Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Azizah Ugusman, National University of Malaysia, Malaysia

REVIEWED BY Jozaa Z. ALTamimi, Princess Nourah Bint Abdulrahman University, Saudi Arabia Feilong Guo, Nanjing General Hospital of Nanjing Military Command, China Mahdieh Khodarahmi, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Iran

*CORRESPONDENCE Hui-hui Yan 🖾 yandoublehui@zju.edu.cn Pian-hong Zhang 🖂 zrlcyyzx@zju.edu.cn

SPECIALTY SECTION This article was submitted to Clinical Nutrition, a section of the journal Frontiers in Nutrition

RECEIVED 08 August 2022 ACCEPTED 30 January 2023 PUBLISHED 14 February 2023

CITATION

Wang L-I, Zhang P-h and Yan H-h (2023) Functional foods and dietary supplements in the management of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front. Nutr.* 10:1014010. doi: 10.3389/fnut.2023.1014010

COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Wang, Zhang and Yan. 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.

Functional foods and dietary supplements in the management of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Lei-lei Wang 🗅 ¹, Pian-hong Zhang 🗅 ^{1*} and Hui-hui Yan 🗅 ^{2*}

¹Department of Clinical Nutrition, The Second Affiliated Hospital, College of Medicine, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China, ²Department of Gastroenterology, The Second Affiliated Hospital, College of Medicine, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China

Objective: In this systematic review and meta-analysis, we aimed to clarify the overall effects of functional foods and dietary supplements in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) patients.

Methods: Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) published in PubMed, ISI Web of Science, Cochrane library, and Embase from January 1, 2000 to January 31, 2022 were systematically searched to assess the effects of functional foods and dietary supplements in patients with NAFLD. The primary outcomes were liver-related measures, such as alanine aminotransferase (ALT), aspartate aminotransferase (AST), and hepatic fibrosis and steatosis, while the secondary outcomes included body mass index (BMI), waist circumference (WC), triacylglyceride (TG), total cholesterol (TC), low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C), and high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C). These indexes were all continuous variables, so the mean difference (MD) was used for calculating the effect size. Random-effects or fixed-effects models were used to estimate the mean difference (MD). The risk of bias in all studies was assessed with guidance provided in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions.

Results: Twenty-nine articles investigating functional foods and dietary supplements [antioxidants (phytonutrients and coenzyme Q10) = 18, probiotics/symbiotic/prebiotic = 6, fatty acids = 3, vitamin D = 1, and whole grain = 1] met the eligibility criteria. Our results showed that antioxidants could significantly reduce WC (MD: -1.28 cm; 95% CI: -1.58, -0.99, P < 0.05), ALT (MD: -7.65 IU/L; 95% CI: -11.14, -4.16, P < 0.001), AST (MD: -4.26 IU/L; 95% CI: -5.76, -2.76, P < 0.001), and LDL-C (MD: -0.24 mg/dL; 95% CI: -0.46, -0.02, P < 0.05) increased in patients with NAFLD but had no effect on BMI, TG, and TC. Probiotic/symbiotic/prebiotic supplementation could decrease BMI (MD: -0.57 kg/m²; 95% CI: -0.72, -0.42, P < 0.05), ALT (MD: -3.96 IU/L; 95% CI: -5.24, -2.69, P < 0.001), and AST (MD: -2.76; 95% CI: -3.97, -1.56, P < 0.0001) levels but did not have beneficial effects on serum lipid levels compared to the control group. Moreover, the efficacy of fatty acids for treating NAFLD was full of discrepancies. Additionally, vitamin D had no significant effect on BMI, liver transaminase, and serum lipids, while whole grain could reduce ALT and AST but did not affect serum lipid levels.

Conclusion: The current study suggests that antioxidant and probiotic/symbiotic/prebiotic supplements may be a promising regimen for NAFLD

patients. However, the usage of fatty acids, vitamin D, and whole grain in clinical treatment is uncertain. Further exploration of the efficacy ranks of functional foods and dietary supplements is needed to provide a reliable basis for clinical application.

Systematic review registration: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero, identifier: CRD42022351763.

KEYWORDS

non-alcoholic fatty liver disease, antioxidants, phytonutrients, probiotics, symbiotics, prebiotics

1. Introduction

Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD), renamed metabolicassociated fatty liver disease (MAFLD) in 2020 (1), is a chronic and progressive metabolic disease characterized by excessive fat deposition in the hepatocytes in the absence of alcohol exposure or other identifiable causes. This may finally lead to cirrhosis, hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC), and other severe liver diseases (2, 3), adversely impacting people's quality of life. It is reported that the global prevalence of NAFLD is 24.1%, of which the highest are in the Middle East and South America and the lowest are in Africa (4, 5). The prevalence of NAFLD in China is about 30%, and this rate is expected to increase further as obesity and type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) are gradually becoming the most common diseases in humans (6, 7).

The occurrence and development of NAFLD depend on multiple factors, including metabolic comorbidities, gut microbiome, and environmental and genetic factors (8). Except for the genetic factors that human beings cannot intervene, the other three conditions are closely related to our current lifestyle and affect each other. In particular, they are influenced by a sedentary lifestyle and the intake of high-energy foods, including fried foods, desserts, and soft drinks (9). The habits mentioned above account for obesity, T2DM, and hyperlipidemia, which are major risk factors for NAFLD (10). It is reported that the prevalence of NAFLD is as high as 60–90%, 27–92%, and 28–70% in patients with obesity, hyperlipidemia, and T2DM, respectively (6).

As no approved pharmacological options exist for NAFLD, lifestyle modifications, including increased physical activity and reduced energy intake, remain the first line of therapy (10, 11); however, consistent low-energy intake and exercise are difficult to achieve in both adults and children. Recently, researchers have found

that gut microbiota plays an important role in the pathophysiology of metabolic diseases, especially obesity-related disorders, including metabolic syndrome and NAFLD (12). The hypothesis underlying its mechanism is that decreased microbial gene richness leads to a decline in bacteria producing short-chain fatty acids and an increase in bacteria synthesizing lipopolysaccharide, which can induce the development of steatosis and trigger systemic inflammation (13, 14). Early probiotic, prebiotic, symbiotic, and fecal microbiota transfer interventions may prevent NAFLD exacerbation (15, 16). Meanwhile, some investigations have reported that the intake of dietary supplements (such as vitamin D, vitamin E, and fatty acid) (17, 18) and functional foods (such as garlic powder, Nigella sativa, sumac powder, and olive oil) (19-23) may ameliorate and/or reverse NAFLD, which may be due to their antioxidant properties. For example, organosulfur compounds in garlic powder and flavonoids in green tea extract belong to the category of functional foods, but in terms of properties, they exhibit antioxidant activities. Their protection is mainly achieved in NAFLD by decreasing oxidative stress and inflammatory responses (12, 20, 24). Although some functional foods may have other properties, such as anticancer and antimicrobial effects (12, 25), these effects on NAFLD are unclear and need to be further explored.

Some functional foods and dietary supplements may decrease liver damage, such as liver disease without cirrhosis, there are inconsistencies in the results obtained by different studies. Considering the inconsistencies of clinical randomized controlled trials (RCTs), we performed this systematic review and meta-analysis to provide clinicians, nutritionists, and other health professionals with relatively unified clinical evidence to help them make relevant clinical decisions, that is, whether functional foods and dietary supplements should be applied to NAFLD management.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Eligibility criteria

This study was only limited to RCTs that reported the effects of functional foods and dietary supplements on liver-related indices in patients suffering from NAFLD, regardless of the method of diagnosis [fibroscan/ultrasonography/elastography technique/magnetic resonance spectroscopy/acoustic structure quantification (ASQ) liver scan/percutaneous liver biopsy/computed tomography (CT)], obesity status, and other metabolic syndrome statuses. Animal or *in vitro* studies, case reports, abstracts, guidelines, reviews, meta-analyses, and conference proceedings were excluded.

Abbreviations: ALP, alkaline phosphatase; ALT, alanine transaminase; ASQ, acoustic structure quantification; AST, aspartate transaminase; BMI, body mass index; CI, Confidence interval; CRP, C-reactive protein; CT, computed tomography; DHA, docosahexaenoic acid; EPA, eicosapentaenoic acid; FBS, fasting blood sugar; GGT, glutamyltransferase; HCC, hepatocellular carcinoma; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; HOMA–IR, homeostasis model assessment for insulin resistance; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; MAFLD, metabolic-associated fatty liver disease; MD, mean differences; NAFLD, Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease; PUFA, polyunsaturated fatty acid; QUICKI, quantitative insulin sensitivity check index; RCTs, Randomized controlled trials; RoB2, Risk of Bias Tool; SPB-201, powdered-water extract of Artemisia annua; TC, total cholesterol; T2DM, type 2 diabetes mellitus; TNF- α , tumor necrosis factor- α ; TG, triacylglyceride; WC, waist circumference; WHR, waist to height ratio.

Two reviewers determined the inclusion and exclusion criteria jointly and retrieved articles separately.

2.1.1. Inclusion criteria

(1) Patients were adults (\geq 18-year-old) with NAFLD; (2) interventions in studies included: dietary supplementation (synbiotic, symbiotic, prebiotic, probiotic, vitamin, and omega-3 supplementation) and functional foods only (exhibiting effects, including antioxidant, anti-inflammatory, immunomodulatory, antimicrobial action); (3) the placebo in the control group was identical in color, shape, size, and packaging to that of the intervention group; (4) the main outcomes were the changes in alanine aminotransferase (ALT) and/or aspartate aminotransferase (AST), hepatic fibrosis, and hepatic steatosis; (5) there were no restrictions on the duration of intervention; (6) only publications written in English were chosen, but the country was not a limiting factor.

2.1.2. Exclusion criteria

(1) Patients with advanced liver disease or/and gastrointestinal dysfunction; (2) interventions in studies combined with exercise

or/and active lifestyle modification, medicine, weight loss surgery, and enteral and/or parenteral nutrition treatment; (3) studies that did not report transaminase values (AST and/or ALT).

2.2. Search strategy

This systematic review and meta-analysis was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Statement (PRISMA). Its protocol was registered on PROSPERO (CRD42022351763). One of the researchers was responsible for keyword searches across four major electronic databases: PubMed, ISI Web of Science, Cochrane library, and Embase, from January 1, 2000 to January 31, 2022. The search strategy and results were finalized through group discussions.

The search method was as follows: ("non-alcoholic fatty liver disease" OR "NAFLD" OR "nonalcoholic fatty liver disease" OR "fatty liver, nonalcoholic" OR "fatty livers, nonalcoholic" OR "liver, nonalcoholic fatty" OR "livers, nonalcoholic fatty" OR "nonalcoholic fatty liver" OR "nonalcoholic fatty livers" OR "nonalcoholic steatohepatitis" OR "nonalcoholic steatohepatitides" OR "steatohepatitides, nonalcoholic" OR "steatohepatitis,



Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram detailing the study selection process for systematic literature review.

TABLE 1 Characteristics of included trials.

References	Country	Sample size	Target population	Age (years)	Duration	Intervention group	Control group	Outcomes measures	Changes to outcome measures post intervention
Aller et al. (42)	Spain	30	NAFLD	≥18	3 months	Lactobacillus bulgaricus and Streptococcus thermophilus	Starch	BMI/weight/FM/WHR/TC/TG/LDL/HDL/insulin/ HOMA/TNF-α/ALT/AST/GGT	↓ALT/AST/GGT
Sangouni et al. (23)	Iran	90	NAFLD	≥18	12 weeks	Garlic powder	Starch	Hepatic steatosis/weight/BMI/WC/ALT/ASL/GGT/ALP/ TC/TAG/HDL/LDL	↓Hepatic steatosis/ALT/ASL/GGT/TC/HDL/LDL
Pezeshki et al. (30)	Iran	80	NAFLD with obesity	20-50	12 weeks	Green tea extract	Placebo	Weight/BMI/ALT/AST/ALP	↓ALT/AST/ALP
Asgharian et al. (43)	Iran	80	NAFLD	18-60	8 weeks	Probiotic	Starch	Steatosis grade/ALT/AST/CRP/weight/BMI	↓Steatosis grade
Han et al. (31)	Korea	96	NAFLD	≥18	8 weeks	SPB-201	Crystallin cellulose	ALT/AST/blood RT/ALP/glucose/BUN/Cr/UA	↓ALT/AST
Soleimani et al. (garlic) (20)	Iran	110	NAFLD	20-70	15 weeks	Garlic powder	Placebo	Weight/TC/TG/LDL/HDL/FBS/HbA1c/ALT/AST/ hepatic steatosis	↓Hepatic steatosis/weight/TC/TG/LDL/FBS/HbA1c/ ALT/AST
Soleimani et al. (Propolis) (32)	Iran	54	NAFLD	18–60	4 months	Poplar propolis	Placebo	Weight/fat mass/fat free mass/FBS/insulin/HOMA- IR/QUICKI/TC/TG/LDL/HDL/Hs- CRP/albumin/ALP/ALT/AST/GGT/T-Bil/D- Bil/hepatic steatosis	↓Hs-CRP//hepatic steatosis
Scorletti et al. (DHA) (53)	UK	103	NAFLD	≥18	15 months	DHA/EPA	Olive oil	BMI/WC/FBS/MRI subcutaneous fat/MRI visceral fat/HbA1c/TG/TC/LDL/HDL/AST/ALT/liver fat/liver fibrosis score/NAFLD fibrosis score	↑HDL
Scorletti et al. (synbiotics) (44)	UK	104	NAFLD	≥18	10 months	Polymerization	Maltodextrin	Weight/BMI/fat/FBS/HbA1c/TG/TC/LDL/HDL/ AST/ALT/GGT/MRS-measured liver/ELF score	↓NAFLD fibrosis score
Jafarvand et al. (48)	Iran	44	NAFLD	20-65	4 weeks	CoQ10	Placebo	BMI/WC/TG/TC/LDL/HDL/AST/ALT	↓WC/AST
Askari et al. (33)	Iran	50	NAFLD	20-66	12 weeks	Cinnamon	Wheat flour	FBS/QUICKI/HOMA/TC/TG/LDL/HDL/ASL/ALT/ GGT/hs-CRP	↓FBS/HOMA/T/LDL/TG/ASL/ALT/GGT/hs- CRP
Farsi et al. (49)	Iran	42	NAFLD	19–54	12 weeks	CoQ10	Starch	Weight/WC/HC/WHR/BMI/NAFLD/grade/ TNF-α/adiponection/ leptin/hs-CRP/AST/ALT/GGT/AST to ALT ratio	↓hs-CRP/AST/GGT/NAFLD grade/TNF-α/leptin; ↑adiponection
Izadi et al. (34)	Iran	70	NAFLD	20-55	8 weeks	Sour tea powder	Placebo	Weight/BMI/WC/TC/TG/LDL/HDL/AST/ALT	↓TG/ALT/AST/

10.3389/fnut.2023.1014010

Wang et al.

TABLE 1 (Continued)

References	Country	Sample size	Target population	Age (years)	Duration	Intervention group	Control group	Outcomes measures	Changes to outcome measures post intervention
Barchetta et al. (54)	Italy	65	NAFLD with DM	25-70	24 weeks	Cholecalciferol	Placebo	Hepatic fat fraction/BMI/WC/ TC/TG/LDL/HDL/FBG/ HbA1c/AST/ALT/r-GT/AST to ALT/FHOMA-IR/QUICKI/adiponectin	No difference
Bae et al. (35)	Korea	78	NAFLD with DM	20-70	12 weeks	Carnitine-orotate complex	Placebo	Weight/BMI/WC/FBS/HbA1c/ HOMA-IR/HOMA-B/AST/ALT/γ- GT/TG/HDL/LDL/CT attenuation	↓ALT/HbA1c/liver attenuation values
Cansanção et al. (52)	Brazil	44	NAFLD	≥18	6 months	n-3 PUFA	Olive oil	ALT/AST/ALP/GGT/FBS/HbA1c/ TG/TC/LDL/HDL/BMI/BMI/WC/WHR/liver fibrosis	↓ALP/liver fibrosis
Hosseinikia et al. (36)	Iran	90	NAFLD	18-65	12 weeks	Quercetin	Placebo	BMI/WHR/ALT/AST/GGT/TNF-α/hs- CRP/TC/TG/HDL/LDL	↓BMI/WHR/TNF-α
Farhangi et al. (50)	Iran	44	NAFLD	20-65	4 weeks	CoQ10	Placebo	FSG/insulin/HOMA-IR/QUICKI/AST/ ALT/vaspin/chemerin/pentraxin	↓AST
Masoumeh et al. (55)	Iran	112	NAFLD	≥18	12 weeks	Whole grain foods	Usual cereals	Grade of fatty liver/ALT/AST/GGT/TG/TC/LDL/ HDL/FBS/HOMA-IR/QUICKI/insulin	↓Grade of fatty/liver/ALT/AST/GGT
Darand et al. (21)	Iran	50	NAFLD	≥18	12 weeks	<i>Nigella sativa</i> seed powder	Starch	Weight/BMI/WC/HC/WHR/ALT/AST/ GGT/hs-CRP/TNF-α/NF-κB/fibrosis grade/steatosis/percentage of steatosis	↓hs-CRP/TNF-α/NF- κb/percentage of steatosis
Mohamad Nor et al. (45)	Malaysia	46	NAFLD	≥18	6 months	Multi-strain probiotics	Placebo	Liver stiffness/AST/ALT/GGT/steatosis score/fibrosis score/BMI/TG/TC/fasting glucose	No difference
Mohammad Shahi et al. (37)	Iran	42	NAFLD	≥18	8 weeks	Phytosterol	Starch	AST/ALT/GGT/AST to ALT ratio/TC/TG/LDL/HDL/LDL to HDL ratio/VLDL/TC to HDL ratio/TNF-α/hs-CRP/adiponectin/leptin	↓AST/ALT/LDL
Rashidmayvan et al. (51)	Iran	44	NAFLD	20-60	8 weeks	NS oil	Paraffin oil	Weight/BMI/WC/WHR/FBS/TG/TC/ HDL/LDL/VLDL/insulin/AST/ALT/GGT/TNF- α/hs-CRP	↓TG/TC/HDL/LDL/VLDL/FBS/AST/ALT/TN α/hs-CRP; ↑HDL
Zhang et al. (38)	China	74	NAFLD	25-65	12 weeks	Anthocyanin	Maltodextrin	Weight/BMI/WC/HC/WHR/AST/ALTNAFLD fibrosis score/TC/TG/LDL/DL/FBG/insulin/HOMA- IR/OGTT	↓ALT/HOMA-IR/2-h glucose
Chong et al. (47)	UK	42	NAFLD	25-70	10 weeks	VSL#3 [®] probiotic	Placebo	TC/TG/LDL/HDL/HbA1c//HOMA-IR/TAC/hs- CRP/ALT/AST/mode ASQ/NAFLD fibrosis risk score	No difference
Navekar et al. (39)	Iran	46	NAFLD with overweight/obesity	20-60	12 weeks	Turmeric powder	Placebo	FBS/insulin/HOMA-IR/leptin/AST/ALT	↓FBS/insulin/HOMA-IR/leptin

05

10.3389/fnut.2023.1014010

(Continued)

Wang	et	al.
------	----	-----

Changes to outcome measures post

Outcomes measures

Control group

Duration Intervention group

Target population

	Í								
Ahn et al. (46)	Korea	68	NAFLD with overweight or obesity	19-75	12 weeks	Six bacterial species	Placebo	W eight/BMI/visceral fat/total fat mass/total body fat/visceral fat grade/WHR/CAP/liver stiffness/intra-hepatic fat fraction/TG/TC/glucose/ insulin/AST/ALT/HOMA-I/total muscle mass/skeletal muscle/HDL/LPS/TNF-α	↓Intra-hepatic fat fraction/TG/weight
Cicero et al. (40)	Iran	65	NAFLD	>18	8 weeks	Phospholipidated curcumin	Placebo	W eight/BMI/leptin/adiponectin/ leptin:adiponectin/FBS/TG/TC/LDL/ HDL/AST/ALT	↓leptin/leptin: adiponectin; ↑adiponectin/HDL
Namkhah et al. (41)	Iran	44	NAFLD with overweight/obesity	20-65	4 weeks	Naringenin	Placebo	NAFLD grades/NFS levels/weight/BMI/WC/AST/ ALT/TG/TC/HDL/LDL	↓NAFLD grades/TG/TC/LDL; ↑HDL
AFLD, non-alcohol uist to height ratio;	lic fatty liver dise FBS, fasting blo	ase; DHA, doct od sugar; HON	osahexaenoic acid; EPA, ei MA–IR, homeostasis mode	cosapentaen el assessment	t for insulin resident	polyunsaturated fatty acid; 5 stance; QUICKI, quantitati	SPB-201, powdered-w ve insulin sensitivity	ater extract of Artemisia annua; DM, diabetes mellitus; BMI check index; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; com C c c control: Arteria externation of the control	, body mass index; WC, weight circumference; WHR, DL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; TC, total

outcome measures. \uparrow , indicated an increase in outcome measures 3 cholest NAFL vaist

nonalcoholic") AND ("diet" OR "diets" OR "dietary supplements" OR "dietary supplement" OR "supplements, dietary" OR "dietary supplementations" OR "supplementations, dietary" OR "food supplementations" OR "food supplements" OR "food supplement" OR "supplement, food" OR "supplements, food" OR "nutraceuticals" OR "nutraceutical" OR "nutriceuticals" OR "nutriceutical" OR "neutraceuticals" OR "neutraceutical" OR "herbal supplements" OR "herbal supplement" OR "supplement, herbal" OR "supplements, herbal" OR "nutrients" OR "nutrient" OR "macronutrients" OR "macronutrient" OR "micronutrient" OR "micronutrients" OR "functional food" OR "food, functional" OR "foods, functional" OR "functional foods") AND ("randomized controlled trial" [publication type] OR "randomized controlled trial" OR "randomized" OR "placebo").

