Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY João Soares Felício, Federal University of Pará, Brazil

REVIEWED BY

Daniela Lopes Gomes, Federal University of Pará, Brazil Patrizio Tatti, Istituto Neurotraumatologico Italiano (INI), Italy

*CORRESPONDENCE Hua Luo 18732196660@163.com

[†]These authors have contributed equally to this work

SPECIALTY SECTION

This article was submitted to Clinical Diabetes, a section of the journal Frontiers in Endocrinology

RECEIVED 26 February 2023 ACCEPTED 10 April 2023 PUBLISHED 05 May 2023

CITATION

Ren Y, Sun S, Su Y, Ying C and Luo H (2023) Effect of fruit on glucose control in diabetes mellitus: a meta-analysis of nineteen randomized controlled trials. *Front. Endocrinol.* 14:1174545. doi: 10.3389/fendo.2023.1174545

COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Ren, Sun, Su, Ying and Luo. 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.

Effect of fruit on glucose control in diabetes mellitus: a metaanalysis of nineteen randomized controlled trials

Yu Ren^{1†}, Shuang Sun^{2†}, Yongwei Su^{3†}, Chenfei Ying⁴ and Hua Luo^{4*}

¹Department of Pharmacy, Taizhou Hospital of Zhejiang Province affiliated to Wenzhou Medical University, Taizhou, Zhejiang, China, ²Key Laboratory of Pathobiology, Ministry of Education, Nanomedicine and Translational Research Center, The Third Bethune Hospital of Jilin University, Changchun, Jilin, China, ³Department of Orthopedic, The First Affiliated Hospital of Jinzhou Medical University, Jinzhou, Liaoning, China, ⁴Department of Orthopedic, Taizhou Hospital of Zhejiang Province affiliated to Wenzhou Medical University, Taizhou, Zhejiang, China

Objective: Diabetes mellitus is a worldwide health problem, and it remains unclarified whether fruit is beneficial in glycemic control. This study aimed to analyze evidence from randomized controlled trials evaluating the effect of fruit consumption on glucose control.

Methods: We searched the PubMed, EMBASE, Ovid, Web of Science, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials databases from the respective database inception dates to December 30, 2022, to identify randomized controlled trials that evaluated the effects of fruit consumption on glucose control. Two researchers independently screened the studies in accordance with the inclusion and exclusion criteria, and performed the literature quality evaluation and data extraction. RevMan 5.4 software was used to perform the data analysis.

Results: Nineteen randomized controlled trials with 888 participants were included. Fruit consumption significantly decreased the fasting blood glucose concentration (MD -8.38, 95% CI -12.34 to -4.43), but it showed no significant difference in the glycosylated hemoglobin (MD -0.17, 95% CI -0.51 to 0.17). Subgroup analyses further suggested that the consumption of both fresh and dried fruit decreased the fasting blood glucose concentration.

Conclusions: Increasing the fruit intake reduced fasting blood glucose concentration. Therefore, we recommend that patients with diabetes eat more fruits while ensuring that their total energy intake remains unchanged.

KEYWORDS

fruit, glucose, diabetes, glycosylated hemoglobin, meta-analaysis

Introduction

According to the International Diabetes Federation Diabetes Atlas of 2021, there are 536.6 million adults living with diabetes worldwide (1). Complications arising from poor glycemic control are a major risk factor against healthy survival in patients with diabetes, and it is unclear whether glycemic control is influenced by fruit consumption. The Australian Diabetes, Obesity and Lifestyle Study of 7675 participants with an average age of 54 years showed that those who ate about two servings of fruit (including apples, bananas, and oranges) per day had a 36% lower risk of developing type II diabetes over the subsequent 5 years than those who ate less than half a serving of fruit per day (2). There is also a clear negative correlation between fruit intake and markers of insulin sensitivity, meaning that people who eat more fruit need to produce less insulin to lower their blood glucose concentration (2). This is important because abnormal metabolism in diabetes, hypertension, vascular sclerosis, obesity, and heart disease is strongly associated with hyperinsulinemia (3, 4). Furthermore, an unhealthy diet lacking fruits and vegetables increases the risks of cardiovascular disease and tumorigenesis (5).

Fresh fruits are rich in dietary fiber, organic acids, minerals, and antioxidants (e.g., vitamins, polyphenols), and contain small amounts of fat and calories, which helps regulate the composition and metabolic activity of intestinal microbes and reduce the incidence of complications in patients with diabetes (6). Polyphenols have a variety of important biological activities, including antiviral, antibacterial, anti-inflammatory, anticancer, and antioxidant. The most important of these activities is antioxidation, which converts free radicals into more stable free radicals to promote their scavenging ability, or reduces reactive oxygen species production by inhibiting mitochondrial oxidative stress to maintain cellular redox homeostasis (7). A 7-year prospective study of 500,000 Chinese adults showed a 17% reduction in mortality among patients with diabetes who consumed fruit on 3 or more days per week, as well as a 28% and 13% reduction in the risks of diabetic microvascular complications and macrovascular complications, respectively (8). Recent studies of patients with diabetes have shown that flavonoid-rich fruit intake is associated with lower glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c) and fasting blood glucose concentrations, and that increased flavonoid fruit intake reduces the risk of retinopathy by 30% (9).

In recent years, increasing attention has been paid to the impact of fresh fruit intake on type 2 diabetes. Fruit has a high sugar content and fruit consumption may affect the blood glucose management. Traditional beliefs have led patients with diabetes to eat only a limited variety of fruits with a low sugar content, such as cucumbers. However, recent studies have shown that fruit consumption has no significant effect on the fasting blood glucose concentration and the blood glucose concentration at 2 hours after meals compared with a control group (10). Furthermore, fruit intake reportedly helps control the HbA1c concentration (11). In addition, another study reported that fruits not only improve the postprandial concentrations of glucose and triglycerides, but also reduce inflammation and cardiovascular risk. Although many clinical studies have assessed the impact of fruits on the fasting blood glucose concentration, most were not large-scale, randomized, controlled trials (RCTs). Therefore, the present meta-analysis combined the previous research findings to explore the relationship between fruit intake and blood glucose control in patients with diabetes, to provide a reference for the consumption of fruits by patients with type 2 diabetes.

Materials and methods

According to the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) statement, this metaanalysis was performed in agreement (12). The protocol for this meta-analysis was registered on PROSPERO (Registration No: CRD42021237276).

Inclusion criteria

(1) RCTs with human participants; (2) studies evaluating fruit intake and control of blood glucose concentration; (3) studies including patients diagnosed with diabetes or prediabetes; (4) studies with a follow-up of at least 1 month; (5) studies that assessed the BPG or HbA1c concentration; (6) studies that assessed the intake of fresh fruit, fruit juice, dry fruit, or fruit powder.

Exclusion criteria

(1) Letters, case reports, reviews, observational studies, animal trials, or republished studies; (2) cohort studies; (3) studies that assessed the intake of fruit extract; (4) studies that included patients diagnosed with type 1 diabetes.

Outcomes

The primary outcome was the difference in the blood glucose response to fruit consumption compared with control. The second outcome was the difference in the HbA1c concentration between a group that consumed fruit versus a control group. The serum lipid and lipoprotein concentrations were also analyzed.

Search strategy

Two researcher searched the PubMed, Ovid, Web of Science, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials databases from their respective inception dates to December 30, 2022, using the keywords "(blood glucose or serum glucose or plasma glucose or glycemic or glycaemic or HbA1c or Hemoglobin A1c) and (fruit or juice) and (diabetes or diabetic or prediabetes or insulin resistance or impaired glucose tolerance) and (randomized controlled trial OR controlled clinical trial OR randomized OR randomly)". We also searched the International Clinical Trials Registry Platform maintained by the World Health Organization to identify ongoing or unpublished eligible trials, and searched the reference lists of articles retrieved in the database search to identify related articles. No language restrictions were applied during the literature search.

Study selection

After the removal of duplicates, two independent researchers (SS and YR) screened all titles and abstracts and determined the study eligibility in accordance with the inclusion and exclusion criteria. For studies considered eligible, the researchers obtained the full text and performed further screening. When the two researchers had differing opinions regarding the eligibility of a study for inclusion and could not reach a consensus, the senior researcher made the final decision after a group discussion.

Data collection

Two researchers (HL and YR) used a standard data extraction form to independently extract all related data from the selected RCTs. When the RCTs had more than two groups and permitted multiple comparisons, we pooled only the data and information of interest reported in the original article. If a study included more than one intervention, we combined groups to create a single pairwise comparison. The extracted data included the first author's name, year of publication, type of study, sample size, interventions in the control and experimental groups, and follow-up duration. Disagreements were resolved by consensus.

Assessment of risk of bias

Two researchers (YWS and YR) independently assessed the quality of all included RCTs based on the Cochrane risk-of-bias criteria (13).

Data synthesis

The meta-analysis was performed using RevMan software (version 5.4; The Cochrane Collaboration). The heterogeneity was assessed by the Q test and I² value. If heterogeneity was not present (P>0.1 and I²<50%), the data were combined with a fixed effect model. If heterogeneity was present (P<0.1 or I²>50%), the random effects model was used. The mean difference (MD) and associated 95% confidence interval (CI) were used to assess outcomes, and P<0.05 was taken to indicate a significant difference. The possibility of small study effects was assessed qualitatively by visual estimations of funnel plots.

Subgroup analyses

We performed several subgroup analyses to test interactions in accordance with the intake of fresh fruit or dry fruit.

Sensitivity analyses

We performed sensitivity analyses by excluding the largest trial, excluding cluster-randomized or quasi-randomized trials, excluding trials with a high risk of bias, and using random effect models.

Results

Eligible studies and study characteristics

We initially identified a total of 3988 articles, and finally included nineteen eligible RCTs with 888 participants in the meta-analysis (11, 14–31). The study flow chart is shown in Figure 1. A summary of the included RCTs is shown in Table 1. The risk of bias of each of the included RCTs is shown in Figure 2.

Primary outcome: effect of fruit on glycemic control

All nineteen RCTs reported the fasting blood glucose concentration. Compared with the control group, fruit consumption reduced the fasting blood glucose concentration (MD -8.38, 95% CI -12.34 to -4.43, $I^2 = 32\%$; Figure 3A). Stratified subgroup analyses were conducted to determine



TABLE 1 Characteristics of included studies.

