent daily dosc; PSQI, Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index; PDSS, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item of Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item of Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-2, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item of Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-2, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item of Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-2, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item of Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-2, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item of Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-2, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item of Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item of Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-2, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item of Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-2, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item of Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item of Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-2, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item Scale; PDSS-2, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item Scale; PDSS-2, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item Scale; PDSS-2, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item Scale; PDSS-2, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item Scale; PDSS-2, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-2, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-2, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-

63.09%) in studies using the PSQI, 40.96% (95% CI: 18.33-63.58%) in studies using the PDSS, 56.16% (95% CI: 22.69-89.62%) in studies using PDSS-1, and 47.16% (95% CI: 40.70-53.63%) in the studies using PDSS-2 (Table 3). In meta-regression analyses, onset age (β =0.0132, z=2.0704, p=0.0384) was positively associated with the prevalence of poor sleep quality. However, mean age, illness duration, levodopa equivalent daily dose, and The Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale part 3 (Motor Examination) score were not found to be statistically significant in the metaregression (Table 3).

3.4 Publication bias and sensitivity analyses

The funnel plot assessment and Egger's test value suggested no significant publication bias (Egger's test t = 1.42, P= 0.1608) (See Supplementary Figure S1). Sensitivity analyses did not identify any outlying studies that could significantly change primary results (See Supplementary Figure S2). To avoid selection bias, no studies were excluded based solely on quality assessment. Sensitivity analysis confirmed that low-quality studies did not significantly alter the pooled prevalence estimates.

4 Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, this was the first systematic review and meta-analysis to examine the prevalence of poor sleep quality in patients with PD. Based on 63 studies, comprising 9,382 PD patients, the prevalence of poor sleep quality in patients with PD was 58.07% (95% CI: 54.26-61.88%). The factors associated with the prevalence of poor sleep quality included study region, income, diagnostic criteria, patient source and PD age of onset.

The pooled PSQI global score in this study was 8.61 (95% CI: 7.67-9.55), which was higher than the findings reported in most other population studies. For example, the global PSQI scores in a general population sample were 3.18 \pm 2.28 in Japan (35), 5.00 \pm 3.37 in Germany (36), 5.14 ± 3.90 in Spain (37), and 5.5 ± 2.8 in Singapore (38). The overall prevalence of poor sleep quality in PD patients was 58.07% (95% CI: 54.26-61.88%), which is substantially higher than most figures reported in other populations, including Singaporean working population (42.5%; 95% CI: 37.9-47.1%) (38), Chinese elderly population (35.9%; 95% CI: 30.6%-41.2%) (39), perinatal and postpartum women (54.2%; 95% CI: 47.9-60.5%) (24), medical students (55%; 95% CI 48.0%-62.0%) (40), patients with tinnitus (53.5%; 95% CI: 40.2-66.8%) (41), and patients with irritable bowel syndrome (37.6%; 95% CI: 31.4-44.3%) (42).

The high prevalence of poor sleep quality in PD patients may be attributed to the disease characteristics. Degenerative changes in the brain associated with the disease can directly impact sleep/wake mechanisms, leading to sleep disruptions (43). Additionally, movement difficulties, such as the inability to move around in bed, involuntary movements, dystonia, and pain caused by leg spasms, all of which can interfere with sleep maintenance (44). However, the overall prevalence of poor sleep quality in PD patients