Literature was managed using a software program (EndNote X8.1, Thomson Reuters, New York, USA), in which the "find duplicates" function was used to eliminate duplicate papers. The studies inconsistent with our eligibility criteria were screened out using the title and abstract. The remaining articles were fully read, and the qualified studies were chosen according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria (Figure 1). All stages of the selection process were repeated by another author, and the differences were solved through group discussion.

2.3. Data extraction and risk of bias assessment

The data from each trial were extracted independently by two authors using a standardized, pre-designed data-extraction form. The data included: (1) study characteristics (first author's name, year of publication, country, and sample size); (2) baseline patient characteristics (targeted population and age); (3) intervention characteristics (type and dose in the intervention and control groups and duration of follow-up); (4) main outcomes (outcome measures and the changes to outcome measures post-intervention). The risk of bias in all studies was assessed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool (RoB2) provided in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (26). The tool contains seven domains, including method of sequence generation, concealment, blinding, blinded outcome, incomplete outcome data, selective outcome reporting, and other biases. All these domains were respectively classified as low risk, high risk, and unclear risk of bias according to the guideline in the Cochrane Handbook. The trial was considered to have "good" quality if it was low-risk for at least three items, "fair" if it was low-risk for two items, and "weak" if it was low-risk for less than two items (27, 28). The quality assessment was separately done by two authors. There was little disagreement between them.

2.4. Outcome measures

The primary outcomes were liver-related measures, such as transaminase values (AST and/or ALT), and hepatic fibrosis and steatosis. Secondary outcomes included anthropometric measurements [such as body mass index (BMI) and waist circumference (WC)] and lipid analyses [triacylglyceride (TG),

[TABLE 1 (Continued)

<u>Ref</u>erences

total cholesterol (TC), low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C), and high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C)].

2.5. Statistical analysis

The mean differences (MD) and 95% confidence interval (CI) between intervention and placebo groups at baseline and postintervention were used for each parameter in this review and metaanalysis. I^2 value was used to evaluate heterogeneity. When the I^2 value was <50%, the fixed-effects model was used; otherwise, the random-effects model was adopted. We used a narrative synthesis when the data were too heterogeneous to be aggregated or when there were only a few articles on intervention measures (29). The publication bias was evaluated using Begg's rank correlation test and Egger's regression asymmetry test. Sensitivity analysis was carried out to define whether the overall effect depended on any particular study. The statistical significance was assessed at $\alpha = 0.05$. All statistical analyses were carried out using Review Manager 5.4 and Stata 12.0.

3. Results

3.1. Study selection

The study selection process is summarized in Figure 1. We selected 2,120 articles through keywords and six articles through references, from which 617 duplicate and 37 ongoing studies were removed. Next, we excluded 1,350 studies after screening the title and abstract. A total of 122 studies were considered eligible and needed a full-text review. Finally, 93 articles were excluded after reading the full text because of the following reasons: non-RCTs; full text not in English; did not measure pre-set outcomes (AST/ALT/hepatic fibrosis and steatosis); abstracts and conference proceedings; and combined with lifestyle interventions (physical exercise and/or weight loss diet). Finally, 29 articles were included in this review and meta-analysis.

3.2. Study characteristics

The characteristics of included studies are summarized in Table 1. Fifteen trials (20, 21, 23, 30-41) evaluated phytonutrients; six trials (42-47) evaluated probiotic/symbiotic/prebiotic; three trials (48-50) evaluated coenzyme Q10; three trials (51-53) evaluated fatty acids; and one trial (54, 55) evaluated vitamin D and whole grain separately in the management of NAFLD. The duration of the intervention varied from 4 weeks to 18 months. The patients were all adults, and the studies were from different countries, including Iran, Korea, Brazil, North America, the United Kingdom, Italy, Malaysia, and China. Among the 29 included studies, 23 (79.31%) articles studied patients with NAFLD only, 2 (6.90%) articles studied NAFLD patients with diabetes, and 4 (13.79%) articles were on overweight/obese patients with NAFLD. The study design of all included RCTs was parallel (Table 1).

3.3. Risk of bias in studies

Out of all the studies, 21 trials (20, 21, 23, 30, 32-36, 38-41, 43, 45-47, 50, 52, 54, 55) had "good" quality, while five trials (42, 44, 48, 51, 53) were "fair". Additionally, the remaining three trials (31, 37, 49) were "weak". Figures 2, 3 show the results of each source of bias.

3.4. Effect of functional foods and dietary supplements on anthropometric parameters

The effect of functional foods and dietary supplements on BMI was examined in 22 clinical trials. It was seen that 13 out of 22 trials (21, 23, 30, 33-36, 38-41, 48, 50) were about antioxidants (phytonutrients and coenzyme Q10), five (42-46)on probiotic/symbiotic/prebiotic, three (51-53) on fatty acids, and one (54) on vitamin D. The meta-analysis showed no significant effect of antioxidants on BMI compared to the placebo (MD: 0.01 kg/m²; 95% CI: -0.07, 0.08, P > 0.05) (Figure 4A). There was no heterogeneity in these included studies ($I^2 = 29.0\%$, P = 0.16). As shown in Figure 4B, BMI significantly decreased (MD: -0.57 kg/m²; 95%



Risk of bias graph: review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item presented as percentages across all included studies.



CI: -0.72, -0.42, P < 0.05) after taking probiotic, symbiotic, and prebiotic in NAFLD patients, with no heterogeneity across studies ($I^2 = 0\%$, P = 0.82). Sensitivity analysis showed that the overall

effect did not depend on any single study (Appendix S1 in the Supplementary material 1).

The proportion and type of fatty acids varied between the three studies; oil composition contained docosahexaenoic acid (DHA)/eicosapentaenoic acid (EPA)/linoleic acid/oleic acid and linolenic acid. Three studies used different oils as a placebo. All three studies showed that BMI did not change significantly in NAFLD patients after using fatty acids (51–53). Barchetta et al. (54) reported that BMI did not change after taking vitamin D and placebo.

Nine studies (21, 23, 33–35, 38, 41, 48, 50) reported the effect of supplements on WC. Our meta-analysis reported that WC declined significantly in nine antioxidant trials compared to the control group (MD: -1.28 cm; 95% CI: -1.58, -0.99, P < 0.05). The effect was homogeneous across the included trials ($I^2 = 37\%$, P = 0.12) (Figure 4C). The effects of probiotic/symbiotic/prebiotic on WC have not been reported. Sensitivity analysis showed that the exclusion of any trials did not affect the results (Appendix S2 in the Supplementary material 1). Four studies (51–54) noted no changes in the WC after taking fatty acid (three trials) and vitamin D (one trial).

No publication bias was found for BMI (Begg's test P = 0.82; Egger's test P = 0.600) and WC (Begg's test P = 0.348; Egger's test P = 0.829).

3.5. Effect of functional foods and dietary supplements on the liver function

Twenty-nine datasets evaluated the effect of functional foods and dietary supplements on ALT. Eighteen out of 29 trials were about antioxidants (phytonutrients and coenzyme Q10), six (42–47) on probiotic/symbiotic/prebiotic, three (51–53) on fatty acids, one (55) on whole grain, and one (54) on vitamin D.

There was a statistical significance in the mean difference of ALT levels in the antioxidant-supplemented group compared to the control group (MD: -7.65 IU/L; 95% CI: -11.14, -4.16, *P* < 0.0001). There was high heterogeneity across studies ($I^2 = 91\%$, P < 0.00001). Subgroup analysis based on the type of antioxidants (phytonutrients or coenzyme Q10) was performed using data from 18 studies. There was statistically significant difference in ALT reductions between phytonutrients group and control group (MD: -9.5 IU/L; 95% CI: -14.12, -4.89, P < 0.0001), but high heterogeneity of these studies still existed ($I^2 = 92\%$, P < 0.00001). Heterogeneity was attenuated among those studies taking coenzyme Q10 ($I^2 = 54\%$, P = 0.11) (Figure 5A), but the ALT reductions had no difference. The intake of probiotic, symbiotic, and prebiotic supplements led to a more significant decrease in ALT compared with control (MD: -3.96 IU/L; 95% CI: -5.24, -2.69, P < 0.001), with no heterogeneity across studies ($I^2 = 0\%$, P = 0.65) (Figure 5B). Sensitivity analysis indicated that no trial changed the pooled effect size (Appendix S3 in the Supplementary material 1). Publication bias were seen for ALT (Begg's test P = 0.722; Egger's test P = 0.016).

The effect of functional foods and dietary supplements on AST levels was examined in 29 clinical trials. The literature distribution on AST was consistent with that on ALT. Our meta-analysis revealed a significant reduction in AST levels after taking antioxidant supplements (MD: -4.26 IU/L; 95% CI: -5.76, -2.76, P < 0.00001), with substantial heterogeneity ($I^2 = 92\%$, P < 0.00001). Studies of phytonutrients or coenzyme Q10 were subgroup analyzed. The AST



reductions were significantly different between the phytonutrients group and control group (MD: -4.79 IU/L; 95% CI: -6.49, -3.08, P < 0.00001), with high heterogeneity among those studies ($I^2 = 93\%$, P < 0.00001). Meanwhile, the AST reductions had significant difference in studies taking coenzyme Q10 (MD: -1.82 IU/L; 95% CI: -3.15, -0.48, P = 0.008), with no heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$, P = 0.57) (Figure 5C). The AST levels after taking probiotic, symbiotic, and prebiotic showed a decrease in the antioxidant-supplemented group compared to the control group (MD: -2.76; 95% CI, -3.97, -1.56, P < 0.0001), with no heterogeneity across

studies ($I^2 = 0\%$, P = 0.46) (Figure 5D). Sensitivity analysis revealed that no specific study affected pooled effects (Appendix S4 in the Supplementary material 1). publication bias was seen for AST levels (Begg's test P = 0.985; Egger's test P = 0.000).

In three trials (51–53) on fatty acids, Rashidmayvan et al. (51) reported that *Nigella sativa* oil containing linoleic acid, oleic acid, and linolenic acid reduced ALT and AST levels, whereas Cansanção et al. (52) and Scorletti et al. (53) found that supplements containing DHA and EPA did not affect ALT and AST levels. Barchetta et al. (54) did not observe any discrepancy in AST and ALT levels between