Study	No. of	subjects	Country	Study	Participants	Duration	Treatment	Control	Outcomes
	Fruit	Control		uesign			group	group	
Adi et al. (14)	17	13	India	RCT	T2DM	6 M	Syzygium 30 potency bid	Placebo	FBG, HbA1c
Barghamdi et al. (15)	35	35	Iran	RCT	T2DM	2 M	C. colocynthis capsule 125 mg qd	Placebo (Starch powder)	FBG, HbA1c
Fallah-1 (17)	22	22	Iran	RCT	T2DM	2 M	Citrullus colocynthis capsule 100 mg tid	Placebo (similar capsule)	FBG, HbA1c, Oxidative parameters
Fallah-2 (16)	25	25	Iran	RCT	T2DM	2 M	Citrullus colocynthis capsule 100 mg tid	Placebo (similar capsule)	FBG, HbA1c, lipid profile, SGOT, SGPT, ALK, BUN, serum creatinine
Golbon et al. (18)	22	22	Iran	RCT	T2DM	12 W	Pomegranate juice 250 ml qd	Placebo (similar color beverage)	FPS, HbA1c, insulin, oxidative stress, and advanced glycated end- products markers
Golbon et al. (19)	30	30	Iran	RCT	T2DM	12 W	Pomegranate juice 200 ml qd	No Treatment	FPS, Oxidized LDL and anti- oxidized LDL antibodies
Huseini et al. (20)	25	25	Iran	RCT	T2DM	2 M	Citrullus colocynthis capsules 100 mg tid	Placebo	FBG, HbA1c, lipid profile, aspartate transaminase, alanine transaminase, alkaline phosphatase, urea and creatinine
Irannejad.et al. (21)	36	36	Iran	RCT	T2DM	12 W	Dried Z. vulgaris 15 g bid	No Treatment	FBG, HbA1c, lipid profile, DBP, SBP, AST, and ALT
Ismawanti et al. (22)	25	13	Indonesia	RCT	T2DM	2 W	Red guavas 282.2 g or papaya 302.4 g bid	Placebo (mineral water)	FBG
Javid et al. (23)	9	12	Iran	RCT	T2DM	NA	Cranberry juice 200 ml qd	Placebo	FBG, HbA1c, lipid profile
Lazavi et al. (11)	21	21	Iran	RCT	T2DM	8 W	Barberry juice 200 ml qd	No Treatment	FBG, HbA1c, lipid profile
Moazen et al. (24)	19	17	Iran	RCT	T2DM	6 W	Dried strawberry powder 50 g qd	Placebo	FBG, HbA1c, malondialdehyde, C- reactive protein
Nemati et al. (25)	9	10	Iran	RCT	T2DM	8 W	Pomegranate juice 240 ml qd	Placebo (water)	FBG, Insulin, liver enzymes
Sabitha et al. (<mark>26</mark>)	17	16	India	RCT	T2DM	3 W	Noni fruit juice 15 ml bid	Placebo	FBG, lipid profile
Shidfar et al. (27)	29	29	Iran	RCT	T2DM	12 W	Cranberry juice 240 ml qd	Placebo (mineral water)	FBG, paraoxonase-1 activity, apoA- 1, apoB
Sohrab et al. (28)	22	22	Iran	RCT	T2DM	12 W	Pomegranate juice 250 mL qd	Placebo (similar color beverage)	FBG, insulin, HOMA-IR, infl ammatory markers

(Continued)

TABLE 1 Continued

	No of	subjects							
Study		Judjeets	Country	Study	Participants	Duration	Treatment	Control	Outcomes
Fruit Contro	Control		design			group	group		
Sousa et al. (29)	28	28	Brazil	RCT	T2DM	4 M	Yellow passion fruit 500 mg tid	Placebo	FBG, HbA1c
Stote et al. (30)	26	26	USA	RCT	T2DM	8 W	Freeze-dried blueberries 11 g bid	Placebo	FBG, HbA1c, lipid profile
Yaghoobi et al. (31)	28	28	Iran	RCT	T2DM	1 M	Colocynthis 100 mg tid	Placebo (similar capsule)	FBG, HbA1c, lipid profile

RCT, randomized controlled trial; T2DM, Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus; M, month; W, week; HbA1c, Hemoglobin A1c; FBG, fasting blood glucose.

whether the effect on the fasting blood glucose concentration differed for the intake of fresh fruit/fruit juice compared with dry fruit. Compared with control, the pooled result showed a significant reduction in fasting blood glucose concentration after the consumption of both fresh fruit (MD -12.82, 95% CI -22.24 to -3.4, $I^2 = 48\%$; Figure 3B1) and dry fruit (MD -5.03, 95% CI -7.15 to -2.90, $I^2 = 0\%$; Figure 3B2).

Secondary outcomes

Pooled analysis showed no difference in the HbA1c concentration between the fruit consumption group and the control group (MD -0.17, 95% CI -0.51 to 0.17, $I^2 = 77\%$; Figure 4).

Discussion

Our meta-analysis showed that fruit consumption significantly reduced fasting blood glucose concentrations but had no significant effect on Hb1Ac concentrations in people with diabetes. We speculate that because the monosaccharides in fruits are mainly fructose-based, have a low blood glucose response, and are slow to absorb, the metabolism of fruit does not require the participation of insulin, and can be quickly cleared and transferred after reaching the liver (32). Another possible reason may be that some of the included fruits have anti-diabetic effects to some extent (14–17, 20, 21, 29, 31). Although the dry fruit had an increased sugar content compared with fresh fruit due to water loss, a subgroup analysis suggested that both dried and fresh fruit reduced blood glucose concentrations, and dried fruit has the characteristics of a long shelf-life and good transportability compared with fresh fruit.

Du et al. found that fruit consumption had a weak inverse, instead of positive, association with levels of blood glucose (8). Our results also suggest that eating fruit reduced the fasting blood glucose concentration. The available evidence suggests that the increase in the fruit intake should be accompanied by a corresponding decrease in the carbohydrate intake, ensuring that the total energy intake remained unchanged (6). The energy produced per 100 grams of fresh fruit is about 21-282 kcal (33). Our experience is that patients with stable blood glucose control who eat 200-250 g of fresh fruit per day need to reduce their daily intake of staple food by 25 g to avoid exceeding their total daily energy intake limit. Increasing the fruit intake is limited to patients with diabetes with stable glycemic control, while patients with diabetes with unstable blood glucose concentrations need to be cautious when increasing their fruit intake. A good method is to measure the urine glucose concentration at 2 hours after eating fruit. If the urine sugar increases, the patient needs to reduce the amount of fruit eaten; if the urine glucose is still high after reducing the fruit consumption, then the amount of staple food eaten needs to be appropriately reduced. In short, fruits should be considered as a part of a diet that has been comprehensively considered to achieve the purpose of not only supplementing nutrition but also controlling diabetes.

Diabetes is currently one of the main conditions that leads to a variety of macrovascular and microvascular complications (34). In severe cases, diabetes lead to disability and is even life-threatening. Although fruit is an important part of the daily diet, the high sugar content of most fruits has led to the conventional belief that fruit consumption may exacerbate diabetes, and thus the fruit intake of patients with diabetes is often severely restricted (35). However, fruits provide a lot of nutrients such as vitamins, fruit acids, minerals, and antioxidants, which help prevent the development and progression of many diseases; therefore, diabetes guidelines in the United States recommend eating more fruits (36). Antioxidants in fruits prevent cell damage by inhibiting lipid peroxidation and having lipotoxic effects (22). Furthermore, fruits may contain resistant starches and oligosaccharides that cannot be digested in the stomach and need to enter the colon for bacterial fermentation (37), which can stimulate the growth and/or activity of one or more beneficial bacteria, thereby improving human health (38). An 8-



year follow-up study showed that diabetic retinopathy was significantly reduced in the group that consumed 253 g of fruit daily compared with the group that consumed 23 g of fruit daily (39). Increasing the fruit intake also reduces the incidences of stroke, coronary heart disease, and cancer (40–42). Other studies have shown beneficial effects of various fruits. For example, eating fresh grapefruit before meals significantly reduces weight while improving insulin resistance (43), polyphenols in strawberry fruits improve insulin sensitivity (44), and carambola juice may lower the

blood glucose concentration and improve liver function in mice with diabetes (45).

Although studies have shown that the sugar load is higher after fruit juice is changed, the blood glucose concentration is easily increased by fruit juice consumption, which is not conducive to blood glucose control and causes vitamin and fiber loss, decreased satiety, and increased total energy; therefore, fruit juice is not recommended for patients with diabetes (46). However, Weisel et al. reported that fruit juice resulted in a decrease in oxidative DNA damage, an increase in reduced glutathione and glutathione status, a return to break-in levels during the subsequent elution period, and a significant reduction in oxidative damage in healthy proband cells in the juice (47). Other studies have shown that watermelon juice exerts antidiabetic effects in experimental animal models of diabetes by modulating glucose transporters, anti-inflammatory activity, antioxidant defense systems, and inhibiting multiple pathways such as α -glucosidase and α -amylase (48). Furthermore, the homeostasis of the gut flora is regulated by the ingestion of bioactive compounds found in citrus fruits and orange juice, such as hesperidin and naringenin (49).

To our knowledge, this is the first study to systematically review the potential effects of fruit consumption on glycemic control in patients with diabetes. The relatively large number of pooled participants achieved a greater statistical power than a single RCT. However, this study has some limitations. First, although this meta-analysis focused on studies evaluating the benefits of fruit consumption on human mechanisms, most of the included studies were assessed in Iran, which may increase the bias in the result. Different fruits have different sugar contents, and the types of fruits eaten varies between countries and regions. The sugar content can even vary between the same fruits with different levels of ripeness. Second, most of the fruits included in this meta-analysis have a certain medicinal value, which warrants further research. Third, most guidelines recommend a diet with a high intake of fiber-rich food, including fruit. This is based on the many positive effects of fruit on human health. However, some health professionals are concerned that fruit intake has a negative impact on glycemic control and therefore recommend restricting the fruit intake. We found no studies addressing this important clinical question (6). Fourth, the I² value is the percentage of total variation across studies due to heterogeneity (between-study variability) rather than chance, with higher values indicating higher levels of heterogeneity between studies and higher inconsistency of results. As there was a high heterogeneity in the studies that assessed the Hb1Ac concentration, this conclusion needs to be further demonstrated by higher quality studies.