Lv et al. 2019 25 135 4 24.73 [12.35; 26.11] Havikova et al. 2011 23 93 4 24.73 [15.37; 34.75] Gui et al. 2018 53 178 22.78 22.78 22.77 4 23.73 Gui et al. 2018 53 178 4 22.78 22.78 22.77 4 23.73 Gui et al. 2028 50 50 4 40.00 [24.44; 54.45] Characterization of the second	Study	Events	Total	Events per 100 observations	Prevalence	[95% CI]
Havikova et al. 2011 23 93 247 37 16.37; 4.47 6 Gui et al. 2018 53 178 257 26.17; 3.707 Hu et al. 2023 81 207 400 28.44; 46.45 Tang et al. 2022 27 61 44.28 31 Sing et al. 2022 27 61 44.28 31 Sing et al. 2021 27 61 44.28 31 Sing et al. 2020 34 75 46.33 Sing et al. 2019 37 80 44.28 53 Sing et al. 2015 249 535 46.54 44.22 530.37 778 Sing et al. 2015 249 535 46.54 44.22 530.37 778 Sing et al. 2015 249 535 46.54 44.22 530.37 778 Sing et al. 2015 249 535 46.54 44.22 530.37 778 Sing et al. 2015 249 535 46.54 44.22 530.37 778 Sing et al. 2015 249 535 46.54 44.22 530.37 778 Sing et al. 2017 32 66 46.84 313.86 54.33 Sing et al. 2017 32 66 46.84 313.80 73.96 565 Sing et al. 2017 32 66 46.84 313.80 73.96 565 Sing et al. 2017 32 66 46.84 313.80 73.96 565 Sing et al. 2017 32 66 46.84 313.80 77.85 56 Sing et al. 2017 32 66 46.84 313.80 77.85 56 Sing et al. 2017 32 66 46.84 313.80 77.85 56 Sing et al. 2017 32 66 46.84 313.80 77.85 56 Sing et al. 2017 32 66 46.84 313.80 77.85 56 Sing et al. 2017 32 66 46.84 313.80 77.85 56 Sing et al. 2018 31 20 55 55 57.84 77.85 57 Line et al. 2017 32 55 56 57.84 77.85 57 Line et al. 2017 32 57 57 57 57.85 57	Study	Lvents	Total	observations	rievalence	[33 % 61]
Yiet al. 2022 82 328 250 20.41; 30.02 20.41; 30.02 Hu et al. 2023 81 207 33:13 32.44; 46.41; 34.82 Chen et al. 2018 107 265 40.33 33:44; 46.42 Tang et al. 2021 76 44.28 31:55; 57.55 21.42; 46.22 61.00 22.62; 61.51 Ding et al. 2020 37 70 45.33 33; 78; 57.25 33:33; 78; 57.25 Song et al. 2015 13 40 46.22 33:33; 78; 57.25 Mahale et al. 2015 73 46.33 33; 78; 57.25 Mahale et al. 2016 74 46.34 33.86; 64.97 Duncan et al. 2014 74 156 46.24 38.26; 64.89 Duncan et al. 2014 74 158 46.44 38.86; 54.99 Shutman et al. 2014 74 158 46.44 38.80; 61.71 Uu et al. 2014 71 14.44 47.76 39.07; 65.65 Shutman et al. 2017 22.6 66.6 47.65 48.26 48.26 48.26 48.26 48.26 48.26 48.26 48.26 48.26				-		
Gui et al. 2018 53 178 29.78 21.17; 37.07 Hu et al. 2023 81 207 40.00 [26.41; 64.42] Chen et al. 2018 107 225 40.33 [34.2; 46.56] Tang et al. 2022 27 61 44.26 [31.55]; 75.55 Song et al. 2015 18 40 45.00 [22.26]; 81.51 Song et al. 2013 24 95.5 46.53 [33.7]; 75.25 Song et al. 2013 74 95 46.53 [35.7]; 75.43 Manale et al. 2014 74 159 46.79 [35.7]; 75.43 Duman et al. 2017 73 159 46.67 [35.8]; 75.75 Sondard et al. 2017 74 159 46.79 [35.7]; 75.43 Duman et al. 2016 74 159 46.79 [35.7]; 75.43 Duman et al. 2016 71 159 46.79 [35.7]; 75.43 Duman et al. 2016 50 100 50.00 [38.83,017]; 45.44 Duman et al. 2016 50 100 50.57						
Hu et al. 2023 81 207						
Xue 2019 20 50 40.00 [26:41:54:22] Chen et al. 2012 27 61 44.26 [31:55:75:55] Zhu et al. 2015 18 40 45.00 [22:26:81:51] Ding et al. 2020 34 75 45.33 [33:75:77:55] Song et al. 2019 37 80 46.23 [35:07:77:84:94] Mahale et al. 2015 73 156 46.53 [46:79] [36:77:84:94] Duncan et al. 2016 74 158 46.84 [35:89:77:84:94] Duncan et al. 2016 73 156 46.84 [35:89:77:84:94] Duncan et al. 2016 74 99 47.47 [37:34:94] Duncan et al. 2017 236 66 48.86 [39:89:81:12] Wang et al. 2015 236 486 48.86 [39:99:89:81:12] Wang et al. 2016 100 60.00 93:89:80:17] 11:0 et al.2017 12:1 et al.2017 22:2 for al.2018 60:44:48:83:80:17] Lin et al. 2014 37 71 62:57 62:57 64:18:81:81 11:83:99 Lin et al. 2016 63:120						
Chen et al. 2018 107 265 40.38 [34.42: 46.35] Tang et al. 2022 27 61 44.38 [31.74: 58.46] Song et al. 2015 18 40 44.38 [31.74: 58.46] Ding et al. 2020 34 75 45.33 [33.79: 57.25] Song et al. 2019 37 80 46.25 [35.03: 57.66] Wang et al. 2015 249 53.5 46.54 442.26 [35.02: 56.65] Mahale et al. 2017 73 156 46.79 [38.77: 54.44] 46.82 [35.00: 76.656] Shuman et al. 2014 47 79 47.47 [37.34: 57.76] 56.6 46.84 [38.68: 54.33] Shuman et al. 2017 32 66 48.46 48.86 [44.93: 80.17] Liu et al.2018 50.00 [38.88: 64.71] Wang et al. 2016 50 100 50.00 [38.88: 64.7] 52.51 53.57 54.44 44.11:8.12, 13.53 16.72, 13.23 11.13, 13.23, 13.77, 13.23, 13.72, 14.23 11.13, 13.23, 14.72, 13.23, 14.72, 13.23, 14.72, 13.23, 14.72, 13.23, 14.72, 13.23, 14.72, 13.23, 14.72, 13.23, 14.72, 13.23, 14.72, 13.23, 14.72, 13.23, 14.72, 13.23, 14.72, 13.23, 14.72, 13.23, 14.72, 13.23, 14.72						
Tang et al. 2022 27 61 44.26 [31:55: 57:55] Song et al. 2015 18 40 45.30 [22:26: 11:51] Ding et al. 2020 34 75 45.33 [37:65: 85: 65] Song et al. 2019 37 80 45.33 [37:65: 85: 65] Wang et al. 2015 73 156 46.34 42:25 [30:25: 66: 65] Mahale et al. 2014 74 158 46.34 13: 55: 95: 95 46.34 13: 55: 95: 95 Shulman et al. 2014 74 758 46: 44 13: 85: 96: 61: 97: 95 47: 76 13: 97: 95: 44; 95 Wang et al. 2017 22: 66 47: 76 13: 97: 95: 44; 95 47: 76 13: 97: 95: 44; 95 Wang et al. 2014 74 75 13: 45: 76: 66 48: 48 13: 45: 96: 61: 95 Pandey et al. 2016 50 100 50: 00 93: 88: 60: 71 11: 93: 92: 64: 12 Uu et al. 2014 37 71 52: 44 41: 11: 63: 61: 69 11: 10 53: 46: 46: 61: 69 Ling et al. 2023 66 77 52: 45: 44: 61: 69 11: 10 54: 44: 52: 19: 86: 63: 37: 65: 63 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
Zhu et al. 2011 26 58 44.63 [31,74; 88.46] Song et al. 2020 34 75 45.33 [33,79; 72,55] Song et al. 2019 37 80 46.25 [36,03; 77,76] Shi 2023 44 95 46.25 [36,02; 76,76] Wang et al. 2015 249 535 46.54 46.64 22; 80.67] Mahale et al. 2015 73 156 46.79 [38,77; 64.94] Duncan et al. 2014 47 158 46.64 93.85; 75.69 Shafazand et al. 2017 32 66 48.66 48.66 48.66 Wang et al. 2016 50 100 50.10 139.82; 64.12 14.44 139.92; 64.12 Liu et al. 2014 37 71 52.11 139.82; 64.12 14.44.81 33.99; 11.22 Liu et al. 2014 37 71 52.11 39.92; 64.12 14.44.81 63.92; Liu et al. 2014 37 71 52.50 44.83 13.99; 74.25; Liu et al. 2014 37 71 52.50 45.24 44.11, 64.78; Liu et al						
Song et al. 2015 16 40 45.33 137, 85.75, 85.95 Song et al. 2019 37 80 46.32 137, 85.75, 85.95 Wang et al. 2015 249 535 46.54 142, 25.80, 85.77, 65.85 Wang et al. 2014 74 158 46.54 142, 25.80, 87.76 Mahale et al. 2014 74 158 46.79 138, 87.75, 45.40 Duncan et al. 2014 74 158 47.76 139, 87.75, 45.40 Shaftzand et al. 2017 22.66 48.48 138, 85.99, 61.12, 139, 92, 64.12 139, 92, 64.12 Wang et al. 2015 63 120 52.44 41.11, 83, 82, 64.43 111, 193, 92, 64.12 111, 93, 92, 64.12 114, 93, 83, 00.73, 83, 76, 65.65 Ling et al. 2015 63 120 52.44 41.11, 83, 82, 64.43 114, 83, 85, 86, 44.33, 81, 80, 81, 81, 81, 81, 81, 81, 81, 81, 81, 81						
Ding et al. 2020 34 75 46.25 35.08; 57.65 Song et al. 2015 249 535 46.64 25.08; 57.76 Mahale et al. 2015 73 156 46.64 22.58, 65 Uncan et al. 2014 74 158 46.64 46.84 38.86; 54.39 Shulman et al. 2014 74 158 46.64 38.86; 54.39 39.07; 56.65 Shafazand et al. 2017 32 66 48.86 48.86 39.09; 65.65 Shafazand et al. 2016 50 100 50.10 39.82; 61.12 139.82; 64.12 14.48 139.92; 64.12 139.82; 64.12 14.48 139.82; 64.12 14.48 139.82; 64.12 14.48 139.82; 64.12 14.48 139.82; 64.12 14.48 139.82; 64.12 14.48 139.82; 64.12 14.48 14.18; 13.99; 64.12 14.18; 13.99; 64.12 14.18; 13.99; 64.12 14.18; 13.99; 64.12 14.42; 16.47, 83.67; 65.75 14.42; 16.47, 83.67; 65.75 14.42; 16.47, 83.67; 66.57 14.42; 16.47, 83.67; 66.57 14.42; 16.47, 83.67; 66.57 14.29; 64.33; 67.66; 57.56.85; 75.68; 77 14.202 14.20; 16.29						
Song et al. 2019 37 80 46.25 [35.02; 56.56] Wang et al. 2015 249 535 46.54 [42.25] 80.27 Mahale et al. 2015 73 156 46.79 38.77 54.94 Duncan et al. 2014 74 158 46.44 138.85 43.33 Shulman et al. 2014 74 758 47.76 137.34 57.76 Chang et al. 2017 22.66 48.46 138.85 43.33 53.93 53.93 55.00 139.83 50.71 11.93.92; 64.12 11.93.92; 64.12 11.93.92; 64.12 11.93.92; 64.12 11.11 139.92; 64.12 11.11 139.92; 64.12 11.11 139.92; 64.12 11.11 139.92; 64.12 11.11 139.92; 64.12 11.11 139.92; 64.12 11.11 139.92; 64.12 11.11 139.92; 64.12 11.11 139.92; 64.12 11.11 139.92; 64.12 11.11 11.11; 61.62; 61.11 11.11; 61.62; 61.11 11.11; 61.62; 61.11 11.11; 61.62; 61.11 11.11; 61.62; 61.11 11.11; 61.62; 61.11 11.11; 61.62; 61.11 11.11; 61.62;						
Liu et al. 2014 37 71 - 52.11 39.92; 64.12 Liu et al. 2015 63 120 - 52.44 [41.11; 63.59 Liang et al. 2015 63 120 - 52.87 [41.37; 63.67] Lin et al. 2023 46 87 - 52.87 [41.37; 63.67] Lin et al. 2021 271 502 53.98 [47.03; 60.43] Liu et al. 2022 271 502 53.98 [47.03; 60.43] Liu et al. 2022 520 938 55.44 [52.19; 58.65] Qin et al. 2020 520 938 55.44 [52.19; 58.65] Qin et al. 2020 50 959 55.44 [52.19; 58.65] Qin et al. 2021 209 359 55.42 [52.93; 63.57] Song et al. 2014 168 284 - 59.15 [53.19; 64.83] Giu et al. 2018 57 94 - 60.64 [50.27; 76.65] Chen et al. 2010 53 83 - 60.78 [52.57; 76.65] Yuan et al. 2015 35 56 - 62.50 [47.35; 76.05] Xuan et al. 2020 153 56 - 62.50 [47.35; 76.05] Zhang et al. 2021 162 253 - 63.88 [52.57; 74.12] Cui et al. 2020 165 253 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 36 37 94 - 63.86 [52.57; 74.12] Cui et al. 2020 165 263 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.26 [54.87; 77.07] Yu et al. 2020 163 93 153 - 66.64 [51.73; 78.48] Wang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.26 [54.87; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 63.83 [56.62; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 63.83 [56.62; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 61.83 [57.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 61.83 [56.82] Mao et al. 2019 63 93 - 67.74 [57.57; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 68.32 [58.31]; 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 63 71.20 - 72.50 [63.06] 80.25] Mao et al. 2019 52 75 - 68.53 [56.87] Mao et al. 2016 87 120 - 73.54 [63.67] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 - 73.54 [63.67] Mao et al. 2017 52 68.81 - 76.44 [65.86] Mao et al. 2014 74 44 64 - 73.81 [58.87; 85.73] Mao et al. 2015 56 - 76.74 [46.58, 85.81] Mao et al. 2014 74 160 - 78.33 [65.80] Mao et al. 2014 74 160 - 78.33 [65.80] Mao et al. 2014 74 160 - 78.33 [65.80] Mao et al. 2015 96 131 - 74.29 [63.60] Mao et al. 2013 47 60 - 78.33 [65.80] Mao et al. 2013 47 60 - 78.33 [65.80]						
Liu et al. 2014 37 71 - 52.11 39.92; 64.12 Liu et al. 2015 63 120 - 52.44 [41.11; 63.59 Liang et al. 2015 63 120 - 52.87 [41.37; 63.67] Lin et al. 2023 46 87 - 52.87 [41.37; 63.67] Lin et al. 2021 271 502 53.98 [47.03; 60.43] Liu et al. 2022 271 502 53.98 [47.03; 60.43] Liu et al. 2022 520 938 55.44 [52.19; 58.65] Qin et al. 2020 520 938 55.44 [52.19; 58.65] Qin et al. 2020 50 959 55.44 [52.19; 58.65] Qin et al. 2021 209 359 55.42 [52.93; 63.57] Song et al. 2014 168 284 - 59.15 [53.19; 64.83] Giu et al. 2018 57 94 - 60.64 [50.27; 76.65] Chen et al. 2010 53 83 - 60.78 [52.57; 76.65] Yuan et al. 2015 35 56 - 62.50 [47.35; 76.05] Xuan et al. 2020 153 56 - 62.50 [47.35; 76.05] Zhang et al. 2021 162 253 - 63.88 [52.57; 74.12] Cui et al. 2020 165 253 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 36 37 94 - 63.86 [52.57; 74.12] Cui et al. 2020 165 263 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.26 [54.87; 77.07] Yu et al. 2020 163 93 153 - 66.64 [51.73; 78.48] Wang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.26 [54.87; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 63.83 [56.62; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 63.83 [56.62; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 61.83 [57.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 61.83 [56.82] Mao et al. 2019 63 93 - 67.74 [57.57; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 68.32 [58.31]; 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 63 71.20 - 72.50 [63.06] 80.25] Mao et al. 2019 52 75 - 68.53 [56.87] Mao et al. 2016 87 120 - 73.54 [63.67] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 - 73.54 [63.67] Mao et al. 2017 52 68.81 - 76.44 [65.86] Mao et al. 2014 74 44 64 - 73.81 [58.87; 85.73] Mao et al. 2015 56 - 76.74 [46.58, 85.81] Mao et al. 2014 74 160 - 78.33 [65.80] Mao et al. 2014 74 160 - 78.33 [65.80] Mao et al. 2014 74 160 - 78.33 [65.80] Mao et al. 2015 96 131 - 74.29 [63.60] Mao et al. 2013 47 60 - 78.33 [65.80] Mao et al. 2013 47 60 - 78.33 [65.80]						
Liu et al. 2014 37 71 - 52.11 39.92; 64.12 Liu et al. 2015 63 120 - 52.44 [41.11; 63.59 Liang et al. 2015 63 120 - 52.87 [41.37; 63.67] Lin et al. 2023 46 87 - 52.87 [41.37; 63.67] Lin et al. 2021 271 502 53.98 [47.03; 60.43] Liu et al. 2022 271 502 53.98 [47.03; 60.43] Liu et al. 2022 520 938 55.44 [52.19; 58.65] Qin et al. 2020 520 938 55.44 [52.19; 58.65] Qin et al. 2020 50 959 55.44 [52.19; 58.65] Qin et al. 2021 209 359 55.42 [52.93; 63.57] Song et al. 2014 168 284 - 59.15 [53.19; 64.83] Giu et al. 2018 57 94 - 60.64 [50.27; 76.65] Chen et al. 2010 53 83 - 60.78 [52.57; 76.65] Yuan et al. 2015 35 56 - 62.50 [47.35; 76.05] Xuan et al. 2020 153 56 - 62.50 [47.35; 76.05] Zhang et al. 2021 162 253 - 63.88 [52.57; 74.12] Cui et al. 2020 165 253 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 36 37 94 - 63.86 [52.57; 74.12] Cui et al. 2020 165 263 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.26 [54.87; 77.07] Yu et al. 2020 163 93 153 - 66.64 [51.73; 78.48] Wang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.26 [54.87; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 63.83 [56.62; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 63.83 [56.62; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 61.83 [57.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 61.83 [56.82] Mao et al. 2019 63 93 - 67.74 [57.57; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 68.32 [58.31]; 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 63 71.20 - 72.50 [63.06] 80.25] Mao et al. 2019 52 75 - 68.53 [56.87] Mao et al. 2016 87 120 - 73.54 [63.67] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 - 73.54 [63.67] Mao et al. 2017 52 68.81 - 76.44 [65.86] Mao et al. 2014 74 44 64 - 73.81 [58.87; 85.73] Mao et al. 2015 56 - 76.74 [46.58, 85.81] Mao et al. 2014 74 160 - 78.33 [65.80] Mao et al. 2014 74 160 - 78.33 [65.80] Mao et al. 2014 74 160 - 78.33 [65.80] Mao et al. 2015 96 131 - 74.29 [63.60] Mao et al. 2013 47 60 - 78.33 [65.80] Mao et al. 2013 47 60 - 78.33 [65.80]						
Liu et al. 2014 37 71 - 52.11 39.92; 64.12 Liu et al. 2015 63 120 - 52.44 [41.11; 63.59 Liang et al. 2015 63 120 - 52.87 [41.37; 63.61.69] Li et al. 2023 46 87 - 52.87 [41.37; 63.61.69] Liu et al. 2021 271 502 - 53.78 [47.03; 60.43] Liu et al. 2012 271 502 - 53.78 [47.03; 60.43] Liu et al. 2012 520 938 - 55.44 [52.19; 58.65] Qin et al. 2020 520 938 - 55.44 [52.19; 58.65] Qin et al. 2021 209 359 - 57.89 [47.33; 67.96] Wang et al. 2021 209 359 - 57.89 [47.33; 67.96] Wang et al. 2021 209 359 - 57.89 [47.33; 67.96] Louter 2013 93 153 - 60.78 [52.57; 68.57] Chen et al. 2020 53 83 - 63.66 [52.57; 74.12] Cui et al. 2020 155 56 - 62.50 [47.55; 77.61.5] Zhang et al. 2021 165 253 - 66.28 [42.57; 76.85] Chen et al. 2020 165 263 - 63.66 [52.57; 74.12] Cui et al. 2020 165 263 - 65.28 [55.90; 72.47] Zhang et al. 2021 36 37 94 - 63.86 [52.57; 74.12] Cui et al. 2020 53 83 - 63.66 [52.57; 74.12] Cui et al. 2020 165 263 - 65.28 [54.60; 74.74] Xhang et al. 2021 162 95 - 65.28 [54.60; 74.74] Mao et al. 2020 165 263 - 65.28 [54.60; 74.74] Mao et al. 2020 165 263 - 65.28 [54.60; 74.74] Mao et al. 2021 64 53 5.60 - 65.28 [54.60; 74.74] Mao et al. 2021 65 263 - 65.28 [57.70.7] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 63.83 [56.62; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 61.83 [56.62; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 61.83 [56.62; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 61.83 [56.62; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 - 61.83 [57.62; 74.74] Mao et al. 2019 52 75 - 61.52 [53.03] Mao et al. 2019 63 93 - 67.74 [57.57; 77.07] Zhang et al. 2022 69 101 - 61.83 [57.62; 74.74] Mao et al. 2019 52 75 - 61.52 [58.31]; 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 63 93 - 67.74 [57.57; 77.07] Yu et al. 2019 63 71 20 - 72.50 [63.60; 80.25] Mao et al. 2014 74 44 64 - 73.81 [68.64; 85.81] Mao et al. 2015 96 131 - 73.28 [64.65; 75.89] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 - 73.81 [58.67; 85.93] Mao et al. 2014 74 160 - 78.33 [65.80; 87.33] Hu et al. 2015 96 131 - 74.29 [62.44; 83.89] Gao et al. 2013 47 60 - 78.33 [65.80; 87.33] Hu et al. 2015 96 101 - 78.33 [65.80; 87.33] Hu et al.		73	156			
Liu et al. 2014 37 71 - 52.11 39.92; 64.12 Liu et al. 2015 63 120 52.80 (43.18; 61.69) Liang et al. 2015 63 120 52.87 (41.18; 63.67) Lin et al. 2017 121 225 53.88 (49.51; 58.41) Liu et al. 2012 271 502 53.88 (49.51; 58.41) Liu et al. 2020 2520 93.8 55.44 (52.19; 58.65) Qin et al. 2020 61 110 55.45 (47.33; 67.96) Wang et al. 2021 209 359 55.4 55.43 Cheng et al. 2013 55 95 56 57.89 (47.33; 67.96) Wang et al. 2014 57 94 58.22 (52.93; 68.37) Song et al. 2014 57 94 58.22 (52.93; 68.37) Guo et al. 2015 35 56 6 58.22 (52.93; 68.37) Chen et al. 2018 57 94 60.44 (50.02; 70.56) Louter 2013 93 153 - 60.78 (52.77; 65.76) Sun et al. 2015 35 56 - 62.50 (47.35; 76.65) Yuan et al. 2020 165 253 - 63.28 (44.55; 75.69) Yuan et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (99.07; 71.47) Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (59.00; 71.47) Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (59.00; 71.47) Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (59.00; 71.47) Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (59.00; 71.47) Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (59.00; 71.47) Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (59.00; 71.47) Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (59.00; 71.47) Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (59.00; 71.47) Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (59.00; 71.47) Zhang et al. 2021 64 95 - 74.74 Shi et al. 2023 79 120 - 65.83 (56.62; 74.24) Mao et al. 2021 75 53 - 66.67 (51.05; 80.00) Cao et al. 2019 75 53 - 66.67 (51.05; 80.00) Cao et al. 2019 75 53 - 66.67 (51.05; 80.00) Cao et al. 2019 75 75 - 68.33 (57.62; 79.47) Dong et al. 2022 69 101 - 68.30 (57.92; 79.47) Mao et al. 2021 79 112 - 70.54 (61.18; 78.77) Xuan et al. 2022 69 101 - 73.28 (64.64; 83.99) Gao et al. 2021 79 112 - 70.54 (71.41; 75.75, 70.77) Yu et al. 2022 67 88 - 76.14 (55.86; 85.91) Mao et al. 2014 74 100 - 78.33 (56.80; 87.93) Hu et al. 2015 96 131 - 73.28 (64.85; 85.91) Guo 2014 78 100 - 78.33 (65.80; 87.93) Hu et al. 2015 98 110 - 78.40 (85.90; 87.93) Hu et al. 2015 98 110 - 78.40 (85.90; 87.93) Hu et al. 2015 98 110 - 78.40 (85.90; 87.93) Hu et al. 2015 98 110 - 78.40 (85.90; 87.93) Hu et al. 2015 98	Duncan et al. 2014	74	158		46.84	[38.86; 54.93]