	interve	ention gro	up	cont	rol grou	qu		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% Cl
.1.1 phytonutrients									
bbas Ali Sangouni 2020	-4.9	14.61	45	3.6	16.61	43	5.9%	-8.50 [-15.05, -1.95]	-
li Pezeshki2016	-13.21	21.04	35	-5.74	23.4	36	4.5%	-7.47 [-17.81, 2.87]	
Byoungduck Han2020	-15.97	18.82	38	-7.41	15.9	41	5.5%	-8.56 [-16.27, -0.85]	-
avood Soleimani(Garlic)2020	-10.5	13.5	47	0.25	15.2	51	6.3%	-10.75 [-16.43, -5.07]	
avood Soleimani(propolis)2020	-3.57	9.2	24	-3.67	9.2	25	6.4%	0.10 [-5.05, 5.25]	Ť
ezeh Askari2014	-26.6	9.91	23	-1.5	11.35	22	6.0%	-25.10 [-31.34, -18.86]	-
atemeh Izadi2020	-4.63	16.55	30	1.2	21.72	31	4.8%	-5.83 [-15.50, 3.84]	
Cheol Bae2015	-73.7	38.7	39	-5.38	37.1	39	2.7%	-68.32 [-85.15, -51.49]	
lahboobe Hosseinikia 2020	-3	18.87	39	1	20.85	39	5.1%	-4.00 [-12.83, 4.83]	
lina Darand2019	-1.68	14.13	22	-1.4	8.28	21	5.8%	-0.28 [-7.17, 6.61]	+
lohammad Ali Javanmardi2018	-18.63	9.62	19	-14.58	10.64	19	6.0%	-4.05 [-10.50, 2.40]	
ei-Wen Zhang2015	-8	6.74	34	-1	6.31	29	7.0%	-7.00 [-10.23, -3.77]	-
oya Navekar2017	-16.6	22.45	21	-16.66	24.97	21	3.3%	0.06 [-14.30, 14.42]	
eyed Reza Mirhafez2019	-16.26	9.56	32	-0.95	12.86	29	6.2%	-15.31 [-21.04, -9.58]	-
ahra Namkhah2021	-1	1.75	22	-0.5	1.25	22	7.5%	-0.50 [-1.40, 0.40]	-1
ubtotal (95% CI)			470			468	83.1%	-9.50 [-14.12, -4.89]	•
terogeneity: Tau² = 67.32; Chi² = 17 st for overall effect: Z = 4.03 (P < 0.0	1.45, df = 0001)	: 14 (P < 0	.00001); I ² = 9	2%				
.1.2 Coenzyme Q10									
Inaz Jafarvand 2015	0	23.4	20	-3.7	10.54	21	4.2%	3.70 [-7.50, 14.90]	
arnaz Farsi2015	-6.95	11.98	20	-0.15	14.43	21	5.3%	-6.80 [-14.90, 1.30]	
ahdieh Abbasalizad Farhangi2014	-4.25	3.08	20	-6.14	2.63	21	7.4%	1.89 [0.13, 3.65]	ŀ
ubtotal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Tau ² = 13.99; Chi ² = 4.3 est for overall effect: Z = 0.03 (P = 0.9	86, df = 2 97)	(P = 0.11)	60 ; l² = 5	4%		63	16.9%	-0.10 [-5.73, 5.53]	•
otal (95% CI)			530			531	100.0%	-7.65 [-11.14, -4.16]	•
eterogeneity: Tau ² = 42.25; Chi ² = 19 est for overall effect: Z = 4.30 (P < 0.0 est for subaroup differences: Chi ² = 6	1.79, df =)001) .41. df = 1	: 17 (P < 0 1 (P = 0.01	.00001 1). I ² = 3); I ² = 9 84.4%	1%				-100 -50 0 50 100 intervention group control group
	inten	ention a	oup	cor	trol are			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
udy or Subgroup	interv Mean	vention gr	oup	cor	trol gro	oup	Weight	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
udy or Subgroup	interv Mean	vention gr	roup Total	cor Mean	trol gro	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
ldy or Subgroup LER, D.A2011	interv Mean -7.3	vention gr SD 28.13	roup Total 14	cor Mean 4.1	itrol gro SD 33.93	oup Total 14	Weight 0.3%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
udy or Subgroup LER, D.A2011 fe Asgharian2016	interv <u>Mean</u> -7.3 3.13	vention gr SD 28.13 3.29	roup Total 14 38	cor <u>Mean</u> 4.1 7.17	101 gro SD 33.93 2.36	Dup Total 14 36	Weight 0.3% 96.8%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
udy or Subgroup LER, D.A2011 efe Asgharian2016 eonora Scorletti2020	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2	vention gr SD 28.13 3.29 37.34	roup Total 14 38 45	Cor Mean 4.1 7.17 -6.32	100 gro 5D 33.93 2.36 30.81	Dup Total 14 36 44	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.8%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53]	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 tefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 ohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021	interv <u>Mean</u> -7.3 3.13 -2 14	28.13 37.34 50.04	roup Total 14 38 45 17	cor <u>Mean</u> 4.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13	atrol gro SD 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39	Dup Total 14 36 44 22	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.8% 0.2%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09]	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 tefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 lohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ui Lin Chong2021	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5	vention gr SD 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.72	roup Total 14 38 45 17 19	cor Mean 4.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2	strol gro SD 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3	Dup Total 14 36 44 22 16	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.8% 0.2% 0.5%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] 5.400 [-50.05, 70]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
udy or Subgroup LER, D.A2011 efe Asgharian2016 eonora Scorletti2020 bhamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ii Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3	vention gr SD 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73	roup Total 14 38 45 17 19 30	Cor Mean 4.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8	33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17	Total 14 36 44 22 16 35	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, -8.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
udy or Subgroup LER, D.A2011 efe Asgharian2016 sonora Scorletti2020 shamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 i Lin Chong2021 ng BongAhn2019 tal (95% CI)	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3	28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73	roup Total 14 38 45 17 19 30 163	cor <u>Mean</u> 4.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8	trol gro SD 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17	Dup Total 14 36 44 22 16 35 167	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-8.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 Ltefa Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 lohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ui Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); ² = 00001)	rention gr SD 28.13 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0%	roup Total 14 38 45 17 19 30 163	cor <u>Mean</u> 4.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8	trol gro SD 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17	Total 14 36 44 22 16 35 167	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 Ltefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 lohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ui Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0	interv <u>Mean</u> -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); l ² = 00001)	vention gr SD 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0%	Total 14 38 45 17 19 30 163	Corr Mean 4.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8	10 gro	Total 14 36 44 22 16 35 167	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-3.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 Ltefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 lohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ui Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.020)	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); l ² = 00001) interve Mean	rention gr SD 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0%	roup <u>Total</u> 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 Dup Total	Con Mean 4.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	rrol gro	up Total 14 36 44 22 16 35 167	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random 95% CI	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 tefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 Iohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 uiu Lin Chong2021 iang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Chi² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0000000000000000000000000000000000	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); I ² = 00001) interv Mean	rention gr SD 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gro SD	roup <u>Total</u> 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 Dup <u>Total</u>	con Mean 4.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8 Con Mean	trol gro SD 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17	up Total 36 44 22 16 35 167 167	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 LLER, D.A2011 tefe Asgharian2016 eonora Scorletti2020 ohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ui Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) teterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = ast for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0 tudy or Subgroup 2.1 phytonutrients bea Mi Sacouni 2020	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); ² = 00001) intervo Mean	rention gr SD 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gro SD 10.00	roup <u>Total</u> 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 163 Dup <u>Total</u>	con Mean 4.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8 con Mean	trol gro SD 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17	up Total 36 44 22 16 35 167 167 up Total	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.8% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-3.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
udy or Subgroup LER, D.A2011 jef Asgharian2016 sonora Scorletti2020 shamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 i Lin Chong2021 ng BongAhn2019 tal (95% Cl) terogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = st for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0 udy or Subgroup 2.1 phytonutrients bas Ali Sangouni 2020 Paraehki 2016	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); l ² = 00001) interv Mean -2.2 7.2	rention gr SD 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gro SD 10.09 11.76	roup <u>Total</u> 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 163 500 500 500 500 500 500 500 50	con <u>Mean</u> 4.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8 con <u>Mean</u>	trol gro SD 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17	up Total 14 36 44 22 16 35 167 167 167	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 lefe Asgharian2016 eonora Scorletti2020 ohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 i Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = st for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0 Ludy or Subgroup 2.1 phytonutrients bbas Ali Sangouni 2020 li Pezeshki2016 uwundidk Hung2020	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); l ² = 00001) intervo Mean -2.2 -7.25 0.21	rention gr SD 28.13 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gro SD 10.09 11.76 0.22	roup <u>Total</u> 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 163 500 Total 45 35 20	con Mean 4.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8 con Mean 1.9 -3.07	attrol gro <u>SD</u> 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 science of the science	Dup Total 14 36 44 22 16 35 167 167 167 167	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] 0.08 [-0.10.05%]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
udy or Subgroup LER, D.A2011 efe Asgharian2016 sonora Scorletti2020 shamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ii Lin Chong2021 ng BongAhn2019 stal (95% CI) sterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = st for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0 udy or Subgroup 2.1 phytonutrients bas Ali Sangouni 2020 Pezeshki2016 roungduck Han2020 prod Soleiment(Cating) 2020	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2.2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); l ² = 00001) interv0 Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21	ention gr 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gr SD 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.7	roup <u>Total</u> 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 163 500 Total 45 35 38 45 	con Mean 4.1 7.17 -6.32 2.8 con <u>Mean</u> 1.9 -3.07 -0.13	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 rol gro <u>SD</u> 8.55 13.07 0.26	Dup Total 14 36 44 22 16 35 167 up Total 43 36 41 5	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.5%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] 6.00 [-0.62, 207]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
udy or Subgroup LER, D.A2011 jef Asgharian2016 sonora Scorletti2020 shamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 i Lin Chong2021 ng BongAhn2019 tal (95% Cl) terogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = st for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0222) udy or Subgroup 2.1 phytonutrients bas Ali Sangouni 2020 Pezeshki2016 roungduck Han2020 avood Soleimani(Gardic)2020	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); l ² = 00001) interv Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.59 -2.77	rention gr SD 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gra SD 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.7 6.07	roup <u>Total</u> 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 163 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	con Mean 4.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8 con Mean 1.9 -3.07 -0.13 1.4	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 rol gro SD 8.55 13.07 0.26 8.6 9.7	Total 14 36 44 22 16 35 167 Total 43 36 41 51	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.6%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -0.99 [-10.85, -3.13] 0.98 [-4.29 2.57]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
LLR, D.A2011 efe Asgharian2016 eonora Scorletti2020 ohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ii Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) aterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = st for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.020) tudy or Subgroup 2.1 phytonutrients bbas Ali Sangouni 2020 ii Pezeshki2016 youngduck Han2020 avood Soleimani(Gartic)2020 avood Soleimani(Gartic)2020 avood Soleimani(Gartic)2020	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); l ² = 00001) interv Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.59 -2.77	rention gr SD 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gro SD 10.09 11.69 10.7 6.97 16.57	roup <u>Total</u> 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 163 500 Total 45 35 38 47 24 47 24 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22	con Mean 4.1 7.177 -6.32 2.8 com <u>Mean</u> 1.9 -3.07 -0.13 1.4 -2.39	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 226.39 23.3 19.17 rol gro <u>SD</u> 8.55 13.07 0.26 8.6 9.7 9.23.3	Dup Total 14 36 44 22 167 Total 43 36 41 51 25	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.6% 6.5%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-8.99, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] 20.40 [4.0, 42, 73]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 LLER, D.A2011 Lefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 lohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ui Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% Cl) eterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0 Ludy or Subgroup .2.1 phytonutrients bbas Ali Sangouni 2020 li Pezeshki2016 youngduck Han2020 lavood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 aezoh Askari2014 otemab Lacidi020	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); l ² = 00001) interv Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.59 -2.77 -3.15	ention gr 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gro SD 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.7 6.97 16.58 12.26	roup <u>Total</u> 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 163 500 <u>Total</u> 45 35 38 38 47 24 23 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	con Mean 4.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8 con Mean 1.9 -3.07 -0.13 1.4 -2.39 -2.1	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 rol gro SD 8.55 13.07 0.26 8.6 9.7 19.83 7.22	Total 14 36 44 22 16 35 167 Total 43 36 41 51 25 22 22	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.6% 6.5% 4.3%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -6.99 [-10.85, -3.13] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] -29.40 [-40.10, -18.70]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 LLER, D.A2011 tefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 lohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ui Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0 construction of the state of the	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 -2.3 0.65); * = 00001) interv Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.59 -2.77 -31.5 -5.7 -3.15	ention gr 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gro sp 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.79 16.58 13.06 22.6	Total 14 38 455 17 19 30 163 163 163 163 163 163 163 163 163 163	con Mean 4.1 7.17 -6.32 2.8 con Mean 1.9 -3.07 -0.13 1.4 -2.39 -2.1 1.0 3.07	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 rol gro SD 8.55 13.07 0.26 8.69 7 19.83 7.39 20.2	Dup Total 14 36 44 22 16 35 167 wp Total 43 36 41 51 52 22 31 25 22 31	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.6% 6.5% 5.7%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] -29.40 [-4.0, 75, -0.05] 52.89 [-7.54, 52.54] -29.40 [-4.0, 75, -0.05] -5.40 [-10.75, -0.05] -	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 tefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 lohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ui Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% Cl) leterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.02000) itudy or Subgroup .2.1 phytonutrients bbas Ali Sangouni 2020 lii Pezeshki2016 tiyoungduck Han2020 vavood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 vavood Soleimani(Gropolis)2020 iaezeh Askari2014 atemeh Izadi2020 i Cheol Bae2015 i Cheol Bae2015	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 -2.3 0.65); ² = 00001) interv Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.59 -2.77 -31.5 -5.7 -26.1	rention gr SD 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% = 0	Total 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 163 163 163 163 163 163 163 163 163	con Mean 4.1 7.17 -6.32 2.8 con Mean 1.9 -3.07 -0.13 1.4 -2.39 -2.1 -0.3 -0.72	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 2.6.39 23.3 19.17 scol gro \$D 8.55 13.07 0.26 8.66 6.97 19.83 7.39 30.1	Dup Total 14 36 44 22 16 35 167 Wp Total 43 36 41 51 25 36 41 51 25 31 39 30	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 1.7% 6.6% 6.5% 1.7% 1.4%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-8.98, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -6.99 [-10.85, -3.13] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] -29.40 [-40, 10, -18.70] -5.40 [-10.75, -0.05] -25.38 [-37.25, -1.351] -20.05 [4.02, 40, -00, -00]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 Ltefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 lohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ui Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% Cl) eterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.020)	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); l ² = 00001) interv Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.27 -31.5 -2.77 -31.5 -2.6.1 -4 -2.2	ention gr 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% = 0% = 0% = 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.7 16.58 13.06 22.9 22.68 22.9	Total 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 163 163 163 163 45 35 35 35 35 35 38 47 24 23 30 39 39	con Mean 4.1 7.17 -6.323 -2.2 2.8 con Mean 1.9 -3.07 -0.13 1.4 -2.39 -2.1 -0.3 -0.72	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 score gro score score 8.55 13.07 0.26 6.97 19.83 7.39 30.1 29.47	Total 14 366 44 22 16 35 167 167 167 43 36 43 36 43 36 41 1 25 222 31 39 39 39	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.6% 1.7% 4.7% 4.3% 1.4% 1.4%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -6.99 [-10.85, -3.13] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] -29.40 [-40.10, -18.70] -5.30 [-37.25, -13.51] -2.00 [-14.69, 10.69] -25.40 [-40.75, -0.5] -25.40 [-40.75, -0.5] -25	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 LLER, D.A2011 Ltefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 lohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ui Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% Cl) leterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0 	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); ² = 00001) interv Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.59 -2.77 -31.5 -5.7 -3.15 -5.7 -2.3	ention gr 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gro sp 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.76 12.68 13.06 22.9 27.68 12.49	Total 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 163 163 163 163 163 163 163 163 163	con Mean 4.1, 7.17 -6.323 1.13 -2-2.8 con Mean 1.9 -3.07 -0.13 1.4 -2.39 -2.1 -0.3 -0.72 -2 -2 -0.72 -2 -2 -0.72	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 8.55 8.55 8.55 8.55 8.55 8.55 8.55 9.026 8.697 19.83 7.39 30.1 19.47 4.65	Total 14 366 44 22 16 35 167 167 167 43 36 41 51 25 22 23 31 39 39 211	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.6% 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.5% 4.7% 1.4% 1.3% 1.3%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] -29.40 [-4.0, 19, -18, 70] -5.38 [-3.72, -13.51] -2.00 [-14.69, 10.69] 1.85 [-3.74, 7.44] 0.70 (-0.00)	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 tefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 lohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ui Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% Cl) leterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0 	interve Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); l ² = 00001) interve Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.59 -2.77 -31.5 -5.77 -26.1 -4 0.8 -48.15	ention gr 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gro <u>SD</u> 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.7 6.97 16.58 13.06 22.9 27.68 12.49 11.93 2.4	roup <u>Total</u> 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 163 000 Total 45 35 35 35 35 38 47 24 23 30 39 39 39 39 39 39 39 39 39 39	con Mean 4.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8 con Mean 93.07 -0.13 1.4 -2.39 -2.1 -0.3 -0.72 -2.1.05 -9.42	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 rol gro <u>SD</u> 8.55 13.07 0.26 8.6 6.97 19.83 30.1 29.47 4.65	Total 14 366 44 22 16 35 167 167 167 167 167 167 167 167 135 167 167 167 167 167 167 167 167 167 167	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 1.7% 1.4% 1.7% 1.4% 1.3% 6.5% 1.4% 1.3% 0.5% 1.4%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -6.99 [-10.85, -3.13] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] -29.40 [-40, 10, -18.70] -5.40 [-10.75, -0.05] -25.38 [-37.25, -13.51] -2.00 [-14.69, 10.69] 1.85 [-3.74, 7.44] -38.73 [-46.04, -31.42]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 LLER, D.A2011 Lefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 lohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ui Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0 Ludy or Subgroup .2.1 phytonutrients bbas Ali Sangouni 2020 li Pezeshki2016 youngduck Han2020 lavood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 avood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 avood Soleimani(propolis)2020 aezeh Askari2014 atemeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 Tahboobe Hosseinikia 2020 tina Darand2019 tohammad Ali Javanmardi2018 ei-Wen Zhang2015	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); l ² = 00001) interv Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.59 -2.77 -31.5 -5.7 -26.1 -4 0.8 -48.15 -1.5	ention gr 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gr 5D 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.7 6.97 16.58 13.06 22.9 27.68 13.96 22.9 27.68	Total 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 163 163 45 35 38 47 24 45 35 38 47 24 23 30 39 39 39 22 219 34	con Mean 4.1.1 7.177 -6.32 1.133 -2 2.8 con Mean 1.9 -3.07 -0.13 1.49 -2.072 -2.2 -1.05 -9.42 -9.42	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 rol gro \$D 8.55 13.07 0.26 8.69 7.39 30.1 29.47 4.65 30.1 129.47	Dup Total 14 36 44 22 167 Total 43 36 41 51 25 22 31 39 39 21 39 21 39 21 39 22	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.6% 1.7% 4.5% 1.3% 4.5% 3.1% 10.6%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -6.99 [-10.85, -3.13] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] -29.40 [-40.10, -18.70] -5.40 [-10.75, -0.05] -25.38 [-37.25, -13.51] -2.00 [-14.69, 10.69] 1.85 [-3.74, 7.44] -38.73 [-46.04, -31.42] -1.50 [-2.91, -0.09]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 LLER, D.A2011 tefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 lohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ui Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0 tudy or Subgroup 2.1 phytonutrients bbas Ali Sangouni 2020 li Pezeshki2016 youngduck Han2020 avood Soleimani(Grafic)2020 avood Soleimani(Grafic)2020 avood Soleimani(Grafic)2020 avood Soleimani(Grafic)2020 avood Soleimani(Barlo)2020 i Cheol Bae2015 Iahboobe Hosseinikia 2020 lina Darand2019 lohammad Ali Javanmardi2018 ei-Wen Zhang2015 toya Navekar2017	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); ² = 00001) interv Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.59 -2.77 -31.5 -5.7 -2.61 -5.7 -2.8 -4.8 0.8 -48.15 -1.5 0.14	ention gr 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 e 0% ention gro sp 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.7 16.58 13.06 22.9 27.68 12.49 11.93 2.88 10.51	Total 14 38 45 177 193 163 Dup Total 45 35 38 47 24 30 39 22 19 34 21	con Mean 4.1.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8 con Mean 1.9 -0.13 1.4 -2.3 -0.72 -2.1.05 -9.42 -0.29 -0.29	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 rol gro <u>\$D</u> 8.55 13.07 0.26 8.697 19.83 7.39 30.1 29.47 4.65 11.03 29.47 4.65	Dup Total 14 36 44 22 16 35 167 Total 43 36 41 51 222 31 39 21 19 29 21	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.6% 6.5% 4.7% 1.4% 1.3% 4.5% 3.1% 10.6%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -6.99 [-10.85, -3.13] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] -29.40 [-4.0, 10, -18.70] -5.38 [-3.725, -13.51] -2.00 [-14.69, 10.69] 1.85 [-3.74, 7.44] -38.73 [-46.04, -31.42] -1.50 [-2.91, -0.09] 0.43 [-6.37, 7.23]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 LLER, D.A2011 tefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 lohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 uiu Lin Chong2021 iang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Chi² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0	interve Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); l ² = 00001) interve Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.59 -2.77 -31.5 -5.77 -26.1 -4 0.88 -48.15 -1.5 0.14 -1.268	ention gr 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gro SD 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.7 6.97 16.58 13.06 22.9 27.68 12.49 11.93 2.88 10.51 1.93 2.88 10.51	roup <u>Total</u> 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 50 53 53 84 7 24 23 30 39 39 22 19 34 132	con 4.1.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8 con Mean 1.9 -3.07 -0.13 1.4 -2.39 -2.1 0 -0.72 -2 2.0 -9.42 0.29 -0.42	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 rol gro <u>SD</u> 8.55 13.07 0.26 8.6 6.97 19.83 30.1 29.47 11.93 2.82 11.94 12.76	Dup Total 144 36 44 22 16 Total 43 36 41 51 25 26 39 39 21 39 21 39 21 39 21 22 23	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.6% 6.5% 1.4% 1.4% 1.4% 1.4% 1.4% 1.4% 1.4% 1.4	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -6.99 [-10.85, -3.13] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] -29.40 [-40, 10, -18.70] -5.40 [-10.75, -0.05] -5.38 [-37.25, -13.51] -2.00 [-14.69, 10.69] 1.85 [-3.74, 7.44] -38.73 [-46.04, -31.42] -1.50 [-2.91, -0.09] -0.43 [-6.37, 7.23] -12.26 [-18.13, -6.39]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 tefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 lohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ui Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Chi² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.02)	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); l ² = 00001) interv Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.57 -2.6.1 -5.77 -2.6.1 -3.55 -5.77 -2.6.1 -0.8 -1.55 0.14 -1.258	ention gr 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gr 5D 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.7 6.97 16.58 13.06 22.9 27.68 13.06 22.9 27.68 13.06 11.93 11.93 2.88 10.51 10.34	Total 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 163 163 163 163 163 163 163 163 163	con 4.1.1 7.177 -6.32 1.133 -2 2.8 con Mean 1.9 -3.07 -0.13 1.49 -2.105 -9.42 -9.42 0 0-0.29 -0.24 -0.5	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 rol gro \$D 8.55 13.07 0.26 8.69 7.39 30.1 29.47 4.65 2.30 7.39 30.1 29.47 4.65 2.32 11.94 12.76 6.10 2.82 11.94 12.76 11.03 2.82 11.94 12.76 11.03 2.82 11.03 2.82 11.03 2.82 11.03 2.82 11.03 2.82 11.03 2.82 1.03 1.03 1.03 1.03 1.03 1.03 1.03 1.03	Dup Total 14 36 44 22 16 35 167 Wp Total 43 36 41 51 22 31 52 39 21 39 21 29 21 22 22 23	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.6% 1.7% 4.7% 1.3% 4.5% 3.1% 1.4% 10.6% 3.4% 4.2% 0.4% 11.6%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -6.99 [-10.85, -3.13] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] -29.40 [-40.10, -18.70] -5.38 [-37.25, -13.51] -2.00 [-14.69, 10.69] 1.85 [-3.74, 7.44] -38.73 (-46.04, -31.42] -1.20 [-2.91, -0.09] 0.43 [-6.37, 7.23] -12.26 [-1.31, -6.39] 0.25 [-0.27, 0.77]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 tiefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 tohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 uiu Lin Chong2021 iang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); l ² = 00001) interv Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.27 -31.5 -5.77 -31.5 -26.1 -4 0.8 -48.15 -1.5 0.14 -12.5 30, df = 00001)	ention gr 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gro 5D 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.7 10.7 10.7 10.58 13.06 22.9 27.68 13.06 22.9 27.68 12.49 21.68 13.06 22.9 27.68 12.49 21.51 10.31 10.	Total 14 38 45 17 19 30 30 163 50p Total 45 35 38 47 45 35 38 47 42 23 30 39 39 22 21 13 23 39 39 22 21 13 24 70 00001)	con 4.1.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8 con Mean 1.9 -3.07 -0.13 1.4 -2.39 -2.1 -0.3 -0.72 -9.42 -9.42 -9.42 -0.42 -1.5 ; ² = 90	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 crol gro SD 8.55 13.07 0.26 8.65 13.07 0.26 8.65 13.07 0.28 13.07 0.28 2.30 11.94 12.94 11.03 2.82 11.94 12.94 1.03 2.82 11.94 12.94 1.03 2.82 11.94 1.03 2.82 11.94 1.03 2.82 1.94 1.94 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95 1.95	Dup Total 14 36 44 22 167 Total 43 36 41 51 25 22 36 41 51 25 22 39 39 21 29 22 468	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.6% 1.7% 4.5% 1.3% 4.5% 3.1% 10.6% 3.4% 4.2% 11.6% 82.1%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -6.99 [-10.85, -3.13] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] -29.40 [-40.10, -18.70] -5.38 [-37.25, -13.51] -2.00 [-14.69, 10.69] 1.85 [-3.74, 7.44] -38.73 [-46.04, -31.42] -1.20 [-2.91, -0.09] 0.43 [-6.37, 7.23] -12.26 [-1.33, -6.39] 0.25 [-0.27, 0.77] -4.79 [-6.49, -3.08]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 LLER, D.A2011 tefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 tohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 uiu Lin Chong2021 iang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); l ² = 00001) interv Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.27 -31.5 -5.77 -31.5 -5.77 -31.5 -5.277 -31.5 -5.277 -31.5 -5.277 -31.5 -5.277 -31.5 -1.5 -0.8 -1.5 -1.5 -1.5 -1.5 -1.25 -1.5 -1.5 -1.5 -1.5 -1.5 -1.5 -1.5 -1.	ention gr 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gro SD 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.27 16.58 13.06 22.9 27.68 12.49 27.68 12.49 27.68 12.49 27.68 12.49 21.68 13.06 22.9 27.68 12.9 27.68 12.9 27.68 12.9 27.68 12.9 2.88 10.51 2.88 10.54 10.55 1	roup Total 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 500 Total 45 35 38 47 45 35 38 47 23 30 39 22 21 9 34 21 22 470 00001)	con 4.1. 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8 con Mean 1.9 -3.07 -0.13 1.4 -2.39 -2.1 -0.3 1.4 -2.39 -2.1 -0.5 -0.72 -0.72 -0.72 -1.0 -0.2 -1.0 -0.2 -1.0 -0.2 -1.0 -0.2 -1.0 -0.2 -1.0 -0.2	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 50 8.55 13.07 0.26 6.697 19.83 7.39 30.1 29.47 4.65 30.1 1.94 7.39 30.1 2.947 4.65 11.03 2.82 11.94 1.03 2.82 11.94 7.39 30.1 2.947 4.95 3.01 1.03 2.95 1.03 1.03 1.03 1.03 1.03 1.03 1.03 1.03	Dup Total 14 36 41 22 167 Total 43 36 41 51 25 22 31 39 39 21 29 21 22 468	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.6% 4.3% 1.4% 1.3% 4.5% 3.1% 10.6% 3.4% 4.2% 11.6% 82.1%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -6.99 [-10.85, -3.13] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] -29.40 [-40.10, -18.70] -5.40 [-10.75, -0.05] -25.38 [-37.25, -13.51] -2.00 [-14.69, 10.69] 1.25 [-3.74, 7.44] -38.73 [-46.04, -31.42] -1.50 [-2.91, -0.09] 0.43 [-6.37, 7.3] -12.26 [-18.13, -6.39] 0.25 [-0.27, 0.77] -4.79 [-6.49, -3.08]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 LLER, D.A2011 LLER, D.A2011 tefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 tohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ui Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0 bitudy or Subgroup .2.1 phytonutrients bbas Ali Sangouni 2020 ui Pezeshki2016 iyoungduck Han2020 Javood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Javood Soleimani(Fragoolis)2020 Javood Soleimani(interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); * = 00001) interv Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.57 -0.21 -5.57 -0.21 -5.57 -2.57 -2.57 -2.57 -31.5 -5.7 -2.61 -3.5 -1.25 -1	ention gr 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gr 5D 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.7 16.58 13.06 22.9 27.68 12.49 11.51 2.88 10.51 10.34 0.75 14 (P < 0. 11.53	roup Total 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 163 500 Total 45 38 47 45 38 47 45 38 47 23 30 39 22 19 39 22 470 00001) 20	con 4.1. 7.177 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8 con Mean 1.9 -3.07 -0.13 1.4 -2.39 -2.1 -0.3 1.4 -2.39 -2.1 -0.3 -2.2 -0.22 -0.42 -1.5 ; ² = 9:3 -2.7 -2.5	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 rol gro \$D 8.55 13.07 0.26 8.65 13.07 0.26 8.69 11.03 29.47 4.65 11.03 29.47 1.03 2.82 11.94 12.76 1.94 1.04 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05	Total 14 36 44 22 16 35 167 167 167 167 43 36 41 51 52 22 31 39 21 19 29 21 29 22 2468	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.6% 6.6% 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 4.5% 3.1% 4.5% 3.4% 4.5% 3.4% 4.5% 3.4% 4.5% 3.4% 2.8	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] -29.40 [-40.10, -18.70] -5.38 [-37.25, -13.51] -2.00 [-14.69, 10.69] 1.85 [-3.74, 7.44] -38.73 [-46.04, -31.42] -1.50 [-2.91, -0.09] 0.43 [-6.37, 7.23] -12.26 [-18.13, -6.39] 0.25 [-0.27, 0.77] -4.79 [-6.49, -3.08]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 LLER, D.A2011 tefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 lohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 uiu Lin Chong2021 iang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Chi² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0	interve Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); ² = 00001) interve Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.59 -2.77 -31.5 -5.7 -26.1 -4 0.8 -48.15 -1.5 0.14 -1.268 -1.25 0.14 -1.268 -1.25 0.14 -1.25 -3.30, df = 00001) -4.4 -5.47	ention gr 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gro 5D 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.7 6.97 16.58 13.06 22.9 27.68 12.49 11.93 2.85 10.34 0.75 14 (P < 0. 11.53 8.31	Total 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 bup Total 45 35 38 47 24 30 39 22 19 34 21 32 470 000001) 20 20	con 4.1. 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2. 2.8 con Mean 1.9 -3.07 -0.13 1.4 -2.39 -0.72 -0.13 1.4 -2.39 -0.72 -0.29 -0.42 -1.5 ; ² = 93 -2.7 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.63 -0.72 -0.75 -0.72 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.62 -0.75 -0	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 rol gro <u>SD</u> 8.55 13.07 0.26 8.6 6.97 19.83 30.1 29.47 4.65 11.94 12.76 1 1.94 7 30.1 1.94 7 10.38	Dup Total 144 36 44 22 167 Total 43 36 43 36 41 51 25 39 39 21 29 22 468	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.6% 6.5% 4.7% 1.4% 11.7% 6.6% 6.5% 4.7% 1.4% 11.6% 82.1%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.18, -0.3] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] -29.40 [-40.10, -18.70] -5.40 [-10.75, -0.05] -25.30 [-37, 25, -13.51] -2.00 [-14.69, 10.69] 1.85 [-3.74, 7.44] -38.73 [-46.04, -31.42] -1.50 [-2.91, -0.09] 0.43 [-6.37, 7.23] -1.226 [-18.13, -6.39] 0.25 [-0.27, 0.77] -4.79 [-6.49, -3.08]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 tiefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 tohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 uiu Lin Chong2021 iang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); l ² = 00001) interv Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.27 -3.15 -5.77 -31.5 -5.77 -31.5 -2.6.1 -4 0.88 -1.25 -1.5 0.14 -1.25 -30, df = 00001) -4.4 -5.47 -4.4	ention gr 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gro SD 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.09 11.76 13.06 22.9 27.68 13.06 22.9 27.68 13.06 22.9 27.68 13.04 11.93 2.88 10.34 0.75 14 (P < 0. 11.53 8.31 2.18	Total 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 163 163 163 163 163 163 163 163 163	con 4.1.1 7.17 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8 con Mean 1.9 -3.07 -0.13 1.4 -2.39 -2.10 5.07 -0.2 -0.5 (12 = 9) -2.2 -0.42 -1.5 (12 = 9) -2.2 -2.7 -0.62 -2.7 -0.62 -2.7 -0.62 -2.7 -0.62 -2.7 -0.62 -2.7 -0.62 -2.7 -0.62 -2.7 -0.62 -2.7 -0.62 -2.7 -0.62 -2.7 -0.62 -2.7 -0.62 -2.7 -0.62 -2.7 -0.62 -2.7 -0.62 -2.7 -0.62 -2.7 -0.42 -0.7 -0.42 -2.77 -0.42 -2.77	trol gro 33.93 30.81 26.39 23.3 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 rol gro SD 8.55 13.07 0.26 8.65 13.07 0.26 8.66 6.97 19.83 7.39 30.1 29.47 4.65 30.11.03 2.82 11.94 12.76 11.03 2.82 11.94 7 30.1 1.03 2.82 11.94 7 30.1 1.03 2.82 11.94 7 30.1 1.03 2.82 11.94 11.03 2.82 11.03 2.82 11.03 2.84 11.03 2.85 11.03 1.04 1.04 1.04 1.04 1.04 1.04 1.04 1.04	2000 Total 14 366 444 222 167 167 167 167 167 167 167 167	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.6% 4.3% 11.7% 6.5% 1.4% 1.3% 4.5% 3.1% 10.6% 3.1% 11.6% 82.1%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -6.99 [-10.85, -3.13] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] -29.40 [-40.10, -18.70] -5.40 [-10.75, -0.05] -25.38 [-37.25, -13.51] -2.00 [-14.69, 10.69] -5.40 [-10.75, -0.05] -25.38 [-37.25, -13.51] -2.00 [-14.69, 10.69] 0.43 [-6.37, 7, 74] -38.73 [-46.04, -31.42] -1.20 [-18.13, -6.39] 0.25 [-0.27, 0.77] -4.79 [-6.49, -3.08] -1.70 [-9.35, 5.95] -4.85 [-10.59, 0.89] -1.70 [-9.35, 5.95] -4.85 [-10.59, 0.89] -1.64 [-3.04, 0.24]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
tudy or Subgroup LLER, D.A2011 LLER, D.A2011 LLER, D.A2011 Ltefe Asgharian2016 leonora Scorletti2020 tohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021 ui Lin Chong2021 ang BongAhn2019 otal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Chi ² = 3.35, df = 5 (P = est for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.0 bitudy or Subgroup .2.1 phytonutrients bbas Ali Sangouni 2020 vii Pezeshki2016 syoungduck Han2020 vavood Soleimani(Garric)2020 vavood Soleimani(Garric)2020 vavood Soleimani(Garric)2020 vavood Soleimani(Garric)2020 ina Darand2019 dina Darand2019 to Cheol Bae2015 Mahboobe Hosseinikia 2020 lina Darand2019 Nohammad Ali Javanmardi2018 bei-Wen Zhang2015 boya Navekar2017 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Lahra Namkhah2021 Subtotal (95% CI) est for overall effect: Z = 5.49; Chi ² = 198 est for overall effect: Z = 5.50 (P < 0.0 .2.2 Coenzyme Q10 imaz Jafarvand 2015 iamaz Farsi2015 Alahdieh Abbasalizad Farhangj2014 ubbtotal (95% CI)	interv Mean -7.3 3.13 -2 14 -5 -2.3 0.65); ² = 00001) interv Mean -2.2 -7.25 -0.21 -5.59 -2.77 -31.5 -5.7 -26.1 -4 0.8 -48.15 -1.5 0.14 -1.268 -1.25 0.14 -1.268 -1.25 -3.30, df = 00001) -4.4 -5.47 -4.4	ention gr 28.13 3.29 37.34 50.04 31.51 24.73 = 0% ention gr 5D 10.09 11.76 0.22 10.7 11.76 0.22 10.7 11.76 13.06 22.9 27.68 13.06 22.9 27.68 13.05 14.9 11.93 2.88 10.51 10.35 14.9 11.53 8.31 2.18	Total 14 38 45 17 19 30 163 163 163 163 163 163 163 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	con 4.1.1 7.177 -6.32 1.13 -2 2.8 con Mean 1.9 -3.07 -0.13 1.4 -2.39 -2.1 -0.72 -2.4 0 -0.22 -9.42 0 -0.29 -0.42 -1.5 ; ² = 9.3 -2.27 -0.62 -2.76	trol gro 33.93 2.36 30.81 26.39 23.3 19.17 8.55 13.07 0.26 8.65 13.07 0.26 8.69 11.03 29.47 4.65 11.03 2.82 11.94 12.76 1 %	2000 Total 14 366 44 422 166 355 167 167 167 167 167 167 167 167	Weight 0.3% 96.8% 0.2% 0.5% 1.4% 100.0% Weight 6.5% 4.3% 11.7% 6.6% 6.5% 1.7% 4.3% 1.4% 1.4% 2.9% 4.3% 10.6% 1.4%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -11.40 [-34.49, 11.69] -4.04 [-5.34, -2.74] 4.32 [-9.89, 18.53] 12.87 [-13.35, 39.09] -3.00 [-21.20, 15.20] -5.10 [-15.99, 5.79] -3.96 [-5.24, -2.69] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -4.10 [-8.00, -0.20] -4.18 [-9.96, 1.60] -0.08 [-0.19, 0.03] -6.99 [-10.85, -3.13] -0.38 [-4.28, 3.52] -29.40 [-40.10, -18.70] -5.38 [-37.25, -13.51] -2.00 [-14.69, 10.69] 1.85 [-3.74, 7.44] -38.73 [-46.04, -31.42] -1.50 [-2.91, -0.09] 0.43 [-6.37, 7.23] -1.26 [-18.13, -6.39] 0.25 [-0.27, 0.77] -4.79 [-6.49, -3.08] -1.70 [-9.35, 5.95] -4.85 [-10.59, 0.89] -1.84 [-3.04, -0.24] -1.82 [-3.15, -0.48]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl

 Total (95% CI)
 530

 Heterogeneity: Tau² = 5.01; Chi² = 205.73, df = 17 (P < 0.00001); I² = 92%

 Test for overall effect: Z = 5.56 (P < 0.00001)</td>

 Test for subarouo differences: Chi² = 7.22, df = 1 (P = 0.007). I² = 86.2%

FIGURE 5 Continued 50

531 100.0%

-4.26 [-5.76, -2.76]

-50

٠

-25 0 25 intervention group control group

	interve	ention gr	roup	cont	trol gro	up		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV. Fixed, 95% CI
ALLER, D.A2011	-5.7	13.68	14	4.7	13.46	14	1.4%	-10.40 [-20.45, -0.35]	
Atefe Asgharian2016	-1.02	3.47	38	1.78	1.78	36	92.9%	-2.80 [-4.05, -1.55]	
Eleonora Scorletti2020	0	17.43	45	0.3	27.04	44	1.6%	-0.30 [-9.77, 9.17]	
Nohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2021	2	17.31	17	-3.4	17.09	22	1.2%	5.40 [-5.50, 16.30]	
Pui Lin Chong2021	-2	18.33	19	1	16.09	16	1.1%	-3.00 [-14.41, 8.41]	
Sang BongAhn2019	-1.9	20.58	30	0.5	16.68	35	1.7%	-2.40 [-11.61, 6.81]	
Total (95% CI)			163			167	100.0%	-2.76 [-3.97, -1.56]	
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 4.64$, $df = 5$ (P = 0 Test for overall effect: Z = 4.51 (P < 0.00).46); I² = 0001)	0%							-50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group
IRE 5	foods a	nd diet;	arv sun	oleme	nts on	liver f	unction	(effect of A : antioxid	ants on ALT: B : probiotic/symbiotic/prebiotic

the vitamin D and control groups. Masoumeh et al. (55) found that ALT and AST levels decreased significantly after taking whole grain compared to the control group. The outcome indicators of hepatic fibrosis and steatosis were too few to be described.

3.6. Effect of functional foods and dietary supplements on lipid profiles

Eighteen trials (20, 23, 32–36, 38, 40–42, 44–48, 51, 53–55) assessed the effect of functional foods and dietary supplements on TG. The quantitative analysis of TG values indicated no significant reduction in TG after antioxidant supplementation [11 trials (20, 23, 32–36, 38, 40, 44, 48)] (MD: -0.13 mg/dL; 95% CI: -0.32, 0.07, P > 0.05) with high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 75\%$, P < 0.05) (Figure 6A). We were not able to perform a subgroup analysis to assess the source of heterogeneity as the number of papers on coenzyme Q10 subgroup was small. Our meta-analysis of five trials (43–47) involving probiotic, symbiotic, and prebiotic intake illustrated that these supplements had an unnoticeable effect on TG reduction (MD: -0.14 mg/dL; 95% CI: -0.42, 0.13, P > 0.05), with no heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$, P > 0.05) (Figure 6B). Sensitivity analysis showed that the results did not depend on any single study (Appendix S5 in the Supplementary material 1).

Consistently, nine datasets (30, 32–35, 39, 41, 42, 49) indicated no significant reduction in TC levels after taking antioxidant supplements compared to the control group (MD: -0.27 mg/dL; 95% CI: -0.58, 0.04, P > 0.05) (Figure 6C), with no heterogeneity ($I^2 =$ 18%, P > 0.05). Five datasets (43–47) on probiotic, symbiotic, and prebiotic supplements reported no significant decrease in TC levels after intervention (MD: 0.12 mg/dL; 95% CI: -0.18, 0.42, P > 0.05) (Figure 6D), with no heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$, P > 0.05). The results of the sensitivity analysis showed that excluding either study from the analysis did not change the overall effect (Appendix S6 in the Supplementary material 1).

The pooled effect size of 10 trials (30, 32–36, 39, 41, 42, 49) reported a significant impact of the antioxidant supplements on HDL-C (MD: 0.09 mg/dL; 95% CI: 0.01, 0.17, P < 0.05) and LDL-C (MD: -0.24 mg/dL; 95% CI: -0.46, -0.02, P < 0.05), with no heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$, P > 0.05; $I^2 = 1\%$, P > 0.05, respectively) (Figures 6E, G). Three trials (43–45) reported no significant effect of probiotic, symbiotic, and prebiotic supplementation on HDL-C (MD: 0.01 mg/dL; 95% CI: -0.09, 0.11, P > 0.05) and LDL-C (MD:

-0.18 mg/dL; 95% CI: -0.5, 0.14, P > 0.05), with no heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$, P > 0.05 for both) (Figures 6F, H). We performed a sensitivity analysis and found that excluding a particular study from the analysis did not change the overall effect on HDL-C and LDL-C (Appendices S7, S8 in the Supplementary material 1).

Four trials (52–55) reported no difference in TG, TC, HDL-C, and LDL-C levels of DHA/EPA, vitamin D, or whole grainarms of the trial. Rashidmayvan et al. (51) reported that *Nigella sativa* oil decreased TG, TC, HDL-C, and LDL-C levels with significant differences between the NS seed and placebo groups.

No evidence of publication bias was seen for TG (Begg's test P = 0.753; Egger's test P = 0.120), TC (Begg's test P = 0.488; Egger's test P = 0.424), LDL-C (Begg's test P = 0.913; Egger's test P = 0.0.138), and HDL-C (Begg's test P = 0.743; Egger's test P = 0.084).

4. Discussion

NAFLD is considered a metabolic disorder that is closely related to lifestyle. The number of studies about the relationship between diet, nutrition, food, and NAFLD has increased in recent years (56), but there have been no recommendations in the guidelines in terms of this relationship. This systematic review and meta-analysis summarized the adjuvant therapy effects of various nutritional interventions on NAFLD, including antioxidants, probiotic/symbiotic/prebiotic, fatty acid supplements, vitamin D, and whole grain, providing guidance for clinical application.

A total of 1,907 patients from 29 trials were included in this review. Eighteen trials assessed the impact of antioxidants on NAFLD. The mechanism may be related to their antioxidant activity and the ability to scavenge free radicals, such as inhibiting the early formation of lipid peroxides in the liver, blocking the transmission process of free radicals by interrupting the chain reaction, or indirectly scavenging free radicals by acting on enzymes related to free radicals (57, 58). For humans, it can reduce liver inflammation, decrease oxidative stress, inhibit lipid oxidation in serum, and finally reduce serum aminotransferase and improve serum lipids (24). This meta-analysis found that the antioxidants significantly reduced WC, ALT, AST, and LDL-C and increased HDL-C in NAFLD patients but did not change the BMI, TC, and TG levels. This meta-analysis found that the antioxidants significantly reduced WC, ALT, AST, and LDL-C and increased HDL-C in NAFLD patients but did not change the BMI, TC, and TG levels. The positive results were consistent