Conclusions

Increasing the fruit intake reduced the fasting blood glucose concentration of patients with diabetes. Therefore, we still recommend that patients with diabetes eat more fruits while

		Fruit		С	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subo	proup Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% Cl
Adi 2020	145.44	1.8	17	149.76	4.32	13	26.0%	-4.32 [-6.82, -1.82]	
Barghamdi 20'	16 15	38	35	160	67	35	2.2%	-3.00 [-28.52, 22.52]	
Fallah 2006	17	64	22	180	47	22	1.4%	-9.00 [-41.18, 23.18]	
Golbon 2015	16	252	20	158.6	/0 1	20	2 3%	3.40 [-37.93, 31.93]	
Golbon 2017	147 8	47.6	30	190.2	67.1	30	1.7%	-42 40 [-71 84 -12 96]	<u> </u>
Huseini 2009	173.9	34	25	176.6	32	25	4.0%	-2.70 [-21.00, 15.60]	_
Irannejad 2020	142.50	6 45.72	36	151.2	42.84	36	3.3%	-8.64 [-29.11, 11.83]	
Ismawanti 202	0 172	41	12	181	33	13	1.7%	-9.00 [-38.32, 20.32]	
Javid 2018	145.78	8 84.26	9	186.4	78.55	12	0.3%	-40.62 [-111.37, 30.13]	
Lazavi 2018	172.95	6 46.65	21	223.1	67.31	21	1.2%	-50.15 [-85.18, -15.12]	
Moazen 2013	150.14	37.57	19	190.22	84.51	17	0.8%	-40.08 [-83.66, 3.50]	
Nemati 2022	139.33	6.34	9	149.09	7.53	10	16.9%	-9.76 [-16.00, -3.52]	-
Sabitha 2009	127.5	5 52.7	17	126.5	37.8	16	1.5%	1.00 [-30.15, 32.15]	
Shidfar 2012	119.8	3 15.1	29	138.1	25.1	29	9.3%	-18.30 [-28.96, -7.64]	
Sonrab 2014	162.3	35.2	22	158.6	49.1	22	2.3%	3.70 [-21.54, 28.94]	
Sousa 2021	162.68	0 /4.88	28	152.29	02.95	28	1.1%	7.00 [11.44 . 0.56]	•
Vachoobi 201/	140.	365	20	171 4	82.2	20	21.3%	-7.00 [-11.44, -2.00]	
1 agri0001 20 14	109.0	, 00.0	20	17.1.4	02.3	20	1.5 %	-11.00 [**0.20, 21.40]	
Total (95% CI)			432			430	100.0%	-8.38 [-12.34, -4.43]	•
Heterogeneity:	Tau ² = 14.04; 0	Chi² = 26.3	0. df =	18 (P =	0.09);	1 ² = 329	0		
Test for overall	effect: Z = 4.15	(P < 0.00	01)						-100 -50 0 50 100
									Tavours (Fruit) Tavours (control)
В									
					0			A. D. 100	Diff.
Study or Suba	roup Mean	Fruit	SD T	otal M	Con	sp T	vtal Woir	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit	roup Mean	Fruit	SD T	otal M	Con lean	SD T	otal Weig	Mean Difference ht IV. Random. 95% C	Mean Difference CI IV. Random. 95% CI
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015	roup Mean	Fruit	<u>SD T</u>	otal M	Con lean 58.6	SD T	22 9.5	Mean Difference ht IV. Random. 95% C 5% 3.40 [-21.84, 28.64]	Mean Difference
<u>Study or Subg</u> 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017	roup Mean 162 147.8	Fruit 3	SD T	22 1: 30 1:	Con lean 58.6	49.1 67.1	22 9.5 30 7.6	Mean Difference ht IV. Random. 95% C 3.40 [-21.84, 28.64] 3% -42.40 [-71.84, -12.96]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl
<u>Study or Subg</u> 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2020	roup Mean 162 147.8 179.28	Fruit 3 36.95833	SD T 5.2 7.6 239	22 1: 30 1: 25	Con lean 58.6 90.2 181	1trol SD T 49.1 67.1 33	22 9.5 30 7.6 13 10.7	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% C 5% 3.40 [-21.84, 28.64] 5% -42.40 [-71.84, -12.96] 7% -1.72 [-24.78, 21.34]	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2020 Javid 2018	roup Mean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78	Fruit 3 4 36.958333 84	SD T 5.2 7.6 239 .26	22 1: 30 1: 25 9 1:	Con 58.6 90.2 181 86.4 7	49.1 67.1 33 8.55	22 9.5 30 7.6 13 10.7 12 1.7	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% C 5% 3.40 [-21.84, 28.64] 5% -42.40 [-71.84, -12.96] 7% -1.72 [-24.78, 21.34] 7% -40.62 [-111.37, 30.13]	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2020 Javid 2018 Lazavi 2018	roup Mean 162 147.8 147.8 145.78 172.95 172.95	Fruit 36.958333 84 46	SD T 5.2 7.6 239 .26 5.65	22 1: 30 1: 25 9 1: 21 2:	Con 58.6 90.2 181 86.4 23.1 6	49.1 67.1 33 8.55 7.31	22 9.5 30 7.6 13 10.7 12 1.7 21 5.8	Mean Difference IN. Random. 95% C 3.40 [-21.84, 28.64] 3% -42.40 [-71.84, -12.96] 7% -1.72 [-24.78, 21.34] 7% -60.2 [-111.37, 30.13] 3% -50.15 [-85.18, -15.12]	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2020 Javid 2018 Lazavi 2018 Nemati 2022 Datiba 2020	roup Mean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 172.95 139.33	Fruit 36.958333 84 46 6	SD T 5.2 7.6 239 .26 .65 .34	22 1: 30 1: 25 9 1: 21 2: 9 14: 17 4:	Con 58.6 90.2 181 86.4 23.1 9.09	49.1 67.1 33 8.55 7.31 7.53	22 9.5 30 7.6 13 10.7 12 1.7 21 5.8 10 26.5	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% C 340 [-21.84, 28.64] 3% -42.40 [-71.84, -12.96] 7% -1.72 [-24.78, 21.34] 7% -40.62 [-111.37, 30.13] 3% -50.15 [-85.18, -15.12] 9% -9.76 [-16.00, -3.52]	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2020 Javid 2018 Lazavi 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabitha 2009 Sbidfar 2012	roup Mean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 172.95 139.33 127.5 119.8	Fruit 36.958333 84 46 6	SD T 5.2 7.6 239 .26 5.65 5.34 2.7 5.1	22 1: 30 1: 25 9 1: 21 2: 9 14: 17 1: 29 1:	Con 58.6 90.2 181 86.4 23.1 6 9.09 26.5 38.1	49.1 49.1 67.1 33 8.55 7.31 7.53 37.8 25.1	22 9.5 30 7.6 13 10.7 12 1.7 21 5.8 10 26.8 16 7.0 29 21	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% C 1V. Random. 95% C 3.40 [-21.84, 28.64] 9% -42.40 [-71.84, -12.96] % -42.40 [-71.84, -12.96] % -42.40 [-71.84, -12.96] % -50.51 [-85.18, -15.12] % -50.75 [-85.18, -15.12] % -9.76 [-16.00, -3.52] % -1.06 [-30.15, 32.45] % -1.08 [-9.76.11]	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2020 Javid 2018 Lazavi 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabitha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014	roup Mean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 172.95 139.33 127.5 119.8 162.3	Fruit 36.958333 84 46 6 5 1 3	SD T 5.2 7.6 239 .26 .34 5.1 5.2	22 1: 30 1: 25 9 1: 21 2: 9 14: 17 1: 29 1: 29 1: 29 1:	Con lean 58.6 90.2 181 86.4 7 23.1 6 9.09 26.5 38.1 58.6	trol <u>SD</u> Tr 49.1 67.1 33 8.55 7.31 7.53 37.8 25.1 49.1	22 9.5 30 7.6 13 10.7 12 1.7 21 5.8 10 26.5 16 7.0 29 21.7 22 9.5	Mean Difference Int UV. Random, 95% C 5% 3.40 [-21.84, 28.64] 5% 4.2.40 [-21.84, 12.86] 7% -1.72 [-24.78, 21.34] 7% -0.62 [-11.37, 30.13] 50.15 [-85.18, -15.12] -9.76 [-16.00, -3.52] 7% -10.2 [-2.8.96, -7.64] 7% -10.2 [-2.5, 2.78 eH]	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2022 Javid 2018 Lazavi 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabitha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95%	Nean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 172.95 139.33 127.5 119.8 162.3 CI)	Fruit 36.958333 84 46 6 5 1 3	SD T 7.6 239 .26 .65 .34 .2.7 5.1 5.2	22 1: 30 1: 25 9 1: 21 2: 9 14: 17 1: 29 1: 29 1: 29 1: 29 1: 22 1:	Con lean 58.6 90.2 181 23.1 6 9.09 26.5 38.1 58.6	49.1 67.1 33 8.55 7.31 7.53 37.8 25.1 49.1	22 9.5 30 7.6 13 10.7 12 1.7 21 5.8 10 26.5 16 7.0 29 21.7 29 21.7 29 21.7 29 21.7 20 9.5 1075 100.0	Mean Difference IN. Random, 95% C 1V. Random, 95% C 3.40 [-21.84, 22.86] 5% 3.40 [-21.84, 22.86] 60.71.84, 12.86] 5% -42.40 [-71.84, -12.86] 5% -42.40 [-71.84, -12.86] 5% -42.40 [-71.84, -12.86] 5% -50.15 [-55.18, -15.12] 5% -50.15 [-55.18, -15.12] 5% -50.15 [-55.18, -15.12] 100 [-23.05, 23.15] -10.30 [-30.15, 32.15] -18.30 [-28.96, -7.64] -7.64] 5% -12.82 [-22.84, -3.40] -12.22 [-22.84, -3.40] -12.82 [-22.84, -3.40]	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2020 Javid 2018 Lazavi 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabitha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneity:	roup Mean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 172.95 139.33 127.5 119.8 162.3 Cl) Tau ² = 77.10; Cł	Fruit 36.958333 84 46 6 5 1 3 3	SD T 5.2 7.6 239 .26 6.65 6.34 62.7 5.1 5.2 df = 8	Datal M 22 1: 30 1: 25 9 9 1: 21 2: 9 14: 17 1: 29 1: 22 1: 184 (P = 0.0:	Con lean 58.6 90.2 181 86.4 7 23.1 6 9.09 26.5 38.1 58.6 55.6 5); ² = 4	49.1 67.1 33 8.55 7.31 7.53 37.8 25.1 49.1 49.1	tal Weig 22 9.5 30 7.6 13 10.7 12 1.7 21 5.8 10 26.5 16 7.6 29 21.7 22 9.5 167 100.0	Mean Difference ht IV. Random. 95%: C ft IV. Random. 95%: C statut 12.40 ft 12.40 ft 12.40 ft 17.12 ft 13.72 ft 14.26 ft 11.72 ft 11.60 ft 10.61 ft 10.61 ft 10.62 ft 10.62 ft 10.62 ft 10.62 ft 10.62 ft 10.63 ft 10.63 ft 12.82 ft 12.82 ft 12.82 ft 12.82 ft 12.82 ft 12.82	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2020 Javid 2018 Lazavi 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabitha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneity: Test for overall	Youp Mean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 172.95 139.33 127.5 119.8 162.3 162.3 CI) Tau ² = 77.10; CI effect: Z = 2.67 162.3	Fruit 3 36.958333 84 46 6 5 1 3 1 ² = 15.45, P = 0.008)	SD T 5.2 7.6 239 .26 5.34 5.7 5.1 5.2 df = 8	Detail M 22 1: 30 1: 25 9 9 1: 21 2: 9 14: 17 1: 29 1: 22 1: 184 (P = 0.0)	Con lean 58.6 90.2 181 86.4 7: 23.1 6 9.09 26.5 38.1 58.6 5); l ² = 4	ttrol <u>SD</u> T- 49.1 67.1 33 8.55 7.31 7.53 37.8 25.1 49.1 48%	22 9.5 30 7.6 13 10.5 12 1.7 21 5.8 10 26.5 16 7.0 29 21.7 22 9.5 100.0 100.0	Mean Difference htt IV. Random. 