Liu et al. 2014 37 71 - 52.11 39.92; 64.12 Liu et al. 2015 63 120 52.64 (14) 111; 63.59 Liang et al. 2015 63 120 52.80 (43); 61.69 Li et al. 2023 46 87 52.87 (41); 63.67 Lin et al. 2017 121 225 53.88 (49); 55.41 Liu et al. 2022 520 93.8 55.44 (52.19; 58.65 Qin et al. 2020 61 110 55.45 (42); 65.65 Qin et al. 2021 209 359 55.44 (52.19; 58.65 Qin et al. 2021 209 359 55.44 (52.19; 58.65 Qin et al. 2011 209 359 55.45 (47); 63.637 Song et al. 2012 129 359 55 56.5 57.89 (47); 33; 67.96 Wang et al. 2021 209 369 52.22 (52.93; 63); 77 Song et al. 2014 57 94 60.46 (50); 70.56 Louter 2013 93 153 - 60.78 (52); 76.65 Sun et al. 2015 35 56 - 62.50 (47); 57.605 Sun et al. 2016 37 94 60.46 (50); 77.45 Chen et al. 2020 165 253 - 65.22 (59); 00; 71.67 Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (44); 55.90; 77.45 Zhang et al. 2021 65 253 - 65.22 (54); 00; 77.45 Zhang et al. 2021 65 253 - 65.22 (54); 00; 77.45 Zhang et al. 2021 65 253 - 65.28 (54); 00; 77.45 Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (54); 00; 77.45 Zhang et al. 2021 65 253 - 65.28 (54); 00; 74.74 Shi et al. 2023 79 120 - 65.83 (56); 62, 72.44 Mao et al. 2020 73 53 - 66.67 (51.05; 80.00) Cao et al. 2019 89 - 75.50 Qiu et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (54); 00; 74.74 Shi et al. 2021 62 95 - 66.53 (54); 00; 74.74 Shi et al. 2021 62 95 - 66.53 (54); 00; 74.74 Shi et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.83 (56); 75.79, 77 Yu et al. 2022 68 100 - 68.00 (57.92, 76); 89] Qiu et al. 2021 79 112 - 61.57, 76, 89] Shabezade h et al. 2016 74 120 - 70.58 (51); 75.89] Shabezade h et al. 2016 75 27 Zhang et al. 2022 90 127 - 70.87 (51); 75.89] Shabezade h et al. 2015 96 131 - 73.28 (64); 85, 80, 63] Mao et al. 2021 79 112 - 70.54 (61); 76, 76, 79, 99] Gao et al. 2021 79 112 - 70.54 (61); 76, 76, 79] Shabezade h et al. 2016 74 120 - 78.30 (63); 75.85] Nu et al. 2019 52 70 - 78.48 (64); 76, 85, 91] Mao et al. 2014 78 100 - 78.33 (65); 76, 89] Shabezade h et al. 2016 52 (68); 71, 76, 69] Shabezade h et al. 2016 52 (68); 76, 69] Shabezade h et al. 2016 54 (65); 76, 69] Shabezade h et a	Shulman et al. 2001	47	99		47.47	[37.34; 57.76]
Liu et al. 2014 37 71 - 52.11 39.92; 64.12 Liu et al. 2015 63 120 52.64 (14) 111; 63.59 Liang et al. 2015 63 120 52.60 (43) (86) (16) Li et al. 2023 46 87 52.87 (41) (87) (86) (7) Lin et al. 2017 121 225 53.88 (49) (55) (84) (44) (56) (7) Liu et al. 2012 71 502 53.88 (49) (55) (58) (41) Liu et al. 2022 520 938 55.44 (52) (9) (58) (56) Qin et al. 2020 61 110 55.45 (44) (52) (9) (58) (56) Qin et al. 2021 209 359 55.45 (55) (47) (57) (58) (57) (57) (57) (57) (57) (57) (57) (57	Chang et al. 2019	64	134		47.76	[39.07; 56.56]
Liu et al. 2014 37 71 - 52.11 39.92; 64.12 Liu et al. 2015 63 120 52.64 (14) 111; 63.59 Liang et al. 2015 63 120 52.60 (43) (86) (16) Li et al. 2023 46 87 52.87 (41) (87) (86) (7) Lin et al. 2017 121 225 53.88 (49) (55) (84) (44) (56) (7) Liu et al. 2012 71 502 53.88 (49) (55) (58) (41) Liu et al. 2022 520 938 55.44 (52) (9) (58) (56) Qin et al. 2020 61 110 55.45 (44) (52) (9) (58) (56) Qin et al. 2021 209 359 55.45 (55) (47) (57) (58) (57) (57) (57) (57) (57) (57) (57) (57	Shafazand et al. 2017	32	66		48.48	[35.99; 61.12]
Liu et al. 2014 37 71 - 52.11 39.92; 64.12 Liu et al. 2015 63 120 52.64 (14) 111; 63.59 Liang et al. 2015 63 120 52.80 (43); 61.69 Li et al. 2023 46 87 52.87 (41); 63.67 Lin et al. 2017 121 225 53.88 (49); 55.41 Liu et al. 2022 520 93.8 55.44 (52.19; 58.65 Qin et al. 2020 61 110 55.45 (42); 65.65 Qin et al. 2021 209 359 55.44 (52.19; 58.65 Qin et al. 2021 209 359 55.44 (52.19; 58.65 Qin et al. 2011 209 359 55.45 (47); 63.637 Song et al. 2012 129 359 55 56.5 57.89 (47); 33; 67.96 Wang et al. 2021 209 369 52.22 (52.93; 63); 77 Song et al. 2014 57 94 60.46 (50); 70.56 Louter 2013 93 153 - 60.78 (52); 76.65 Sun et al. 2015 35 56 - 62.50 (47); 57.605 Sun et al. 2016 37 94 60.46 (50); 77.45 Chen et al. 2020 165 253 - 65.22 (59); 00; 71.67 Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (44); 55.90; 77.45 Zhang et al. 2021 65 253 - 65.22 (54); 00; 77.45 Zhang et al. 2021 65 253 - 65.22 (54); 00; 77.45 Zhang et al. 2021 65 253 - 65.28 (54); 00; 77.45 Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (54); 00; 77.45 Zhang et al. 2021 65 253 - 65.28 (54); 00; 74.74 Shi et al. 2023 79 120 - 65.83 (56); 62, 72.44 Mao et al. 2020 73 53 - 66.67 (51.05; 80.00) Cao et al. 2019 89 - 75.50 Qiu et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (54); 00; 74.74 Shi et al. 2021 62 95 - 66.53 (54); 00; 74.74 Shi et al. 2021 62 95 - 66.53 (54); 00; 74.74 Shi et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.83 (56); 75.79, 77 Yu et al. 2022 68 100 - 68.00 (57.92, 76); 89] Qiu et al. 2021 79 112 - 61.57, 76, 89] Shabezade h et al. 2016 74 120 - 70.58 (51); 75.89] Shabezade h et al. 2016 75 27 Zhang et al. 2022 90 127 - 70.87 (51); 75.89] Shabezade h et al. 2015 96 131 - 73.28 (64); 85, 80, 63] Mao et al. 2021 79 112 - 70.54 (61); 76, 76, 79, 99] Gao et al. 2021 79 112 - 70.54 (61); 76, 76, 79] Shabezade h et al. 2016 74 120 - 78.30 (63); 75.85] Nu et al. 2019 52 70 - 78.48 (64); 76, 85, 91] Mao et al. 2014 78 100 - 78.33 (65); 76, 89] Shabezade h et al. 2016 52 (68); 71, 76, 69] Shabezade h et al. 2016 52 (68); 76, 69] Shabezade h et al. 2016 54 (65); 76, 69] Shabezade h et a				<u>=</u>		[44.03; 53.10]
Liu et al. 2014 37 71 - 52.11 39.92; 64.12 Liu et al. 2015 63 120 52.64 (14) 111; 63.59 Liang et al. 2015 63 120 52.80 (43); 61.69 Li et al. 2023 46 87 52.87 (41); 63.67 Lin et al. 2017 121 225 53.88 (49); 55.41 Liu et al. 2022 520 93.8 55.44 (52.19; 58.65 Qin et al. 2020 61 110 55.45 (42); 65.65 Qin et al. 2021 209 359 55.44 (52.19; 58.65 Qin et al. 2021 209 359 55.44 (52.19; 58.65 Qin et al. 2011 209 359 55.45 (47); 63.637 Song et al. 2012 129 359 55 56.5 57.89 (47); 33; 67.96 Wang et al. 2021 209 369 52.22 (52.93; 63); 77 Song et al. 2014 57 94 60.46 (50); 70.56 Louter 2013 93 153 - 60.78 (52); 76.65 Sun et al. 2015 35 56 - 62.50 (47); 57.605 Sun et al. 2016 37 94 60.46 (50); 77.45 Chen et al. 2020 165 253 - 65.22 (59); 00; 71.67 Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (44); 55.90; 77.45 Zhang et al. 2021 65 253 - 65.22 (54); 00; 77.45 Zhang et al. 2021 65 253 - 65.22 (54); 00; 77.45 Zhang et al. 2021 65 253 - 65.28 (54); 00; 77.45 Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (54); 00; 77.45 Zhang et al. 2021 65 253 - 65.28 (54); 00; 74.74 Shi et al. 2023 79 120 - 65.83 (56); 62, 72.44 Mao et al. 2020 73 53 - 66.67 (51.05; 80.00) Cao et al. 2019 89 - 75.50 Qiu et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.28 (54); 00; 74.74 Shi et al. 2021 62 95 - 66.53 (54); 00; 74.74 Shi et al. 2021 62 95 - 66.53 (54); 00; 74.74 Shi et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.83 (56); 75.79, 77 Yu et al. 2022 68 100 - 68.00 (57.92, 76); 89] Qiu et al. 2021 79 112 - 61.57, 76, 89] Shabezade h et al. 2016 74 120 - 70.58 (51); 75.89] Shabezade h et al. 2016 75 27 Zhang et al. 2022 90 127 - 70.87 (51); 75.89] Shabezade h et al. 2015 96 131 - 73.28 (64); 85, 80, 63] Mao et al. 2021 79 112 - 70.54 (61); 76, 76, 79, 99] Gao et al. 2021 79 112 - 70.54 (61); 76, 76, 79] Shabezade h et al. 2016 74 120 - 78.30 (63); 75.85] Nu et al. 2019 52 70 - 78.48 (64); 76, 85, 91] Mao et al. 2014 78 100 - 78.33 (65); 76, 89] Shabezade h et al. 2016 52 (68); 71, 76, 69] Shabezade h et al. 2016 52 (68); 76, 69] Shabezade h et al. 2016 54 (65); 76, 69] Shabezade h et a						
Liang et al. 2015 63 120 52.87 [41.87; 63.67] Lin et al. 2017 121 225 - 53.78 [47.03; 60.43] Liu et al. 2022 271 502 - 53.98 [49.51; 56.41] Liu et al. 2022 520 938 - 54.64 [42.21; 64.78] Wang et al. 2022 520 938 - 57.89 [47.33; 67.64 Gin et al. 2020 61 110 - 54.55 [45.67; 64.93] Cheng et al. 2013 55 95 - 57.89 [47.33; 67.64 Song et al. 2014 57 94 - 60.64 [50.27; 75.68 Sun et al. 2018 57 94 - 60.64 [50.27; 75.68 Sun et al. 2018 57 94 - 60.64 [50.27; 75.68 Yuan et al. 2020 53 83 - 63.86 [52.57; 74.12] Cui et al. 2019 359 - 63.83 - 63.86 [52.57; 74.12] Cui et al. 2019 35 - 65.2 [50.07; 74.52] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Yu et al. 2022 68 100 - 65.83 [56.62; 74.24] Mao et al. 2020 73 53 - 66.04 [51.73; 78.48] Wang et al. 2021 62 95 - 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Yu et al. 2022 68 100 - 66.83 [57.67] Mao et al. 2020 79 112 - 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Zhang et al. 2020 79 112 - 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Jong et al. 2022 69 101 - 68.33 [57.62; 79.47] Dong et al. 2022 69 101 - 68.33 [57.62; 79.47] Dong et al. 2020 79 112 - 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Jong et al. 2021 62 90 127 - 70.87 [62.15; 78.58] Mao et al. 2015 96 131 - 73.28 [64.84; 88.97] Mao et al. 2015 96 131 - 73.28 [64.84; 88.97] Mao et al. 2014 74 81 100 - 74.29 [62.44; 83.89] Gao et al. 2015 96 131 - 73.68 [69.44; 82.52] Zhang et al. 2014 74 81 100 - 74.29 [62.44; 83.89] Mao et al. 2014 74 81 100 - 74.29 [62.44; 83.89] Chen et al. 2013 47 60 - 76.46 [69.44; 82.52] Zhang et al. 2014 52 68 - 76.46 [69.44; 82.52] Zhang et al. 2013 47 60 - 76.33 [68.64; 88.57] Chen et al. 2013 47 60 - 76.33 [68.64; 88.57]						
Li et al. 2023 46 87 53.78 [41.67; 63.67] Lin et al. 2021 21 225 53.78 [47.03; 60.43] Liu et al. 2022 271 502 53.98 [44.51; 58.41] Liu et al. 2022 520 938 55.44 [44.21; 64.78] Wang et al. 2020 61 110 55.95 57.89 [47.33; 67.96] Wang et al. 2021 209 359 56.22 [52.93; 63.37] Song et al. 2014 168 224 57.68.57] Chen et al. 2018 30 48 57.94 60.78 [52.57; 68.55] Chen et al. 2020 53 83 62.55 [47.35; 76.05] Sun et al. 2015 35 56 62.50 [48.55; 76.08] Yuan et al. 2020 53 83 62.55 [47.55; 76.57] Chen et al. 2020 165 253 62.57 [45.57] Zhang et al. 2021 162 95 65.22 [54.90; 76.05] Yuan et al. 2020 165 253 66.22 [59.00; 71.47] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.22 [54.90; 76.74] Mao et al. 2019 63 93 79 120 66.83 [56.62; 74.24] Mao et al. 2019 63 93 65.77 [47.57] Chen et al. 2020 165 253 66.77 [47.57] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.26 [47.05; 77.45] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 66.26 [54.80; 77.45] Cao et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.26; 76.47] Mao et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.26; 77.67] Qiu et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.26; 77.67] Qiu et al. 2020 79 112 66.83 [56.62; 74.24] Mao et al. 2019 63 93 77.24 [57.66; 76.60] Qiu et al. 2020 79 112 66.83 [56.62; 76.80] Qiu et al. 2020 79 112 77.56 [54.80] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 68.00 [77.25] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 77.55 [53.10] Mao et al. 2019 52 75 98.31 77.22 Cao et al. 2019 63 93 77.24 [57.62; 77.47] Dong et al. 2020 79 112 77.56 [65.80,00] Cao et al. 2019 63 93 77.24 [64.83] Mao et al. 2017 75 [63.10] 78.73] Mao et al. 2016 87 120 78.80 77.24 [64.18; 78.77] Mao et al. 2019 52 70 70.74 [64.18; 78.77] Jang et al. 2020 79 112 77.72 [68.60] Niu et al. 2021 79 112 77.72 [68.60] 76.78 [62.15; 78.59] Sahebzadeh et al. 2014 78 100 78.33 [68.63; 88.27] Mao et al. 2015 96 131 77.22 [64.64; 88.57] Mao et al. 2014 78 100 78.33 [68.63; 88.27] Ma et al. 2015 98 110 78.63 [68.64; 88.27] Ma et al. 2013 47 60 76.70 [64.63; 88.27] Ma et al. 2013 47 60 76.70 [64.63; 88.27] Ma et al. 2015 98 110 78.73 [68.65] 77.94 [67.94; 88.27] Ma et al. 2015 98 110 79.75 [79.94] Sahobs						
Gub et al. 2016 57 54 60.74 [50.02, 70.36] Louter 2013 93 153 60.78 [52.57, 88.57] Chen et al. 2008 30 48 62.50 [47, 35, 76.05] Sun et al. 2015 35 56 62.50 [47, 35, 76.05] Vuan et al. 2020 53 83 63.86 [52.57, 74.12] Cui et al. 2019 89 138 64.49 [55.90, 72.45] Zhang et al. 2020 165 253 65.22 [59.00, 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.26 [54.80, 74.74] Mao et al. 2007 35 53 66.04 [51.73, 78.48] Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.64 [51.73, 78.48] Wang et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.92, 76.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58.31, 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62, 79.47] Dong et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18, 78.77] Zhang et al. 2019 52 70 75.56						
Gub et al. 2016 57 54 60.74 [50.02, 70.36] Louter 2013 93 153 60.78 [52.57, 88.57] Chen et al. 2008 30 48 62.50 [47, 35, 76.05] Sun et al. 2015 35 56 62.50 [47, 35, 76.05] Vuan et al. 2020 53 83 63.86 [52.57, 74.12] Cui et al. 2019 89 138 64.49 [55.90, 72.45] Zhang et al. 2020 165 253 65.22 [59.00, 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.26 [54.80, 74.74] Mao et al. 2007 35 53 66.04 [51.73, 78.48] Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.64 [51.73, 78.48] Wang et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.92, 76.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58.31, 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62, 79.47] Dong et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18, 78.77] Zhang et al. 2019 52 70 75.56						
Gub et al. 2016 57 54 60.74 [50.02, 70.36] Louter 2013 93 153 60.78 [52.57, 88.57] Chen et al. 2008 30 48 62.50 [47, 35, 76.05] Sun et al. 2015 35 56 62.50 [47, 35, 76.05] Vuan et al. 2020 53 83 63.86 [52.57, 74.12] Cui et al. 2019 89 138 64.49 [55.90, 72.45] Zhang et al. 2020 165 253 65.22 [59.00, 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.26 [54.80, 74.74] Mao et al. 2007 35 53 66.04 [51.73, 78.48] Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.64 [51.73, 78.48] Wang et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.92, 76.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58.31, 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62, 79.47] Dong et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18, 78.77] Zhang et al. 2019 52 70 75.56						
Gub et al. 2016 57 54 60.74 [50.02, 70.36] Louter 2013 93 153 60.78 [52.57, 88.57] Chen et al. 2008 30 48 62.50 [47, 35, 76.05] Sun et al. 2015 35 56 62.50 [47, 35, 76.05] Vuan et al. 2020 53 83 63.86 [52.57, 74.12] Cui et al. 2019 89 138 64.49 [55.90, 72.45] Zhang et al. 2020 165 253 65.22 [59.00, 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.26 [54.80, 74.74] Mao et al. 2007 35 53 66.04 [51.73, 78.48] Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.64 [51.73, 78.48] Wang et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.92, 76.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58.31, 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62, 79.47] Dong et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18, 78.77] Zhang et al. 2019 52 70 75.56						
Gub et al. 2016 57 54 60.74 [50.02, 70.36] Louter 2013 93 153 60.78 [52.57, 88.57] Chen et al. 2008 30 48 62.50 [47, 35, 76.05] Sun et al. 2015 35 56 62.50 [47, 35, 76.05] Vuan et al. 2020 53 83 63.86 [52.57, 74.12] Cui et al. 2019 89 138 64.49 [55.90, 72.45] Zhang et al. 2020 165 253 65.22 [59.00, 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.26 [54.80, 74.74] Mao et al. 2007 35 53 66.04 [51.73, 78.48] Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.64 [51.73, 78.48] Wang et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.92, 76.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58.31, 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62, 79.47] Dong et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18, 78.77] Zhang et al. 2019 52 70 75.56						
Gub et al. 2016 57 54 60.74 [50.02, 70.36] Louter 2013 93 153 60.78 [52.57; 68.57] Chen et al. 2008 30 48 62.50 [47.35; 76.05] Sun et al. 2015 35 56 63.86 [52.57; 74.12] Cui et al. 2019 89 138 64.49 [55.90; 72.45] Zhang et al. 2020 165 253 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.26 [54.60; 74.74] Mao et al. 2007 35 53 66.04 [51.73; 78.48] Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.04 [51.73; 78.48] Wang et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.92; 76.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58.31; 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62; 78.47] Dong et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Zhang et al. 2021 69 101 68.32 [58.63, 77.22] Dong et al. 2019 52 75 69.57						
Gub et al. 2016 57 54 60.74 [50.02, 70.36] Louter 2013 93 153 60.78 [52.57; 68.57] Chen et al. 2008 30 48 62.50 [47.35; 76.05] Sun et al. 2015 35 56 63.86 [52.57; 74.12] Cui et al. 2019 89 138 64.49 [55.90; 72.45] Zhang et al. 2020 165 253 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.26 [54.60; 74.74] Mao et al. 2007 35 53 66.04 [51.73; 78.48] Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.04 [51.73; 78.48] Wang et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.92; 76.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58.31; 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62; 78.47] Dong et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Zhang et al. 2021 69 101 68.32 [58.63, 77.22] Dong et al. 2019 52 75 69.57				- <u></u>		
