Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Zhengsheng Zou, Fifth Medical Center of the PLA General Hospital, China

REVIEWED BY Aimin Zhou, Cleveland State University, United States Mao Qianguo, Xiamen Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine, China

*CORRESPONDENCE Xianbo Wang, ⊠ wangxb@ccmu.edu.cn

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

SPECIALTY SECTION

This article was submitted to Gastrointestinal and Hepatic Pharmacology, a section of the journal Frontiers in Pharmacology

RECEIVED 05 February 2023 ACCEPTED 13 March 2023 PUBLISHED 21 March 2023

CITATION

Bi Y, Shi K, Chen J and Wang X (2023), Curative effect of anti-fibrosis Chinese patent medicines combined with ursodeoxycholic acid for primary biliary cholangitis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front. Pharmacol.* 14:1159222. doi: 10.3389/fbhar.2023.1159222

COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Bi, Shi, Chen and Wang. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Curative effect of anti-fibrosis Chinese patent medicines combined with ursodeoxycholic acid for primary biliary cholangitis: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Yufei Bi[†], Ke Shi[†], Jialiang Chen and Xianbo Wang*

Center of Integrative Medicine, Beijing Ditan Hospital, Capital Medical University, Beijing, China

Objective: To delineate the curative effect and safety of anti-fibrosis Chinese patent medicines (CPMs) combined with ursodeoxycholic acid (UDCA) for primary biliary cholangitis (PBC).

Methods: A literature search was conducted using PubMed, Web of Science, Embase, Cochrane Library, Wanfang database, VIP database, China Biology Medicine Database, and Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure from their inception until August 2022. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of the treatment of PBC with anti-fibrotic CPMs were collected. The eligibility of the publications was assessed using the Cochrane risk-of-bias tool. The evaluation indicators were the clinical efficacy rate, liver fibrosis, liver function, immune function, and symptom score. Meta-analysis and subgroup analysis were conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of anti-fibrosis CPMs. Risk ratio (RR) was used to assess dichotomous variables, and continuous variables with a 95% confidence interval were calculated using mean difference.

Results: Twenty-two RCTs including 1,725 patients were selected. The findings demonstrated that anti-fibrotic CPMs combined with UDCA improved the efficacy rate, liver function, liver fibrosis, immunological indicators, and clinical symptoms compared with UDCA alone (all p < 0.05).

Conclusion: This study demonstrates that the combination of anti-fibrotic CPMs and UDCA can improve both clinical symptoms and outcomes. Nevertheless, more high-quality RCTs are needed to assess the effectiveness of anti-fibrosis CPMs for PBC.

Abbreviations: ALHX, anluo huaxian pills; ALP, alkaline phosphatase; ALT, alanine aminotransferase; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; APASL, asian pacific association for the study of the liver; Cl, confidence interval; CPM, Chinese patent medicine; FDA, United States Food and Drug Administration; FFBJRG, Fufang Biejia Ruangan tablets; FZHY, Fuzheng Huayu capsules; GGT, gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase; HA, hyaluronidase; IgG, immunoglobulin G; IgM, immunoglobulin M; IV-C, type IV collagen; LN, laminin; MD, mean difference; PBC, primary biliary cholangitis; PC-III, type III procollagen; PRISMA, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses; RCTs, randomized controlled trials; RR, risk ratio; SMD, standardized mean difference; TCM, traditional Chinese medicine; UDCA, ursodeoxycholic acid.

KEYWORDS

primary biliary cholangitis, Chinese patent medicine, anti-fibrosis, ursodeoxycholic acid, meta-analysis

1 Introduction

Primary biliary cholangitis (PBC), also called primary biliary cirrhosis, is a chronic autoimmune cholestatic liver disease whose pathogenesis has not been fully elucidated (European Association for the Study of the Liver, 2017). PBC frequently occurs in middle-aged women, and its clinical serological characteristics include positive anti-mitochondrial antibodies and elevated levels of alkaline phosphatase (ALP) or gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase (GGT) (You et al., 2022). The main pathological features of the liver include progressive, non-suppurative, and destructive intrahepatic cholangitis, leading to fibrosis and eventually cirrhosis (Zhang et al., 2021; You et al., 2022; European Association for the Study of the Liver, 2017). PBC is mainly caused by genetic and environmental factors, with unknown pathogenesis and hidden clinical manifestations (You et al., 2022). Some patients with PBC have cirrhosis at the time of diagnosis (Zhang et al., 2021), making anti-fibrotic therapy particularly important.