95%: CC \$42.01 [-71.84, -12.96] +24.01 [-71.84, -12.96] \$56.12 [-71.84, -12.96] +0.62 [-11.37, 30.13] \$50.15 [+85.18, -15.12] +0.62 [-11.37, 30.13] \$50.15 [+85.18, -15.12] +0.03 [-15.45, -13.54] \$50.15 [+85.18, -15.12] +0.03 [-15.45, -13.54] \$50.15 [+85.18, -15.12] +0.03 [-15.45, -13.54] \$50.15 [+85.18, -15.12] +0.03 [-15.45, -28.94] \$50.15 [+15.12] +0.03 [-15.45, -28.94] \$50.15 [+15.12] +0.12.82 [-22.24, -3.40]	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2022 Javid 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabitha 2019 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneity: Test for overall	Mean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 172.95 139.33 127.5 119.8 162.3 CI) Tau ² = 77.10; Cł effect: Z = 2.67	Fruit 3 36.958333 84 46 6 5 5 1 3 3 1 ² = 15.45, P = 0.008)	SD T 5.2 7.6 239 .26 .65 .34 .2.7 5.1 .5.2 df = 8	22 1: 30 1: 25 9 1: 21 2: 9 14: 17 1: 29 1: 22 1: 184 (P = 0.0:	Con lean 58.6 90.2 181 86.4 7: 23.1 6 9.09 26.5 38.1 58.6 5); l ² = 4	trol <u>SD</u> T. 49.1 67.1 33 8.55 7.31 7.53 37.8 25.1 49.1 48%	22 9.5 30 7.6 13 10.0 12 1.7 21 5.8 10 26.9 16 7.0 29 21.7 22 9.9 775 100.0	Mean Difference ht IX. Random. 95%: C ht IX. Random. 95%: C statistic 3.40 [-71.84, -12.80] statistic -1.72 [-24.76, 21.34] statistic -1.82 [-22.84] statistic -1.83 0.7 [-23.86] statistic -1.28 2 [-22.24, -3.40]	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawati 2020 Javid 2018 Lazavi 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabitha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneity: Test for overall 1. Dry fruit 4. df 2010	Mean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 172.95 139.33 127.5 119.8 162.3 CI) Tau ² = 77.10; Cł effect: Z = 2.67	Fruit 3 36.958333 84 46 6 5 1 3 3 1 ² = 15.45, P = 0.008)	SD T 5.2 7.6 239 .26 .65 .34 .27 5.1 5.2 df = 8	otal M 22 1: 30 1: 25 9 9 14: 17 1: 29 1: 24 2: 17 1: 29 1: 184 (P = 0.0:	Con lean 58.6 90.2 181 86.4 7: 23.1 6 9.09 26.5 38.1 58.6 5); I ² = 4	trol SD Tr 49.1 67.1 33 8.55 7.31 7.53 37.8 25.1 49.1 48%	Data Weig 22 9.9 30 7.6 13 10.7 12 1.7 21 5.8 10 26.5 16 7.0 29 21.7 22 9.9 175 100.0	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% C 340 [-21.84, 28.64] • 42.40 [-71.84, -12.86] • 1.72 [-24.78, 21.34] • 40.62 [-11.37, 30.13] • 40.62 [-11.37, 30.13] • 40.63 [-11.60, -3.52] • 97.6 [-16.00, -3.52] • 10.0 [-30.15, 22.51, 30, [-28.96, -7.64] • 12.82 [-22.24, -3.40]	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2022 Javid 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabiha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneity) Test for oversil 1. Dry fruit Adi 2020 Barahamdi 2012	Mean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 172.95 139.33 127.55 119.8 162.3 CI) Tau ² = 77.10; Cf effect: Z = 2.67 145.44 6	Fruit 3 36.95833: 844 46 6 5 1 3 3 ii ² = 15.45, P = 0.008)	SD Ti 5.2 7.6 239 .26 .65 .34 .2.7 5.1 .5.2 df = 8 1.8 38	otal M 22 1: 30 1: 25 9 9 14: 17 1: 22 1: 184 (P = 0.0: 17 14: 35 17	Con lean 58.6 90.2 181 86.4 7: 23.1 6 9.09 26.5 38.1 58.6 5); l ² = 4 9.76 160	trol <u>SD</u> Tr 49.1 67.1 33 8.55 7.31 7.53 37.8 25.1 49.1 49.1 48% 4.32 67	Data Weig 22 9.9 30 7.6 13 10.7 12 1.7 12 1.7 10 26.8 16 7.0 29 21.7 22 9.8 175 100.0 13 72.3 35 0.3	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%: C Model Cl: 184, 28, 64] Model C: 21, 84, 28, 64] Model C: 21, 84, 28, 64] Model C: 21, 84, 28, 64] Model C: 21, 74, 84, 72, 66] Model C: 11, 37, 30, 13] Model C: 15, 165, 163, 151, 125 Model C: 13, 30, 123, 58, 36, 76, 64] Model C: 22, 68, 67, 64] Model C: 22, 42, 34, 64] Model Model Model Model Model Model Model Model Model Model Model Model Model Model Model Model Model Mod	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2022 Javid 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabitha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneity: Test for overall 1. Dry fruit Adi 2020 Barghamdi 201 Fallah 2006	Kean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 172.95 139.33 127.5 119.8 162.3 CI) Tau ² = 77.10; Cf effect: Z = 2.67 (145.44 6 157 171	Fruit 3 36.958333 84 46 6 5 1 3 1 2 = 15.45, P = 0.008)	SD Ti 5.2 7.6 239 .26 .65 .34 .2.7 5.1 .5.2 df = 8 1.8 .38 61	otal M 22 1: 30 1: 25 9 9 14: 17 1: 22 1: 184 (P = 0.0: 17 14: 22 22	Con lean 58.6 90.2 181 86.4 73 23.1 6 9.09 26.5 58.6 5); I ² = 4 9.76 160 180	trol <u>SD</u> T: 49.1 67.1 33 8.55 7.31 7.53 37.8 25.1 49.1 48% 4.32 67 47	tal Weig 22 9.5 30 7.6 13 10.7 12 1.7 21 5.6 10 26.8 10 26.8 10 29 29 9.1 29 9.1 29 9.1 30 72.1 35 0.1 35 0.2 20 0.4	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%: C 41. V. Random. 95%: C 42.40 [-71.84, -12.96] % -42.40 [-71.84, -12.96] % -40.62 [-11.37, 30.13] % -05.2 [-11.37, 30.13] % -05.6 [-11.37, 30.13] % -05.6 [-11.60, -0.352] % -17.6 [-20.89, 6.7.64] % -12.82 [-22.24, -3.40] % -4.32 [-6.82, -1.82] % -30.0 [-25.52, -22.52] % -30.0 [-25.52, -25.22] % -0.00 [-41.18, -3.18]	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2022 Javid 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabitha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneity: Test for overall 1. Dry fruit Adi 2020 Barghamdi 2011 Fallah 2006 Fallah rct 2006	Kean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 172.95 139.33 127.55 119.8 162.3 CI) Tau ² = 77.10; Cl effect: Z = 2.67 145.44 6 157 711 174	Fruit 3 36.95833 84 46 6 5 1 3 3 1 ² = 15.45, P = 0.008)	SD T 5.2 7.6 239 .26 .65 .34 .2.7 5.1 .5.2 df = 8 1.8 38 61 64	Datal M 22 1: 30 1: 25 9 9 1: 21 2: 9 1: 29 1: 29 1: 22 1: 184 (P = 0.0: 17 14: 35 22 25 22	Con lean 58.6 90.2 181 86.4 73 23.1 6 9.09 26.5 538.1 558.6 55); I ² = 4 9.76 160 177	ttrol <u>SD</u> T: 49.1 67.1 33 8.55 7.31 8.55 7.33 37.8 25.1 49.1 48% 4.32 67 47 62	Datal Weig 22 9.6 30 7.6 13 10.7 12 1.7 21 5.8 10 26.5 16 7.0 29 9.6 75 100.0 13 72.1 35 0.7 20 9.4 22 9.5 13 72.1 35 0.7 20 9.4	Mean Difference ht IV. Random. 95% C 340 [21.84, 28.64] 42.40 [71.84, 12.86] *42.40 [71.84, 12.86] *40.62 [11.73, 20.13] *40.52 [11.73, 20.13] *40.52 [11.73, 20.13] *40.52 [11.73, 20.13] *40.52 [11.73, 20.13] *40.52 [11.73, 20.13] *40.52 [11.60, -3.52] *40.52 [11.60, -3.52] *10.0 [-30.15, 32.15] *5.00 [24.57, 28.84] *3.70 [24.57, 28.84] *4.22 [-22.24, -3.40] *3.00 [24.57, 22.82] *4.30 [24.86, -1.82] *3.00 [24.57, 22.82] *5.00 [24.57, 22.82] *3.00 [24.57, 23.93, 31.93] *3.00 [24.57, 33, 31.93] *3.00 [24.57, 33, 31.93]	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawani 2022 Javid 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabiha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneily: Test for overall 1. Dry fruit Adi 2020 Barghamdi 2016 Fallah rct 2006 Fallah rct 2006 Huseini 2009	roup Mean 162 147.8 147.8 145.78 145.78 145.78 145.78 172.95 130.33 127.5 119.8 162.3 112.3 21.07 145.44 6 6 157.17 171 171 174 173.9	Fruit 3 36.95833 84 46 6 5 1 3 3 1 ² = 15.45, P = 0.008)	SD Tr 5.2 7.6 239 .26 .65 .34 2.7 5.1 5.2 df = 8 .8 8 61 64 34	otal M 22 1: 30 1: 25 9 9 1: 21 2: 9 1: 29 1: 29 1: 22 1: 184 (P = 0.0: 17 14: 35 22 25 25 25 1'	Con lean 58.6 90.2 181 86.4 7.23.1 6 9.09 26.5 38.1 55.6 55.; l ² = 4 9.76 160 180 177 76.6	ttrol <u>SD</u> T: 49.1 67.1 33 8.55 7.31 8.55 7.33 37.8 25.1 49.1 48% 4.32 67 47 62 32	22 9.5 30 7.6 13 10.7 12 1.7 21 5.8 10 26.5 10 26.5 10 27.5 100.1 35 13 72.2 35 0.7 20.4 25 25 0.4 25 0.4	Mean Difference Man Difference M. N. Random. 95%: C M. N. Random. 95%: C M. O. (-21.84, 28.64) M. O. (-21.18, 4.72.04) M. O. (-11.17, 30.13) M. O. (-11.16, 30.32) M. O. (-20.15, 22.62) M. O. (-21.12, 22.42, -3.40) M. O. (-24.12, 22.22) M. O. (-24.12, 22.18) M. O. (-24.12, 22.18) M. O. (-24.12, 23.18) M. O. (-24.12, 23.18) M. O. (-24.12, 20.15, 00) M. O. (-24.10, 15.00)	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2015 Javid 2018 Lazavi 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabiha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneity: Test for overall 1. Dry fruit Adi 2020 Barghamdi 2016 Fallah rct 2006 Huseini 2009 Irannejad 2020	roup Mean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 172.95 139.33 127.5 119.8 162.3 () 170.7 170.7 17	Fruit 3 4 36.95833 84 46 6 5 5 1 3 3 1 ² = 15.45, P = 0.008)	SD Ti 5.2 7.6 239 .26 6.65 3.34 2.7 5.1 5.2 4 f = 8 1.8 38 61 64 34 .72	otal M 22 1: 30 1: 25 9 9 12: 21 21 21 21 17 11: 29 14: 17 12: 184 (P = 0.0: 17 14: 35 22 25 1: 36 1:	Con lean 58.6 90.2 181 88.4 7: 32.1 6 9.09 53.1 53.6 53.6 53.6 53.1 180 180 180 177 76.6 51.2 4	ttrol <u>SD</u> Ti 49.1 67.1 33 8.55 7.31 7.53 37.8 25.1 49.1 48% 4.32 67 47 62 32 2.84	22 9.8 30 7.6 31 10.7 12 1.7 21 5.8 10 26.8 22 9.5 13 10.7 10 26.8 75 100.0 13 72.3 35 0.7 22 0.4 25 0.4 25 1.3 36 1.7	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%: C Manual Markowski V. Random. 