Gub et al. 2016 57 54 60.74 [50.02, 70.36] Louter 2013 93 153 60.78 [52.57, 88.57] Chen et al. 2008 30 48 62.50 [47, 35, 76.05] Sun et al. 2015 35 56 62.50 [47, 35, 76.05] Vuan et al. 2020 53 83 63.86 [52.57, 74.12] Cui et al. 2019 89 138 64.49 [55.90, 72.45] Zhang et al. 2020 165 253 65.22 [59.00, 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.26 [54.80, 74.74] Mao et al. 2007 35 53 66.04 [51.73, 78.48] Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.64 [51.73, 78.48] Wang et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.92, 76.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58.31, 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62, 79.47] Dong et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18, 78.77] Zhang et al. 2019 52 70 75.56						
Louter 2013 93 153 60.74 [60.02, 70.36] Louter 2013 93 153 60.78 [52.57, 88.57] Chen et al. 2008 30 48 62.50 [47.35, 76.05] Sun et al. 2015 35 56 62.50 [47.35, 76.05] Vuan et al. 2020 53 83 64.49 [55.90, 72.45] Zhang et al. 2020 165 253 65.22 [59.00, 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.26 [54.80, 74.74] Mao et al. 2007 35 53 66.04 [51.73, 78.48] Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.04 [51.73, 78.48] Wang et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.92, 76.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58.31, 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62, 79.47] Dong et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18, 78.77] Zhang et al. 2019 52 75 69.57 [59.10, 78.59] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 70.54				生		
Louter 2013 93 153 60.74 [60.02, 70.36] Louter 2013 93 153 60.78 [52.57, 88.57] Chen et al. 2008 30 48 62.50 [47.35, 76.05] Sun et al. 2015 35 56 62.50 [47.35, 76.05] Vuan et al. 2020 53 83 64.49 [55.90, 72.45] Zhang et al. 2020 165 253 65.22 [59.00, 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.26 [54.80, 74.74] Mao et al. 2007 35 53 66.04 [51.73, 78.48] Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.04 [51.73, 78.48] Wang et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.92, 76.07] Yu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58.31, 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62, 79.47] Dong et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18, 78.77] Zhang et al. 2019 52 75 69.57 [59.10, 78.59] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 70.54				-		
Chen et al. 2008 30 48 62.50 [47,35;76.05] Sun et al. 2015 35 56 62.50 [48,55;75.08] Yuan et al. 2020 53 83 64.49 [55.90;72.45] Zhang et al. 2021 165 253 65.22 [59.00;71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.22 [59.00;71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.26 [54.80;74.74] Mao et al. 2007 35 53 66.04 [51.73;78.48] Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.67 [51.05; 80.00] Cao et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.22; 77.22] Qiu et al. 2022 68 100 68.30 [57.62; 79.47] Dong et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62; 79.47] Dong et al. 2022 64 92 69.57 [59.10; 78.73] Mao et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Dong et al. 2021 90 127 70.87 [62.15; 78.59] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 73.28						
Sun et al. 2015 35 56 62.50 [48,55;75.08] Yuan et al. 2020 53 83 63.86 [52.57;74,12] Cui et al. 2019 89 138 64.49 [55.00;72,45] Zhang et al. 2020 165 253 65.22 [59.00;71,07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.22 [59.00;74,74] Shi et al. 2023 79 120 65.83 [56.62;74,24] Mao et al. 2007 35 53 66.04 [51.73;78,48] Wang et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.92;76.98] Qiu et al. 2022 68 100 68.00 [57.92;76.98] Qiu et al. 2023 64 92 69.57 [59.10;78.73] Mao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62;79.47] Dong et al. 2020 09 127 70.54 [61.18;78.77] Zhang et al. 2016 87 120 72.50 [63.60;80.25] Niu et al. 2016 87 120 72.50 [63.60;80.25] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 7120 72.50 [63.60;80.25] </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
Yuan et al. 2020 53 83 63.86 [52.57; 74.12] Cui et al. 2019 89 138 64.49 [55.90; 72.45] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.26 [54.80; 74.74] Shi et al. 2023 79 120 68.83 [56.62; 74.24] Mao et al. 2018 30 45 66.67 [51.05; 80.00] Ca et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.25; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 68 100 68.00 [57.62; 79.47] Dong et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62; 79.47] Dong et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58.31; 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62; 79.47] Dong et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18; 78.7] Zhang et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62; 79.47] Zhang et al. 2016 87 120 70.54 [61.18; 78.7] Mao et al. 2019 52 75 70.87						
Cui et al. 2019 89 138 64.49 [55.90; 72.45] Zhang et al. 2020 165 253 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.26 [54.80; 74.74] Shi et al. 2023 79 120 65.83 [56.62; 74.24] Mao et al. 2017 35 53 66.04 [51.73; 78.48] Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.67 [51.05; 80.00] Cao et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.25; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 68 100 68.30 [57.52; 76.98] Qiu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58.31; 77.22] Dong et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62; 79.47] Dong et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Zhang et al. 2022 90 127 70.87 [62.15; 78.59] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 73.91 [58.67; 85.86] Mao et al. 2014 34 46 73.28 [64.85; 80.63] Mao et al. 2014 52 70 74.29<						
Zhang et al. 2020 165 253 65.22 [59.00; 71.07] Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.26 [54.80; 74.74] Shi et al. 2023 79 120 65.33 [56.62; 74.24] Mao et al. 2017 35 53 66.04 [51.73; 78.48] Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.67 [51.05; 80.00] Cao et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.22; 76.98] Qiu et al. 2022 68 100 68.32 [58.31; 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.57 [59.10; 78.73] Mao et al. 2020 64 92 69.57 [59.10; 78.73] Mao et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Zhang et al. 2022 90 127 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Zhang et al. 2016 87 120 72.50 [63.60; 80.25] Niu et al. 2016 87 120 72.50 [63.60; 80.25] Niu et al. 2016 87 120 72.50 [63.60; 80.25] Niu et al. 2016 87 120 74.29						
Zhang et al. 2021 62 95 65.26 [54.80; 74.74] Shi et al. 2023 79 120 65.83 [56.62; 74.24] Mao et al. 2017 35 53 66.04 [51.73; 76.48] Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.67 [51.05; 80.00] Cao et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.25; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 68 100 68.32 [58.31; 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62; 79.47] Dong et al. 2020 64 92 69.57 [59.10; 78.73] Mao et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Zhang et al. 2020 79 112 70.87 [62.15; 78.59] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 72.50 [63.60; 80.25] Niu et al. 2014 34 46 73.91 [58.87; 85.73] Lu 2019 52 70 74.29 [62.44; 83.99] Gao et al. 2013 126 165 76.36 [69.14] & 2.62] Shorvanek et al. 2013 126 165 76.47						
Shi et al. 2023 79 120 66.83 [56.62; 74.24] Mao et al. 2007 35 53 66.04 [51.73; 78.48] Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.67 [51.05; 80.00] Cao et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.25; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 68 100 68.00 [57.22; 76.98] Qiu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58.31; 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62; 79.47] Dong et al. 2020 64 92 69.33 [57.62; 79.47] Mao et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Zhang et al. 2022 90 127 70.87 [62.15; 78.59] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 72.50 [63.60; 80.25] Niu et al. 2015 96 131 73.28 [64.85; 80.63] Mao et al. 2014 34 46 73.291 [58.87; 85.73] Lu 2019 52 70 74.29 [62.44; 83.99] Gao et al. 2013 126 165 76.47 <						
Mao et al. 2007 35 53 66.04 [51,73;78,48] Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.67 [51,05; 80.00] Cao et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57,25; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 68 100 68.00 [57,92; 76.98] Qiu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58,31; 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.57 [59.10; 78.73] Mao et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Dong et al. 2022 90 127 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Zhang et al. 2016 87 120 72.50 [63.60; 80.25] Niu et al. 2015 96 131 70.54 [64.48; 80.63] Mao et al. 2014 34 46 73.91 [58.87; 85.73] Lu 2019 52 70 76.14 [65.86; 84.58] Skorvanek et al. 2013 126 165 76.47 [64.26; 85.91] Guo 2014 78 100 78.30 [65.86; 84.58] [65.87] Guo 2014 78 100 76.47				÷		
Wang et al. 2018 30 45 66.67 f51.05; 80.00 Cao et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 f57.25; 77.07 Yu et al. 2022 68 100 68.30 f57.42; 79.47 Qiu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 f58.31; 77.22 Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 f57.62; 79.47 Dong et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 f61.18; 78.73 Mao et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 f61.18; 78.73 Shebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 72.50 f63.66; 84.58 Niu et al. 2015 96 131 72.50 f63.86; 80.63 Mao et al. 2014 34 46 73.91 f58.87; 85.73 Lu 2019 52 70 74.29 f62.44; 83.99 Gao et al. 2013 126 165 76.36 f69.14; 82.62 Zhang et al. 2010 52 68 76.47 f64.62; 85.91 Guo 2014 78 100 78.36 f69.14; 82.62 Zhang et al. 2013 126 165 76.47 f64.62; 85.91 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
Cao et al. 2019 63 93 67.74 [57.25; 77.07] Yu et al. 2022 68 100 68.00 [57.92; 76.98] Qiu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58.31; 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62; 79.47] Dong et al. 2023 64 92 69.57 [59.10; 78.73] Mao et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Zhang et al. 2022 90 127 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 72.50 [63.60; 80.25] Niu et al. 2015 96 131 73.28 [64.85; 80.63] Mao et al. 2014 34 46 73.91 [58.87; 85.73] Lu 2019 52 70 76.14 [65.45; 81.59] Gao et al. 2013 126 165 76.14 [65.45; 81.59] Skorvanek et al. 2013 126 165 78.36 [69.14; 82.62] Zhang et al. 2010 52 68 76.47 [64.62; 85.91] Guo 2014 78 100 78.33						
Yu et al. 2022 68 100 68.00 [57.92; 76.98] Qiu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58.31; 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.57 [59.10; 78.73] Mao et al. 2020 64 92 95 69.57 [59.10; 78.73] Mao et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Zhang et al. 2022 90 127 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 72.50 [63.60; 80.25] Niu et al. 2015 96 131 71.57 [64.48; 80.63] Mao et al. 2014 34 46 73.28 [64.48; 80.63] Lu 2019 52 70 76.14 [65.46; 84.58] Skorvanek et al. 2013 126 165 76.14 [65.46; 84.58] Skorvanek et al. 2013 126 165 76.47 [64.26; 85.97] Guo 2014 78 100 78.30 [65.86; 87.93] Hu et al. 2009 141 170 78.33 [65.86; 87.93] Hu et al. 2015 98 110				÷		
Qiu et al. 2022 69 101 68.32 [58.31; 77.22] Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62; 79.47] Dong et al. 2023 64 92 69.57 [59.11; 77.22] Mao et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18; 78.73] Zhang et al. 2022 90 127 70.87 [62.15; 78.59] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 72.50 [63.60; 80.26] Niu et al. 2015 96 131 73.21 [64.85; 80.63, 27] Mao et al. 2014 34 46 73.91 [58.87; 85.73] Lu 2019 52 70 74.29 [62.44; 83.99] Gao et al. 2012 67 88 76.14 [65.86; 84.58] Skorvanek et al. 2013 126 165 76.36 [69.14; 82.65] Zhang et al. 2010 52 68 76.47 [64.62; 85.91] Guo 2014 78 100 78.30 [65.80; 87.33] Hu et al. 2009 141 170 78.33 [65.80; 87.33] Hu et al. 2015 98 110 89.36						
Cao et al. 2019 52 75 69.33 [57.62; 79.47] Dong et al. 2023 64 92 69.57 [59.10; 78.73] Mao et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Zhang et al. 2022 90 127 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 72.50 [63.60; 80.25] Niu et al. 2015 96 131 73.91 [58.87; 85.73] Lu 2019 52 70 74.29 [62.44; 83.99] Gao et al. 2012 67 88 76.14 [65.87; 85.67] Skorvanek et al. 2013 126 165 76.36 [69.14; 82.62] Zhang et al. 2010 52 68 76.47 [64.62; 85.91] Guo 2014 78 100 78.00 [68.61; 83.67] Guo 2014 78 100 78.33 [65.63; 80; 87.93] Hu et al. 2009 141 170 82.94 [76.43; 88.27] Ma et al. 2015 98 110 89.90 [81.72; 94.23] Santos Garcia et al. 2022 42 47 89.36						
Dong et al. 2023 64 92 69.57 [59.10; 78.73] Mao et al. 2020 79 112 70.54 [61.18; 78.77] Zhang et al. 2022 90 127 70.87 [62.15; 78.59] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 72.50 [63.60; 80.25] Niu et al. 2015 96 131 73.28 [64.48; 80.63] Mao et al. 2014 34 46 73.19 [58.87; 85.73] Lu 2019 52 70 74.29 [62.44; 83.99] Gao et al. 2012 67 88 76.14 [65.86; 84.58] Skorvanek et al. 2013 126 165 76.36 [69.14; 82.62] Zhang et al. 2010 52 68 76.47 [64.62; 85.91] Guo 2014 78 100 78.30 [65.86; 87.93] Hu et al. 2009 141 170 78.33 [65.86; 87.93] Hu et al. 2015 98 110 89.09 [81.72; 94.23] <				-		
Zhang et al. 2022 90 127 70.87 [62.15; 78.59] Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 72.50 [63.60; 80.25] Niu et al. 2015 96 131 73.28 [64.85; 80.63] Mao et al. 2014 34 46 73.91 [58.87; 85.73] Lu 2019 52 70 74.29 [62.44; 83.99] Gao et al. 2022 67 88 76.14 [65.67; 85.67] Skorvanek et al. 2013 126 165 76.36 [69.14; 82.62] Zhang et al. 2010 52 68 76.47 [64.62; 85.91] Guo 2014 78 100 78.00 [68.61; 85.67] Chen et al. 2013 47 60 78.33 [65.80; 87.93] Hu et al. 2009 141 170 82.94 [76.43; 88.27] Ma et al. 2015 98 110 89.09 [81.72; 94.23] Santos García et al. 2022 42 47 89.36 [76.90; 96.45] <td></td> <td>64</td> <td>92</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>[59.10; 78.73]</td>		64	92			[59.10; 78.73]
Sahebzadeh et al. 2016 87 120 72.50 [63.60; 80.25] Niu et al. 2015 96 131 73.28 [64.85; 80.63] Mao et al. 2014 34 46 73.11 [58.87; 85.73] Lu 2019 52 70 74.29 [62.44; 83.99] Gao et al. 2012 67 88 76.14 [65.86; 84.58] Skorvanek et al. 2013 126 165 76.36 [69.14; 82.62] Zhang et al. 2010 52 68 76.47 [64.62; 85.91] Guo 2014 78 100 78.00 [68.61; 85.67] Chen et al. 2013 47 60 78.33 [65.80; 87.93] Hu et al. 2009 141 170 82.94 [76.43; 88.27] Ma et al. 2015 98 110 89.09 [81.72; 94.23] Santos García et al. 2022 42 47 89.36 [76.90; 96.45]						
Niu et al. 2015 96 131 73.28 [64.85; 80.63] Mao et al. 2014 34 46 73.91 [58.87; 85.73] Lu 2019 52 70 74.29 [62.44; 83.99] Gao et al. 2022 67 88 76.14 [65.66; 84.58] Skorvanek et al. 2013 126 165 76.36 [69.14; 82.62] Zhang et al. 2010 52 68 76.47 [64.62; 85.91] Guo 2014 78 100 78.33 [65.80; 87.93] Hu et al. 2013 47 60 78.33 [65.80; 87.93] Hu et al. 2009 141 170 82.94 [76.43; 88.27] Ma et al. 2015 98 110 89.09 [81.72; 94.23] Santos García et al. 2022 42 47 89.36 [76.90; 96.45]						[62.15; 78.59]
Mao et al. 2014 34 46 73.91 [58.87; 85.73] Lu 2019 52 70 74.29 [62.44; 83.99] Gao et al. 2022 67 88 76.14 [65.86; 84.58] Skorvanek et al. 2013 126 165 76.36 [69.14; 82.62] Zhang et al. 2010 52 68 76.47 [64.62; 85.91] Guo 2014 78 100 78.30 [68.61; 85.67] Chen et al. 2013 47 60 78.30 [68.61; 85.67] Hu et al. 2009 141 170 82.94 [76.43; 88.27] Ma et al. 2015 98 110 89.09 [81.72; 94.23] Santos García et al. 2022 42 47 89.36 [76.90; 96.45]	Sahebzadeh et al. 2016		120		72.50	[63.60; 80.25]
Lu 2019 52 70 74.29 [62.44; 83.99] Gao et al. 2022 67 88 76.14 [65.46; 84.58] Skorvanek et al. 2013 126 155 76.36 [69.14; 82.62] Zhang et al. 2010 52 68 76.47 [64.62; 85.91] Guo 2014 78 100 78.33 [65.86; 84.68] Chen et al. 2013 47 60 78.33 [65.80; 87.93] Hu et al. 2009 141 170 82.94 [76.43; 88.27] Ma et al. 2015 98 110 98.909 [81.72; 94.23] Santos García et al. 2022 42 47 89.36 [76.90; 96.45]						
Gao et al. 2022 67 88 76.14 [65.86; 84.58] Skorvanek et al. 2013 126 165 76.36 [69.14; 82.62] Zhang et al. 2010 52 68 76.47 [64.62; 85.91] Guo 2014 78 100 78.00 [68.61; 86.67] Chen et al. 2013 47 60 78.33 [65.80; 87.93] Hu et al. 2009 141 170 82.94 [76.43; 88.27] Ma et al. 2015 98 110 89.09 [81.72; 94.23] Santos García et al. 2022 42 47 89.36 [76.90; 96.45]						
Skorvanek et al. 2013 126 165 76.36 [69.14; 82.62] Zhang et al. 2010 52 68 76.47 [64.62; 85.91] Guo 2014 78 100 78.30 [68.61; 85.67] Chen et al. 2013 47 60 78.33 [65.60; 87.93] Hu et al. 2009 141 170 82.94 [76.43; 88.27] Ma et al. 2015 98 110 89.09 [81.72; 94.23] Santos García et al. 2022 42 47 89.36 [76.90; 96.45]						
Zhang et al. 2010 52 68 76.47 [64.62; 85.91] Guo 2014 78 100 78.00 [68.61; 85.67] Chen et al. 2013 47 60 78.33 [65.80; 87.93] Hu et al. 2009 141 170 82.94 [76.43; 88.27] Ma et al. 2015 98 110 89.09 [81.72; 94.23] Santos García et al. 2022 42 47 89.36 [76.90; 96.45]						
Guo 2014 78 100 78.00 [68.61; 85.67] Chen et al. 2013 47 60 78.33 [65.80; 87.93] Hu et al. 2009 141 170 82.94 [76.43; 88.27] Ma et al. 2015 98 110 89.09 [81.72; 94.23] Santos García et al. 2022 42 47 89.36 [76.90; 96.45]						
Chen et al. 2013 47 60 78.33 [65.80; 87.93] Hu et al. 2009 141 170 82.94 [76.43; 88.27] Ma et al. 2015 98 110 89.09 [81.72; 94.23] Santos García et al. 2022 42 47 89.36 [76.90; 96.45]						
Hu et al. 2009 141 170 82.94 [76.43; 88.27] Ma et al. 2015 98 110 89.09 [81.72; 94.23] Santos García et al. 2022 42 47 89.36 [76.90; 96.45]						
Ma et al. 2015 98 110 89.09 [81.72; 94.23] Santos García et al. 2022 42 47 89.36 [76.90; 96.45]						[65.80; 87.93]
Santos García et al. 2022 42 47				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
				-		
: Random effects model 9382	Santos García et al. 2022	42	47		89.36	[76.90; 96.45]
	Random effects model		9382		58.07	[54.26; 61.88]
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0216$, $p < 0.01$	Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 94\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0216$,	p < 0.01				
0 20 40 60 80 100				0 20 40 60 80 100		