Ursodeoxycholic acid (UDCA) is an effective treatment for PBC (You et al., 2022), and its mechanism of action includes cholelithiasis, cytoprotection, anti-inflammatory effects, and immune regulation (Zhang et al., 2021). UDCA has greatly improved longevity in patients with PBC. However, 40% of patients with PBC still respond poorly to it (Cheung et al., 2016), and non-responders have a lower survival rate than the general population. Owing to rapid disease progression and poor long-term prognosis, patients who respond poorly to UDCA may require alternative treatment methods urgently; however, currently, no unified therapies exist.

Traditional Chinese medicine (TCM) has advantages in treating liver fibrosis, owing to its combination of ingredients and multiple pathways and targets. Previous studies have shown that Fuzheng Huayu capsules (FZHY) (Liu et al., 2019), Fufang Biejia Ruangan tablets (FFBJRG) (Ji et al., 2022), and Anluo Huaxian pills (ALHX) (Lu et al., 2017) are commonly used clinically as Chinese patent medicines (CPMs) for the anti-fibrosis treatment of liver these have been approved by the State Food and Drug Administration of China, with national medicine permission numbers of Z20020074 (FZHY), Z19991011 (FFBJRG), and Z20010098 (ALHX). The fibrosis stage is important in the progression of PBC. If anti-fibrosis treatment is administered in time at this stage, the occurrence of liver cancer or even liver failure will be reversed (Prince et al., 2002). Additionally, a recent study demonstrated that the treatment of PBC with TCM exerts anti-fibrotic effects and helps improve patients' pruritus, fatigue, and the response rate to UDCA (Chen et al., 2018). Meanwhile, several studies have revealed that FZHY, FFBJRG, and ALHX have unique advantages in improving biochemical indices, anti-fibrosis, and quality of life in patients with PBC (Chen et al., 2019; Jiang et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2020). Furthermore, a previous real-world cohort study (Chen et al., 2018) conducted by our research group found that TCM combined with UDCA increased the 1-year biochemical response rate of patients with PBC by 15.1% compared with that of UDCA alone (43.0% vs. 27.9%, p < 0.05).

Therefore, it is of great significance to explore the clinical curative effects of CPMs combined with UDCA on PBC. Therefore, a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) was conducted to measure the efficacy of CPMs plus UDCA for treating PBC.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Standards for inclusion and exclusion of literature

The inclusion criteria were: 1) the studies reported RCTs; 2) the participants were diagnosed with PBC based on the consensus recommendations of the Asian Pacific Association for the Study of the Liver (APASL); 3) the treatment involved anti-fibrotic CPMs plus UDCA; and 4) at least one of the following outcome indices was used: clinical efficacy rate, ALP, GGT, alanine aminotransferase (ALT), aspartate aminotransferase (AST), hyaluronic acid (HA), laminin (LN), collagen type IV (IV-C), type III procollagen (PC-III), immunoglobulin M (IgM), immunoglobulin G (IgG), and clinical symptoms. The primary outcome was the clinical efficacy rate, whereas the secondary outcomes were liver function, hepatic fibrosis, immunological indicators, and clinical symptoms.

The exclusion criteria were: 1) the experimental group used none of the three aforementioned anti-fibrotic CPMs or other TCMs; 2) duplicate studies; 3) studies with incomplete research data; and 4) animal experiments, conferencing articles, reviews, non-RCTs, and other unrelated studies.

2.2 Search strategy

The meta-analysis followed the newest Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement (Supplementary Table S1) (Page et al., 2021). A literature search was conducted using PubMed, Web of Science, Embase, Cochrane Library, Wanfang database, VIP database, China Biology Medicine Database, and Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure from their inception until August 2022, with no language restriction. The search terms included: "Primary Biliary Cirrhosis," "Primary Biliary Cholangitis," "PBC," "Chinese patent medicine," "CPMs," "traditional Chinese medicine," "TCM," "Ursodeoxycholic Acid," "UDCA," "Fuzheng Huayu capsules," "FZHY," "Fufang Biejia Ruangan tablets," "FFBJRG," "Anluo huaxian Pills," "ALHX," "ursodeoxycholic acid," "UDCA," "randomized controlled trials," and "RCT." The search strategy is presented in Table 1.

2.3 Data acquisition and quality evaluation

The literature was independently screened by two researchers (BI and SHI) in terms of the inclusion and exclusion standards. Data

TABLE 1 The search strategy.

Order	Search items
#1	((Primary Biliary Cholangitis [Title/Abstract]) OR (Primary Biliary Cirrhosis [Title/Abstract])) OR (PBC [Title/Abstract])
#2	(ursodeoxycholic acid [Title/Abstract]) OR (UDCA [Title/Abstract])
#3	(((((((([u((((((((((U(((U(((U(((U(((U((U((U((U((U
#4	((randomized controlled trial [Title/Abstract]) OR (RCTs [Title/Abstract])) OR (randomized [Title/Abstract])
#5	#1 AND #2 AND #3AND#4



acquisition consisted of 1) general information: title, first author, and publication year; 2) sex, age, sample size, intervention measures, and treatment course; and 3) observed outcome indicators.