	interve	ention grou	р	co	ntrol group			Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Fixed, 95% C		IV. Fixed. 95% Cl
Abbos Ali Sangouni 2020	04.0	010525	45	0.1	0.0	12	20 5%	0.50 [0.96 0.14]		
Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020	-0.4 0	36 1	45	-1.8	40.4	43	29.5%	-0.50 [-0.86, -0.14]		
Davood Soleimani(Ganic)2020	-19.5	50.44	24	-22 24	50 44	25	0.0%	-7 10 [-35 35 21 15]		
Faezeh Askari2014	-0.5 7	7 72226	23	-0.03	81 25202	22	0.0%	-0 47 [-46 96 46 02]		
Fatemeh Izadi2020	-0.22 6	8 82071	30	-0.05	57 08345	31	0.0%	-0.17 [-31.95, 31.61]		
li Cheol Bae2015	0.05	220.3	39	0.08	84.3	39	0.0%	-0.03 [-74.06, 74.00]		
Mabboobe Hosseinikia 2020	-0.38 3	7 65005	19	-0.03	38 42541	19	0.0%	-0.35 [-24 54 23 84]		
Pei-Wen Zhang2015	-0.17 0	452614	34	-0.21	0 484984	29	70.4%	0.04 [-0.19 0.27]		•
Seved Reza Mirhafez2019	0.17 0	41.6	32	0.02	38.97	29	0.0%	-0.02 [-20.24 20.20]		_
Zahra Namkhah2021	-52 7	59.7	22	39.8	55.9	22	0.0% -	92 50 [-126 68 -58 32]	-	I
Subtotal (95% CI)	02.1	00.1	315	00.0	00.0	310	100.0%	-0.13 [-0.32, 0.07]		
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 39.45$, df = 9 (F Test for overall effect: Z = 1.26 (P = 0	⊃ < 0.000 0.21)	01); l² = 77°	%							
1.6.2 Coenzyme Q10										
Elnaz Jafarvand 2015	-0.19 5	58.30926	20	-0.18	54.00444	21	0.0%	-0.01 [-34.46, 34.44]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			20			21	0.0%	-0.01 [-34.46, 34.44]		
Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 0.00 (P = 1	1.00)									
Total (95% CI)			335			331	100.0%	-0 13 [-0 32, 0 07]		
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 30.45$ df - 10	(P < 0.00)	01) 12 = 750	10			501	/0	0.10[-0.02, 0.07]		
Test for overall effect: $7 = 1.26$ (P = 0	221)	51),1 - 15								-100 -50 0 50 100
Test for subgroup differences: $Chi^2 = 1.20$ (P = 0	0.00. df =	= 1 (P = 0.9	9), l ² = 1	0%						intervention group control group
i -										
	in	ntervention	group		control gr	oup		Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mea	an s	D To	tal Me	ean i	SD To	tal Weigl	IV. Fixed, 95% 0		IV. Fixed, 95% CI
ALLER, D.A2011	-0.	23 83.698	45	14 0	.14 50.276	44	14 0.0	% -0.37 [-51.51, 50.77	1	
Eleonora Scorletti2020	-0	0.2 1.1532	56	45	0 0.721	11	44 48.9	-0.20 [-0.60, 0.20]	i	
Mohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor202	21 -0	0.1 0.	68	17 -0	.07 0.	77	22 37.3	-0.03 [-0.49, 0.43]	i	•
D 111 01 0001										
Pui Lin Chong2021	0.	02 0.868	85	19 0	.28 1.3061	01	16 13.8	-0.26 [-1.01, 0.49]]	1
Sang BongAhn2019	0. -0	02 0.868 42 99.784	85 93	19 0 30 0	.28 1.3061 .05 102.	01 .96	16 13.8° 35 0.0°	% -0.26 [-1.01, 0.49] % -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91]]	
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019	0. -0.	02 0.868 42 99.784	85 93	19 0 30 0	.28 1.3061 .05 102.	01 .96	16 13.8° 35 0.0°	% -0.26 [-1.01, 0.49] % -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91]]	<u> </u>
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI)	0. -0.	02 0.868 42 99.784	85 93	19 0 30 0 25	.28 1.3061 .05 102.	01 .96 1:	16 13.8 ⁴ 35 0.0 ⁴ 31 100.0 ⁴	 -0.26 [-1.01, 0.49] -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13]]]	
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P =	0. -0. ? = 0.98); 0.31)	02 0.868 42 99.784 1 ² = 0%	85 93	19 0 30 0 25	.28 1.3061 .05 102.	01 96 1:	16 13.8' 35 0.0' 31 100.0'	 -0.26 [-1.01, 0.49] -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13]]] [-50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P =	0. -0. ? = 0.98); 0.31)	02 0.868 42 99.784 1 ² = 0%	85 93 1	19 0 30 0 25	.28 1.3061 .05 102.	01 96 1:	16 13.8' 35 0.0' 31 100.0'	 ~ -0.26 [-1.01, 0.49, ~ -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91] ~ -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13]] 	-50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P =	0. -0. 9 = 0.98); 0.31) interv	02 0.868 42 99.784 1 ² = 0% vention gro	85 93 1	19 0 30 0 25	.28 1.3061 .05 102.	01 96 1:	16 13.8' 35 0.0' 31 100.0'	 -0.26 [-1.01, 0.49 -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] Mean Difference]] [-50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group Mean Difference
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup	0. -0. 9 = 0.98); 0.31) interv Mean	02 0.868 42 99.784 1 ² = 0% vention gro SD	93 93 1 0up Total	25 Cr Mean	.28 1.3061 .05 102. ontrol grou SD	01 96 1: p <u>Total</u>	16 13.8' 35 0.0' 31 100.0' Weight	 0.26 [-1.01, 0.49] -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% Cl 	I	-50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020	0. -0. -0. 9 = 0.98); 0.31) interv <u>Mean</u> -0.3	02 0.868 42 99.784 1 ² = 0% vention gro <u>SD</u> 0.9	5 93 1 <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u> 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	25 Mean 0	.28 1.3061 .05 102. ontrol grou <u>SD</u> 0.953939	01 96 1: <u>p</u> <u>Total</u> 43	16 13.8' 35 0.0' 31 100.0' <u>Weight</u> 64.0%	 0.26 [-1.01, 0.49, -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91 -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09]]] 	-50 -25 0 25 50 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020	0. -0. 2 = 0.98); 0.31) interv <u>Mean</u> -0.3 -12.95	02 0.868 42 99.784 1 ² = 0% vention gro <u>SD</u> 0.9 26.6	5 93 1 <u>5</u> 93 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	19 0 30 0 25 Ca <u>Mean</u> 0 3.32	0.953939 24.2	01 96 1: p <u>Total</u> 43 51	16 13.8' 35 0.0' 31 100.0' <u>Weight</u> 64.0% 0.1%	 -0.26 [-1.01, 0.49, -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91 -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17]]] 	Mean Difference
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Gropolis)2020	0. -0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24	02 0.868 42 99.784 1 ² = 0% vention gro <u>SD</u> 0.9 266.6 23.97	5 93 1 <u>Total</u> 45 47 24	19 0 30 0 25 25 0 <u>Mean</u> 0 3.32 -3.14	28 1.3061 .05 102. 0.953939 24.2 23.97	01 96 1: P <u>Total</u> 43 51 25	16 13.8' 35 0.0' 31 100.0' <u>Weight</u> 64.0% 0.1% 0.1%	 Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33]]] I 	Mean Difference
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Grafic)2020 Davood Soleimani(propolis)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015	0. -0. -0. 0.31) interv <u>Mean</u> -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04	02 0.868 42 99.784 1 ² = 0% vention gro <u>SD</u> 0.9 26.6 23.97 30.05312	5 93 1 <u>Total</u> 45 47 24 20	19 0 30 0 25 25 0 3.32 -3.14 0.04	28 1.3061 .05 102. 0.953939 24.2 23.97 37.2166	01 96 1: P <u>Total</u> 43 51 25 21	16 13.8' 35 0.0' 31 100.0' <u>Weight</u> 64.0% 0.1% 0.0%	 0.26 [-1.01, 0.49, -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] U. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66]]] I 	Mean Difference
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014	0. -0. -0. 0.31) interv <u>Mean</u> -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.86	02 0.868 42 99.784 1 ² = 0% vention groc 5D 0.9 26.6 23.97 30.05312 51.09589	5 93 1 <u>Total</u> 45 47 24 20 23	19 0 30 0 25 25 <u>Mean</u> 0 3.32 -3.14 0.04 -0.22	28 1.3061 .05 102. 0.953939 24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658	01 96 13 P <u>Total</u> 43 51 25 21 22	16 13.8' 35 0.0' 31 100.0' 31 100.0' 31 100.0' 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0%	 0.26 [-1.01, 0.49, -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] U. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.64 [-23.03, 21.75]]] I	Mean Difference
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(propolis)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020	0. -0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.86 -0.22	02 0.868 42 99.784 42 99.7	5 93 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	25 C Mean 0 3.32 -3.14 -0.22 -0.13	28 1.3061 .05 102. .05 102. .05 .0953939 .24.2 .23.97 37.21666 19.34658 .57.04446	01 96 1: P Total 43 51 25 21 25 21 31	16 13.8' 35 0.0' 31 100.0' 31 100.0' 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0%	 Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.39 [-52.89, 25.71]]] I 	Mean Difference
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(propolis)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Fazenh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015	0. -0. 0.31) interv Mean -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.22 -0.52	02 0.868 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 45 25075 51.09589 45.25075 53.585034	5 93 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	19 0 30 0 25 25 -3.14 -0.22 -0.13 0.06	28 1.3061 .05 102. 0.953939 24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658 57.04446 40.98258	01 96 1: P Total 43 51 25 21 25 21 22 31 19	16 13.8'' 35 0.0'' 31 100.0'' 31 100.0'' 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	 Mean Difference V. Fixed, 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -110 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-26.66, 20.66] -0.68 [-25.06, 23.90]]] I	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019	0. -0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.86 -0.22 -0.52 0.25	02 0.868 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 90.784 42 90.784 90.9 26.6 23.97 30.05312 51.09589 45.25075 35.85034 0.816149	5 93 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 2 3 1 1 9 3 4	25 cc Mean 0 3.322 -3.14 0.04 0.022 -0.13 0.066 0.43	28 1.3061 .05 102. 0.953939 24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658 57.04446 40.98258 1.212436	01 96 1: Total 43 51 25 21 22 31 31 29 29	16 13.8'' 35 0.0'' 31 100.0'' 31 100.0'' 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 35.7%	 0.26 [-1.01, 0.49, -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] (V. Fixed, 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.64 [-23.03, 21.75] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.58 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.18 [-0.70, 0.34]]] I	Mean Difference
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Grafic)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021	0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 -0.25 -0.22 -0.52 0.25 -0.23	02 0.868 42 99.784 1 ² = 0% vention gro <u>SD</u> 0.9 26.6 2.9.7 30.05312 51.09589 45.25075 35.85034 0.816149 27.79	55 93 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	cc 25 25 25 30 0 25 25 0 3.322 -3.14 0.04 -0.22 -0.13 0.06 0.43 0.01	28 1.3061 .05 102. 0.953939 24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658 57.04446 40.98258 1.212436 26.65	01 96 1: P Total 43 51 25 21 22 31 19 29 29	16 13.8" 35 0.0" 31 100.0" 31 100.0" 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1%	 0.26 [-1.01, 0.49, -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] 0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] 1.02 [-0.59, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.64 [-23.03, 21.75] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.38 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33]]] I	Mean Difference
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(propolis)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021	0. -0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.36 -0.22 -0.52 0.25 -0.23	02 0.868 42 99.784 1 ² = 0% vention gro 0.9 26.6 23.97 30.05312 51.09589 45.25075 35.85034 0.816149 27.79	55 93 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	25 cc 25 25 25 0 0 3.32 -3.14 0.04 0.04 0.04 0.43 0.11	28 1.3061 .05 102. 0.953339 24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658 57.04446 40.98258 1.212436 26.65	01 96 <u>Total</u> 43 51 25 22 31 19 29 29	16 13.8' 35 0.0' 31 100.0' 31 100.0' 31 100.0' 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0	 0.26 [-1.01, 0.49, -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91 -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] 1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.64 [-23.03, 21.75] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.58 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.18 [-0.70, 0.34] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33]]] I	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI)	0. -0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.86 -0.22 -0.52 0.25 -0.23	02 0.868 42 99.784 1 ² = 0% vention gro 0.9 26.6 23.97 30.05312 51.09589 45.25075 35.85034 0.816149 27.79	55 93 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	c Mean 0 3.32 -3.14 0.04 -0.22 -0.13 0.06 0.43 0.11	28 1.3061 .05 102. .05 102. .05 102. .05 202. .0953939 .24.2 .23.97 37.21666 19.34658 .57.04446 40.98258 1.212436 .26.65	01 96 Total 43 51 25 21 25 21 22 31 19 29 29 270	16 13.8' 35 0.0' 31 100.0' 31 100.0' 31 100.0' 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 35.7% 0.1% 100.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.64 [-23.03, 21.75] -0.58 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.18 [-0.70, 0.34] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04]]] I	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (f	0. -0. 0.31) interv Mean -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.82 -0.52 0.25 -0.23 P = 0.28);	02 0.868 42 99.784 42 99.794 42 99.7	55 33 1 1 5000 5000 5000 5000 5000 5000	19 0 30 0 25 25 -3.14 0.04 -0.22 -0.13 0.06 0.43 0.11	28 1.3061 .05 102. 0.953939 24.2 23.97 37.21666 40.98258 1.212436 26.65	01 96 Total 43 51 25 21 22 31 19 29 29 29 270	16 13.8" 35 0.0" 31 100.0" 31 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 35.7% 0.1% 100.0% 100.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-26.69, 20.66] -0.64 [-23.03, 21.75] -0.9 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.58 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.18 [-0.70, 0.34] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04]		Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlo;2020 Davood Soleimani(Gropolis)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (f Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P =	0. -0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.86 -0.22 -0.25 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23	02 0.868 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 90.784 0.9 26.6 23.97 30.05312 51.09589 45.25075 35.85034 45.25075 35.85034 45.25075 35.85034 45.25075 35.85034 45.2779 45.2779	55 333 1 1 Total 455 47 24 20 23 300 19 34 32 274	119 0 30 0 25 25 <u>Mean</u> 0 3.322 -3.14 0.044 0.433 0.11	28 1.3061 .05 102. 0.953939 24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658 57.04466 40.98258 1.212436 26.65	01 96 1: 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	16 13.8'' 35 0.0'' 31 100.0'' 31 100.0'' 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 35.7% 0.1% 100.0%	 0.26 [-1.01, 0.49, -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] (V. Fixed, 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.64 [-23.03, 21.75] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.58 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] 		Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (f Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P =	0. -0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 -0.86 -0.22 -0.52 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.28); :0.09)	02 0.868 42 99.784 42 99.779 42 99.779 42 97.79 42 97.79 42 97.79 42 97.79 42 97.79	55 33 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	25 Cc 25 Cc Mean 0 0 3.322 -3.14 0.044 0.024 0.066 0.433 0.111	28 1.3061 .05 102. 0.953939 24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658 57.04446 40.98258 1.212436 26.65	01 96 Total 43 51 25 21 22 21 22 29 29 29 270	16 13.8" 35 0.0" 31 100.0" 31 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 35.7% 0.1% 100.0% 100.0%	 0.26 [-1.01, 0.49, -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91 -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] 0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] 1.14 [-0.42, 0.13] 1.15 [-0.30, [-0.69, 0.09] -0.64 [-23.03, 21.75] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.58 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.18 [-0.70, 0.34] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] 		Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(propolis)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (f Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P =	0. -0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23	02 0.868 42 99.784 1 ² = 0% vention groc <u>SD</u> 0.9 26.6 2.9.7 30.05312 51.09589 45.25075 35.85034 0.816149 27.79 1 ² = 18%	55 33 Total 45 47 24 20 23 30 19 34 32 274	19 0 30 0 25 25 -3.14 0.04 -0.22 -0.13 0.06 0.43 0.11	28 1.3061 .05 102. 0.953939 24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658 57.0446 40.98258 1.212436 26.65	01 96 Total 43 51 25 21 22 31 19 29 29 29 270	16 13.8' 35 0.0' 31 100.0' 31 100.0' 64.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 100.0%	 0.26 [-1.01, 0.49, -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] 0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] 1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.64 [-23.03, 21.75] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.38 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.38 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04]] 	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garilo;2020 Davood Soleimani(Gropolis)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (f Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P =	0. -0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.86 -0.22 -0.52 0.25 -0.23 -0.23 -0.28); 0.09)	02 0.868 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 50.784 50.784 50.785 51.09589 45.25075 35.85034 0.816149 27.79 1 ² = 18%	55 33 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	19 0 30 0 25 25 -3.14 0.04 -0.22 0.13 0.06 0.43 0.11	28 1.3061 .05 102. 0.953939 24.2 23.97 37.21666 40.98258 1.212436 26.65	01 96 1: 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	16 13.8" 35 0.0" 31 100.0" 31 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 100.0% 100.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.64 [-23.03, 21.75] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.58 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.18 [-0.70, 0.34] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04]		Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (f Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P =	0. -0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.86 -0.22 -0.25 -0.23 -0.24 -0.25 -0.22 -0.23 -0	02 0.868 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 0.9 0.9 26.6 23.97 30.05312 51.09589 45.25075 51.09589 45.25075 51.09589 45.25075 35.85034 0.816149 27.79 1 ² = 18%	255 333 1 1 2000 201 201 201 201 201 201 201 20	19 0 30 0 25 C C Mean 0 3.322 -3.14 0.04 0.43 0.11	control grou 50 0.953939 24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658 57.04446 26.65 26.65	01 96 70 70 70 11 25 21 25 21 22 31 39 29 29 29 270	16 13.8' 35 0.0' 31 100.0' 31 100.0' 64.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0%	 Mean Difference V. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.58 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI 		Mean Difference -20 -10 0 10 20 intervention group control group
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (F Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P = Study or Subgroup	0. -0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.28); 0.09) int	02 0.868 42 99.784 1 ² = 0% vention gro <u>SD</u> 0.9 26.6 2.9.7 30.05312 51.09589 45.25075 35.85034 0.816149 27.79 1 ² = 18% tervention f <u>S</u> 6 43 370 6 43 370 6 43 370 1 ² = 18 4 1 ² = 18%	55 33 Total 45 47 24 20 30 19 34 32 274 group D Total	al Mean (1) (1) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2	28 1.3061 .05 102. 0.953939 24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658 57.0446 40.98258 1.212436 26.65 control gro an S 1.482564 2.4.25 2.4.45 2.4.25 2.4.45 2.4.25 2.4.25 2.4.25 2.4.25 2.4.25 2.4.55 2.4.45 2.4.55 2.4.45 2.4.55 2.4.45 2.4.55 2.55 2.55 2.55 2.55 2.55 2.55 2.55 2.55 2.55	01 96 701 43 51 25 21 22 31 19 29 29 29 29 29 270	16 13.8" 35 0.0" 31 100.0" 31 100.0" 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.1% 100.0% 100.0%	 Mean Difference V. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.34 [-0.70, 0.34] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] 		Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% Cl -20 -10 0 10 20 intervention group control group
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (F Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P = Study or Subgroup ALLER, D.A2011 Eleonora Scorletti2020	0. -0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.86 -0.22 -0.52 0.25 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.29) -0.23 -0.29) -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.	02 0.868 42 99.764 1 ² = 0% vention gro <u>SD</u> 0.9 26.6 23.97 30.05312 51.09569 45.25075 35.85034 0.816149 27.79 1 ² = 18% tervention <u>S</u> 6 43.3729 1 0 98488	55 33 1 Total 45 47 24 20 23 30 19 34 32 274 group D Tot 6 6	cc 30 0 225 -3.14 0.04 -0.22 -0.13 0.06 0.43 0.11	28 1.3061 .05 102. .05 1	01 96 Total 43 51 25 21 25 21 25 21 29 29 29 270 270	16 13.8" 35 0.0" 31 100.0" 31 100.0" 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 100.0% 0.1% 100.0% 0.0% 100.0% 0.0% 100.0% 0.0%	 Mean Difference V. Fixed. 95% CI -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.64 [-23.03, 21.75] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.58 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.18 [-0.70, 0.34] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.15 [-34.14, 33.84] 0.20 [-18.0 569] 		Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -20 -10 0 10 20 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (F Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P = Study or Subgroup ALLER, D.A2011 Eleonora Scorletti2020 Mohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2007	0. -0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.36 -0.22 -0.52 0.25 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.25 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.	02 0.868 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 0.9 26.6 23.97 30.05312 51.09589 45.25075 35.85034 0.816149 27.79 1.028488 43.3729 1.0.98488 20.0000000000000000000000000000000000	55 33 1 Total 45 47 24 20 23 34 32 274 group D Tot 6 3 4 3 2 7 4 3 4 3 2 3 4 5 4 7 2 4 5 4 7 2 4 5 4 7 2 4 5 4 7 2 4 5 4 7 2 4 5 4 7 2 4 7 2 4 5 4 7 2 4 7 2 4 7 2 4 7 2 4 7 2 4 7 2 4 7 2 4 7 2 4 7 2 4 7 7 2 4 7 7 2 4 7 7 2 4 7 7 7 4 7 7 4 7 7 7 4 7 7 7 4 7 7 7 4 7 7 7 7 4 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	cc 30 0 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	28 1.3061 .05 102. .05 102. .05 102. .0953939 24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658 57.04446 40.98258 1.212436 26.65 .26.6	01 96 Total 43 51 25 21 25 21 29 29 29 270 270	16 13.8" 35 0.0" 31 100.0" 31 100.0" 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 35.7% 0.1% 100.0% 10% 100.0% 0.1% 20.8% 2.18%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.64, 23.03, 21.75] -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.64 [-23.03, 21.75] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.58 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.18 [-0.70, 0.34] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.15 [-34.14, 33.84] 0.20 [-0.18, 0.58] 0.18 [-0.45.081]]] 	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (f Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P = Study or Subgroup ALLER, D.A2011 Eleonora Scorletti/2020 Mohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2027 Pui Lin Chong2021	0. -0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.22 -0.25 -0.23 -0.22 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.22 -0.23 -0.24 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.	02 0.868 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 0.9 0.9 0.9 26.6 23.97 30.05312 51.09589 45.25075 35.85034 0.816149 27.79 12 = 18% 46 43.3729 1 0.98488 23 0.9 1 0.98488 23 0.9 1 0.98488	274 33 55 33 55 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57	(1) 0 30 0 25 (c) (25 (c) (25) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c)	control grou <u>SD</u> 0.9539399 24.2 23.97 37.21666 40.98258 1.212436 26.65 26.65 21.12436 26.65 21.12436 2	01 96 Total 43 51 25 21 22 31 19 29 29 270 270	16 13.8" 35 0.0" 31 100.0" 31 100.0" 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.1% 100.0% 100.0% al Weight 4 0.0% 2 22.8% 6 15.4"	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.64, 20.6] -0.47 [-49.85, 48.91] -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-22.66, 20.66] -0.64 [-23.03, 21.75] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.58 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.18 [-0.70, 0.34] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.15 [-34.14, 33.84] 0.20 [-0.18, 0.58] 0.18 [-0.45, 0.81] -0.38 [-0.45, 0.81] -0.38 [-0.45, 0.4]		Mean Difference V. Fixed. 95% Cl -20 -10 0 10 20 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% Cl
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(propolis)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (f Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P = Study or Subgroup ALLER, D.A2011 Eleonora Scorletti2020 Mohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2027 Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019	0. -0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23); -0.09) int <u>Meaa</u> 0.1 -0.2 -0.1 -0.2 -0.28); -0.28); -0.21 -0.28); -0.21 -0.22 -0.28); -0.21 -0.22 -0.22 -0.22 -0.22 -0.23); -0.22 -0.22 -0.23 -0.22 -0.23 -0.22 -0.23 -0.22 -0.23 -0.22 -0.23 -0.22 -0.23 -0.22 -0.23 -0.22 -0.23 -0.22 -0.23 -0.22 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.22 -0.23 -0.24 -0.24 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.24	$\begin{array}{c} 0.2 & 0.868 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 0.9 & 0.9 \\ 26.6 \\ 2.97 \\ 30.05312 \\ 51.09589 \\ 45.25075 \\ 35.85034 \\ 0.816149 \\ 27.79 \\ 45.25075 \\ 35.85034 \\ 0.816149 \\ 27.79 \\ 47.79 \\ 47.79 \\ 12 & 18\% \\ 13.284 \\ 10.98488 \\ 33 & 0.9 \\ 91 & 1.3284 \\ 33 & 0.9 \\ 91 & 1.3284 \\ 34 & 0.9 \\ 11.105 \\ 11$	55 33 Total 45 47 24 47 24 20 23 30 19 34 32 274 Total 6 4 5 4 7 7 24 20 274 32 274	al Mean (1) 0 (2) 25 (2) 25	2.28 1.3061 .05 102. .05 102. .05 102. .0953939 24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658 57.0446 40.98258 1.212436 26.65 .031 48.2546 .1 0.84858 .1 0.84855 .1 0.84855 .1 0.97216 .2 38.0542 .2 38.0542 .1 0.97216 .2 38.0542 .2	01 96 701 43 51 25 21 22 31 19 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29	16 13.8" 35 0.0" 31 100.0" 31 100.0" 31 100.0" 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.1% 100.0% 0.1% 100.0% 100.0% 2 2.8% 6 15.4% 5 0.0"	 Mean Difference V. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.34 [-0.70, 0.34] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04]]] 	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (F Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P = Study or Subgroup ALLER, D.A2011 Eleonora Scorletti2020 Mohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor202: Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019	0. -0. -0. 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.22 -0.52 0.25 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.	02 0.868 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 0.9 26.6 23.97 30.05312 51.09589 45.25075 35.85034 0.816149 27.79 45.25075 30.95324 10.95848 10.95848 10.95848 10.95848 10.95848 10.95848 10.95946 10.	55 33 1 Total 45 47 24 20 23 30 19 34 32 274 9 7 7 6 3 2 6 3 2 6 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	al Mean al al a	28 1.3061 .05 102. .05 1	01 96 Total 43 51 25 21 25 21 29 29 29 270 270	16 13.8" 35 0.0" 31 100.0" 31 100.0" 31 100.0" 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 0.1% 100.0% 0.1% 2 2.8% 4 61.8% 2 2.2.8% 6 15.4% 5 0.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] • -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] • -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] • -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] • -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] • -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] • -0.14 [-0.42, 0.13] • -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.58 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.18 [-0.70, 0.34] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] • 0.15 [-34.14, 33.84] • 0.20 [-0.18, 0.58] • 0.18 [-0.45, 0.81] • 0.28 [-1.04, 0.48] • 0.24 [-42.04, 41.56]		Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -20 -10 0 10 20 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (f Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P = Study or Subgroup ALLER, D.A2011 Eleonora Scorletti2020 Mohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2027 Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI)	0.1 -0.2 0.31) -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.22 -0.52 0.25 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25	02 0.868 42 99.784 42 99.7	55 33 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	al Mean al	28 1.3061 .05 102. .05 102. .05 102. .05 102. .0953939 .24.2 .23.97 .37.21666 19.34658 .57.04446 40.98258 1.212436 .26.65 .26.65 .26.65 .26.65 .26.85	01 96 7 7 7 0 1 2 5 2 1 2 5 2 1 2 5 2 1 2 2 9 2 9 2 9 2 9 2 9 2 9 2 9 2 9 2	16 13.8" 35 0.0" 31 100.0" 31 100.0" 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 100.0% 2.22.8% 6 15.4% 5 0.0% 1 100.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.64, 23.03, 21.75] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.34 [-0.70, 0.34] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.15 [-34.14, 33.84] 0.20 [-0.18, 0.58] 0.18 [-0.45, 0.81] -0.24 [-42.04, 41.56] 0.12 [-0.18, 0.42]	j] 	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garilo;2020 Davood Soleimani(Gropolis)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (f Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P = Study or Subgroup ALLER, D.A2011 Eleonora Scorletti2020 Mohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2022 Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.26 df = 4 (P	0. -0. -0. 0.31) interv Mean -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.36 -0.22 -0.25 -0.23 0.25 -0.23 0.25 -0.23 0.25 -0.23 0.25 -0.23 0.25 -0.23 0.25 -0.23 0.25 -0.23 0.09) interv Mean 0.1 0.2 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5 -0.5	02 0.868 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 6 23.97 30.05312 51.09589 45.25075 35.85034 0.816149 27.79 1.279 1.279 1.0.98488 30.99 3.0.99 3.00 3.00	55 33 1 Total 45 47 24 20 23 300 19 34 32 274 9 7 274 274 274 274 274 274 274	Image Image 30 0 30 0 25 25 25 - 3.322 - -3.344 0.044 -0.22 -0.13 0.066 0.433 0.11 -0.22 14 0.145 -0.77 0.135 -0.73 0.300 -0.22 -0.330	28 1.3061 .05 102. .05 102. .0953939 24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658 57.04446 40.98258 1.212436 26.65 .049 26.65 .049 .04858 .048458 .05 1.0 .048458 .05 1.0 .05 1.0 .05 .0 .05 .05 .0 .05 .05 .05 .05 .05 .05 .05 .05 .05 .05	01 96 Total 43 51 25 21 25 21 22 35 21 29 29 270 270 270	16 13.8" 35 0.0" 31 100.0" 31 100.0" 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.1% 100.0% 0.1% 100.0% 0.1% 4 0.0% 5 0.0% 1 100.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.42, 0.13] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.64 [-23.03, 21.75] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.58 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.18 [-0.70, 0.34] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.15 [-34.14, 33.84] 0.20 [-0.18, 0.58] 0.18 [-0.45, 0.81] -0.24 [-42.04, 41.56] 0.12 [-0.18, 0.42]		Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (f Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P = Study or Subgroup ALLER, D.A2011 Eleonora Scorletti2020 Mohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2027 Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.26, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 0.79 (P =	0. -0. -0. -0. -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 -0.22 -0.52 -0.23 -2.25 -0.23 -2.25 -0.23 -2.25 -0.23); -0.09) -1.01 -0.0 -0.1 -0.2 -0.28); -0.09) -0.21 -0.22 -0.28); -0.23 -0.28); -0.25 -0.28); -0.21 -0.25 -0.28); -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.28); -0.25 -0.28); -0.25 -0.28); -0.25 -0.2	$22 0.868 \\ 42 99.784 \\ 42 99.784 \\ 42 99.784 \\ 42 99.784 \\ 42 99.784 \\ 42 99.784 \\ 42 99.784 \\ 63.97 \\ 0.9 22.5075 \\ 35.85034 \\ 0.816149 \\ 27.79 \\ 45.25075 \\ 35.85034 \\ 0.816149 \\ 27.79 \\ 45.25075 \\ 35.85034 \\ 0.816149 \\ 27.79 \\ 12 2.878 \\ 10.98488 \\ 33 0.9 \\ 91 1.3284 \\ 33 0.9 \\ 91 1.3284 \\ 33 0.9 \\ 91 1.3284 \\ 34 0.9 \\ 11.095 \\ 2 2 0\% \\ 4 0.9 \\ 4 0$	55 33 Total Total 45 47 24 20 30 19 34 32 274 9700p Total 6 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	al Mean al	2.28 1.3061 .05 102. .05 102. .0953939 24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658 57.0446 40.98258 1.212436 26.65 .031 48.2546 .1 0.84855 .1 0.84855 .1 0.94855 .1 0.948555 .1 0.9485555 .1 0.9485555 .1 0.94855555 .1 0.948555555555555555555555555555555555555	01 96 70 11 22 31 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29	16 13.8" 35 0.0" 31 100.0" 31 100.0" 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.1% 100.0% 0.1% 100.0% 1 2 2.8% 6 15.4% 5 0.0% 1 100.0%	 Mean Difference V. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.34 [-0.70, 0.34] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04]]] I 	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(propolis)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (F Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P = Study or Subgroup ALLER, D.A2011 Eleonora Scorletti2020 Mohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor202: Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.26, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 0.79 (P = 0	0. -0. -0. -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -	$\begin{array}{c} 0.2 & 0.868 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 0.9 & 0.9 \\ 26.6 \\ 23.97 \\ 30.05312 \\ 51.09589 \\ 45.25075 \\ 35.85034 \\ 0.816149 \\ 27.79 \\ 45.25075 \\ 35.85034 \\ 0.816149 \\ 27.79 \\ 45.25075 \\ 35.85034 \\ 0.816149 \\ 27.79 \\ 45.25075 \\ 35.85034 \\ 0.816149 \\ 27.79 \\ 45.25075 \\ 35.85034 \\ 0.816149 \\ 27.79 \\ 45.25075 \\ 35.85034 \\ 0.91648 \\ 30.910 \\ 10.9488 \\ 30.910 \\ 10.91648 \\ 30.910 \\ 10.9108 \\ 10.91648 \\ 10.9108 \\ 10.9108 \\ 10.9108 \\ 10.9108 \\ 10.910$	55 33 1 Total 45 47 24 20 23 30 19 34 32 274 9 7 7 4 5 4 7 24 20 23 30 19 34 32 274 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	al Meen (1) 0 (2) 25 (2) 25	2.28 1.3061 .05 102. .05 102. .05 102. .05 102. .0953399 .24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658 .26.65 .26.55 .26.5	01 96 Total 43 51 25 21 25 21 25 21 29 29 29 270 D Tota 41 19 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29 29	16 13.8" 35 0.0" 31 100.0" 31 100.0" 31 100.0" 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 0.1% 2 2.8% 6 15.4% 5 0.0% 1 100.0%	 Mean Difference V. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -0.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.64 [-3.03, 21.75] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.58 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] Mean Difference W. Fixed. 95% CI -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] Mean Difference W. Fixed. 95% CI -0.15 [-34.14, 33.84] 0.20 [-1.8, 0.58] 0.18 [-0.45, 0.81] -0.28 [-1.04, 0.48] -0.24 [-42.04, 41.56] 0.12 [-0.18, 0.42]]] _ 	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (F Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P = Study or Subgroup ALLER, D.A2011 Eleonora Scorletti2020 Mohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2027 Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.26, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 0.79 (P = 0	$\begin{array}{c} 0.1\\ -0.2\\ -0.3\\ 0.31 \end{array}$ interv <u>Mean</u> -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.22 -0.52 0.25 -0.23 $D = 0.28);$ 0.09) interv <u>Mean</u> 0.1 0.2 -0.0 $D = 0.28;$ 0.09) interv <u>Mean</u> 0.1 0.2 -0.0 $D = 0.28;$ 0.1 0.2 -0.0 -0.5 $D = 0.87;$ 0.43)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.2 & 0.868 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 42 & 99.784 \\ 12 & 90.848 \\ 51.09589 \\ 51$	55 33 1 Total 45 47 24 20 23 30 19 34 32 274 9 7 2 6 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	al Mean (1) 0 (3) 0 (2) (2) (2) (3) (3) (3) (4) (4) (5) (4) (5) (5) (5) (5) (5) (5) (5) (5	28 1.3061 .05 102. .05 102. .05 102. .0953339 24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658 1.212436 26.65 .26.65	01 96 Total 43 51 25 21 25 21 22 31 19 29 29 270 D Tota 44 4 1 17 4 4 1 17 7 23 3 1 3 3 13	16 13.8" 35 0.0" 31 100.0" 31 100.0" 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.1% 100.0% 0.0% 100.0% 0.1% 202.8% 0.15.4% 5 0.0% 1 100.0%	 Mean Difference i.v. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.64 [-23.03, 21.75] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.58 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.15 [-34.14, 33.84] 0.20 [-0.18, 0.58] 0.18 [-1.04, 0.48] -0.24 [-42.04, 41.56] 0.12 [-0.18, 0.42]] 	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -20 -10 0 10 20 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -20 -10 0 10 20 intervention group control group
Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.41, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 1.02 (P = Study or Subgroup Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020 Davood Soleimani(Garilo;2020 Davood Soleimani(Gropolis)2020 Elnaz Jafarvand 2015 Faezeh Askari2014 Fatemeh Izadi2020 Pei-Wen Zhang2015 Seyed Reza Mirhafez2019 Zahra Namkhah2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 9.80, df = 8 (f Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P = Study or Subgroup ALLER, D.A2011 Eleonora Scorletti2020 Mohamad Hizami Mohamad Nor2022 Pui Lin Chong2021 Sang BongAhn2019 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.26, df = 4 (P Test for overall effect: Z = 0.79 (P = C	0. -0. -0. 0.31) interv Mean -0.3 -12.95 -4.24 0.04 -0.86 -0.22 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.23 -0.25 -0	02 0.868 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 42 99.784 0.9 26.6 23.97 30.05312 51.09589 45.25075 35.85034 0.816149 27.79 45.25075 35.85034 0.816149 27.79 46 43.3729 1 0.98488 23 0.9 9 1.3284 6 111.095 2 = 0%	55 33 1 Total 45 47 24 47 24 20 23 30 19 34 32 274 5 6 12 6 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	III 0 30 0 25 Centres Cent	28 1.3061 .05 102. .05 102. .05 102. .0953939 24.2 23.97 37.21666 19.34658 57.04446 40.98258 1.212436 26.65 .26.6	01 96 Total 43 51 25 21 25 21 29 29 29 270 D Tots 44 1 19 29 29 270	16 13.8'' 35 0.0'' 31 100.0'' 31 100.0'' 64.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 0.1% 100.0% 2.22.8% 6 15.4% 5 0.0% 1 100.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.64, 20.63] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.30 [-0.69, 0.09] -16.27 [-26.37, -6.17] -1.10 [-14.53, 12.33] 0.00 [-20.66, 20.66] -0.64 [-23.03, 21.75] -0.09 [-25.89, 25.71] -0.58 [-25.06, 23.90] -0.18 [-0.70, 0.34] -0.34 [-14.01, 13.33] -0.27 [-0.58, 0.04] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -0.15 [-34.14, 33.84] 0.20 [-0.18, 0.58] 0.18 [-0.45, 0.81] -0.24 [-42.04, 41.56] 0.12 [-0.18, 0.42]]]] 	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -20 -10 0 10 20 intervention group control group Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -20 -10 0 10 20 intervention group control group