is lower than the rates reported in patients with chronic non-cancer pain (75.3%, 95% CI: 62.8-87.8%) (45), and hemodialysis patients (75.30%, 95% CI: 70.08-82.50%) (46). The prevalence is also lower than that in certain occupational groups with high work demands, such as nurses (61.00%, 95% CI: 55.8-66.1%) (47) and military personnel (69.00%, 95% CI: 62.33-75.30%) (25), who often experience high stress, shift work, long work hours, high burnout, and exposure to trauma (48).

In subgroup analyses, we found that the overall prevalence of poor sleep quality in PD patients was significantly lower in North America (47.88%, 95% CI: 40.26-55.50%) and high-income countries (56.40%, 95% CI: 40.51-72.28%) compared to other regions and countries. The burden of PD appears to be greater in low-income areas, which may contribute to poorer sleep quality (49, 50). On the other hand, higher-income countries may have access to better healthcare facilities, resources, and support, which can indirectly lower the risk of poor sleep quality PD patients (51). Greater healthcare resources in high-income countries may lead to more effective management of symptoms in PD patients in these countries, and thereby improving their sleep quality.

Variables	Number of studies	Sample size	Pooled mean score (95% CI)	12	P values
PSQI global score	28	3369	8.6101 (7.6664; 9.5538)	98.80%	< 0.0001
Subjective sleep quality	6	540	1.3010 (0.9834; 1.6187)	94.50%	< 0.0001
Sleep latency	6	540	1.3541 (0.9200; 1.7883)	97.40%	< 0.0001
Sleep duration	6	540	1.1770 (0.9375; 1.4164)	87.50%	< 0.0001
Habitual sleep efficiency	6	540	0.9736 (0.6394; 1.3078)	93.30%	< 0.0001
Sleep disturbance	6	540	1.4194 (1.2180; 1.6208)	91.80%	< 0.0001
Use of sleep medications	6	540	0.7347 (0.3085; 1.1609)	98.40%	< 0.0001
Daytime dysfunction	6	540	1.7561 (1.3769; 2.1354)	96.50%	< 0.0001

TABLE 2 The pooled PSQI global and sleep component score in Parkinson's disease patients.

TABLE 3 Subgroup analyses and meta-regression analyses.