95%: C 42.40 [-71.84, -12.86] % -42.40 [-71.84, -12.86] % -1.72 [-24.78, 21.34] % -0.62 [-11.37, 30.13] % -0.62 [-11.37, 30.13] % -0.62 [-11.37, 30.13] % -0.62 [-11.33, 30.13] % -0.62 [-11.60, 0.3.52] % -10.0 [-3.51.8, -15.12] % -10.0 [-3.52, 22.89.4] % -12.82 [-2.2.4, -3.40] % -12.82 [-6.82, -1.82] % -3.00 [-2.55, 2.2.52] % -3.00 [-2.55, 2.2.52] % -3.00 [-2.7.9, 3.133] % -3.00 [-3.7.9, 3.133] % -3.00 [-3.7.9, 3.133] % -3.00 [-3.7.9, 3.133] % -3.00 [-3.7.9, 3.133] % -3.00 [-3.7.9, 3.133] % -3.00 [-3.7.9, 1.11.133]	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2022 Javid 2018 Lazavi 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabitha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneity) Test for overal 1. Dry fruit Adi 2020 Barghandi 2017 Fallah 2006 Fallah r c1 2006 Fallah r c1 2009 Irannejad 2020 Irannejad 2020 Irannejad 2020	roup Mean 162 147.8 179.26 145.78 172.55 139.33 127.5 119.8 162.3 162.3 CI) Tau ² = 77.10; CI effect: 2.267 174.54 145.44 6 157 174.9 145.44 6 157	Fruit 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 4 6 6 5 1 3 3 3 1 2 2 1 5,45, P = 0.008) 4 5 3 7	SD Ti 5.2 7.6 239 .26 65 .34 22,7 5.1 5.2 df = 8 1.8 38 61 64 34 .72 .57	otal M 22 1: 30 1: 25 9 121 2: 9 14: 177 12: 22 1: 22 1: 184 (P = 0.0) 177 14: 35 22 25 1' 35 22 25 1' 19 19 19 19	Con lean 90.2 1 181 86.4 77 23.1 6 90.9 1 26.5 3 38.1 2 58.6 1 55; l ² = 4 9.76 1 180 180 177 76.6 1 51.2 4 8.0.22 8	spin spin 49.1 67.1 33 8.55 7.31 7.53 37.8 25.1 49.1 4.32 67 47 62 32 2.84 4.51	22 9.5 30 7.6 31 10.7 12 1.7 11 10.7 12 1.7 10 26.8 10 26.8 10 26.9 175 100.0 13 72.1 35 0.7 22 9.8 75 100.0	Mean Difference ht IX. Random. 95%: C ht I	Mean Difference IV. Random. 35% CI
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawani 2022 Javid 2018 Nemat 2022 Sabihra 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneity: Test for overall Ad 2020 DB arghamd 2012 Fallah c206 Fallah rct 2006 Fusini 2009 Irannejad 2020 Sousa 2021	roup Mean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 145.71 139.33 127.5 119.8 162.3 117.5 170 145.44 6 157 171.1 147.4 6 157 171.1 174.9 142.65 157 171.1 174.1 162.3 162.6	Fruit 3 36.95833 84 46 6 5 1 3 1 2 2 15.45, P = 0.008) 37 74	SD Ti 5.2 7.6 239 2.26 3.34 2.7 5.1 5.2 df = 8 38 61 63 4 34 34 34 372 5.7 8.88	otal M 22 1: 30 1: 25 9 121 2: 9 14: 17 12: 22 12: 184 (P = 0.0) 17 14: 22 2: 135 22 25 1: 36 1: 19 19 28 15	Con lean 58.6 90.2 181 86.4 7,7 38.1 38.1 38.1 55.5 185.6 9.76 180 180 177 76.6 180 177 76.5 2.4 4 0.22 8 8 1.29 6 0.2 8 1.20 8 8 1.20 8 1.20 8 1.20 8 1.20 8 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20	spin spin 49.1 67.1 33 8.5 7.53 37.8 25.1 49.1 48% 4.32 67 47 62 32 2.84 4.51 2.95 4.51	tal Weig 22 9.8 30 7.6 13 10.7 12 1.7 21 5.8 10 26.5 10 26.5 175 100.0 13 72.1 29 9.1 29 21.7 29 21.7 29 21.7 29 2.1.7 20.04 25 25 0.4 25 0.4 25 0.4 25 0.4 25 0.4 26 1.7 17 0.2 28 0.2	Mean Difference ht IX. Random. 95%: C ht 142. 40 [-71.84, -12.96] ht -17.2 [-24.78, 21.34] ht -17.2 [-24.78, 21.34] ht -16.2 [-13.73, 00.13] ht -9.76 [-16.00, -3.52] ht -9.76 [-16.00, -3.52] ht -9.76 [-16.00, -3.52] ht -18.30 [-28.96, -7.64] ht -18.20 [-28.52, 22.52] ht -0.00 [-11.8, 23.16] ht -0.00 [-11.8, 23.16] ht -2.00 [-20.01, 560] ht -2.00 [-20.01,	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2022 Javid 2018 Lazavi 2018 Nemati 2022 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Helerogeneity: Test for overall 1. Dry fruit Adi 2020 Barghamdi 201 Fallah 2006 Fallah rct 2006 Huseini 2009 Iranerigal 2022 Moazen 2013 Sousa 2021 Stota 2020 Verbedati 2021	roup Mean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 172.29 180.33 127.5 162.3 107.5 162.3 107.5 162.3 107.5 162.3 107.5 162.3 107.5 162.3 107.5 162.3 172.5 162.3 172.5 162.3 172.5 162.3 172.5 162.3 172.5 162.3 172.5 172.5 162.3 172.5 162.3 172.5 172	Fruit 3 36.95833; 84 46 6 5 1 3 3 1 ² = 15.45, P = 0.008) 45 37 74	SD Ti 5.2 7.6 239 226 .655 .34 22.7 5.1 5.2 df = 8 38 61 64 34 34 372 .57 .88 5.4	tal M 22 1: 30 11 25 9 9 14 21 2: 9 14 29 14 29 14 29 12 21 2: 23 17 29 14 35 22 25 1 35 22 25 1 26 1 36 19 28 15 26 1 37 19 28 15 26 1	Con lean 58.6 90.2 181 823.1 86.4 7.7 58.6 9.09 9.09 58.6 181 180 177 76.6 51.2 180 177 76.6 51.2 180 129 6 53.3 1.29 6 53.3	August August<	tal Weig 22 9.8 30 7.6 31 10.5 12 1.7 21 5.8 10 26.8 10 26.8 10 26.9 10 26.9 10 26.9 22 9.8 75 100.0 13 72.1 35 0.1 25 0.4 25 0.4 25 1.3 36 1.1 17 0.3 26 22.8 28 0.2	Mean Difference ht IV. Random. 95%: C ft IV. Random. 95%: C statut -17.14, -12.86] statut -17.2 [-24.78, 21.34] statut -17.2 [-24.78, 21.34] statut -17.2 [-17.84, -12.86] statut -17.2 [-24.78, 21.34] statut -17.2 [-24.78, 21.34] statut -18.30 [-28.86, -7.64] 3.70 [-21.54, 28.84] -3.00 [-28.52, 22.52] statut -3.00 [-28.52, 22.52] statut -3.00 [-28.52, 22.52] statut -3.00 [-28.52, 33.3133] statut -3.00 [-28.36, 3.50] statut -3.08 [-3.63.83] statut -3.01 [-3.63.44, 47.62] statut -3.04 [-3.64, 47.62] statut -3.04 [-3.64, 47.62] statut -3.04 [-3.64, 47.62] statut -11.36 [-2.64, 47.62] statut -11.36 [-2.64, 47.62] statut -11.44, -2.64 [-6.64, 47.62] statut -11.44, -2.64 [-6.64, 67.62]	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawani 2022 Javid 2018 Lazavi 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabibha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneily: Teatro overall 1. Dry fruit Adi 2020 Barghamdi 201 Fallah crd 2006 Fallah crd 2006 Huseini 2009 Irannejad 2020 Moazen 2013 Sousa 2021 Stota 2020 Yaghoobi 2014 Subtotal (95%	roup Mean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 172.51 139.33 127.5 119.8 182.3 162.3 CI) Tau ² = 77.10; CI 6 157 171 174 174 173.9 142.56 150.1 150.5 150.5	Fruit 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	SD Ti 5.2 7.6 239 226 .65 334 2.7 5.1 5.2 4 5.1 5.2 4 6 4 38 61 64 34 34 2.7 .88 5.4 .65 5.4 .65	tal M 22 1: 30 1: 25 9 9 1: 21 2: 21 2: 21 2: 21 2: 22 1: 22 1: 184 7 14: 35 25: 1: 25: 2: 25: 1: 36: 1: 19: 19 28: 15: 26: 1: 28: 1: 28: 1: 28: 1: 28: 1: 28: 1: 28: 1: 28: 1: 28: 1:	Con lean	Auge Auge <th< td=""><td>tal Weig 22 9.5 30 7.6 13 10.2 12 1.7 21 5.8 16 7.0 29 21.7 120 9.5 13 70.2 35 0.1 22 9.5 13 72.1 35 0.1 22 9.5 13 72.1 35 0.1 22 9.5 13 72.1 35 0.1 22 0.4 25 0.4 25 0.4 25 0.2 28 0.2 28 0.4 25 100</td><td>Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%: C ht -1.72 [24.78, 21.34] ht -1.72 [24.28, 21.34] ht -1.83 [24.28, 21.34] ht -1.83 [24.86, 7.80] ht -1.83 [24.86, 7.80] ht -1.83 [24.80, 7.80] ht<td>Mean Difference</td></td></th<>	tal Weig 22 9.5 30 7.6 13 10.2 12 1.7 21 5.8 16 7.0 29 21.7 120 9.5 13 70.2 35 0.1 22 9.5 13 72.1 35 0.1 22 9.5 13 72.1 35 0.1 22 9.5 13 72.1 35 0.1 22 0.4 25 0.4 25 0.4 25 0.2 28 0.2 28 0.4 25 100	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%: C ht -1.72 [24.78, 21.34] ht -1.72 [24.28, 21.34] ht -1.83 [24.28, 21.34] ht -1.83 [24.86, 7.80] ht -1.83 [24.86, 7.80] ht -1.83 [24.80, 7.80] ht <td>Mean Difference</td>	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawani 2022 Sabitha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneily: Test for overall 1. Dry fruit Adi 2020 Barghamdi 201 Fallah 2026 Fulah rct 2006 Fulah rct 2006 Fusehini 2009 Irannejad 2020 Moazen 2013 Sousa 2021 Stote 2020 Yaghoobi 2014 Subtotal (95%	roup Mean 162 147.8 179.285 145.78 179.255 139.33 127.5 119.8 162.3 119.8 162.3 157.5 170 145.44 6 157 171.1 174.9 142.56 157.5 150.5 146.3 146.3 159.5 CI) 174.162.26	Fruit 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	SD Ti 5.2 7.6 239 239 239 255 1.65 5.1 5.2 df = 8 1.8 38 61 64 34 34 5.7 5.4 65 5.4 65 5.4 5.5 5.4 5.5 5.4 5.5 5.4 5.5 5.1 5.5 5.1 5.2 5.1 5.2 5.1 5.2 5.1 5.2 5.1 5.2 5.1 5.2 5.1 5.2 5.1 5.2 5.1 5.2 5.1 5.2 5.1 5.2 5.1 5.2 5.1 5.2 5.1 5.2 5.2 5.1 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.1 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.1 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.2	tal M 22 1: 30 1: 9 1: 25 9 9 1: 22 1: 29 1: 20 1: 20 1: 21 2: 25 1: 35 22 25 1: 35 22 25 1: 19 19 28 15 261 1: 281 1: 261 1: 261 0:	Con lean 58.6 90.2 1 181 23.1 6 26.5 1 26.5 1 58.6 1 59.76 1 180 180 177 76.6 1 51.2 4 0.22 8 1.29 6 5.3 3 71.4 1 129 6 1.29 6	August August<	tal Weig 22 9.5 30 7.6 13 10.1 12 1.3 10 26.8 10 26.8 10 27.9 20 21.3 35 0.1 25 0.4 25 0.4 25 0.4 26 22.5 28 0.3 25 100.0	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%: C Manual Markowski 42.40 [-71.84, -12.86] -42.40 [-71.84, -12.86] -42.40 [-71.84, -12.86] -42.40 [-71.84, -12.86] -42.40 [-71.84, -12.86] -42.40 [-71.84, -12.86] -9.76 [-16.00, -3.82] -9.76 [-16.00, -3.82] -9.76 [-16.00, -3.82] -9.76 [-16.00, -3.82] -9.76 [-16.00, -3.82] -9.76 [-16.00, -3.82] -9.76 [-16.00, -3.82] -9.76 [-16.28, -6.764] -9.70 [-11.18, 23.18] -9.00 [-14.18, 23.18] -9.00 [-14.18, 23.18] -9.00 [-14.18, 23.18] -9.00 [-14.18, 23.18] -9.00 [-14.18, 23.18] -9.00 [-14.18, 23.18] -9.00 [-14.18, 23.18] -9.00 [-14.18, 23.18] -9.00 [-14.18, 23.18] -9.00 [-14.28, 25.24.54] -11.90 [-12.36, 3.30] -11.90 [-12.28, 21.44] -11.90 [-12.28, 21.44] -11.90 [-12.28, 21.44] -11.90 [-12.28, 21.44] -11.90 [-12.28, 21.44] -11.90 [-12.28, 21.44] <tr< td=""><td>Mean Difference</td></tr<>	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2022 Javid 2018 Lazavi 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabitha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneity: Test for oversil 1. Dry fruit Adi 2020 Barghandi 201 Fallah 2006 Fallah r ct 2006 Fallah ct 2000 Vagahoobi 2014 Stote 2020 Yaghoobi 2014 (95% Heterogeneity: Test for overall	coup Mean 162 147.8 179.26 145.78 179.25 139.33 127.5 119.8 182.3 162.3 CI) Tau* = 77.10; CI effect: Z = 2.67 174.45 6 157 150; 14 162.48 162, 26 150.14 162, 26 150.14 162, 26 150.5 170 142.56 150.5 159.5 CI) Tau* = 0.00; Chi effect: Z = 4.64	Fruit 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 4 5 1 3 3 4 4 5 1 3 3 4 4 5 5 3 7 4 5 3 7 4 5 5 5 3 3 5 5 5 3 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	SD Ti 5.2 7.6 239 2.26 3.65 3.34 2.7 5.1 5.2 df = 8 1.8 38 61 64 34 3.72 5.5 8.88 5.4 6.5 3.4 6.65 3.4 6.65 3.4 6.65 3.4 6.65 3.8 6.65 5.1 5.1 5.2 7.6 6.65 5.1 5.1 5.2 7.6 6.65 5.1 5.2 7.6 6.65 5.1 5.2 7.6 6.65 5.1 5.2 7.6 6.65 5.1 5.2 7.6 6.65 5.1 5.2 7.6 6.65 5.1 5.2 7.6 6.65 5.1 5.2 7.6 6.65 5.1 5.2 7.6 6.65 5.1 5.2 7.6 6.65 5.1 5.2 7.6 6.65 5.1 5.2 7.6 6.65 5.1 5.2 7.6 6.65 5.1 5.2 7.6 6.88 5.5 7.7 7.6 7.7 7.6 7.6 7.7 7.6 7.7 7.7	tal M 22 1.1 25 9 9 1.1 21 22 17 1.1 29 1.2 184 (P = 0.0 17 1.4' 35 22 25 25 25 1.9 28 1.7 28 1.5 266 1.9 288 1.5 266 1.2 261 28 262 1.2	Con lean 58.6 90.2 181 86.4 7, 23.1 6 9.09 58.6 58.6 59.7 180 180 177 6.6 53.3 128 6 53.3 129 6 53.3 129 6 53.3 129 6 53.3	Aug.1 SD T. 49.1 67.1 33 8.55 7.31 8.55 7.31 8.55 7.33 37.8 25.1 49.1 49.2 1 - - 48% - - - 48% - - - - 42.2 - - - - - 48% -	Value Value 22 9.1 30 7.4 13 10.7 12 1.5 10 26.6 16 7.1 12 2.1 12 3.2 13 72.2 13 72.2 13 72.2 14 7.2 15 7.0 16 7.1 17 0.2 28 0.2 29 2.1 21 3.6 1.7 0.2 28 0.2 29 2.2 20 2.2 21 3.6 1.7 0.2 20 2.2 20 2.2 21 2.3 22 2.0 23 2.0 24 2.2 25 100.1	Mean Difference ht IX. Random. 95%: C ht -17.2 [-24.78, 21.34] ht -9.76 [-111.37, 30.13] ht -9.76 [-110.0, -3.22] -9.76 [-100.0, -3.22] -9.76 [-100.0, -3.22] ht -100 [-25.52, 22.52] -3.00 [-28.52, 22.52] -3.00 [-28.52, 22.52] +3.25 [-22.24, -3.40] -3.00 [-28.52, 22.52] +3.30 [-37.93, 31.93] -2.70 [-21.00, 15.60] +4.32 [-6.82, -1.822] -2.00 [-37.93, 31.93] +4.00 [-32.63, 63.30] -7.00 [-14.18, -23.66, 3.30] +4.00 [-34.26, 63.30] -7.00 [-14.4, -2.56] +5.03 [-7.15, -2.90] -5.03 [-7.15, -2.90]	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawani 2022 Javid 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabiha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneily: Test for overall 1. Dry fruit Adi 2020 Barghamdi 201 Fallah rct 2006 Husenii 2009 Irannejad 2020 Mozero 2013 Sousa 2021 Stote 2020 Yaghoobi 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneily: Test for overall	roup Mean 162 147.8 179.28 179.28 179.71 139.33 127.5 119.8 180.3 127.5 198.4 162.3 101 Tau ² = 77.10; Cł effect: Z = 2.67 117 171 174 173.9 142.56 150.14 162.8 162.5 150.5 150.5 159.5 Ci) 159.5 Ci) 159.5	Fruit 34 36.95833: 84 46 6 5 1 1 3 1 ² = 15.45, P = 0.008) 45 37 74 3 2 ² = 4.78, df P < 0.0000	SD T. 5.2 7.6 239 226 655 334 22.7 5.1 5.2 df = 8 1.8 38 61 64 34 34 38 61 64 34 38 61 65 57 65 57 65 57 65 51 51 52 65 51 52 65 51 52 65 53 65 55 72 72 55 72 72 55 72 72 72 72 72 72 72 72 72 72	tal M 22 1: 30 1: 30 1: 21 2: 9 9 121 2: 9 14: 17 1: 184 17 17 14: 35 2: 25 1: 36 1: 9 19 19 19 19 19 28 1: 28 1: 28 1: 28 1: 28 1: 28 1: 28 1: 28 1: 201 = 0.85);	Com lean 58.6 181 86.4 181 86.4 79.23.1 26.5 38.1 58.6 55); l ² = 4 9.76 160 180 181 180 55); l ² = 4 9.76 160 180 181 182 183 184 180 76.6 4 0.22 6 53.3 71.4 12 12 12 12 12 12 13 14	troi <u>SD</u> T. 49.1 33 8.55 7.31 7.53 37.8 25.1 49.1 40.1	tal Weig 22 9.3 7.4 30 13 10.1 12 1.3 10 26.1 11 10.2 12 1.3 10 22.1 10 22.1 11 22.2 12 2.3 13 72.2 13 72.2 13 72.2 14 72.2 15 0.0 16 7.1 17 0.2 28 0.2 28 0.2 28 0.2 28 0.4 100.4 100.4 15 100.4	Mean Difference H. IV. Random. 95%: C M. J. K. Random. 95%: C M. J. C. (21.84, 12.96) % - 1.72 (24.78, 21.34) % - 1.72 (24.78, 21.34) % - 0.62 (-11.13, 30.13) % - 0.62 (-11.13, 30.13) % - 0.62 (-11.11, 82.318) % - 0.62 (-11.14, 23.84) % - 0.62 (-11.14, 23.18) % - 1.2 (22.24, 3.40) % - 3.00 (-26.52, 22.62) % - 3.00 (-26.52, 22.62) % - 3.00 (-26.52, 22.62) % - 3.00 (-26.52, 22.62) % - 3.00 (-26.52, 22.62) % - 3.00 (-26.52, 22.62) % - 3.00 (-26.52, 22.62) % - 3.00 (-26.52, 22.62) % - 3.00 (-26.52, 22.62) % - 3.00 (-26.52, 22.62) % - 7.00 (-11.44, 2.51) % - 7.00 (-11.44, -2.50) % - 7.00 (-11.44, -2.50) % - 5.03 (-7.15, -2.90)	Mean Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawanti 2022 Javid 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabitha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneity: Test for overail 1. Dry fruit Adi 2020 Barghamdi 201 Fallah 2006 Huseini 2009 Iraneiga 2020 Moazen 2013 Sotes 2020 Yaghoobi 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneity: Test for overail	roup Mean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 172.95 119.33 127.55 118.8 127.73 118.7 128.74 2.67 145.74 6 157.15 1.62.3 162.3 1.65.4 6 157.7 142.56 159.5 142.65 159.5 162.3 169.2 162.46.3 169.5 169.7 169.5 169.7 169.5 169.7 169.5 169.7 169.5 169.7 169.5 169.7 169.5 169.7 169.5 169.7 169.5 169.7 169.5 169.7 169.5 169.7 169.5 169.7 169.5 170.7 170.7 180.7 169.5 190.7 169.5 190.7 169.5 190.7	Fruit 3 3 3 6 3 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	SD T, 5.2 7.6 8.239 2.26 6.65 5.1 5.2 7.7 5.1 5.2 4.6 5.1 5.2 6.65 5.7 8.88 5.4 6.65 5.7 8.88 5.4 6.65 5.7 8.88 5.4 6.65 5.7 8.88 5.4 6.65 5.7 8.88 5.4 7.6 7.6 7.6 7.6 7.6 7.6 7.6 7.6	tal M 22 11 25 9 9 14 17 12 29 12 29 12 29 12 29 12 22 12 17 144 35 22 25 1 36 11 19 19 28 15 266 11 261 22 28 15 266 12 266 12 266 12 266 12 261 12 261 12	Con lean 58.6 90.2 181 886.4 7, 23.1 6 58.6 58.6 58.6 58.6 59.7 160 180 180 177 76.6 51.2 4 0.22 8 53.3 71.4 177 176.6 153.3 174.6 174.7 1	August August<	tal Weig 22 9.3 77 13 13 10.1 14 16.6 77 100.3 13 72.2 9.3 77.5 100 26.5 101 22.6 13 72.2 9.3 75 101 26.5 13 72.2 9.3 75.7 102 20.1 13 72.2 9.3 76.1 13 72.2 9.3 75.1 13 70.1 13 72.2 14 70.1 15 100.4 16 7.1 17 70.2 18 70.2 19 70.2 10.1 70.2 10.2 10.1 10.3 70.2 10.4 70.2 10.5 100.4	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%: C 340 [-21.84, 28.64] -42.40 [-71.84, -12.86] -42.40 [-71.84, -12.86] -47.72 [-24.78, 21.34] -40.52 [-11.37, 30.13] -40.52 [-11.37, 30.13] -40.52 [-11.37, 30.13] -40.52 [-11.37, 30.13] -40.52 [-11.37, 30.13] -50.61 [-45.18, -15.12] -9.76 [-10.00, -3.52] -9.76 [-10.00, -3.52] -9.76 [-10.00, -3.52] -9.76 [-10.00, -3.52] -12.82 [-2.2.4, -3.40] -12.82 [-2.2.4, -3.40] -12.82 [-2.2.4, -3.40] -5.00 [-3.7.93, 31.83] -3.00 [-3.7.93, 31.83] -3.00 [-3.7.93, 31.83] -4.10.82 [-3.64, 4.7.82] -5.03 [-7.15, -2.90]	Maan Difference
Study or Subg 1. Fresh fruit Golbon 2015 Golbon 2017 Ismawani 2022 Javid 2018 Nemati 2022 Sabitha 2009 Shidfar 2012 Sohrab 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneity: Test for overall 1. Dry fruit Adi 2020 Barghamdi 2017 Fallah rct 2006 Fallah rct 2006 Fallah rct 2006 Fallah rct 2006 Fallah rct 2006 Fallah rct 2006 Huseini 2009 Irannejad 2020 Yaghoobi 2014 Subtotal (95% Heterogeneity: Test for overall	coup Mean 162 147.8 179.28 145.78 172.05 139.33 127.5 119.8 182.3 162.3 CI) Tau ² = 77.10; CI Ffeet: Z = 2.67 145.44 6 157.7 171.11 174.29 160.15 145.44 162.3 150.1 173.9 142.26 150.1 159.5 CI) Tau ² = 0.00; Ch; CH Feffect: Z = 4.64 164.44	Fruit 36.95633 44 46 6 6 7 1 3 3 1 2 1 5.45, 5 1 2 3 3 4 4 3 3 1 2 1 5.45, 5 1 3 4 4 4 4 4 5 5 1 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	SD T. 5.2 7.6 229 226 65 5.2 5.2 4f = 8 1.8 61 64 5.7 5.4 5.4 65 5.4 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5 7.5	Dtal M 22 11 25 9 12 25 9 14 17 12 29 12 29 12 29 12 29 12 29 12 22 11 22 12 17 14 35 22 25 1 26 1 28 1 28 1 28 1 28 1 28 1 28 1 28 1 28 1 28 1 28 1 28 1 28 1 28 1 28 1 28 1 28 1 28 1 28 1	Com lean 58.6	August August<	tal Weig 22 9.2 31 0.7 13 10.1 12 1.1 12 1.1 12 1.1 12 1.1 12 1.1 12 1.1 13 70.2 29 21.1 75 100.4 13 70.2 20 2.2 20 2.2 20 2.2 21 2.1 75 100.4 13 7.2.2 22 2.4 23 1.3 17 10.2 26 2.3 27 2.8 28 2.0 29 1.0 20 2.5 30 3.1 21 3.2 22 3.2 23 3.2 24 2.2 25 1.0	Mean Difference ht IX. Random. 95%: C ht 1.2 (21.48, 12.43) ht 1.0 (21.11.7, 30.13) ht 1.0 (21.11.7, 30.13) ht 1.0 (21.11.7, 30.13) ht 1.0 (23.15, 32.15) ht 1.0 (30.15, 32.15) ht 1.10 (30.15, 32.15) ht 1.2 (32.2, 22.52) ht 1.2 (22.2, 4.3.40) ht 1.2 (22.2, 22.52) ht 3.0 (28.52, 22.52) ht 3.0 (28.52, 22.52) ht 3.00 (28.52, 22.52) ht 3.00 (28.52, 22.52) ht 3.00 (28.52, 22.52) ht 3.00 (28.52, 22.52) ht 1.13 (24.84, 67.62) ht 1.13 (24.84, 67.62) ht	Mean Difference IV. Random. 35% CI