Literature eligibility was estimated using the Cochrane collaboration tool, including incomplete outcome data, selective reporting, allocation concealment, random-sequence generation, blinding of outcome assessment, blinding of participants and personnel, and other biases. Based on these standards, the literature eligibility was categorized as three levels of risk of bias: high, unclear, and low.

2.4 Statistical methods

The statistical analysis was performed using RevMan 5.4 software. According to the type of outcome, continuous data

Included	Sample size	Ger male/f	ider female	Ag	ge	Interventio	on	Treatment Duration	Outcome Index
Trial	N1/N2	N1	N2	N1	N2	N1	N2		
Liu 2020a	44/44	16/28	18/26	55.28 ± 6.28	55.19 ± 6.32	FZHY + UDCA	UDCA	48 W	2)7)
Jiang et al., 2019	41/41	4/37	5/36	N	Ν	FZHY + UDCA	UDCA	12 M	1)2)8)
Yang 2017	60/60	15/45	13/47	52.5 ± 7.4	51.6 ± 6.8	FZHY + UDCA	UDCA	12 W	1)2)
Gao et al. (2015)	31/30	2/29	2/28	43.60 ± 10.4	45.20 ± 9.6	FZHY + UDCA	UDCA	24 W	1)2)3)8)
Zhang et al. (2014)	30/30	3/27	3/27	56.52 ± 10.42	58.04 ± 9.80	FZHY + UDCA	UDCA	24 W	2)5)7)
Wu et al. (2012)	40/40	5/35	4/36	43.7 ± 12.0	45.0 ± 11.6	FZHY + UDCA	UDCA	48 W	1)2)3)5)6)7)8)
Ying 2012	65/65	19	111	N	Ν	FZHY + UDCA	UDCA	24 W	1)2)8)
Xie et al. (2012)	15/14	3	26	N	Ν	FZHY + UDCA	UDCA	6 M	1)3)5)
Zhang 2021	48/47	11/37	8/39	48.46 ± 5.66	47.91 ± 4.86	FFBJRG + UDCA	UDCA	6 M	3)4)8)
Ai 2021	43/43	5/38	4/39	42.69 ± 3.12	42.57 ± 3.09	FFBJRG + UDCA	UDCA	6 M	3)7)
Liu 2020b	38/38	6/32	5/33	35.65 ± 3.52	36.58 ± 4.21	FFBJRG + UDCA	UDCA	6 M	2)
Wang 2020	36/36	16/20	17/19	41.21 ± 2.37	41.56 ± 2.25	FFBJRG + UDCA	UDCA	6 M	2)
Zhang et al. (2020)	21/21	Ν	Ν	N	Ν	FFBJRG + UDCA	UDCA	6 M	1)2)3)5)8)
Zhang 2019	85/85	17/68	21/64	43.9 ± 13.6	42.7 ± 14.1	FFBJRG + UDCA	UDCA	6 M	1)5)7)
Chen et al. (2019)	41/37	Ν	Ν	N	Ν	FFBJRG + UDCA	UDCA	24 W	1)3)5)
Pang 2017	25/25	9/16	10/15	52.1 ± 6.7	52.3 ± 7.1	FFBJRG + UDCA	UDCA	24 M	1)2)
Zhang et al. (2015)	32/32	4	60	Ν	Ν	FFBJRG + UDCA	UDCA	12 M	1)2)3)
Wang 2015	39/39	8/31	6/33	53.7 ± 6.9	52.1 ± 7.4	FFBJRG + UDCA	UDCA	12 M	2)4)
Huang et al. (2015)	28/28	3/25	4/24	57.97 ± 9.07	57.59 ± 8.46	FFBJRG + UDCA	UDCA	12 M	1)4)5)
Qiu and Rao 2015	42/42	15/27	12/30	31.6 ± 1.9	31.2 ± 1.5	ALHX + UDCA	UDCA	24 W	1)2)3)5)6)7)8)
Wang et al. (2015)	32/32	5/27	6/26	47.5	48.2	ALHX + UDCA	UDCA	3 M	1)2)3)

TABLE 2 Basic characteristics of the included studies.

Abbreviations: N1, experimental group; N2, control group; W, weeks; M, months; FZHY, fuzheng huayu capsules; FFBJRG, fufang biejia ruangan tablets; ALHX, anluo huaxian pills; Outcome Index: 1) clinical efficacy rate; 2) liver function; 3) hepatic fibrosis; 4) acoustic radiation force impulse imaging; 5) symptoms; 6) portal dynamics; 7) immune function; 8) adverse effects.