	inte	ervention gro	oup	cor	trol grou	p		Mean Difference		Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mear	n SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weigh	nt IV. Fixed, 95%	CI	IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
Abbas Ali Sangouni 2020	0.1	0.2	45	0	0.264575	43	68.8	% 0.10 [0.00, 0.2	0]	-	
Davood Soleimani(Garlic)2020	0 1.6	5 7.3	47	0.7	9.1	51	0.19	% 0.90 [-2.35, 4.1	5]		
avood Soleimani(propolis)20	-0.31	6.55	24	-1.73	6.55	25	0.0	% 1.42 [-2.25, 5.0	9]		
Inaz Jafarvand 2015	0.04	8.643495	20	0.04	12.15633	21	0.0	% 0.00 [-6.43, 6.4	3]		
aezeh Askari2014	0.01	7.472617	23	0	5.632051	22	0.0	% 0.01 [-3.85, 3.8	7]		
atemeh Izadi2020	0.04	8.983874	30	-0.03	11.29026	31	0.0	% 0.07 [-5.04, 5.1	8]		
i Cheol Bae2015	0.02	2 5.6	39	0.01	5.3	39	0.1	% 0.01 [-2.41, 2.4]	3]		
ei-Wen Zhang2015	0.02	5.730236	19	0.01	11.63197	19	0.0	% 0.01 [-5.82, 5.8	4]		
eyed Reza Mirhafez2019	0.17	0.265141	34	0.1	0.32078	29	30.8	% 0.07 [-0.08, 0.2	2]	•	
ahra Namkhah2021	0.01	7.93	32	-0.1	5.76	29	0.1	% 0.11 [-3.35, 3.5	7]		
otal (95% CI)			313			309	100.0	% 0.09 [0.01, 0.17	1		
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.86, df	= 9 (P = 1.00	0); I ² = 0%							-10	-5 0 5	10
est for overall effect: Z = 2.20	0 (P = 0.03)								-10	intervention group control group	10
										intervention group - control group	
								Difference		Mana Difference	
	interventio	on group	C	ontrol g	roup		IV	lean Difference		Mean Difference	
tudy or Subgroup N	Mean	SD Tota	I Mean		SD Tot	al We	light	IV, Fixed, 95% CI		IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
LLER, D.A2011	0 11.75	5287 14	0.08	8.029	321 1	14 C	0.0% -	0.08 [-7.54, 7.38]		<u> </u>	
leonora Scorletti2020	0.01	0.2 45	5 0	0.360	555 4	14 73	3.6%	0.01 [-0.11, 0.13]		-	
ui Lin Chong2021	0.02 0.250	0599 19	9 0.01	0.345	109 1	16 26	5.3%	0.01 [-0.19, 0.21]		•	
otal (95% CI)		78	3		7	74 100	0.0%	0.01 [-0.09, 0.11]			
		$00) \cdot 12 = 00/$							+		+
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, o	df = 2 (P = 1	.00), 1 - 070							E 0		
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, d est for overall effect: Z = 0.	df = 2 (P = 1 19 (P = 0.85	5)							-50	-29 U 29 intervention group control group	50
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, d est for overall effect: Z = 0.	df = 2 (P = 1 19 (P = 0.85 inter	vention grou	p	contr	ol group	T-4-1 1	Af - 1 1 - 6	Mean Difference	-50	Mean Difference	50
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, iest for overall effect: Z = 0. udy or Subgroup	df = 2 (P = 1 19 (P = 0.85 inter <u>Mean</u>	vention grou SD	p Total M	contr lean	ol group	Total V	<u>Veight</u>	Mean Difference	-50	Mean Difference	50
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, iest for overall effect: Z = 0. udy or Subgroup ibas Ali Sangouni 2020	inter <u>Mean</u> <u>10</u> (P = 0.85	vention grou SD 0.655744	p <u>Total M</u> 45	contr lean 0 0.1	ol group SD 1 355744	Total V 43	<u>Veight</u> 63.2%	Mean Difference <u>IV. Fixed. 95%</u> -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0	-50 <u>c CI</u> 3]	Mean Difference	50
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, d jest for overall effect: Z = 0. udy or Subgroup ubas Ali Sangouni 2020 ivood Soleimani(Garlic)2020	intern Mean -0.3 -11.9	vention grou SD 0.655744 25.2	p <u>Total M</u> 45 47	contr lean 0 0.1 3.36	ol group SD 1 655744 26.3 22.44	Total V 43 51	<u>Veight</u> 63.2% 0.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0	-50 <u>CI</u> [3] [6]	Mean Difference	50
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, d est for overall effect: Z = 0. udy or Subgroup bas Ali Sangouni 2020 vood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 vood Soleimani(Gropolis)202	df = 2 (P = 1 19 (P = 0.85 <u>Mean</u> -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92	vention grou <u>SD</u> 0.655744 25.2 23.41 0.65270	p Total M 45 47 24	contr lean 0 0.1 3.36 3.08	ol group SD 1 555744 26.3 23.41 70405	Total V 43 51 25	Veight 63.2% 0.0% 0.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.5	-50 <u>CI</u> [3] [6] [5]	Mean Difference	
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (iest for overall effect: Z = 0. udy or Subgroup bas Ali Sangouni 2020 wood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 wood Soleimani(propolis)202 naz Jafarvand 2015	intern Mean -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92 0.09	vention grou SD 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679	p Total M 45 47 24 20	contr lean 0 0. 3.36 3.08 0.05 30	bl group SD 1 555744 26.3 23.41 .73125	Total V 43 51 25 21	Veight 63.2% 0.0% 0.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.9 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3	-50 <u>CI</u> 33] 66] 55]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (iest for overall effect: Z = 0. udy or Subgroup bas Ali Sangouni 2020 vood Soleimani(Grafic)2020 vood Soleimani(gropolis)202 naz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014	inten Mean -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92 0.09 -0.49 -0.9	vention grou SD 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433	p Total M 45 47 24 20 23 -	contr lean 0 0. 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.13 20	bl group SD 1 555744 26.3 23.41 .73125 .86121 24052	Total V 43 51 25 21 22	<u>Weight</u> 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0] -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0] -2.16 [-15.27, 10.9] 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3] -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5]	-50 CI 13] 16] 15] 16]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl	
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (iest for overall effect: Z = 0, udy or Subgroup bas Ali Sangouni 2020 vood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 vood Soleimani(Gropolis)202 naz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Chord Pac 2015	intern Mean -0.3 -11.9 0 .92 0.09 -0.49 -0.25 0.00	vention grou SD 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127	p <u>Total</u> M 45 47 24 20 23 - 30 - 20	contr lean 0 0.1 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.13 20 0.21 35 0.21	bl group SD 1 555744 26.3 23.41 .73125 .86121 .61053 .42.0	Total V 43 51 25 21 22 31 20	Veight 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	Mean Difference <u>IV. Fixed. 95%</u> -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0] -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0] -2.16 [-15.27, 10.2] 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3] -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5] -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3] 0.09 [-2.41, 14.5]	-50 <u>CI</u> 33] 46] 45] 46] 49] 47]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl	
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, d est for overall effect: Z = 0, udy or Subgroup bas Ali Sangouni 2020 vood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 vood Soleimani(propolis)202 naz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 i Wor Zhoar2015	intern Mean -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92 0.09 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 0.49	vention grou <u>SD</u> 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.2 23.21027	p <u>Total M</u> 45 47 24 20 23 -1 30 -1 30 -1 30	contr lean 0 0.1 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.21 35 0.01	bl group <u>SD</u> 555744 26.3 23.41 .73125 .86121 .61053 13.9 82240	Total V 43 51 25 21 22 31 39 10	Veight 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.5 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3 -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5 -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3 0.08 [-8.41, 8.5 0.44 [-12.22, -20.5	-50 CI 33] 66] 55] 66] 59] 57] 57]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, d est for overall effect: Z = 0. udy or Subgroup bas Ali Sangouni 2020 vood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 vood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 vood Soleimani(propolis)202 naz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 i-Wen Zhang2015 ued Para Mitchofer2010	inter Mean -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92 0.09 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.48 0.09 -0.48 -0.25 0.09 -0.48 -0.3 -0.3 -0.5 -0	vention grou SD 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.2 23.61297 0.56407	p <u>Total M</u> 45 47 24 20 23 -1 30 -1 39 19 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2	contr lean 0 0. 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.13 20 0.21 35 0.01 15 0.04 15 0.04 15	bl group <u>SD</u> 555744 26.3 23.41 .61053 13.9 .83349 M32e7	Total V 43 51 25 21 22 31 39 19 20	Veight 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.9 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3 -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5 -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3 0.08 [-8.41, 8.5 -0.44 [-13.22, 12.3 -0.04 [-0.47, 04	-50 CI 33] 36] 55] 36] 99] 37] 37] 37] 44]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
Idy or Subgroup bas Ali Sangouni 2020 vood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 vood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 vood Soleimani(propolis)202 iaz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 i-Wen Zhang2015 yed Reza Mirhafez2019 bra Namkab2021	intern 19 (P = 0.85 19 (P = 0.85 Mean -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92 0.09 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.48 0.16 0 10	vention grou <u>SD</u> 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.2 23.61297 0.56107 27.94	p <u>Total</u> M 45 47 24 23 -1 30 -1 39 19 -1 32 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1	contr lean 0 0. 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.21 35 0.01 0.04 15 0.27 0. 0.28	bl group SD 1 555744 26.3 23.41 .73125 .86121 .61053 13.9 .83349 343267 20.32	Total V 43 51 25 21 22 31 39 19 29 29	Veight 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 36.6%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.9 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3 -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5 -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3] 0.08 [-8.41, 8.5 -0.44 [-13.22, 12.3 -0.11 [-0.47, 0.2 -0.47 [-12.65 44]	-50 CI 33] 66] 55] 66] 57] 67] 69] 67] 69] 67] 69] 67] 69] 69] 69] 69] 69] 69] 69] 69	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (iest for overall effect: Z = 0. bas Ali Sangouni 2020 vood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 vood Soleimani(gropolis)202 naz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 i-Wen Zhang2015 yed Reza Mirhafez2019 hra Namkhah2021	intern Mean -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92 0.09 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.48 0.16 -0.19	vention grou SD 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.2 23.61297 0.56107 27.91	p <u>Total</u> M 45 47 24 23 -1 30 -1 39 19 -1 34 -1 32 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1	contr lean 0 0.1 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.05 30 0.01 32 0.01 35 0.01 0.13 20 0.21 35 0.01 0.13 20 0.22 0.3 0.28	bl group SD 1 555744 26.3 23.41 .73125 .86121 .61053 13.9 .83349 343267 20.38	Total V 43 51 25 21 22 31 39 19 29 29	Veight 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 36.6% 0.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0] -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0] -2.16 [-15.27, 10.9] 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3] -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5] -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3] 0.08 [-8.41, 8.5] -0.44 [-13.22, 12.3] -0.11 [-0.47, 0.2] -0.47 [-12.66, 11.7]	-50 Cl 33] 66] 55] 56] 57] 57] 54] 55] 57] 52]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl	
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (² est for overall effect: Z = 0. ² overall effec	inten Mean -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92 0.09 -0.49 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.48 0.16 -0.19	vention grou SD 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.61297 0.56107 27.91	p Total M 45 47 24 20 23 -1 30 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 32 -1 32 -1 32 -1 -3 -3 -3 -3 -3 -3 -3 -3 -3 -3	contr lean 0 0.1 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.05 30 0.01 32 0.01 35 0.01 0.13 20 0.21 35 0.01 0.13 20 0.22 0.5 0.28	bl group S55744 26.3 23.41 .73125 .86121 .61053 13.9 .83349 343267 20.38	Total V 43 51 25 21 22 31 39 19 29 29 29 309 1	Veight 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 36.6% 0.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0] -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0] -2.16 [-15.27, 10.9] 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3] -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5] -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3] 0.08 [-8.41, 8.5] -0.44 [-13.22, 12.3] -0.11 [-0.47, 0.2] -0.47 [-12.66, 11.7] -0.24 [-0.46, -0.0]	-50 CI 33] 66] 95] 66] 99] 77] 77] 73] 44] 25] 22]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (rest for overall effect: Z = 0, udy or Subgroup bas Ali Sangouni 2020 avood Soleimani(Gartic)2020 avood Soleimani(Gartic)2020 az Jafarvand 2015 tezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 i-Wen Zhang2015 syed Reza Mirhafez2019 hra Namkhah2021 tetal (95% CI) terogeneity: Chi ² = 9,11, df =	intern Mean -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92 0.09 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 9 (P = 0.43)	vention grou SD 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.2 23.61297 0.56107 27.91	p Total M 45 24 : 20 : 23 - 39 : 19 - 34 : 32 : 313	contr 0 0.3 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.21 35 0.01 30 0.04 15 0.04 15 0.27 0.3	bl group SD 7 555744 26.3 23.41 .73125 .86121 .61053 13.9 .83349 343267 20.38	Total V 43 51 25 21 22 31 39 19 29 29 29 309 1	Veight 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 36.6% 0.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.5 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3 -0.36 [-25.31, 24.4 -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3 0.08 [-8.41, 8.5 -0.44 [-13.22, 12.3 -0.11 [-0.47, 0.2 -0.47 [-12.66, 11.7 -0.24 [-0.46, -0.0	-50 <u>C</u> 33] 66] 55] 66] 99] 77] 77] 77] 73] 24] 29]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (est for overall effect: Z = 0, bas Ali Sangouni 2020 vood Soleimani(Gartic)2020 vood Soleimani(propolis)202 naz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 i-Wen Zhang2015 yed Reza Mirhafez2019 hra Namkhah2021 tal (95% CI) terogeneity: Chi ² = 9.11, df = st for overall effect: Z = 2.14	df = 2 (P = 1 19 (P = 0.85 -0.3 -0.3 -0.9 0 0.92 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.49 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.49 -0.49 -0.19 -0.49 -0.25 -0.49 -0.40	vention grou SD 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.2 23.61297 0.56107 27.91	p 45 47 24 23 - 30 - 39 19 - 34 32 313	contr lean 0 0.0 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.13 20 0.01 0.04 15 0.27 0.1 0.28	51 group 555744 26.3 23.41 73125 86121 86121 86121 13.9 843267 20.38	Total V 43 51 25 21 22 31 39 19 29 29 29 309 1	Weight 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 36.6% 0.0% 100.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.5 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3 -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5 -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3 0.08 [-8.41, 8.5 -0.04 [-13.22, 12.3 -0.11 [-0.47, 0.2 -0.47 [-12.66, 11.7 -0.24 [-0.46, -0.0	-50 <u>6</u> <u>6</u> <u>7</u> <u>7</u> <u>7</u> <u>7</u> <u>7</u> <u>7</u> <u>7</u> <u>7</u>	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (est for overall effect: Z = 0, bas Ali Sangouni 2020 vood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 vood Soleimani(propolis)202 naz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 i-Wen Zhang2015 yed Reza Mirhafez2019 hra Namkhah2021 tal (95% CI) terogeneity: Chi ² = 9.11, df = st for overall effect: Z = 2.14 (intern Mean -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 9 (P = 0.43); (P = 0.03)	vention grou SD 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.2 23.61297 0.56107 27.91	p 45 47 24 23 - 30 - 39 19 - 34 32 313	contr lean 0 0.1 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.13 20 0.21 35 0.01 0.21 35 0.01 0.21 35 0.01 0.23 0.27 0.1 0.28	55744 26.3 23.41 73125 .86121 6.1053 13.9 .83349 943267 20.38	Total V 43 51 25 21 22 31 39 19 29 29 309 1	Veight 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 36.6% 36.6%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.5 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3 -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5 -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3 0.08 [-8.41, 8.5 -0.44 [-13.22, 12.3 -0.47 [-12.66, 11.7 -0.24 [-0.46, -0.0	-50 <u>6</u> <u>6</u> <u>7</u> <u>7</u> <u>7</u> <u>7</u> <u>7</u> <u>7</u> <u>7</u> <u>7</u>	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (est for overall effect: Z = 0, bas Ali Sangouni 2020 vood Soleimani(Gartic)2020 vood Soleimani(Gartic)2020 vood Soleimani(propolis)202 naz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 i-Wen Zhang2015 yed Reza Mirhafez2019 hra Namkhah2021 tal (95% CI) terogeneity: Chi ² = 9.11, df = st for overall effect: Z = 2.14 (intern Mean -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 •9 (P = 0.43); (P = 0.03)	vention grou SD 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.2 23.61297 0.56107 27.91	p <u>45</u> 47 24 23 -1 30 -39 19 -34 32 313	contr lean 0 0.1 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.01 0.21 35 0.01 0.21 35 0.01 0.24 15 0.27 0.1 0.28	51 group 555744 26.3 23.41 73125 .86121 6.1053 13.9 .83349 343267 20.38	Total V 43 51 25 21 22 31 39 19 29 29 309 1	Veight 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 36.6% 0.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.5 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3 -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5 -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3 0.08 [-8.41, 8.5 -0.04 [-13.22, 12.3 -0.11 [-0.47, 0.2 -0.47 [-12.66, 11.7 -0.24 [-0.46, -0.0	-50 <u>C</u> 33] 55] 56] 59] 57] 77] 44] 55] 22] 23]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (² est for overall effect: Z = 0. ³ bbas Ali Sangouni 2020 ³ avood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 ³ avood Soleimani(propolis)202 ³ haz Jafarvand 2015 ³ lezeh Askari2014 ⁴ temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 ³ H-Wen Zhang2015 ³ H-Wen Zhang	intern Mean -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 9 (P = 0.43); (P = 0.03)	vention grou SD 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.2 23.61297 0.56107 27.91 J ² = 1%	p <u>45</u> 47 24 23 -30 - 39 19 - 34 - 32 - 313	contr lean 0 0.1 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.13 20 0.21 35 0.01 0.21 35 0.01 0.27 0.1 0.28	bl group SD 55744 26.3 23.41 7.3125 .86121 6.1053 13.9 .83349 343267 20.38	Total V 43 51 25 21 22 31 39 19 29 29 29 309 1	Veight. 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 36.6% 0.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.9 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3 -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3 -0.08 [-8.41, 8.5 -0.44 [-13.22, 12.3 -0.11 [-0.47, 0.2 -0.47 [-12.66, 11.7 -0.24 [-0.46, -0.0	-50 <u>C</u> (3) (6) (5) (6) (9) (7) (4) (5) (7) (4) (5) (2) (2) (2) (2) (3) (4) (5) (4) (5) (5) (4) (5) (5) (5) (6) (5) (6) (5) (7) (6) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (iest for overall effect: Z = 0. udy or Subgroup ibas Ali Sangouni 2020 ivood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 ivood Soleimani(gropolis)202 naz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 ii-Wen Zhang2015 iyed Reza Mirhafez2019 hra Namkhah2021 tal (95% CI) terogeneity: Chi ² = 9.11, df = st for overall effect: Z = 2.14 (intervention in	vention grou SD 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.61297 0.56107 27.91 ² = 1%	p Total M 45 47 24 23 -1 39 19 -1 34 19 -1 32 -1 32 -1 32 -1 32 -1 32 -1 32 -1 32 -1 32 -1 32 -1 32 -1 -3 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1	contr lean 0 0.3 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.13 20 0.21 35 0.21 35 0.27 0.3 0.28	Digroup SD 1 55744 26.3 23.41 73125 .86121 61053 13.9 .83349 343267 20.38	Total Y 43 51 25 21 22 31 39 19 29 309	Veight. 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 36.6% 0.0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.6 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3 -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5 -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3 0.08 [-8.41, 8.5 -0.44 [-13.22, 12.3 -0.11 [-0.47, 0.2 -0.47 [-12.66, 11.7 -0.24 [-0.46, -0.0 ean Difference	-50 (C) (3) (6) (5) (6) (5) (6) (9) (7) (7) (4) (5) (2) (2) (2) (3) (4) (5) (2) (4) (5) (2) (4) (5) (5) (4) (5) (5) (5) (6) (5) (6) (5) (7) (6) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
Ideorgeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (iest for overall effect: Z = 0. bas Ali Sangouni 2020 vood Soleimani(Grafic)2020 vood Soleimani(Gropolis)202 naz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 i-Wen Zhang2015 yed Reza Mirhafez2019 hra Namkhah2021 tal (95% CI) terogeneity: Chi ² = 9.11, df = st for overall effect: Z = 2.14 (df = 2 (P = 1 19 (P = 0.85 <u>Mean</u> -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92 -0.49 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 9 (P = 0.43); (P = 0.03) intervention	vention grou <u>SD</u> 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.61297 0.56107 27.91 ² = 1% 19.0000 SD Total	p Total M 45 47 24 20 123 -1 30 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 39 -1 -3 -3 -3 -3 -3 -3 -3 -3 -3 -3	contr lean 0 0.3 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.21 35 0.21 35 0.27 0.3 0.28 ntrol gr	bl group <u>SD</u> 1 555744 26.3 23.41 .73125 .86121 .61053 13.9 .83349 343267 20.38 .0000 .000 .00	Total V 43 51 25 21 22 31 39 29 29 29 309 1	Veight. 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0] -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0] -2.16 [-15.27, 10.9] 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3] -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5] -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3] 0.08 [-8.41, 8.5] -0.44 [-13.22, 12.3] -0.11 [-0.47, 0.2] -0.47 [-12.66, 11.7] -0.24 [-0.46, -0.0] ean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI	-50 <u>C1</u> 33] 36] 55] 56] 59] 77] 77] 73] 73] 74] 22] 23] 23] 23] 24] 25] 24] 25] 25] 25] 25] 26] 27] 27] 27] 27] 27] 27] 27] 27	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (iest for overall effect: Z = 0. udy or Subgroup bas Ali Sangouni (2020 twood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 twood Soleimani(Gropolis)202 naz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 i-Wen Zhang2015 byed Reza Mirhafez2019 hra Namkhah2021 ttal (95% CI) terogeneity: Chi ² = 9.11, df = st for overall effect: Z = 2.14 the st for overall effect: Z = 2.14 the st for overall effect: Z = 2.14	interv Mean -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92 -0.49 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 -9 (P = 0.43); (P = 0.03) intervention lean 0 29 48.09	vention group SD 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.61297 0.56107 27.91 ² = 1% SD Total 722 14	P Total M 45 47 24 20 -23 -23 -30 -19 -34 32 -34 -34 -34 -34 -34 -34 -34 -34	contr lean 0 0.1 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.21 35 0.01 0.01 15 0.27 0.1 0.28 ntrol gr 36 055	bl group <u>55</u> 744 26.3 23.41 .73125 .86121 .61053 13.9 .83349 343267 20.38 .83349 .8349	Total V 43 51 25 21 22 31 39 29 29 309 1 1 9 29 29 309 1	Veight 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.5 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3 -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5 -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3 0.08 [-8.41, 8.5 -0.44 [-13.22, 12.3 -0.11 [-0.47, 0.2 -0.47 [-12.66, 11.7 -0.24 [-0.46, -0.0 ean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI 00 [-31.49, 31.49]	-50 <u>6</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u>	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI	20
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (iest for overall effect: Z = 0. bas Ali Sangouni 2020 wood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 wood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 wood Soleimani(propolis)202 az Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 i-Wen Zhang2015 yed Reza Mirhafez2019 hra Namkhah2021 tal (95% CI) terogeneity: Chi ² = 9.11, df = st for overall effect: Z = 2.14 (udy or Subgroup M LER, D.A2011 (inter Mean -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 9 (P = 0.43); (P = 0.03) intervention ean 0.29 48.092 0.21 -0.3	vention grou <u>SD</u> 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.61297 0.56107 27.91 ² = 1% 1 group <u>SD</u> Total 27.2 14	p <u>Total M</u> 45 47 24 23 -1 30 -1 39 19 -3 39 19 -3 31 313 <u>co</u> <u>Mean</u> 0.29 2	contr lean 0 0.1 3.36 3.08 0.01 3 20 0.21 35 0.01 0.24 15 0.27 0.1 0.28 ntrol gr 36.055 0.055	Di group SD 1 55744 26.3 23.41 7.3125 .86121 13.9 .83349 343267 20.38 20.38	Total V 43 51 25 21 29 39 309 1 309 1 4 0.1 7 7	Weight 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% M Math 0% 0/ 1%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.5 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3 -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5 -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3 0.08 [-8.41, 8.5 -0.44 [-13.22, 12.3 -0.11 [-0.47, 0.2 -0.47 [-12.66, 11.7 -0.24 [-0.46, -0.0 ean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI 00 [-31.49, 31.49] 0.20 [0.6, 7, 0.7]	-50 (3) (6) (5) (6) (7) (7) (4) (5) (2) (2) (2) (2) (3) (4) (5) (2) (3) (4) (5) (5) (4) (5) (5) (5) (5) (6) (5) (6) (5) (6) (5) (6) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI	
Idv or Subgroup bas Ali Sangouni 2020 vood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 vood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 vood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 vood Soleimani(propolis)202 haz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 i-Wen Zhang2015 yed Reza Mirhafez2019 hra Namkhah2021 tal (95% CI) terogeneity: Chi ² = 9.11, df = st for overall effect: Z = 2.14 i udy or Subgroup M .LER, D.A2011 (eonora Scorletti2020)	intervention 9 (P = 0.43); 9 (P = 0.43); 0 0.92 0.09 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 9 (P = 0.43); (P = 0.03) intervention lean 0.29 48.092 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 -0.25 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 -0.23 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.48 -0.19 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.48 -0.19 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.25 -0.29 -0.48 -0.19 -0.25 -0.29 -0.	vention grou <u>SD</u> 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.2 23.61297 0.56107 27.91 ² = 1% 1 group <u>SD</u> Total 272 14 0.8 455 502 10	P Total M 45 47 24 20 19 - 39 19 - 39 19 - 32 313 Co Mean 0.29 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	contr lean 0 0.1 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.13 20 0.21 35 0.21 35 0.27 0.1 0.28 ntrol gr 36.055 0.9539	Digroup <u>SD</u> <u>SD</u> 26.3 23.41 7.3125 .86125 13.9 .83349 343267 20.38 20.38 Digroup <u>SD</u> Tota 33 14 39 44 39 44	Total V 43 51 25 21 39 19 29 29 309 1 309 1 4 0.(4 0.(4 76.)	Weight. 63.2% 0.0% 0.1%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.9 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3 -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3 0.08 [-8.41, 8.5 -0.44 [-13.22, 12.3 -0.11 [-0.47, 0.2 -0.47 [-12.66, 11.7 -0.24 [-0.46, -0.0 ean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI 00 [-31.49, 31.49] 0.20 [-0.57, 0.17] 0.40 [-0.25, 0.57]	-50 3] 3] 6] 55 6] 9] 77] 4] 55 2] 2] 2] 	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
udy or Subgroup bas Ali Sangouni 2020 vood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 vood Soleimani(Grappolis)202 naz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 i-Wen Zhang2015 yed Reza Mirhafez2019 hra Namkhah2021 tal (95% CI) terogeneity: Chi² = 9.11, df = st for overall effect: Z = 2.14 i udy or Subgroup M LLER, D.A2011 0 eonora Scorletti2020 1 Lin Chong2021 -0	interv Mean -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92 -0.49 -0.29 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 -0.29 48.092 -0.29 -0.29 -0.29 -0.49 -0.29 -0.48 -0.19 -0.20 -0.29 -0.20 -0	vention group SD 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.61297 0.56107 27.91 ² = 1% 19 SD Total 272 14 0.8 45 393 19	p Total M 45 47 24 20 19 -1 39 19 -1 34 19 -1 313 313 coo Mean 0.29 0 0.08	contr lean 0 0.3 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.21 35 0.21 35 0.27 0.3 0.28 ntrol gr 36.055 0.9539 0.	SD SD S5744 26.3 23.41	Total Y 43 51 25 21 29 39 19 29 309 1 309 1 4 0.0 4 76.5	Weight. 63.2% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.6 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3 -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5 -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3 0.08 [-8.41, 8.5 -0.44 [-13.22, 12.3 -0.11 [-0.47, 0.2 -0.47 [-12.66, 11.7 -0.24 [-0.46, -0.0 ean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI 00 [-31.49, 31.49] -0.20 [-0.57, 0.17] -0.10 [-0.75, 0.55]	-50 (C) (3) (6) (5) (6) (5) (6) (9) (7) (7) (4) (5) (2) (2) (2) (2) (3) (4) (5) (5) (4) (5) (5) (5) (5) (6) (5) (6) (5) (7) (6) (5) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (iest for overall effect: Z = 0. udy or Subgroup bas Ali Sangouni 2020 wood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 wood Soleimani(gropolis)202 naz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 i-Wen Zhang2015 iyed Reza Mirhafez2019 hra Namkhah2021 ttal (95% CI) terogeneity: Chi ² = 9.11, df = st for overall effect: Z = 2.14 (udy or Subgroup M LLER, D.A2011 (eonora Scorletti2020 ii Lin Chong2021 -(ttal (95% CI)	interv Mean -0.3 -1.9 0 0.92 -0.49 -0.29 -0.48 -0.19 -0.29 -0.49 -0.29 -0.48 -0.19 -0.29 -0.	vention grou <u>SD</u> 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.61297 0.56107 27.91 ² = 1% 19.86127 27.91 ² = 1% 19.86127 27.91 19.86127 27.91 19.86127 27.91 19.86127 27.91 19.86127 27.91 27.	p Total M 45 47 24 23 -1 39 19 -1 34 19 -1 34 313 313 coo Mean 0.29 0 0.08	contr lean 0 0.3 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.21 35 0.01 0.04 15 0.27 0.3 0.28 ntrol gr 36.055 0.9539 0.	SD SD \$55744 26.3 26.3 23.41 .73125 .86121 .61053 13.9 .83349 .43267 20.38 20.38 DUD Doug SD Tota 39 44 36 16 74 36	Total Y 43 51 25 21 22 31 39 19 29 309 309 1 I Weig 4 0.0 4 76.5 5 23.4	Weight 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.1% 0.0% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.8 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3 -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5 -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3 -0.08 [-8.41, 8.5 -0.44 [-13.22, 12.3 -0.11 [-0.47, 0.2 -0.47 [-12.66, 11.7 -0.24 [-0.46, -0.0 ean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI 00 [-31.49, 31.49] -0.20 [-0.57, 0.17] -0.10 [-0.75, 0.55] 0.18 [-0.50, 0.141]	-50 <u>C1</u> 33] 36] 55] 56] 59] 77] 77] 77] 72] 22] 23] 23] 24]	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	20
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (iest for overall effect: Z = 0, bas Ali Sangouni 2020 vood Soleimani(Grafic)2020 vood Soleimani(Grafic)2020 vood Soleimani(Gropolis)202 naz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 i-Wen Zhang2015 yed Reza Mirhafez2019 hra Namkhah2021 tal (95% CI) terogeneity: Chi ² = 9.11, df = st for overall effect: Z = 2.14 (udy or Subgroup M LER, D.A2011 (eonora Scorletti2020 ui Lin Chong2021 - (otal (95% CI)	df = 2 (P = 1 19 (P = 0.85 <u>Mean</u> -0.3 -11.9 0 0.92 0.09 -0.49 -0.49 -0.49 -0.49 -0.49 -0.25 0.09 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 •9 (P = 0.43); (P = 0.03) intervention <u>ean</u> 0.29 48.092 -0.2 (P = 0.2 (P = 0.43); (P = 0.03) -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.4 -0.19 -0.4 -0.19 -0.4 -0.19 -0.2 -0.4 -0.19 -0.2 -0.4 -0.19 -0.2 -0.4 -0.19 -0.2 -0.4 -0.19 -0.2 -0.4 -0.19 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.4 -0.19 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.4 -0.19 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.2 -0.4 -0.19 -0.2 -0.	vention group <u>SD</u> 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.2 23.61297 0.56107 27.91 ² = 1% SD Total SD Total 272 14 0.8 45 393 19 78 278	P Total M 45 47 24 30 -1 39 19 -1 34 313 Co Mean 0.29 0 0.08	contr lean 0 0.3 3.36 3.08 0.05 30 0.21 35 0.01 0.01 0.01 15 0.27 0.3 0.28 ntrol gr 36.055 0.9539 0.	SD SD \$55744 26.3 23.41 .73125 .86121 .61053 .83349 .83349 .43267 20.38 D Tota .9 .44 .33 .44 .36 16 .74 .74	Total V 43 51 25 21 21 22 31 39 19 29 29 309 1 4 76. 5 23. 4 10.	Weight 63.2% 0.0% 0%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.5 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3 -0.36 [-25.31, 24.4 -0.04 [-13.22, 12.3 -0.14 [-0.47, 0.2 -0.47 [-12.66, 11.7 -0.24 [-0.46, -0.0 ean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI 00 [-31.49, 31.49] -0.20 [-0.57, 0.17] -0.10 [-0.75, 0.55] 0.18 [-0.50, 0.14]	-50 <u>C1</u> 33] 66] 55] 56] 99] 77] 77] 77] 72] 21 	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.00, (est for overall effect: Z = 0. bas Ali Sangouni 2020 vood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 vood Soleimani(Garlic)2020 vood Soleimani(propolis)202 haz Jafarvand 2015 ezeh Askari2014 temeh Izadi2020 Cheol Bae2015 i-Wen Zhang2015 yed Reza Mirhafez2019 hra Namkhah2021 tal (95% CI) terogeneity: Chi ² = 9.11, df = st for overall effect: Z = 2.14 (udy or Subgroup M LLER, D.A2011 (eonora Scorletti2020 ii Lin Chong2021 - (ntal (95% CI) terogeneity: Chi ² = 0.07, df	ff = 2 (P = 1) $ff = 2 (P = 1)$ $ff = 0.85$ $ff = -0.3$ -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 -0.3 0.9 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 -0.29 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 -0.29 -0.48 0.16 -0.19 -0.29 -0.20 -0.20 -0.20 -0.20 -0.20 -0.20 -0.20 -0.20 -0.20 -0.20	vention grou <u>SD</u> 0.655744 25.2 23.41 29.12679 57.21433 19.86127 23.2 23.61297 0.56107 27.91 ² = 1% 19.87 <u>SD</u> Total 27.2 14 0.8 45 593 19 78 97); ² = 0%	p Total M 45 47 24 23 -1 39 19 -3 39 19 -3 31 313 Con Mean 0.29 0 0.08	contr lean 0 0.1 3.36 3.08 0.01 3 20 0.21 35 0.01 0.24 15 0.27 0.1 0.28 ntrol gr 36.055 0.9539 0.	bl group SD 1 55744 26.3 23.41 7.3125 .86121 13.9 .83349 343267 20.38 20.38 Dup D Tota 33 14 39 44 36 16 74	Total V 43 51 25 21 22 31 39 19 29 29 309 1 4 0.0 4 76. 5 23.3 4 100.	Weight 63.2% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 900.0% M 9% - 9% - 00% 00%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% -0.30 [-0.57, -0.0 -15.26 [-25.46, -5.0 -2.16 [-15.27, 10.5 0.04 [-18.28, 18.3 -0.36 [-25.31, 24.5 -0.04 [-14.45, 14.3 0.08 [-8.41, 8.5 -0.44 [-13.22, 12.3 -0.11 [-0.47, 0.2 -0.47 [-12.66, 11.7 -0.24 [-0.46, -0.0 ean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI 000 [-31.49, 31.49] -0.20 [-0.57, 0.17] -0.10 [-0.75, 0.55] 0.18 [-0.50, 0.14]	-50 (CI (3) (6) (5) (5) (6) (9) (7) (7) (4) (5) (2) (2) (2) (3) (4) (5) (5) (4) (5) (5) (4) (5) (5) (4) (5) (5) (5) (4) (5) (5) (5) (5) (6) (5) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI 	