FIGURE 3

(A) Forest plot of comparison: fruit versus placebo; outcome: fasting blood glucose; (B) Forest plot of subgroup comparison: fruit versus placebo; outcome: fasting blood glucose.



ensuring that their total energy intake remains unchanged. We concluded that moderate amounts of practical fruit products reduce blood glucose concentration, but the specific amounts of daily practical fruits need to be investigated in multicenter RCTs.

Author contributions

YR and SS performed literature review. YR and HL collected data, performed data analysis, interpreted results, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. YS and YR assessed risk of bias, reviewed the protocol, screened articles, and reviewed the results and manuscript. CY contributed to the systematic review protocol and critically reviewed the results and manuscript. HL contributed to the protocol development and reviewed the manuscript. YR, SS, YS, CY, and HL critically revised successive drafts of the manuscript and approved the final version. HL has affirmed that this manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported. that no important aspects of the study have been omitted. and that any discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained. HL is the guarantor of this work and, as such, had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

Conflict of interest

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

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated

References

1. Sun H, Saeedi P, Karuranga S, Pinkepank M, Ogurtsova K, Duncan BB, et al. IDF diabetes atlas: global, regional and country-level diabetes prevalence estimates for 2021 and projections for 2045. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* (2022) 183:109119. doi: 10.1016/j.diabres.2021.109119

2. Bondonno NP, Davey RJ, Murray K, Radavelli-Bagatini S, Bondonno CP, Blekkenhorst LC, et al. Associations between fruit intake and risk of diabetes in the AusDiab cohort. J Clin Endocrinol Metab (2021) 106(10):e4097–108. doi: 10.1210/ clinem/dgab335

3. Wang X, Yu C, Zhang B, Wang Y. The injurious effects of hyperinsulinism onblood vessels. *Cell Biochem Biophys* (2014) 69(2):213-8. doi: 10.1007/s12013-013-9810-6

4. Jia G, Sowers JR. Hypertension in diabetes: an update of basic mechanisms and clinical disease. *Hypertension* (2021) 78(5):1197-205. doi: 10.1161/ hypertensionaha.121.17981

5. Gao M, Jebb SA, Aveyard P, Ambrosini GL, Perez-Cornago A, Carter J, et al. Associations between dietary patterns and the incidence of total and fatal cardiovascular disease and all-cause mortality in 116,806 individuals from the UK biobank: a prospective cohort study. *BMC Med* (2021) 19(1):83. doi: 10.1186/s12916-021-01958-x

6. Christensen AS, Viggers L, Hasselstrom K, Gregersen S. Effect of fruit restriction on glycemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes - a randomized trial. *Nutr J* (2013) 12. doi: 10.1186/1475-2891-12-29

7. Ola MS, Al-Dosari D, Alhomida AS. Role of oxidative stress in diabetic retinopathy and the beneficial effects of flavonoids. *Curr Pharm Des* (2018) 24 (19):2180-7. doi: 10.2174/1381612824666180515151043

8. Du H, Li L, Bennett D, Guo Y, Turnbull I, Yang L, et al. Fresh fruit consumption in relation to incident diabetes and diabetic vascular complications: a 7-y prospective study of 0.5 million Chinese adults. *PloS Med* (2017) 14(4):e1002279. doi: 10.1371/ journal.pmed.1002279

9. Matos AL, Bruno DF, Ambrósio AF, Santos PF. The benefits of flavonoids in diabetic retinopathy. *Nutrients* (2020) 12(10). doi: 10.3390/nu12103169

10. Poolsup N, Suksomboon N, Paw NJ. Effect of dragon fruit on glycemic control in prediabetes and type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS One* (2017) 12(9):e0184577. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0184577

11. Lazavi F, Mirmiran P, Sohrab G, Nikpayam O, Angoorani P, Hedayati M. The barberry juice effects on metabolic factors and oxidative stress in patients with type 2 diabetes: a randomized clinical trial. *Complement Ther Clin Pract* (2018) 31:170–4. doi: 10.1016/j.ctcp.2018.01.009

 Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JP, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. *PloS Med* (2009) 6 (7):e1000100. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000100

13. Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Chandler J, Welch VA, Higgins JP, et al. Updated guidance for trusted systematic reviews: a new edition of the cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* (2019) 10:Ed000142. doi: 10.1002/14651858.Ed000142

14. Adi BS, Vangani A, Siva Rami Reddy E. Effect of syzygium cumini in type 2 diabetes mellitus by assessing glycosylated haemoglobin and blood glucose levels: a double blind randomized controlled trial. *J Global Trends Pharm Sci* (2020) 11 (4):8546–51.