 $42.2~\pm~9.2$

ALHX + UDCA

UDCA

24 W

1)2)3)

Li and Wu 2013

30/30

2/28

3/27

 $45.6\,\pm\,10.3$

are depicted as mean difference (MD) or standardized mean difference (SMD), while categorical data are presented as risk ratios (RRs); all are expressed with a 95% confidence interval (CI). Furthermore, the χ^2 and I^2 tests were used for heterogeneity analysis.

10.3389/fphar.2023.1159222

The fixed-effects model was used for analysis if $p \ge 0.1$ and $I^2 \le 50\%$ in the subgroup or overall. Conversely, the random-effects model was employed if p < 0.1 and $I^2 > 50\%$. Additionally, we searched for sources of heterogeneity in the results and employed a sensitivity analysis to affirm whether the results were stable. Moreover, subgroup analyses were performed based on the use of three different CPMs. A *p*-value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Publication bias was analyzed using funnel plots.

3 Results

3.1 Study selection

In total, 621 relevant studies were selected in the initial search. After duplicates were removed, 332 studies remained. After screening the titles, abstracts, and introductions of each article, 84 articles were deleted. Finally, after reading the full-text articles for further screening and evaluation, 22 publications (Wu et al., 2012; Xie et al., 2012; Ying, 2012; Li and Wu, 2013; Zhang et al., 2014; Gao et al., 2015; Huang et al., 2015; Qiu and Rao, 2015; Wang, 2015; Wang et al., 2015; Pang, 2017; Chen et al., 2019; Jiang et al., 2019; Zhang, 2019; Liu, 2020b; Wang, 2020; Zhang et al., 2020; Ai, 2021; Zhang, 2021) were included. The selection procedure for publications is shown in Figure 1.

3.2 Study characteristics

All 22 included studies were RCTs conducted in China and involved 1,725 patients with PBC. All studies were classified into an experimental group and a control group to compare the efficacies of CMPs combined with UDCA and UDCA monotherapy. The basic traits of each study are summarized in Table 2.

3.3 Quality assessment

We used the Cochrane risk-of-bias tool to estimate article quality. Of these, eight publications (Wu et al., 2012; Ying, 2012; Zhang et al., 2015; Yang, 2017; Jiang et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2020; Ai, 2021; Zhang, 2021) used a random number table, 12 (Xie et al., 2012; Li and Wu, 2013; Zhang et al., 2014; Huang et al., 2015; Qiu and Rao, 2015; Wang, 2015; Wang et al., 2015; Cheung et al., 2016; Pang, 2017; Zhang, 2019; Liu, 2020a; Liu, 2020b) did not describe the randomization method, and two (Wang 2020; Chen et al., 2019 did not mention the word "random." Only one publication (Zhang et al., 2015) used a double-blind design and reported the number of missing cases in the experimental and control groups. In terms of hidden allocation, one publication (Huang et al., 2015) adopted a non-transparent envelope. The details of the risk of bias assessment are shown in Figures 2, 3.

3.4 CPMs drug composition

These studies used three anti-fibrosis CPMs, including FZHY, FFBJRG, and ALHX, and listed the TCMs used. Dongchongxiacao (*Cordyceps sinensis* (Berk.) Sacc) is an ingredient in FZHY and

TABLE 3 The herbal formula of FZHY, FFBJRRG and ALHX.

Herbal formula	Chinese name	Latin name	Picture
FZHY	Danshen	Salvia miltiorrhiza Bge	
	Dongchongxiacao	Cordyceps sinensis (Berk.) Sacc	- Alexandree
	Taoren	Prunus persica (L.) Batsch	
	Jiaogulan	Gynostemma aggregatum C.Y.Wu and S.K.Chen	
	Songhuafen	Pollen Pini	
	Wuweizi	Schisandra chinensis (Turcz.) Baill	
FFBJRG	Biejia	Shell of Trinyx sinensis Widgmann	
	Danggui	Angelica sinensis (Oliv.) Diels	- AND
	Dangshen	Codonopsis pilosula (Franch.) Nannf	
	Chishao	Paeonia Lactiflora Pall	Sector Sector
	Ezhu	Rhizoma curcumae	**
	Sanqi	Panax notoginseng (Burk.) F. H. Chen	

(Continued on following page)

TABLE 3 (Continued) The herbal formula of FZHY, FFBJRRG and ALHX.