Subgroup analysis						
Subgroups	Categories	No. of studies	Prevalence (95%CI)	l ²	P values within subgroups	P values across subgroups
	East Asia & Pacific	53	58.37% (54.35-62.39%)	94%	<0.01	<0.01
Geographic region	Europe & Central Asia	5	59.65% (37.61-81.68%)	97%	<0.01	
	South Asia	2	48.04% (41.93-54.16%)	0%	0.62	
	North America	2	47.88% (40.26-55.50%)	0%	0.9	
	Upper middle income	53	58.37% (54.35-62.39%)	94%	<0.01	<0.01
Countries by income	High income	7	56.40% (40.51-72.28%)	96%	<0.01	
	Lower middle income	3	56.51% (40.51-72.51%)	91%	<0.01	
Study design	Cross-sectional	61	58.24% (54.32-62.16%)	94%	<0.01	<0.01
Study design	Cohort	2	53.29% (41.23-65.35%)	84%	0.01	
	UKPDS	38	59.04% (54.18-63.89%)	94%	<0.01	<0.01
	MDS-PD	5	59.11% (40.65-77.57%)	98%	<0.01	
Diagnostic criteria	Diagnosticcriteria for PD in China	14	57.20% (49.03-65.37%)	93%	<0.01	
	PD criteria by NEDC	6	52.83% (42.44-63.22%)	83%	<0.01	
Cut-off value*	>4, >5, >6 and	41	59.61% (54.87-64.35%)	94%	<0.01	<0.01
	>7 or above 7	16	57.93% (50.64-65.22%)	95%	<0.01	
	Mixed	15	62.86% (53.72-72.00%)	95%	<0.01	<0.01
Patient source	Inpatients	3	60.57% (50.23-70.91%)	77%	0.01	
	Outpatients	12	53.66% (45.21-62.11%)	96%	<0.01	
Scale	PSQI	57	59.14% (55.19-63.09%)	94%	<0.01	<0.01
	PDSS	2	40.96% (18.33-63.58%)	92%	<0.01	
	PDSS-1	2	56.16% (22.69-89.62%)	98%	<0.01	
	PDSS-2	2	47.16% (40.70-53.63%)	0%	0.83	

Meta-regression analyses											
Variables	Number of studies	Coefficient	Standard Error	95% Lower	95% Upper	z values	P values				
Mean age	55	0.0076	0.0048	-0.0017	0.0169	1.5949	0.1107				
Illness duration	51	0.0105	0.0124	-0.0139	0.0348	0.8415	0.4001				
Male proportion	59	-0.1265	0.2418	-0.6005	0.3474	-0.5233	0.6008				
Onset age	21	0.0132	0.0064	0.0007	0.0258	2.0704	0.0384				
MoCA	16	-0.0047	0.0115	-0.0272	0.0178	-0.4075	0.6836				
MMSE	19	-0.0044	0.0073	-0.0186	0.0099	-0.6044	0.5456				
UPDRS-3	33	0.0068	0.0043	-0.0017	0.0153	1.5580	0.1192				
LEDD mean	16	-0.0006	0.0004	-0.0014	0.0002	-1.5178	0.1291				
H&YStage	31	-0.0126	0.0547	-0.1198	0.0946	-0.2304	0.8178				
Study quality	63	-0.0682	0.0348	-0.1363	-0.0001	-1.9618	0.0498				

*Only the study using the PSQI;H&Y stage: Hoehn and Yahr stage; UKPDS, UK Parkinson's Disease Society Brain Bank Diagnostic Criteria; MDS-PD, Movement Disorder Society Clinical Diagnostic Criteria for Parkinson's disease; PD criteria by NEDC, Parkinson's diagnostic criteria established by the National Extrapyramidal Disorders Conference; MoCA, Montreal Cognitive Assessment; MMSE, Mini-Mental State Examination; UPDRS-3, The Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale part 3 (Motor Examination); H&Y stage, Hoehn and Yahr stage; LEDD, Levodopa equivalent daily dose; PSQI, Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index; PDSS, Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-1, First item of Parkinson's Disease Sleep Scale; PDSS-2, Parkinson's disease sleep scale-2.

The overall prevalence of poor sleep quality was significantly higher among inpatients (60.57%, 95% CI: 50.23-70.91%) compared to outpatients (53.66%, 95% CI: 45.21-62.11%), which may be attributed to the severity of PD. Hospitalized patients usually suffer from a more advanced stage of the disease, necessitating closer medical monitoring and treatment (52). Certain symptoms, such as tremors, muscle stiffness, and difficulties with motor control, can all contribute to disrupted sleep (53, 54). Furthermore, changes in the environment such as being hospitalized or separated from their families and regular living environment can also contribute to a decline in sleep quality (55, 56). Consequently, hospitalized PD patients are more likely to encounter sleep problems.

In the subgroup analyses, the pooled prevalence of poor sleep quality in studies using the MDS-PD (59.11%, 95% CI: 40.65-77.57%) was significantly higher than those using the diagnostic PD criteria by NEDC (52.83%, 95% CI: 42.44-63.22%). Notably, certain studies had applied the UK Parkinson's Disease Society Brain Bank (UKPDS) criteria and the Parkinson's diagnostic criteria established by Chinese Medical Association (CMA) in the National Extrapyramidal Disorders Conference (NEDC), both of which differ from the Movement Disorder Society Clinical Diagnostic Criteria for Parkinson's disease(MDS-PD) in terms of diagnostic strictness and clinical application. Such diagnostic variations represent a key source of heterogeneity: the MDS-PD incorporates advanced biomarkers and updated clinical features to maximize specificity (23), whereas the UKPDS relies primarily on classic motor symptoms with established high sensitivity but lower specificity for early PD. The CMA guidelines adapt international standards to regional practices, potentially introducing operational variability, and NEDC (1984) lacks contemporary validation with possible under-identification of non-motor phenotypes (57, 58). Such methodological heterogeneity can directly influence prevalence estimates, as stricter criteria (e.g., MDS-PD) may capture patients with more advanced pathology and higher comorbidity burden, while broader criteria (e.g., NEDC/UKPDS) can include borderline cases with milder sleep disturbances. Consequently, the observed prevalence differences likely reflect both true biological variability and diagnostic threshold effects, necessitating cautious interpretation of cross-criteria study comparisons.

Subgroup analyses also revealed significantly higher pooled prevalence rates in cross-sectional studies (58.24%, 95% CI: 54.32-62.16%) compared to cohort studies (53.29%, 95% CI: 41.23-65.35%). It should be noted that only a small number of cohort studies (n = 2) were included, which might have resulted in less reliable estimates. Similarly, the higher prevalence observed in studies using the PSQI might partially reflect selection bias, due to the small number of studies using the PDSS (n = 2), PDSS-1 (n = 2), and PDSS-2 (n=2). Therefore, the findings of these subgroup analysis are tentative.

In meta-regression analyses, the age of onset of PD was positively associated with prevalence of poor sleep quality. Previous studies found that gender and age of onset are significant factors influencing the clinical phenotype of PD, affecting both motor symptoms and various non-motor symptoms (59). Patients with late-onset PD tend to experience more frequent non-motor symptoms, including cognitive dysfunction, autonomic dysfunction, and sleep disturbances (60, 61). A study conducted in China on non-motor symptoms in PD found positive correlations between age, daily levodopa dose, and Non-Motor Symptoms Scale (NMSS) scores in patients with lateonset PD. However, these correlations were not observed in those with early-onset PD, suggesting that age and daily levodopa dose may play a more significant role in the severity of non-motor symptoms in patients with late-onset PD compared to those with early-onset PD (62). Several brainstem nuclei are potentially involved in the mechanisms underlying non-motor symptoms such as gastrointestinal regulation, pain perception, emotion control, and sleep-wake cycles (63, 64). The presence of Lewy

bodies, which are composed of abnormal α -synuclein and are found outside the dopaminergic neurons of the midbrain, probably contribute to the pathology of non-motor manifestations in PD (63, 65, 66). Different distribution and severity of central nervous system lesions and pathophysiological course of PD between patients with early-onset and late-onset PD may be crucial factors influencing the non-motor features (e.g., sleep quality) associated with the disease (62).

Overall, our meta-analysis indicates that patients with PD have a high prevalence of poor sleep quality. Sleep problems are closely associated with mental health (67), and patients with PD often experience psychological stress (68), anxiety and depression (69, 70). Therefore, maintaining good sleep quality plays a crucial role in sustaining emotional and mental stability and enhancing the mental well-being and quality of life for patients (71). Cognitive decline and difficulties with concentration are common challenges faced by PD patients (72, 73). Prioritizing sleep quality in patients with PD is essential for managing symptoms, enhancing mental health, and preserving cognitive functioning. By optimizing the sleep environment, establishing healthy sleep habits, and utilizing medications or other treatments, when necessary, the sleep quality of patients with PD can be improved. Moreover, metaregression showed that study quality was negatively associated with sleep quality in PD patients. Thus, lower study quality may lead to underestimation of sleep problems in PD patients. Improving the methodological rigor of studies may help to more accurately assess the severity of sleep quality problems (74).

Strengths of this meta-analysis include high number of included studies and large sample size, and the utilization of comprehensive analytical methods, such as subgroup and meta-regression analyses, to identify factors associated with poor sleep quality. Nonetheless, several limitations should be noted. First, despite use of sophisticated statistical methods, heterogeneity still remained in the subgroup analyses, as is expected in meta-analyses of epidemiological surveys, as pointed out in previous studies (25, 47). Second, certain factors related to poor sleep quality, such as living environment, psychiatric comorbidities, and educational background, were not included in most studies. Third, wide confidence intervals for subgroups might be related to small sample sizes or the use of different PD diagnostic criteria in some studies. Fourth, the overrepresentation of Chinese studies might introduce bias that could affect the generalizability of the findings to other populations (75). Fifth, while our analysis identified key correlates of poor sleep quality, the preponderance of crosssectional data precluded any causal conclusions. Longitudinal studies are warranted to explore the temporal relationships, particularly between sleep deterioration and PD progression trajectories. Furthermore, significant heterogeneity in PD diagnostic criteria (e.g., MDS-PD vs. UKPDS vs. CMA vs. NEDC) could result in methodological variability. Although this reflects real-world clinical practice, differences in diagnostic sensitivity/specificity might influence pooled prevalence estimates and subgroup comparability. Future meta-analyses would benefit from standardized application of contemporary diagnostic frameworks of PD.

In conclusion, poor sleep quality is common among patients with PD, particularly in lower middle-income countries and Europe & Central Asia regions. To mitigate the adverse effects of poor sleep quality in PD patients, regular monitoring of sleep quality and sleep hygiene is crucial, particularly in high-risk subgroups. Additionally, further studies of sleep quality and PD patients in low- and middleincome countries are warranted, as well as prospective cohort studies to clarify the causality between poor sleep quality and other factors.

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

TS: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. YW: Data curation, Formal Analysis, Methodology, Writing – review & editing. JL: Data curation, Formal Analysis, Methodology, Writing – review & editing. WB: Data curation, Formal Analysis, Methodology, Writing – review & editing. HS: Writing – review & editing. SR: Data curation, Writing – review & editing. HZ: Data curation, Writing – review & editing. TC: Data curation, Writing – review & editing. CN: Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing. YX: Conceptualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. GW: Data curation, Methodology, Writing – review & editing.

Funding

The author(s) declare that financial support was received for the research and/or publication of this article. The study was supported by Beijing High Level Public Health Technology Talent Construction Project (Discipline Backbone-01-028), the Beijing Municipal Science & Technology Commission (No. Z181100001518005), and the Beijing Hospitals Authority Clinical Medicine Development of Special Funding Support (XMLX202128) and the University of Macau (MYRG2019-00066-FHS; MYRG2022-00187-FHS).

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to all participants and clinicians involved in this study.

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, 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/fpsyt.2025.1606743/ full#supplementary-material

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 1

Quality assessment of included studies.

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE 1

Funnel plot of pooled prevalence of poor sleep quality in Parkinson's disease patients.

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE 2

Sensitivity analysis of pooled prevalence of poor sleep quality in Parkinson's disease patients.

References

1. Triegaardt J, Han TS, Sada C, Sharma S, Sharma P. The role of virtual reality on outcomes in rehabilitation of Parkinson's disease: meta-analysis and systematic review in 1031 participants. *Neurol Sci.* (2020) 41:529–36. doi: 10.1007/s10072-019-04144-3

2. Pringsheim T, Jette N, Frolkis A, Steeves TDL. The prevalence of Parkinson's disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Movement Disord*. (2014) 29:1583–90. doi: 10.1002/mds.25945

3. Pfeiffer RF. Non-motor symptoms in Parkinson's disease. Parkinsonism Related Disord. (2016) 22:S119-22. doi: 10.1016/j.parkreldis.2015.09.004

4. Martinez-Martin P, Rodriguez-Blazquez C, Kurtis MM, Chaudhuri KR, Group oBotNV. The impact of non-motor symptoms on health-related quality of life of patients with Parkinson's disease. *Movement Disord.* (2011) 26:399–406. doi: 10.1002/mds.23462

5. Prakash KM, Nadkarni NV, Lye W-K, Yong M-H, Tan E-K. The impact of nonmotor symptoms on the quality of life of Parkinson's disease patients: a longitudinal study. *Eur J Neurol.* (2016) 23:854–60. doi: 10.1111/ene.12950

6. Stavitsky K, Cronin-Golomb A. Sleep quality in Parkinson disease: an examination of clinical variables. *Cognit Behav Neurol.* (2011) 24:43–9. doi: 10.1097/WNN.0b013e31821a4a95

7. Comella CL. Sleep disturbances and excessive daytime sleepiness in Parkinson disease: an overview. *J Neural Transm Suppl.* (2006) 70):349–55. doi: 10.1007/978-3-211-45295-0_53

8. Najafi MR, Chitsaz A, Askarian Z, Najafi MA. Quality of sleep in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Int J Prev Med.* (2013) 4:S229-33. doi: 10.1186/s12883-024-03548-9

9. Schrempf W, Brandt MD, Storch A, Reichmann H. Sleep disorders in parkinson's disease. J Parkinson's Dis. (2014) 4:211–21. doi: 10.3233/JPD-130301

10. Santos-García D, Castro ES, de Deus Fonticoba T, Panceiras MF, Enriquez JM, González JP, et al. Sleep problems are related to a worse quality of life and a greater non-motor symptoms burden in parkinson's disease. *J Geriatric Psychiatry Neurol.* (2021) 34:642–58. doi: 10.1177/0891988720964250

11. Kline C. Sleep quality. In: Gellman MD, Turner JR, editors. *Encyclopedia of Behavioral Medicine*. Springer, New York (2013). p. 1811-3.