TG; **C**: antioxidants on TC; **D**: probiotic/symbiotic/prebiotic on TC; **E**: antioxidants on HDL-C; **F**: probiotic/symbiotic/prebiotic on HDL-C; **G**: antioxidants on LDL-C; and **H**: probiotic/symbiotic/prebiotic on LDL-C).

with the action mechanism of antioxidants, whose hypolipidemic properties were related to the reduction of liver adipogenesis (20). With the action of antioxidants, inflammation induced by hepatocyte steatosis was improved, and ALT/AST levels were significantly decreased. WC, which is closely related to visceral fat deposition (59), also decreased significantly. Moreover, the amount of cholesterol decreased, especially oxidized LDL, HDL increased (60), which was consistent with the results of this study. On the other hand, TC reflects the sum of all LDL-C, HDL-C and VLDL in serum. In this study, LDL-C decreased and HDL-C increased, so the resulting overall lack of change can be understood. The lack of significant changes in TG may be due to the fact that only a small part of TG is synthesized by the body itself, and most TG is obtained from diet, which is influenced by many factors (61). Finally, elevated BMI is not a prerequisite for the diagnosis of NAFLD, and many of the included studies included patients with normal BMI, so it is not difficult to understand the lack of changes in BMI levels caused by antioxidants. However, due to the different dosages and types of antioxidants used in each trial, its effect should be further investigated in clinical application.

Six randomized indicated that trials taking probiotic/symbiotic/prebiotic decreased BMI, ALT, and AST levels but did not have favorable effects on blood lipid levels compared to the control group. The results were inconsistent with the previous review (62). This difference might be related to the type of strains. Studies have shown that different strains have different effects on liver function and blood lipid levels (12, 15, 63). However, since few trials were included in the study, the respective effects of probiotic/symbiotic/prebiotic could not be compared through subgroup analysis. In general, their adjuvant therapeutic effect on NAFLD is clear. The potential mechanism may involve regulating human metabolism by decreasing inflammatory markers and altering lipid profile (3). However, the dose and duration of their clinical application are ill-defined; therefore, more multi-central clinical research is needed to provide detailed guidance in the future.