Herbal formula	Chinese name	Latin name	Picture
	Ziheche	Placenta hominis	E.
	Dongchongxiacao	Cordyceps sinensis (Berk.) Sacc	
	Huangqi	Astragali Radix	J.S.A.
	Banlangen	Isatis indigotica Fortune ex Lindl	
	Lianqiao	Forsythia suspensa (Thunb.) Vahl	
ALHX	Sanqi	Panax notoginseng (Burk.) F. H. Chen	
	Shuizhi	Whitmania pigra Whitman	
	Shengdihuang	Rehmannia glutinosa Libosch	The second
	Jiangcan	Bombyx mori Linnaeus	一般
	Baizhu	Atractylodes macrocephala Koidz	
	Dilong	Pheretima aspergillum (E. Perrier)	T
	Yujin	Curcuma wenyujin Y.H.Chen and C.Ling	A STA

(Continued on following page)

TABLE	3	(Continued)	The	herbal	formula	of	FZHY.	FFBJRRG	and	ALHX.
INDEL	-	(continucu)	inc	nerbui	Tormana	01	,	11 Dominio	unu	ALIA.

Herbal formula	Chinese name	Latin name	Picture
	Niuhuang	Bezoar	
	Walengzi	Arca subcrenata Lischke	
	Mudanpi	Paeonia suffruticosa Andr	
	Dahuang	Rheum officinale Baill	
	Shengmaiya	Hordeum vulgare L	
	Shuiniujiao	horn of Bubalus bubalis Linnaeus	
	Jineijin	Endothelium Corneum Gigeriae Galli	

FFBJRG, while Sanqi (*Panax notoginseng* (Burkill) F. H. Chen) is an ingredient in ALHX and FFBJRG. The compositions of the anti-hepatic fibrosis herbal formulations are listed in Table 3.

3.5 Outcome index

3.5.1 Clinical efficacy rate

A total of 13 clinical trials described the clinical efficacy rate as the main outcome, which was classified as markedly effective, effective, and ineffective grades. A random-effects model was implemented for analysis regarding heterogeneity testing (p = 0.0009, $I^2 = 64\%$), and anti-fibrosis CPMs plus UDCA improved the clinical efficacy rate compared with UDCA alone (RR = 0.11, 95% CI: 0.06, 0.16; p < 0.00001) (Figure 4A). Subgroup analysis showed that the clinical efficacy rate of FFBJRG was better than that of the other two CPMs and had no heterogeneity (p = 0.96, $I^2 = 0\%$) (Figure 4B).

3.6 Liver function

3.6.1 Alkaline phosphatase

We found 10 trials that reported the effects of anti-fibrotic CPMs plus UDCA on ALP levels. A random-effects model was implemented based on the *p*-value and I^2 value. The subgroup analyses showed that anti-fibrotic CPMs plus UDCA were superior to UDCA alone in terms of serum ALP levels (RR = -28.83, 95% CI: -36.57, -21.10; *p* < 0.00001) (Figure 5A).

3.6.2 Gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase

A total of 16 articles reported GGT levels as the outcome. In the subgroup analyses, random-effects models were used due to heterogeneity (p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 77\%$). Consequently, the anti-fibrotic CPMs plus UDCA were more effective at decreasing GGT levels than UDCA alone (MD = -14.69, 95% CI: -18.88, -10.50; p < 0.00001) (Figure 5B).