12. Krystal AD, Edinger JD. Measuring sleep quality. Sleep Med. (2008) 9:S10-7. doi: 10.1016/S1389-9457(08)70011-X

13. Fabbri M, Beracci A, Martoni M, Meneo D, Tonetti L, Natale V. Measuring subjective sleep quality: A review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. (2021) 18:1082. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18031082

14. Buysse DJ, Reynolds CF, Monk TH, Berman SR, Kupfer DJ. The Pittsburgh sleep quality index: A new instrument for psychiatric practice and research. *Psychiatry Res.* (1989) 28:193–213. doi: 10.1016/0165-1781(89)90047-4

15. Landry GJ, Best JR, Liu-Ambrose T. Measuring sleep quality in older adults: a comparison using subjective and objective methods. *Front Aging Neurosci.* (2015) 7:166. doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2015.00166

16. Tse Winona, Liu Yiming, Barthlen Gabriele M, Hälbig Thomas D, Tolgyesi Sonia V, Gracies Jean-Michel. Clinical usefulness of the Parkinson's disease sleep scale. *Parkinsonism Related Disord*. (2005) 11:317–21. doi: 10.1016/j.parkreldis.2005.02.006

17. Pandey S, Bajaj BK, Wadhwa A, Anand KS. Impact of sleep quality on the quality of life of patients with Parkinson's disease: a questionnaire based study. *Clin Neurol Neurosurg.* (2016) 148:29–34. doi: 10.1016/j.clineuro.2016.06.014

 Lv D, Wang X, Zhu Y, Zhao L, Guo Q. Clinical analysis of parkinson's disease with anxiety, depression and sleep disorders. *Clin Misdiagn Misther*. (2019) 32:83–8. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1002-3429.2019.02.019

19. Santos García D, Cabo López I, Labandeira Guerra C, Yáñez Baña R, Cimas Hernando MI, Paz González JM, et al. Safinamide improves sleep and daytime sleepiness in Parkinson's disease: results from the SAFINONMOTOR study. *Neurol Sci.* (2022) 43:2537–44. doi: 10.1007/s10072-021-05607-2

20. Junho BT, Kummer A, Cardoso FE, Teixeira AL, Rocha NP. Sleep quality is associated with the severity of clinical symptoms in Parkinson's disease. *Acta Neurol Belgica*. (2018) 118:85–91. doi: 10.1007/s13760-017-0868-6

21. Page Matthew J, McKenzie Joanne E, Bossuyt Patrick M, Boutron Isabelle, Hoffmann Tammy C, Mulrow Cynthia D, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *PloS Med.* (2021) 18:e1003583. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003583

22. Daniel S, Lees A. Parkinson's Disease Society Brain Bank, London: overview and research. J Neural Transm Supplementum. (1993) 39:165–72.

23. Postuma RB, Berg D, Stern M, Poewe W, Olanow CW, Oertel W, et al. MDS clinical diagnostic criteria for Parkinson's disease. *Movement Disord*. (2015) 30:1591–601. doi: 10.1002/mds.26424

24. Yang Y, Li W, Ma TJ, Zhang L, Hall BJ, Ungvari GS, et al. Prevalence of poor sleep quality in perinatal and postnatal women: A comprehensive meta-analysis of observational studies. *Front Psychiatry.* (2020) 11:161. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2020.00161

25. Bai W, Gui Z, Chen MY, Zhang Q, Lam MI, Si TL, et al. Global prevalence of poor sleep quality in military personnel and veterans: A systematic review and metaanalysis of epidemiological studies. *Sleep Med Rev.* (2023) 71:101840. doi: 10.1016/ j.smrv.2023.101840

26. Dong M, Wang SB, Li Y, Xu DD, Ungvari GS, Ng CH, et al. Prevalence of suicidal behaviors in patients with major depressive disorder in China: A comprehensive meta-analysis. *J Affect Disord*. (2018) 225:32–9. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2017.07.043

27. Boyle MH. Guidelines for evaluating prevalence studies. *Evid Based Ment Health.* (1998) 1:37–9. doi: 10.1136/ebmh.1.2.37

28. Loney PL, Chambers LW, Bennett KJ, Roberts JG, Stratford PW. Critical appraisal of the health research literature: prevalence or incidence of a health problem. *Chronic Dis Canada.* (1998) 19:170–6.

29. Cai H, Chen P, Zhang Q, Lam MI, Si TL, Liu YF, et al. Global prevalence of major depressive disorder in LGBTQ+ samples: A systematic review and meta-analysis

of epidemiological studies. J Affect Disord. (2024) 360:249-58. doi: 10.1016/ j.jad.2024.05.115

30. Chen P, Lam MI, Si TL, Zhang L, Balbuena L, Su Z, et al. The prevalence of poor sleep quality in thegeneral population in China: a meta-analysis of epidemiological studies. *Eur Arch Psychiatry Clin Neurosci.* (2024) 274:1–14. doi: 10.1007/s00406-024-01764-5

31. R Core Team. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria (2013). Available online at: http://www.R-project.org/ (Accessed December 1, 2023).

32. Harris RJ, Deeks JJ, Altman DG, Bradburn MJ, Harbord RM, Sterne JAC. Metan: fixed- and random-effects meta-analysis. *Stata J.* (2008) 8:3–28. doi: 10.1177/1536867x0800800102

33. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*. (2003) 327:557–60. doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557

34. The World Bank Group.*Countries and Economies.* (2023). https://data. worldbank.org (Accessed December 5, 2023).

35. Okubo N, Matsuzaka M, Takahashi I, Sawada K, Sato S, Akimoto N, et al. Relationship between self-reported sleep quality and metabolic syndrome in general population. *BMC Public Health*. (2014) 14:562. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-14-562

36. Hinz A, Glaesmer H, Brähler E, Löffler M, Engel C, Enzenbach C, et al. Sleep quality in the general population: psychometric properties of the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index, derived from a German community sample of 9284 people. *Sleep Med.* (2017) 30:57–63. doi: 10.1016/j.sleep.2016.03.008

37. Madrid-Valero JJ, Martínez-Selva JM, Couto B, Sánchez-Romera JF, Ordoñana JR. Age and gender effects on the prevalence of poor sleep quality in the adult population. *Gaceta Sanitaria*. (2017) 31:18–22. doi: 10.1016/j.gaceta.2016.05.013

38. Visvalingam N, Sathish T, Soljak M, Chua AP, Dunleavy G, Divakar U, et al. Prevalence of and factors associated with poor sleep quality and short sleep in a working population in Singapore. *Sleep Health*. (2020) 6:277–87. doi: 10.1016/ j.sleh.2019.10.008

39. Lu L, Wang SB, Rao W, Zhang Q, Ungvari GS, Ng CH, et al. The prevalence of sleep disturbances and sleep quality in older chinese adults: A comprehensive metaanalysis. *Behav Sleep Med.* (2019) 17:683–97. doi: 10.1080/15402002.2018.1469492

40. Jahrami H, Dewald-Kaufmann J, Faris M-I, AlAnsari AMS, Taha M, AlAnsari N. Prevalence of sleep problems among medical students: a systematic review and metaanalysis. J Public Health. (2020) 28:605–22. doi: 10.1007/s10389-019-01064-6

41. Gu H, Kong W, Yin H, Zheng Y. Prevalence of sleep impairment in patients with tinnitus: a systematic review and single-arm meta-analysis. *Eur Arch Oto-Rhino-Laryngol.* (2022) 279:2211–21. doi: 10.1007/s00405-021-07092-x

42. Wang B, Duan R, Duan L. Prevalence of sleep disorder in irritable bowel syndrome: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *Saudi J Gastroenterol.* (2018) 24:141–50. doi: 10.4103/sjg.SJG_603_17

43. Högl BE, Gómez-Arévalo G, García S, Scipioni O, Rubio M, Blanco M, et al. A clinical, pharmacologic, and polysomnographic study of sleep benefit in Parkinson's disease. *Neurology*. (1998) 50:1332–9. doi: 10.1212/wnl.50.5.1332

44. Schütz L, Sixel-Döring F, Hermann W. Management of sleep disturbances in parkinson's disease. J Parkinson's Dis. (2022) 12:2029-58. doi: 10.3233/JPD-212749

45. Sun Y, Laksono I, Selvanathan J, Saripella A, Nagappa M, Pham C, et al. Prevalence of sleep disturbances in patients with chronic non-cancer pain: A systematic review and metaanalysis. *Sleep Med Rev.* (2021) 57:101467. doi: 10.1016/j.smrv.2021.101467

46. Mirghaed MT, Sepehrian R, Rakhshan A, Gorji H. Sleep quality in Iranian hemodialysis patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Iran J Nurs Midwifery Res.* (2019) 24:403–9. doi: 10.4103/ijnmr.IJNMR_184_18

47. Zeng LN, Yang Y, Wang C, Li XH, Xiang YF, Hall BJ, et al. Prevalence of poor sleep quality in nursing staff: A meta-analysis of observational studies. *Behav Sleep Med.* (2020) 18:746–59. doi: 10.1080/15402002.2019.1677233

48. Vidotti V, Ribeiro RP, Galdino MJQ, Martins JT. Burnout Syndrome and shift work among the nursing staff. *Rev Latino-Americana Enfermagem*. (2018) 26:e3022. doi: 10.1590/1518-8345.2550.3022

49. Lix LM, Hobson DE, Azimaee M, Leslie WD, Burchill C, Hobson S. Socioeconomic variations in the prevalence and incidence of Parkinson's disease: a population-based analysis. *J Epidemiol Community Health.* (2010) 64:335–40. doi: 10.1136/jech.2008.084954

50. Perales F, Plage S. Losing ground, losing sleep: Local economic conditions, economic vulnerability, and sleep. *Soc Sci Res.* (2017) 62:189–203. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2016.08.006

51. Jourdain VA, Schechtmann G. Health economics and surgical treatment for parkinson's disease in a world perspective: results from an international survey. *Stereotactic Funct Neurosurg.* (2014) 92:71–9. doi: 10.1159/000355215

52. Oguh O, Videnovic A. Inpatient management of parkinson disease: current challenges and future directions. *Neurohospitalist.* (2012) 2:28-35. doi: 10.1177/1941874411427734

53. Merlino G, Gigli GL. Sleep-related movement disorders. *Neurol Sci.* (2012) 33:491–513. doi: 10.1007/s10072-011-0905-9

54. De Cock VC, Vidailhet M, Arnulf I. Sleep disturbances in patients with parkinsonism. Nat Clin Pract Neurol. (2008) 4:254-66. doi: 10.1038/ncpneuro0775

55. Dobing S, Frolova N, McAlister F, Ringrose J. Sleep quality and factors influencing self-reported sleep duration and quality in the general internal medicine inpatient population. *PloS One*. (2016) 11:e0156735. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0156735

56. Parsapour K, Kon AA, Dharmar M, McCarthy AK, Yang HH, Smith AC, et al. Connecting hospitalized patients with their families: case series and commentary. *Int J Telemed Appl*. (2011) 2011:804254. doi: 10.1155/2011/804254

57. Lihua Y. National symposium on extrapyramidal diseases held in Shanghai. Shanghai Med. (1985) 02):105.

58. Postuma RB, Berg D. The New Diagnostic Criteria for Parkinson's Disease. Int Rev Neurobiol. (2017). 132:55–78. doi: 10.1016/bs.irn.2017.01.008

59. Liu M, Luo YJ, Gu HY, Wang YM, Liu MH, Li K, et al. Sex and onset-age-related features of excessive daytime sleepiness and night-time sleep in patients with Parkinson's disease. *BMC Neurol.* (2021) 21:165. doi: 10.1186/s12883-021-02192-x

60. Hu T, Ou R, Liu H, Hou Y, Wei Q, Song W, et al. Gender and onset age relateddifferences of non-motor symptoms and quality of life in drug-naïve Parkinson's disease. *Clin Neurol Neurosurg.* (2018) 175:124–9. doi: 10.1016/j.clineuro.2018.11.001

61. Kägi G, Klein C, Wood NW, Schneider SA, Pramstaller PP, Tadic V, et al. Nonmotor symptoms in Parkin gene-related parkinsonism. *Movement Disord.* (2010) 25:1279–84. doi: 10.1002/mds.22897

 Guo X, Song W, Chen K, Chen X, Zheng Z, Cao B, et al. Gender and onset agerelated features of non-motor symptoms of patients with Parkinson's disease – A study from Southwest China. *Parkinsonism Related Disord*. (2013) 19:961–5. doi: 10.1016/ j.parkreldis.2013.06.009

63. Braak H, Tredici KD, Rüb U, de Vos RAI, Jansen Steur ENH, Braak E. Staging of brain pathology related to sporadic Parkinson's disease. *Neurobiol Aging*. (2003) 24:197–211. doi: 10.1016/S0197-4580(02)00065-9

64. Grinberg LT, Rueb U, ATdL A, Heinsen H. Brainstem pathology and non-motor symptoms in PD. J Neurol Sci. (2010) 289:81–8. doi: 10.1016/j.jns.2009.08.021

65. Ferrer I, López-Gonzalez I, Carmona M, Dalfó E, Pujol A, Martínez A. Neurochemistry and the non-motor aspects of PD. *Neurobiol Dis.* (2012) 46:508–26. doi: 10.1016/j.nbd.2011.10.019

66. Blesa J, Foffani G, Dehay B, Bezard E, Obeso JA. Motor and non-motor circuit disturbances in early Parkinson disease: which happens first?*Nat Rev Neurosci.* (2022) 23:115–28. doi: 10.1038/s41583-021-00542-9

67. Chen P, Zhang L, Sha S, Lam MI, Lok KI, Chow IHI, et al. Prevalence of insomnia and its association with quality of life among Macau residents shortly after the summer 2022 COVID-19 outbreak: A network analysis perspective. Original Research. *Front Psychiatry.* (2023) 14:1113122. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2023.1113122

68. Austin KW, Ameringer SW, Cloud LJ. An integrated review of psychological stress in parkinson's disease: biological mechanisms and symptom and health outcomes. *Parkinson's Dis.* (2016) 2016:9869712. doi: 10.1155/2016/9869712

69. Dissanayaka NN, Sellbach A, Matheson S, O'Sullivan JD, Silburn PA, Byrne GJ, et al. Anxiety disorders in Parkinson's disease: Prevalence and risk factors. *Movement Disord*. (2010) 25:838–45. doi: 10.1002/mds.22833

70. Schrag A. Quality of life and depression in Parkinson's disease. J Neurol Sci. (2006) 248:151-7. doi: 10.1016/j.jns.2006.05.030

71. Leger D. Sleep and Quality of Life in Insomnia, In: *Sleep and Quality of Life in Clinical Medicine*, Verster JC, Pandi-Perumal SR, Streiner DL, Editors. (2008) Totowa, NJ: Humana Press p. 47–51.

72. Maquet P. The role of sleep in learning and memory. *Science*. (2001) 294:1048–52. doi: 10.1126/science.1062856

73. Hobson JA, Pace-Schott EF. The cognitive neuroscience of sleep: neuronal systems, consciousness and learning. *Nat Rev Neurosci.* (2002) 3:679–93. doi: 10.1038/nrn915

74. Brown CA, Kuo M, Phillips L, Berry R, Tan M. Non-pharmacological sleep interventions for youth with chronic health conditions: A critical review of the methodological quality of the evidence. *Disability Rehabilitation*. (2013) 35:1221–55. doi: 10.3109/09638288.2012.723788

75. Henrich J, Heine SJ, Norenzayan A. The weirdest people in the world?*Behav Brain Sci.* (2010) 33:61–83. doi: 10.1017/S0140525X0999152X

76. Ma H, Ren Y. Correlation analysis of sleep disorder and cognitive dysfunction in patients with Parkinson disease. *Chin J Clinicians(Electronic Ed).* (2015) 9:39–45. doi: 10.3877/cma.j.issn.1674-0785.2015.23.011

77. Chen J, Zhang Q, Zhou S, Yang J, Feng Y. Analysis of sleep disorders in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Zhejiang Med.* (2013) 35:1275–7.