Three RCTs reported the role of fatty acid supplementation in the treatment of NAFLD, but the results showed significant heterogeneity, which might be related to the dosage and durations of the trials. The dosages ranged from 1,000 to 4,000 mg, and the durations were from 8 to 24 weeks (51–53), which was in agreement with the result of another review (64). Therefore, additional trials are needed to demonstrate the effectiveness of fatty acids in NAFLD patients.

The effect of vitamin D may be related to reduced inflammatory markers (65), while whole grain could change intestinal microbial metabolites (66, 67). There were only a few articles on vitamin D and whole grain in this study because several interventions combined physical exercise with other supplements had to be excluded. At present, vitamin D combined with other treatments has been proven as an adjunctive therapy to improve liver function for NAFLD patients (68, 69). However, the articles on whole grain were scarce; therefore, larger sample size studies will be needed to provide evidence for the use of the low-cost whole grain.

This review has several limitations. Although our study showed that functional food and dietary supplements improved AST and ALT in patients with NAFLD, the source of all heterogeneity could not be explained by the subgroup analysis, especially most of the studies did not identify the stage of NAFLD and the included subjects in some studies were from a single ethnicity- mainly from Asia. Moreover, functional foods and dietary supplements used in these articles were produced in different countries with various dosages, which might have an impact on the results. Multi-center clinical research from different countries should be carried out to explore effective doses using uniform sources of functional foods and dietary supplements in the clinic. In addition, we only searched studies published in English in databases such as PubMed, ISI Web of Science, Cochrane library, and Embase. Thus, additional relevant studies might exist, and additional reviews may be required.

5. Conclusion

The current study suggests that antioxidant and probiotic/symbiotic/prebiotic supplements alone or in combination

with other therapies may be a promising regimen for NAFLD patients. However, the usage of fatty acids, vitamin D, and whole grain in clinical treatment is uncertain. Further exploration of the efficacy ranks of functional foods and dietary supplements is needed to provide a reliable basis for clinical application.

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

H-hY and L-lW conceived, designed the study, searched databases, screened articles, extracted data, and performed statistical analyses. P-hZ contributed to the revision of the manuscript. All authors contributed to the writing and revision of the manuscript.

Funding

The study was supported by Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China (LY22H160002).

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank TopEdit (www.topeditsci.com) for its linguistic assistance during the preparation of this manuscript.

Conflict of interest

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

Publisher's note

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

Supplementary material

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnut.2023. 1014010/full#supplementary-material

References

1. Eslam M, Newsome PN, Sarin SK, Anstee QM, Targher G, Romero-Gomez M, et al. A new definition for metabolic dysfunction-associated fatty liver disease: an international expert consensus statement. *J Hepatol.* (2020) 73:202–9. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2020.07.045

2. Gibson PS, Lang S, Dhawan A, Fitzpatrick E, Blumfield ML, Truby H, et al. Systematic review: nutrition and physical activity in the management of paediatric nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr.* (2017) 65:141–9. doi: 10.1097/MPG.00000000001624

3. Ma J, Zhou Q, Li H. Gut microbiota and nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: insights on mechanisms and therapy. *Nutrients*. (2017) 9:1–21. doi: 10.3390/nu9101124

4. Marchesini G, Bugianesi E, Burra P, Marra F, Miele L, Alisi A. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in adults 2021: a clinical practice guideline of the Italian Association for the Study of the Liver (AISF), the Italian Society of Diabetology (SID) and the Italian Society of Obesity (SIO). *Digest Liver Dis.* (2022) 54:170–82. doi: 10.1016/j.dld.2021.04.029

5. Younossi ZM, Koenig AB, Abdelatif D, Fazel Y, Henry L, Wymer M. Global epidemiology of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease-meta-analytic assessment of prevalence, incidence, and outcomes. *Hepatology*. (2016) 64:73–84. doi: 10.1002/hep.28431

6. Chinese Medical Association Fatty Liver Expert Committee. Guidelines of prevention and treatment for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: a 2018 update. *Infect Dis Info.* (2018) 31:393–706. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.1007-3418.2018.03.008

7. Wu Y, Zheng Q, Zou B, Yeo YH Li X, Li J, et al. The epidemiology of NAFLD in mainland china with analysis by adjusted gross regional domestic product: a metaanalysis. *Hepatol Int.* (2020) 14:259–69. doi: 10.1007/s12072-020-10023-3

8. Cotter TG, Rinella M. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease 2020: the state of the disease. *Gastroenterology*. (2020) 158:1851–64. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2020.01.052

9. European Association for the Study of the Liver, European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). EASL-EASD-EASO clinical practice guidelines for the management of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *Diabetologia*. (2016) 59:1121–40. doi: 10.1007/s00125-016-3902-y

10. Zou TT, Zhang C, Zhou YF, Han YJ, Xiong JJ, Wu XX, et al. Lifestyle interventions for patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: a network meta-analysis. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol.* (2018) 30:747–55. doi: 10.1097/MEG.00000000001135

11. Katsagoni CN, Georgoulis M, Papatheodoridis GV, Panagiotakos DB, Kontogianni MD. Effects of lifestyle interventions on clinical characteristics of patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a meta-analysis. *Metabolism.* (2017) 68:119–32. doi: 10.1016/j.metabol.2016.12.006

12. Hrncir T, Hrncirova L, Kverka M, Hromadka R, Machova V, Trckova E, et al. Gut microbiota and nafld: Pathogenetic mechanisms, microbiota signatures, and therapeutic interventions. *Microorganisms*. (2021) 9:1–18. doi: 10.3390/microorganisms9050957

13. Aron-Wisnewsky J, Warmbrunn MV, Nieuwdorp M, Clement K. Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: modulating gut microbiota to improve severity? *Gastroenterology*. (2020) 158:1881–98. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2020.01.049

14. Aron-Wisnewsky J, Vigliotti C, Witjes J, Le P, Holleboom AG, Verheij J, et al. Gut microbiota and human nafld: Disentangling microbial signatures from metabolic disorders. *Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol.* (2020) 17:279–97. doi: 10.1038/s41575-020-0269-9

15. Leung C, Rivera L, Furness JB, Angus PW. The role of the gut microbiota in NAFLD. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol. (2016) 13:412–25. doi: 10.1038/nrgastro.2016.85

16. Khan MY, Mihali AB, Rawala MS, Aslam A, Siddiqui WJ. The promising role of probiotic and synbiotic therapy in aminotransferase levels and inflammatory markers in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease - a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol.* (2019) 31:703–15. doi: 10.1097/MEG.00000000001371

17. Amin HL, Agah S, Mousavi SN, Hosseini AF, Shidfar F. Regression of non-alcoholic fatty liver by vitamin d supplement: a double-blind randomized controlled clinical trial. *Arch Iran Med.* (2016) 19:631–8. Available online at: www.aimjournal.ir/Article/1053

18. Komolafe O, Buzzetti E, Linden A, Best LMJ, Madden AM, Roberts D, et al. Nutritional supplementation for nonalcohol-related fatty liver disease: a network metaanalysis. *Cochr Database Syst Rev.* (2021) 7:1–366. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD013157.pub2

19. Cicero AFG, Colletti A, Bellentani S. Nutraceutical approach to non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (nafld): the available clinical evidence. *Nutrients.* (2018) 10:1–18. doi: 10.3390/nu10091153

20. Soleimani D, Paknahad Z, Rouhani MH. Therapeutic effects of garlic on hepatic steatosis in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease patients: a randomized clinical trial. *Diabetes Metabolic Syndr Obes Targets Therapy.* (2020) 13:2389–97. doi: 10.2147/DMSO. \$254555

21. Darand M, Darabi Z, Yari Z, Saadati S, Hedayati M, Khoncheh A, et al. *Nigella sativa* and inflammatory biomarkers in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: Results from a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, clinical trial. *Comp Ther Med.* (2019) 44:204–9. doi: 10.1016/j.ctim.2019.04.014

22. Kazemi S, Shidfar F, Ehsani S, Adibi P, Janani L. Eslami O. The effects of sumac (*Rhus coriarial*) powder supplementation in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: A randomized controlled trial. *Comp Ther Clin Pract.* (2020) 41:101259. doi: 10.1016/j.ctcp.2020.101259

23. Sangouni AA, Azar MRMH, Alizadeh M. Effect of garlic powder supplementation on hepatic steatosis, liver enzymes and lipid profile in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a double-blind randomised controlled clinical trial. *Br J Nutr.* (2020) 124:450–6. doi: 10.1017/S0007114520001403

24. Sabir U, Irfan HM, Umer I, Niazi ZR, Asjad HMM. Phytochemicals targeting nafld through modulating the dual function of forkhead box o1 (foxo1) transcription factor signaling pathways Naunyn Schmiedebergs. *Arch Pharmacol.* (2022) 395:741–55. doi: 10.1007/s00210-022-02234-2

25. Ekhlasi G, Shidfar F, Agah S, Merat S, Hosseini AF. Effects of pomegranate and orange juice on antioxidant status in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease patients: a randomized clinical trial. *Int J Vitamin Nutr Res.* (2015) 85:292–8. doi: 10.1024/0300-9831/a000292

26. Higgins JT, Deeks J, Altman DG. Special topics in statistics. In: Higgins JT, Green S, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version* 5.1.0 (Updated March 2011). The Cochrane Collaboration (2011). Available online at: www.handbook.cochrane.org (accessed December 19, 2022).

27. Savovic J, Turner RM, Mawdsley D, Jones HE, Beynon R, Higgins JPT, et al. Association between risk-of-bias assessments and results of randomized trials in cochrane reviews: the robes meta-epidemiologic study. *Am J Epidemiol.* (2018) 187:1113–22. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwx344

28. Michaelis R, Tang V, Wagner JL, Modi AC, LaFrance WC. Jr., Goldstein LH, et al. Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis of the impact of psychological treatments for people with epilepsy on health-related quality of life. *Epilepsia.* (2018) 59:315–32. doi: 10.1111/epi.13989

29. Suzanne R, Sharpton BM, Emily H-T. Gut microbiome-targeted therapies in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Am J Clin Nutr.* (2019) 110:139–49. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/nqz042

30. Pezeshki A, Safi S, Feizi A, Askari G, Karami F. The effect of green tea extract supplementation on liver enzymes in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Int J Prev Med.* (2015) 7:1–6. doi: 10.4103/2008-7802.173051

31. Han B, Kim S-M, Nam GE, Kim S-H, Park S-J, Park Y-K, et al. A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multi-centered clinical study to evaluate the efficacy and safety of artemisia annua l. Extract for improvement of liver function. *Clin Nutr Res.* (2020) 9:258–70. doi: 10.7762/cnr.2020.9.4.258

32. Soleimani D, Rezaie M, Rajabzadeh F, Gholizadeh Navashenaq J, Abbaspour M, Miryan M, et al. Protective effects of propolis on hepatic steatosis and fibrosis among patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) evaluated by real-time two-dimensional shear wave elastography: a randomized clinical trial. *Phytotherapy Res.* (2021) 35:1669–79. doi: 10.1002/ptr.6937

33. Askari F, Rashidkhani B, Hekmatdoost A. Cinnamon may have therapeutic benefits on lipid profile, liver enzymes, insulin resistance, and high-sensitivity c-reactive protein in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease patients. *Nutr Res.* (2014) 34:143-8. doi: 10.1016/j.nutres.2013.11.005

34. Izadi F, Farrokhzad A, Tamizifar B, Tarrahi MJ, Entezari MH. Effect of sour tea supplementation on liver enzymes, lipid profile, blood pressure, and antioxidant status in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a double-blind randomized controlled clinical trial. *Phytother Res.* (2021) 35:477–85. doi: 10.1002/ptr.6826

35. Bae JC, Lee WY, Yoon KH, Park JY, Son HS, Han KA. Improvement of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease with carnitine-orotate complex in type 2 diabetes (corona) a randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care*. (2015) 38:1245–52. doi: 10.2337/dc14-2852

36. Hosseinikia M, Oubari F, Hosseinkia R, Tabeshfar Z, Salehi MG, Mousavian Z, et al. Quercetin supplementation in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial. *Nutr Food Sci.* (2020) 50:1279–93. doi: 10.1108/NFS-10-2019-0321

37. Mohammad Shahi M, Ali Javanmardi M, Saeed Seyedian S, Hossein Haghighizadeh M. Effects of phytosterol supplementation on serum levels of lipid profiles, liver enzymes, inflammatory markers, adiponectin, and leptin in patients affected by nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: a double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized clinical trial. *J Am Coll Nutr.* (2018) 37:651–8. doi: 10.1080/07315724.2018.1466739

38. Zhang PW, Chen FX Li D, Ling WH, Guo HH. A consortcompliant, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled pilot trial of purified anthocyanin in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Medicine*. (2015) 94:e758. doi: 10.1097/MD.00000000000758

39. Navekar R, Rafraf M, Ghaffari A, Asghari-Jafarabadi M, Khoshbaten M. Turmeric supplementation improves serum glucose indices and leptin levels in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver diseases. *J Am Coll Nutr.* (2017) 36:261–7. doi: 10.1080/07315724.2016.1267597

40. Cicero AFG, Sahebkar A, Fogacci F, Bove M, Giovannini M, Borghi C. Effects of phytosomal curcumin on anthropometric parameters, insulin resistance, cortisolemia and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease indices: a double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial. *Eur J Nutr.* (2020) 59:477–83. doi: 10.1007/s00394-019-01916-7

41. Namkhah Z, Naeini F, Mahdi Rezayat S, Mehdi Y, Mansouri S, Javad Hosseinzadeh-Attar M. Does naringenin supplementation improve lipid profile, severity of hepatic steatosis and probability of liver fibrosis in overweight/obese patients with NAFLD? A randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, clinical trial. Int J Clin Pract. (2021) 75:e14852. doi: 10.1111/ijcp.14852

42. Aller R, De Luis DA, Izaola O, Conde R, Gonzalez Sagrado M, Primo D, et al. Effect of a probiotic on liver aminotransferases in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease patients: a double blind randomized clinical trial. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci.* (2011) 15:1090–5. Available online at: https://web.p.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid= b2e2ef50-a141-459c-8598-bded15c98bb%40redis

43. Asgharian A, Askari G, Esmailzade A, Feizi A, Mohammadi V. The effect of symbiotic supplementation on liver enzymes, c-reactive protein and ultrasound findings in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a clinical trial. *Int J Prev Med.* (2016) 7:1–6. doi: 10.4103/2008-7802.178533

44. Scorletti E, Afolabi PR, Miles EA, Smith DE, Almehmadi A, Alshathry A, et al. Synbiotics alter fecal microbiomes, but not liver fat or fibrosis, in a randomized trial of patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Gastroenterology.* (2020) 158:1597–610.e1597. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2020.01.031

45. Mohamad Nor MH, Ayob N, Mokhtar NM, Raja Ali RA, Tan GC, Wong Z, et al. The effect of probiotics (MCP ([®]) BCMC ([®]) strains) on hepatic steatosis, small intestinal mucosal immune function, and intestinal barrier in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *Nutrients.* (2021) 13:1–17. doi: 10.3390/nu130 93192

46. Ahn SB, Jun DW, Kang BK, Lim JH, Lim S, Chung MJ. Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study of a multispecies probiotic mixture in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Sci Rep.* (2019) 9:5688. doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-42059-3

47. Chong PL, Laight D, Aspinall RJ, Higginson A, Cummings MH, A. randomised placebo controlled trial of VSL#3([®]) probiotic on biomarkers of cardiovascular risk and liver injury in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *BMC Gastroenterol.* (2021) 21:144. doi: 10.1186/s12876-021-01660-5

48. Jafarvand E, Farhangi MA, Alipour B, Khoshbaten M. Effects of coenzyme q10 supplementation on the anthropometric variables, lipid profiles and liver enzymes in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Bangladesh J Pharmacol.* (2016) 11:35–42. doi: 10.3329/bjp.v11i1.24513

49. Farsi F, Mohammadshahi M, Alavinejad P, Rezazadeh A, Zarei M, Engali KA. Functions of coenzyme q10 supplementation on liver enzymes, markers of systemic inflammation, and adipokines in patients affected by nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: a double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized clinical trial. *J Am Coll Nutr.* (2016) 35:346–53. doi: 10.1080/07315724.2015.1021057

50. Farhangi MA, Alipour B, Jafarvand E, Khoshbaten M. Oral coenzyme q10 supplementation in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: effects on serum vaspin, chemerin, pentraxin 3, insulin resistance and oxidative stress. *Arch Med Res.* (2014) 45:589–95. doi: 10.1016/j.arcmed.2014.11.001

51. Rashidmayvan M, Mohammadshahi M, Seyedian SS, Haghighizadeh MH. The effect of *nigella sativa oil* on serum levels of inflammatory markers, liver enzymes, lipid profile, insulin and fasting blood sugar in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver. *J Diabetes Metab Disord.* (2019) 18:453–9. doi: 10.1007/s40200-019-00439-6

52. Cansanção K, Citelli M, Carvalho Leite N, López de Las Hazas MC, Dávalos A, Tavares do Carmo MDG, et al. Impact of long-term supplementation with fish oil in individuals with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a double blind randomized placebo controlled clinical trial. *Nutrients*. (2020) 12:1–12. doi: 10.3390/nu12113372

53. Scorletti E, Bhatia L, McCormick KG, Clough GF, Nash K, Hodson L, et al. Effects of purified eicosapentaenoic and docosahexaenoic acids in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: Results from the welcome* study. *Hepatology*. (2014) 60:1211–21. doi: 10.1002/hep.27289

54. Barchetta I, Del Ben M, Angelico F, Di Martino M, Fraioli A, La Torre G, et al. No effects of oral vitamin d supplementation on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in patients with type 2 diabetes: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *BMC Med.* (2016) 14:92. doi: 10.1186/s12916-016-0638-y

55. Masoumeh D, Jafary Heidarloo A, Farnush B, Mohammad A. Whole-grain consumption and its effects on hepatic steatosis and liver enzymes in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: a randomised controlled clinical trial. *Br J Nutr.* (2020) 123:328–36. doi: 10.1017/S0007114519002769

56. Al-Jiffri O, Al-Sharif FM, Abd El-Kader SM, Ashmawy EM. Weight reduction improves markers of hepatic function and insulin resistance in type-2 diabetic patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver. *Afr Health Sci.* (2013) 13:667–72. doi: 10.4314/ahs.v13i3.21

57. Sana R, Sangam R, Aditya U, Archana, Rohit A. Current treatment paradigms and emerging therapies for NAFLD/NASH. *Front Biosci.* (2021) 26:206–37. doi: 10.2741/4892

58. Rives C, Fougerat A, Ellero-Simatos S, Loiseau N, Guillou H, Gamet-Payrastre L, et al. Oxidative stress in NAFLD: role of nutrients and food contaminants. *Biomolecules*. (2020) 10:1702. doi: 10.3390/biom10121702

59. Robert R, Ian JN, Shizuya Y, Iris S, Jaap S, Paolo M, et al. Waist circumference as a vital sign in clinical practice: a Consensus Statement from the IAS and ICCR Working Group on Visceral Obesity. *Nat Rev Endocrinol.* (2020) 16:177–89. doi: 10.1038/s41574-019-0310-7

60. Millar CL, Duclos Q, Blesso CN. Effects of dietary flavonoids on reverse cholesterol transport, HDL metabolism, and HDL function. *Adv Nutr.* (2017) 8:226-39. doi: 10.3945/an.116.014050

61. Farhangi MA, Vajdi M, Fathollahi P. Dietary total antioxidant capacity (TAC), general and central obesity indices and serum lipids among adults: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Vitam Nutr Res.* (2022) 92:460–22. doi: 10.1024/0300-9831/a000675

62. Amir H, Hamed M, Maryam M, Ehsan G. Efficacy of synbiotic supplementation in patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis of clinical trials: synbiotic supplementation and NAFLD. *Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr.* (2019) 59:2494–505. doi: 10.1080/10408398.2018.1458021

63. Loman BR, Hernandez-Saavedra D, An R, Rector RS. Prebiotic and probiotic treatment of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Nutr Rev.* (2018) 76:822–39. doi: 10.1093/nutrit/nuy031

64. Parker HM, Johnson NA, Burdon CA, Cohn JS, O'Connor HT, George J. Omega-3 supplementation and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Hepatol.* (2012) 56:944–51. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2011. 08.018

65. Bjelakovic M, Nikolova D, Bjelakovic G, Gluud C. Vitamin d supplementation for chronic liver diseases in adults. *Cochr Database Syst Rev.* (2021) 8:Cd011564. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD011564.pub3

66. Tovar J, Nilsson A, Johansson M, Björck I. Combining functional features of whole-grain barley and legumes for dietary reduction of cardiometabolic risk: a randomised cross-over intervention in mature women. *Br J Nutr.* (2014) 111:706–14. doi: 10.1017/S000711451300305X

67. Angelino D, Martina A, Rosi A, Veronesi L, Antonini M, Mennella I, et al. Glucose- and lipid-related biomarkers are affected in healthy obese or hyperglycemic adults consuming a whole-grain pasta enriched in prebiotics and probiotics: a 12-week randomized controlled trial. *J Nutr.* (2019) 149:1714–23. doi: 10.1093/jn/nxz071

68. Guo XF, Wang C, Yang T, Li S, Li KL Li D. Vitamin D and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Food Funct.* (2020) 11:7389–99. doi: 10.1039/D0FO0 1095B

R, Hajia. oxidative stres '-olic fatty 47 69. Sharifi N, Amani R, Hajiani E, Cheraghian B. Does vitamin d improve liver enzymes, stress, and inflammatory biomarkers adults with non-alcoholic liver disease? randomized in Α clinical trial. Endocrine. (2014) 47:70-80. doi: 10.1007/s12020-014-0336-5