	Experime	ental	Contro	ol		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Gao 2015	30	31	29	30	10.9%	1.00 [0.91, 1.10]	+
Jiang 2019	38	41	31	41	6.1%	1.23 [1.01, 1.49]	
Li 2013	30	30	29	30	11.0%	1.03 [0.94, 1.13]	+
Pang 2017	25	25	21	25	6.5%	1 19 [0 99, 1 43]	
Qiu 2015	35	42	31	42	5.1%	1 13 [0 90, 1 41]	
Wang 2015b	29	32	22	32	4 3%	1 32 [1 02 1 71]	
Wu 2012	30	40	37	40	10.4%	1 05 [0 95 1 17]	
Vana 2017	53	40	45	40	7.6%	1.05 [0.95, 1.17]	
Tang 2017	57	00	45	00	10.0%	1.27 [1.08, 1.48]	-
Ting 2012	05	05	02	05	12.5%	1.05 [0.99, 1.11]	
Zhang 2015	30	32	24	32	5.3%	1.25 [1.00, 1.56]	
Zhang 2019	80	85	67	85	9.3%	1.19 [1.06, 1.35]	
Zhang 2020	20	21	15	21	3.7%	1.33 [1.00, 1.78]	
Zhang 2021	45	48	37	47	7.3%	1.19 [1.01, 1.41]	
Total (95% CI)		552		550	100.0%	1.13 [1.06, 1.21]	•
Total events	523		450				
Heterogeneity: Tau2 -	0.01. Chi2.	= 33 27	df = 12 /		0091-12-6		<u>I I I I I </u>
Test for everall offert		- 0.000		0.0	009), 1 0	94 76	0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2
rest for overall effect.	Z = 3.87 (P	= 0.000)))				Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
	Experime	ontel	Contr			Piek Difference	Pick Difference
Study or Subaraus	Experime	Tetel	Evente	Totol	Mojoht	M H Bandom 05% Cl	Risk Difference
	Events	Total	Lvents	TOLA	weight	M-n, Kanuom, 95% Cl	
	635		122				
Gao 2015	30	31	29	30	10.3%	0.00 [-0.09, 0.09]	
Jiang 2019	38	41	31	41	6.3%	0.17 [0.02, 0.32]	<u> </u>
Wu 2012	39	40	37	40	9.9%	0.05 [-0.04, 0.14]	
Yang 2017	57	60	45	60	8.0%	0.20 [0.08, 0.32]	
Ving 2012	65	65	62	65	12 7%	0.05 [0.01, 0.10]	-
Fultatel (05% CI)	05	227	02	226	47.0%	0.09 [0.00, 0.16]	▲
Subiolal (95% CI)		231		230	47.0%	0.08 [0.00, 0.16]	•
I otal events	229		204				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 2.06 (P	= 12.76, 9 = 0.04)	af = 4 (P	= 0.01); I² = 69%		
1.1.2 FFBJRG							
Pang 2017	25	25	21	25	6.2%	0.16 [0.01, 0.31]	
Zhang 2015	30	32	24	32	5 5%	0 19 0 02 0 361	
Zhang 2010	80	05	67	05	0.5%	0.15 [0.05, 0.35]	
Zhang 2019	80	00	07	00	9.5%	0.15 [0.05, 0.25]	
Zhang 2020	20	21	15	21	4.0%	0.24 [0.02, 0.45]	
	15	48	37	47	7.2%	0.15 [0.01, 0.29]	
Zhang 2021	40	40					
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI)	40	211		210	32.4%	0.17 [0.10, 0.23]	
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	200	211	164	210	32.4%	0.17 [0.10, 0.23]	•
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	200 0.00; Chi² :	211 = 0.62, c	164 lf = 4 (P =	210	32.4%	0.17 [0.10, 0.23]	•
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2	200 0.00; Chi² = Z = 5.15 (P	211 = 0.62, c < 0.000	164 lf = 4 (P = 001)	210 0.96);	32.4% I ² = 0%	0.17 [0.10, 0.23]	•
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 1.1.3 ALHX	200 0.00; Chi² = Z = 5.15 (P	211 = 0.62, c ? < 0.000	164 lf = 4 (P = 001)	210 0.96);	32.4% I ² = 0%	0.17 [0.10, 0.23]	•
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 3 1.1.3 ALHX	200 0.00; Chi² = Z = 5.15 (P	211 = 0.62, c < 0.000	164 If = 4 (P = 001) 29	210 0.96); 30	32.4%	0.03 [0.05 0.12]	-
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : 1.1.3 ALHX Li 2013	200 0.00; Chi² = Z = 5.15 (P 30	211 = 0.62, c < 0.000	164 lf = 4 (P = 001) 29	210 0.96); 30	32.4% I ² = 0%	0.03 [-0.05, 0.12]	-
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : 1.1.3 ALHX Li 2013 Qiu 2015	200 0.00; Chi² : Z = 5.15 (P 30 35	211 = 0.62, c < 0.000 30 42	164 lf = 4 (P = 001) 29 31	210 0.96); 30 42	32.4% ² = 0% 10.4% 5.4%	0.03 [-0.05, 0.12] 0.10 [-0.08, 0.27]	
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 1.1.3 ALHX Li 2013 Qiu 2015 Wang 2015b	200 0.00; Chi ² : Z = 5.15 (P 30 35 29	211 = 0.62, c < 0.000 30 42 32	164 lf = 4 (P = 001) 29 31 22	210 0.96); 30 42 32	32.4% ² = 0% 10.4% 5.4% 4.8%	0.17 [0.10, 0.23] 0.03 [-0.05, 0.12] 0.10 [-0.08, 0.27] 0.22 [0.03, 0.41]	
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : 1.1.3 ALHX Li 2013 Qiu 2015 Wang 2015b Subtotal (95% CI)	200 0.00; Chi ² = Z = 5.15 (P 30 35 29	211 = 0.62, c > < 0.000 30 42 32 104	164 lf = 4 (P = 001) 29 31 22	210 0.96); 30 42 32 104	32.4% ² = 0% 10.4% 5.4% 4.8% 20.6%	0.17 [0.10, 0.23] 0.03 [-0.05, 0.12] 0.10 [-0.08, 0.27] 0.22 [0.03, 0.41] 0.10 [-0.03, 0.23]	
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: ; 1.1.3 ALHX Li 2013 Qiu 2015 Wang 2015b Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	200 0.00; Chi ² : Z = 5.15 (P 30 35 29 94	211 = 0.62, c > < 0.000 30 42 32 32 104	164 lf = 4 (P = 001) 29 31 22 82	210 0.96); 30 42 32 104	32.4% ² = 0% 10.4% 5.4% 4.8% 20.6%	0.17 [0.10, 0.23] 0.03 [-0.05, 0.12] 0.10 [-0.08, 0.27] 0.22 [0.03, 0.41] 0.10 [-0.03, 0.23]	