15. Barghamdi B, Ghorat F, Asadollahi K, Sayehmiri K, Peyghambari R, Abangah G. Therapeutic effects of citrullus colocynthis fruit in patients with type II diabetes: a clinical trial study. *J Pharm Bioallied Sci* (2016) 8(2):130–4. doi: 10.4103/0975-7406.171702

16. Fallah Huseini H, Heshmat R, Larijani B, Fakhrzadeh, Darvishzadeh F, Jafariazar Z, et al. The clinical investigation of citrullus colocynthis (L.) schrad. fruit in treatment of type II diabetic patients; a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *J Med Plants* (2006) 5(SUPPL. 2):31–5.

17. Fallah Huseini H, Zaree A, Heshmat R, Larijani B, Fakhrzadeh H, Rezaii Sharifabadi R, et al. The effect of citrullus colocynthis (L.) schrad. fruit on oxidative stress parameters in type II diabetic patients. [Persian]. *J Med Plants* (2006) 5 (SUPPL 2):55–60.

18. Golbon S, Pooneh A, Maryam T, Hadi T, Masoud K, Javad N. Pomegranate (Punica granatum) juice decreases lipid peroxidation, but has no effect on plasma advanced glycated end-products in adults with type 2 diabetes: a randomized doubleblind clinical trial. *Food Nutr Res* (2015) 59:28551. doi: 10.3402/fnr.v59.28551 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.

19. Golbon S, Samira E, Giti S, Reza Neyestani T, Pooneh A, Mehdi H, et al. Effects of pomegranate juice consumption on oxidative stress in patients with type 2 diabetes: a single-blind, randomized clinical trial. *Int J Food Sci Nutr* (2017) 68(2):249–55. doi: 10.1080/09637486.2016.1229760

20. Huseini HF, Darvishzadeh F, Heshmat R, Jafariazar Z, Raza M, Larijani B. The clinical investigation of citrullus colocynthis (L.) schrad fruit in treatment of type II diabetic patients: a randomized, double blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial. *Phytother Res* (2009) 23(8):1186–9. doi: 10.1002/ptr.2754

21. Irannejad Niri Z, Shidfar F, Jabbari M, Zarrati M, Hosseini A, Malek M, et al. The effect of dried ziziphus vulgaris on glycemic control, lipid profile, apo-proteins and hs-CRP in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *J Food Biochem* (2021) 45(3):e13193. doi: 10.1111/jfbc.13193

22. Ismawanti Z, Suparyatmo JB, Wiboworini B. The comparative effect of red guava (Psidium guajava. l.) with papaya (Carica papaya) on blood glucose level of type 2-diabetic patients. *Romanian J Diabetes Nutr Metab Dis* (2020) 27(3):209–13.

23. Javid AZ, Maghsoumi-Norouzabad L, Ashrafzadeh E, Yousefimanesh HA, Zakerkish M, Angali KA, et al. Impact of cranberry juice enriched with omega-3 fatty acids adjunct with nonsurgical periodontal treatment on metabolic control and periodontal status in type 2 patients with diabetes with periodontal disease. J Am Coll Nutr (2018) 37(1):71–9. doi: 10.1080/07315724.2017.1357509

24. Moazen S, Amani R, Homayouni Rad A, Shahbazian H, Ahmadi K, Taha Jalali M. Effects of freeze-dried strawberry supplementation on metabolic biomarkers of atherosclerosis in subjects with type 2 diabetes: a randomized double-blind controlled trial [Randomized controlled trial research support, non-U.S. gov't]. *Ann Nutr Metab* (2013) 63(3):256–64. doi: 10.1159/000356053

25. Nemati S, Tadibi V, Hoseini R. Pomegranate juice intake enhances the effects of aerobic training on insulin resistance and liver enzymes in type 2 diabetic men: a singleblind controlled trial. *BMC Nutr* (2022) 8(1):48. doi: 10.1186/s40795-022-00538-3

26. Sabitha P, Adhikari Prabha MR, Shetty Rukmini MS, Anupama H, Asha K. The beneficial effects of noni fruit juice in diabetic patients. *J Clin Diagn Res* (2009) 3 (6):1822–6.

27. Shidfar F, Heydari I, Hajimiresmaiel SJ, Hosseini S, Shidfar S, Amiri F. The effects of cranberry juice on serum glucose, apoB, apoA-I, lp(a), and paraoxonase-1 activity in type 2 diabetic male patients. *J Res Med Sci* (2012) 17(4):355–60.

28. Sohrab G, Nasrollahzadeh J, Zand H, Amiri Z, Tohidi M, Kimiagar M. Effects of pomegranate juice consumption on inflammatory markers in patients with type 2 diabetes: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *J Res Med Sci* (2014) 19(3):215–20.

29. Sousa D, Araujo M, Mello V, Damasceno MMC, Freitas R. Cost-effectiveness of passion fruit albedo versus turmeric in the glycemic and lipaemic control of people with type 2 diabetes: randomized clinical trial. *J Am Coll Nutr* (2021) 40(8):679–88. doi: 10.1080/07315724.2020.1823909

30. Stote KS, Wilson MM, Hallenbeck D, Thomas K, Rourke JM, Sweeney MI, et al. Effect of blueberry consumption on cardiometabolic health parameters in men with type 2 diabetes: an 8-week, double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Curr Dev Nutr* (2020) 4(4). doi: 10.1093/cdn/nzaa030

31. Yaghoobi M, Miri-Moghaddam E, Navidian A, Nikbakht R, Mehrafarin A, Fallah Huseini H. Safety and efficacy of processed citrullus colocynthis l. fruit in treatment of hyperlipidemic type II diabetic patients: a randomized, placebo-controlled clinical trial. [Persian]. *J Med Plants* (2014) 13(52):81–8.

32. Braunstein CR, Noronha JC, Khan TA, Mejia SB, Wolever TM, Josse RG, et al. Effect of fructose and its epimers on postprandial carbohydrate metabolism: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Nutr* (2020) 39(11):3308–18. doi: 10.1016/j.clnu.2020.03.002

33. Rouman Ahmad. (2020). Available at: https://www.healthynex.com/fruit-calories-chart.html.

34. Gerbaud E, Darier R, Montaudon M, Beauvieux MC, Coffin-Boutreux C, Coste P, et al. Glycemic variability is a powerful independent predictive factor of midterm major adverse cardiac events in patients with diabetes with acute coronary syndrome. *Diabetes Care* (2019) 42(4):674–81. doi: 10.2337/dc18-2047

35. Rosenblat M, Hayek T, Aviram M. Anti-oxidative effects of pomegranate juice (PJ) consumption by diabetic patients on serum and on macrophages. *Atherosclerosis* (2006) 187(2):363–71. doi: 10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2005.09.006

36. American Diabetes Association. Standards of medical care in diabetes-2022 abridged for primary care providers. *Clin Diabetes* (2022) 40(1):10–38. doi: 10.2337/ cd22-as01

37. Duda-Chodak A, Tarko T, Satora P, Sroka P. Interaction of dietary compounds, especially polyphenols, with the intestinal microbiota: a review. *Eur J Nutr* (2015) 54 (3):325–41. doi: 10.1007/s00394-015-0852-y

38. Slavin JL, Lloyd B. Health benefits of fruits and vegetables. Adv Nutr (2012) 3 (4):506–16. doi: 10.3945/an.112.002154

39. Tanaka S, Yoshimura Y, Kawasaki R, Kamada C, Tanaka S, Horikawa C, et al. Japan Diabetes complications study g. fruit intake and incident diabetic retinopathy with type 2 diabetes [Randomized controlled trial research support, non-U.S. gov't]. *Epidemiology* (2013) 24(2):204–11. doi: 10.1097/EDE.0b013e318281725e

40. He FJ, Nowson CA, MacGregor GA. Fruit and vegetable consumption and stroke: meta-analysis of cohort studies. *Lancet* (2006) 367(9507):320-6. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(06)68069-0

41. Yoshizaki T, Ishihara J, Kotemori A, Yamamoto J, Kokubo Y, Saito I, et al. Association of vegetable, fruit, and okinawan vegetable consumption with incident stroke and coronary heart disease. *J Epidemiol* (2020) 30(1):37–45. doi: 10.2188/jea.JE20180130

42. Bradbury KE, Appleby PN, Key TJ. Fruit, vegetable, and fiber intake in relation to cancer risk: findings from the European prospective investigation into cancer and nutrition (EPIC). Am J Clin Nutr (2014) 100 Suppl 1:394s–8s. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.113.071357

43. Fujioka K, Greenway F, Sheard J, Ying Y. The effects of grapefruit on weight and insulin resistance: relationship to the metabolic syndrome. *J Med Food* (2006) 9(1):49–54. doi: 10.1089/jmf.2006.9.49

44. Paquette M, Medina Larque AS, Weisnagel SJ, Desjardins Y, Marois J, Pilon G, et al. Strawberry and cranberry polyphenols improve insulin sensitivity in insulinresistant, non-diabetic adults: a parallel, double-blind, controlled and randomised clinical trial [Randomized controlled trial]. *Br J Nutr* (2017) 117(4):519–31. doi: 10.1017/S0007114517000393

45. Ying-xia Y, Tian-min H, Ren-bin H, Xiao-hui X. Study on the liver tissue antioxidative stress and hypoglycemic effects of carambola fruit juice. *Food Res Dev* (2018) 39(9):148–51. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1005-6521.2018.09.028

46. Wojcicki JM, Heyman MB. Reducing childhood obesity by eliminating 100% fruit juice. *Am J Public Health* (2012) 102(9):1630-3. doi: 10.2105/ ajph.2012.300719

47. Weisel T, Baum M, Eisenbrand G, Dietrich H, Will F, Stockis JP, et al. An anthocyanin/polyphenolic-rich fruit juice reduces oxidative DNA damage and increases glutathione level in healthy probands. *Biotechnol J* (2006) 1(4):388–97. doi: 10.1002/biot.200600004

48. Ajiboye BO, Shonibare MT, Oyinloye BE. Antidiabetic activity of watermelon (Citrullus lanatus) juice in alloxan-induced diabetic rats. *J Diabetes Metab Disord* (2020) 19(1):343–52. doi: 10.1007/s40200-020-00515-2

49. Lima ACD, Cecatti C, Fidelix MP, Adorno MAT, Sakamoto IK, Cesar TB, et al. Effect of daily consumption of orange juice on the levels of blood glucose, lipids, and gut microbiota metabolites: controlled clinical trials [Controlled clinical trial]. *J Med Food* (2019) 22(2):202–10. doi: 10.1089/jmf.2018.0080