78. Chen Q, Hu G, Han Y, Zhang H, Zhang Y. Clinical study on non-motor symptoms of Parkinson's disease. *Chin J Gerontol.* (2008) 28:1829–30. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1005-9202.2008.18.028

79. Chen Z, Hong X, Chen ZH. Corrlation between sleep disturbance and motor, non-motor symptoms in patients with parkinson's disease. *J Clin Res.* (2018) 35:445-448,452. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1671-7171.2018.03.009

80. Guo P, Yu S, Zuo L, Liu L, Pu Y, Hu Y, et al. The clinical features, related factors and the changes of video polysomnography in patients with Parkinson disease accompanied with sleep disorders. *Chin J Neuroimmunol Neurol.* (2018) 25:26–31.

81. Guo J. Analysis and nursing care of factors related to sleep disorders in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Chin J Pratical Nervous Dis.* (2014) 17:139–40.

82. Yuan D, Hu J, Zhao Q, Wang X, Zhang X, Li JF. Correlation between progression of Parkinson disease and depression and sleep disorders. *J China Med Univ.* (2020) 49:326–30. doi: 10.12007/j.issn.0258-4646.2020.04.008

83. Xue D. Investigation on the current status of sleep disorders in patients with Parkinson's disease and nursing methods. *Electronic J Pract Clin Nurs Sci.* (2019) 4:103,105.

84. Hu X, Zhang B. Clinical analysis of sleep disorders in patients with Parkinson's disease. J Int Neurol Neurosurg. (2009) 36:201–5. doi: 10.16636/j.cnki.jinn.2009.03.013

85. Cheng L, Yu J, Wu D. Analysis on related factors of the sleep disorder to patients with Parkinson disease. *Chin J Pratical Nervous Dis.* (2013) 16:17–8.

86. Wang X, Feng T, Gu Z, Liu P, Chen B. Assessment of sleep disturbance based on the clinical heterogeneity of early-stage idiopathic Parkinson's disease. *Clin Med China*. (2015) 2):103–6. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.1008-6315.2015.02.003

87. Wang X, Feng T, Gu Z, Liu P, Zhang X, Chen B. Relationship between sleep disturbance and non-motor symptoms in Parkinson's disease patients. *Chin J Geriatric Heart Brain Vessel Dis.* (2015) 17:507–10. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1009-0126.2015.05.019

88. Wang H, Wang Y. Eletroencephalogram changes of patients with parkinson's disease, sleep disorder and cognition hypofuntion. *Syst Med.* (2018) 3:20-2. doi: 10.19368/j.cnki.2096-1782.2018.11.020

89. Wang Z, Sun W, Ma J, Shi X, Li M, Huang S, et al. The analysis of the relationship between sleep disorders and mental symptoms in patients with Parkinson disease. *Chin J Nerv Ment Dis.* (2021) 47:78–82. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1002-0152.2021.02.003

90. Mao J, Zhang M. Effects of sleep quality on prospective memory and neuropsychological related indicators in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Zhejiang Clin Med J.* (2020) 22:259–260,265.

91. Mao C, Dai Y, Liu C. Analysis of sleep disorder in patients with early parkinson's disease. *Jiangsu Med J.* (2007) 33:897–9. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.0253-3685.2007.09.013

92. Mao Y, Saimaiti Y. Clinical observation of non-motor symptoms in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Med Inf Chin.* (2014) 20):124–5. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1006-1959.2014.20.136

93. Liang P, Cui L, Wu Z, Yu J, Chen M. A survey of Sleep related cognitions in pafients with pakinson"s disease and related nursing. *Clin Med Engineering*. (2015) 22:928–9. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1674—4659.2015.07.0928

94. Zhu Y, Zheng H, Yang Q. Incidence and related factors of psychosis in parkinson disease. *Chin J Med Guide*. (2011) 13:1682–3. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1009-0959.2011.10.017

95. Cao W, Liu X, Ma C, Chen Y, Ren X, Zhang H, et al. Study on related factors of non - motor symptoms in patients with different motor phenotypes of Parkinson's disease. J Nanjing Med University(Natural Sci). (2019) 39:1764–8. doi: 10.7655/ NYDXBNS20191213

96. Cao S, Yu D, Su R, Guo Y. Analysis of the incidence of sleep disorders and related influencing factors in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Chin J Integr Med On Cardio-/ Cerebrovascuiar Dis.* (2019) 17:1257–9. doi: 10.12102/j.issn.1672-1349.2019.08.041

97. Zhang J, Gao P, Wei J. Investigation on the current status of sleep disorders in patients with Parkinson's disease and nursing strategies. *Chin Community Physician (Med Professional).* (2010) 12:175–6.

98. Zhang H, Zhang L, Zhu J, Jiang X, Wu Z. Analysis of the incidence and clinical features of sleep disorders in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Pract Geritr.* (2020) 34:674–8. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1003-9198.2020.07.011

99. Zhang Y, Liu Y, Wang W, Liu H, Gu P. Influential factors of autonomic nervous dysfunction in patients with Parkinson's disease. *J Clin Internal Med.* (2022) 39:386–90. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1001-9057.2022.06.008

100. Zhang Y, Luo C, Liao C. Clinical analysis of sleep disorders and cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease. *Front Med (Chinese)*. (2021) 11:96–7.

101. Cui W, Qing S, Liu L, Chen Q. Clinical characteristics and prognosis of cognitive impairment in patients with Parkin- son's disease. J Guangxi Med Univ. (2019) 36:1923-6. doi: 10.16190/j.cnki.45-1211/r.2019.12.010

102. Song Y, Zhao Z, Li Y, Yin Q. Influence factors and nursing of sleep disorder parkinson's disease. *Chin Foreign Med Res.* (2015) 13:95–7. doi: 10.14033/j.cnki.cfmr.2015.23.050

103. Song J, Sun X, Ma L, Lu L, Fan K, Wang Z, et al. Analysis of cognitive impairment and its related factors in Parkinson's disease. *Chin J Gerontol.* (2019) 39:858–62. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1005-9202.2019.04.031

104. Sun L, Gao X, Mo D, Gong D. Clinical study on sleep disorders and related factors in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Nerve Injury Funct Reconstruction*. (2015) 2):159–61. doi: 10.3870/sjsscj.2015.02.021

105. Lu Y. Investigation on the current status of sleep disorders in patients with Parkinson's disease and research on nursing strategies. *Shanxi Med J.* (2019) 48:388–90. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.0253-9926.2019.03.050

106. Liu H, Chen K. Relationship study between Glu and GABA and sleep disorders in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Proceeding Clin Med.* (2018) 27:27–9. doi: 10.16047/j.cnki.cn14-1300/r.2018.01.008

107. Liu Y, Li J, Fang Q, Qin Y, Wei Y. Study of health related quality of life in patients with Parkinson's disease. *World Latest Med Inform.* (2013) 16):58–59,31. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1671-3141.2013.16.031

108. Liu H, Chou F, Ma L, Zhang Y, Wang M, Gu P. Effect of sleep quality on cognitive function in mild-o-moderate Parkinson patients. J Neurosci Ment Health. (2014) 14:502–5. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1009-6574.2014.05.021

109. Liu D, Wang Y, Wang Q, Mao H, Wang S. Study on the correlation between discharge readiness, family resilience and alexithymia in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Chin Gen Pract Nursing*. (2022) 20:4723–6. doi: 10.12104/j.issn.1674-4748.2022.33.029

110. Yu L, Peng L, Luo T, Huang C, Wang Z. Relationship study between sleep disorders and EEG activity, neuropsychological indicators and health-related quality of life in patients with parkinson's disease. *Prog Modern Biomed.* (2022) 22:3863–7. doi: 10.13241/j.cnki.pmb.2022.20.012

111. Yi Q, Chen Y-P, Li J-T, Li J-Y, Qiu Q-X, Wang D-L, et al. Worse sleep quality aggravates the motor and non-motor symptoms in parkinson's disease. Article. *Front Aging Neurosci.* (2022) 14:887094. doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2022.887094

112. Wang J, Xiong K, Chao J, Zhuang S, Li J, Liu C. Seasonal variations of nonmotor symptoms in patients with Parkinson's disease in Southeast China. Article in Press. *Chin Med J.* (2022). doi: 10.1097/CM9.0000000002276

113. Tang X, Yang J, Zhu Y, Gong H, Sun H, Chen F, et al. High PSQI score is associated with the development of dyskinesia in Parkinson's disease. Article. *NPJ Parkinson's Dis.* (2022) 8:124. doi: 10.1038/s41531-022-00391-y

114. Song Y, Gu Z, An J, Chan P. Gender differences on motor and non-motor symptoms of *de novo* patients with early Parkinson's disease. *Neurol Sci.* (2014) 35:1991–6. doi: 10.1007/s10072-014-1879-1

115. Shulman LM, Taback RL, Bean J, Weiner WJ. Comorbity of the nonmotor symptoms of Parkinson's disease. Article. *Movement Disord.* (2001) 16:507–10. doi: 10.1002/mds.1099

116. Sahebzadeh N, Farsi Baf MM, Homam SM. Sleep quality and cognitive impairment in patients with Parkinson's disease in Iran. Article. *Turk Norol Dergisi*. (2016) 22:121–6. doi: 10.4274/tnd.84755

117. Qiu F, Gu P, Liu W, Li D. The spectrum characteristics of Parkinson's disease (PD) patients with sleep disorders. *Neurol Sci.* (2022) 43:327–33. doi: 10.1007/s10072-021-05240-z

118. Qin X, Li X, Chen G, Chen X, Shi M, Liu XK, et al. Clinical features and correlates of poor nighttime sleepiness in patients with parkinson's disease. *Parkinsons Dis.* (2020) 2020:6378673. doi: 10.1155/2020/6378673

119. Mahale R, Yadav R, Pal PK. Quality of sleep in young onset Parkinson's disease: Any difference from older onset Parkinson's disease. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. (2015) 21:461–4. doi: 10.1016/j.parkreldis.2015.02.007

120. Louter M, van der Marck MA, Pevernagie DAA, Munneke M, Bloem BR, Overeem S. Sleep matters in Parkinson's disease: Use of a priority list to assess the presence of sleep disturbances. Article. *Eur J Neurol.* (2013) 20:259–65. doi: 10.1111/ j.1468-1331.2012.03836.x

121. Lin YY, Chen RS, Lu CS, Huang YZ, Weng YH, Yeh TH, et al. Sleep disturbances in Taiwanese patients with Parkinson's disease. *Brain Behav.* (2017) 7: e00806. doi: 10.1002/brb3.806

122. Havlikova E, van Dijk JP, Nagyova I, Rosenberger J, Middel B, Dubayova T, et al. The impact of sleep and mood disorders on quality of life in Parkinson's disease patients. *J Neurol.* (2011) 258:2222–9. doi: 10.1007/s00415-011-6098-6

123. Gao L, Huang W, Cai L, Li H. Association between sleep disturbances and pain subtypes in Parkinson's disease. *Neurol Sci.* (2022) 43:4785–90. doi: 10.1007/s10072-022-06030-x

124. Duncan GW, Khoo TK, Yarnall AJ, O'Brien JT, Coleman SY, Brooks DJ, et al. Health-related quality of life in early Parkinson's disease: The impact of nonmotor symptoms. *Movement Disord*. (2014) 29:195–202. doi: 10.1002/mds.25664

125. Ding M, Zhu Y, Lu Z, Shen H, Dai J, Zhu X. Analysis of independent risk factors affecting cognitive function in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Chin J Pract Nervous Dis.* (2020) 23:1590–5. doi: 10.12083/sysj.2020.17.006

126. Shafazand S, Wallace DM, Arheart KL, Vargas S, Luca CC, Moore H, et al. Insomnia, sleep quality, and quality of life in mild to moderate parkinson's disease. *Ann Am Thorac Soc.* (2017) 14:412–9. doi: 10.1513/AnnalsATS.201608-625OC

127. Skorvanek M, Nagyova I, Rosenberger J, Krokavcova M, Ghorbani Saeedian R, Groothoff JW, et al. Clinical determinants of primary and secondary fatigue in patients with Parkinson's disease. *J Neurol.* (2013) 260:1554–61. doi: 10.1007/s00415-012-6828-4

128. Shi F, Guan H, Gao Z, Huang Y, Wang D. Clinical characteristics of parkinson'S disease patients with sleep disorder and effect of anti resistance exercise intervention. *J Int Psychiatry*. (2023) 50:799–801,805. doi: 10.13479/j.cnki.jip.2023.04.011

129. Dong R, Tan H. Correlation of sleep disorders with emotional apathy and executive function in Parkinson disease. *J Apoplexy Nervous Dis.* (2023) 40:807–12. doi: 10.19845/j.cnki.zfysjjbzz.2023.0180

130. Chang CW, Fan JY, Chang BL, Wu YR. Anxiety and levodopa equivalent daily dose are potential predictors of sleep quality in patients with parkinson disease in Taiwan. *Front Neurol.* (2019) 10:340. doi: 10.3389/fneur.2019.00340

131. Shi Y. Incidence of sleep disturbances in patients with Parkinson's disease and its relationship to negative Emotions and qualiy of life. *J Int Psychiatry*. (2023) 50:796–8. doi: 10.13479/j.cnki.jip.2023.04.009

132. Li H, Yuan X, Ye Q, Yuan C, Gao C, Hu Y. Analysis of factors influencing sleep disorders and the distribution characteristics of traditional Chinese medicine syndromes in people with early-or mid-stage Parkinson's disease. *Shanghai J Tradit Chin Med.* (2023) 57:21–5. doi: 10.16305/j.1007-1334.2023.2208083

133. Gui X, Wang L, Wu C, Sun X. Characteristics of sleep disturbances in Parkinson's disease patients with young onset and late onset. *Zhejiang Med.* (2018) 40:1698–701. doi: 10.12056/j.issn.1006-2785.2018.40.15.2017-3203

134. Hu Y, Sun Y, Lan Z, Wang H, Li X, Zhong Y. Analysis of the relationships betwen changes in polysomnographic EEG map features and cogni- tive dysfunction in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Chin J Stereotact Funct Neurosurg.* (2023) 36:76–81. doi: 10.19854/j.cnki.1008-2425.2023.02.0003

135. Niu X, Gou Y. Analysis of related influential factors for sleep disorder in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Nao Yu Shen Jing Ji Bing Za Zhi.* (2015) 23:353-8.