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : 1.1.3 ALHX Li 2013 Qiu 2015 Wang 2015b Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	200 0.00; Chi ² : Z = 5.15 (P 30 35 29 94 0.01; Chi ² :	211 = 0.62, c < 0.000 30 42 32 104 = 4.56, c	164 If = 4 (P = 001) 29 31 22 82 If = 2 (P =	210 0.96); 30 42 32 104 0.10);	32.4% ² = 0% 10.4% 5.4% 4.8% 20.6% ² = 56%	0.17 [0.10, 0.23] 0.03 [-0.05, 0.12] 0.10 [-0.08, 0.27] 0.22 [0.03, 0.41] 0.10 [-0.03, 0.23]	
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : 1.1.3 ALHX Li 2013 Qiu 2015 Wang 2015b Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: :	200 0.00; Chi ² : Z = 5.15 (P 30 35 29 94 0.01; Chi ² : Z = 1.51 (P	211 = 0.62, c < 0.000 42 32 104 = 4.56, c	164 If = 4 (P = 001) 29 31 22 82 If = 2 (P =	210 ; 0.96); 30 42 32 104 ; 0.10);	32.4% ² = 0% 10.4% 5.4% 4.8% 20.6% ² = 56%	0.17 [0.10, 0.23] 0.03 [-0.05, 0.12] 0.10 [-0.08, 0.27] 0.22 [0.03, 0.41] 0.10 [-0.03, 0.23]	
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : 1.1.3 ALHX Li 2013 Qiu 2015 Wang 2015b Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : Total (95% CI)	200 0.00; Chi ² : Z = 5.15 (P 30 35 29 94 0.01; Chi ² : Z = 1.51 (P	211 = 0.62, c > < 0.000 30 42 32 104 = 4.56, c > = 0.13) 552	164 If = 4 (P =)01) 29 31 22 82 If = 2 (P =	210 0.96); 30 42 32 104 0.10); 550	32.4% ² = 0% 10.4% 5.4% 4.8% 20.6% ² = 56% 100.0%	0.17 [0.10, 0.23] 0.03 [-0.05, 0.12] 0.10 [-0.08, 0.27] 0.22 [0.03, 0.41] 0.10 [-0.03, 0.23] 0.11 [0.06, 0.16]	
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : 1.1.3 ALHX Li 2013 Qiu 2015 Wang 2015b Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : Total (95% CI) Total events	200 0.00; Chi ² : Z = 5.15 (P 30 35 29 94 0.01; Chi ² : Z = 1.51 (P 523	211 = 0.62, c < 0.000 30 42 32 104 = 4.56, c = 0.13) 552	164 If = 4 (P = 001) 29 31 22 82 If = 2 (P = 450	210 0.96); 30 42 32 104 0.10); 550	32.4% ² = 0% 10.4% 5.4% 4.8% 20.6% ² = 56% 100.0%	0.17 [0.10, 0.23] 0.03 [-0.05, 0.12] 0.10 [-0.08, 0.27] 0.22 [0.03, 0.41] 0.10 [-0.03, 0.23] 0.11 [0.06, 0.16]	
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: . 1.1.3 ALHX Li 2013 Qiu 2015 Wang 2015b Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	200 0.00; Chi ² : Z = 5.15 (P 30 35 29 94 0.01; Chi ² = Z = 1.51 (P 523 0.00; Chi ² =	211 = 0.62, c > < 0.000 30 42 32 104 = 4.56, c > = 0.13) 552 = 27.50.	164 If = 4 (P = 1001) 29 31 22 If = 2 (P = 450 df = 12 (F	210 0.96); 30 42 32 104 0.10); 550 P = 0.0	32.4% ² = 0% 10.4% 5.4% 4.8% 20.6% ² = 56% 100.0% 07); ² = 56	0.17 [0.10, 0.23] 0.03 [-0.05, 0.12] 0.10 [-0.08, 0.27] 0.22 [0.03, 0.41] 0.10 [-0.03, 0.23] 0.11 [0.06, 0.16]	
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: . 1.1.3 ALHX Li 2013 Qiu 2015 Wang 2015b Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: .	200 0.00; Chi ² : Z = 5.15 (P 30 35 29 94 0.01; Chi ² : Z = 1.51 (P 523 0.00; Chi ² = Z = 4.37 (P	211 = 0.62, c > < 0.000 42 32 104 = 4.56, c > = 0.13) 552 = 27.50, > < 0.000	164 If = 4 (P = 001) 29 31 22 82 If = 2 (P = 450 df = 12 (F	210 30 42 32 104 550 P = 0.0	32.4% ² = 0% 10.4% 5.4% 4.8% 20.6% ² = 56% 100.0% 07); ² = 56	0.17 [0.10, 0.23] 0.03 [-0.05, 0.12] 0.10 [-0.08, 0.27] 0.22 [0.03, 0.41] 0.10 [-0.03, 0.23] 0.11 [0.06, 0.16]	
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : 1.1.3 ALHX Li 2013 Qiu 2015 Wang 2015b Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : Test for overall effect: : Test for overall effect: :	200 0.00; Chi ² : Z = 5.15 (P 30 35 29 94 0.01; Chi ² : Z = 1.51 (P 523 0.00; Chi ² : Z = 4.37 (P	211 = 0.62, c < 0.000 30 42 32 104 = 4.56, c = 0.13) 552 = 27.50, < 0.000	164 If = 4 (P = 29 31 22 82 If = 2 (P = 450 df = 12 (F 1) 0 df = 2 (F	210 30 42 32 104 550 P = 0.0 2 = 0.0	32.4% ² = 0% 10.4% 5.4% 4.8% 20.6% ² = 56% 100.0% 07); ² = 56 2), ² = 22	0.17 [0.10, 0.23] 0.03 [-0.05, 0.12] 0.10 [-0.08, 0.27] 0.22 [0.03, 0.41] 0.10 [-0.03, 0.23] 0.11 [0.06, 0.16]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : 1.1.3 ALHX Li 2013 Qiu 2015 Wang 2015b Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : Test for overall effect: : Test for subaroup diffe	200 0.00; Chi ² : Z = 5.15 (P 30 35 29 94 0.01; Chi ² : Z = 1.51 (P 523 0.00; Chi ² : Z = 4.37 (P rences: Ch	211 = 0.62, c < 0.000 30 42 32 104 = 4.56, c = 0.13) 552 = 27.50, < < 0.000 ji ² = 3.00	164 If = 4 (P = 29 31 22 If = 2 (P = 450 df = 12 (F 11) . df = 2 (F	210 30 42 32 104 0.10); 550 P = 0.0 P = 0.2	32.4% ² = 0% 10.4% 5.4% 4.8% 20.6% ² = 56% 100.0% 07); ² = 56 2). ² = 33.	0.17 [0.10, 0.23] 0.03 [-0.05, 0.12] 0.10 [-0.08, 0.27] 0.22 [0.03, 0.41] 0.10 [-0.03, 0.23] 0.11 [0.06, 0.16]	-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

3.6.3 Alanine aminotransferase

Sixteen studies described ALT levels as the main outcome. A random-effects model was implemented for the analysis based on the heterogeneity test (p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 91\%$). Overall, ALT levels significantly decreased after the combination of anti-fibrotic CPMs and UDCA (MD = -10.01, 95% CI: -13.63, -6.39; p < 0.00001) (Figure 5C).

3.6.4 Aspartate aminotransferase

Sixteen studies reported serum AST levels as the main outcome. The AST data were processed using a random-effects model because AST was heterogeneous (p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 95\%$). The use of antifibrotic CMPs plus UDCA showed a greater decrease in serum AST levels than that with UDCA alone (MD = -10.83, 95% CI: -15.20, -6.46; p < 0.00001) (Figure 5D).

Δ				В
Study or Subaroup	Experimental Control Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weigh	Mean Difference	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl	Experimental Control Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Suboroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV. Random, 95% CI IV. Random, 95% CI
2.1.1 FZHY				2.2.1 FZHY
Jiang 2019 Liu 2020a	106.45 22.68 41 140.69 15.32 41 7.79 110.02 12.08 44 138.96 12.28 44 8.29	% -34.24 [-42.62, -25.86] % -28.94 [-34.03 -23.85]		Gao 2015 45.2 38.6 31 69.2 35.2 30 3.5% -24.00 [42.53, -5.47]
Wu 2012	98.2 10.1 40 116.1 12.6 40 8.29	% -17.90 [-22.90, -12.90]	-	Wu 2012 52 8.7 40 62.4 10.1 40 10.0% -10.40 [-14.53,-8.27]
Xie 2012	142 41 15 150 45 14 3.59	% -8.00 [-39.40, 23.40]		Xie 2012 139 26 15 161 32 14 2.9% -22.00 [-43.31, -0.69]
Yang 2017 Zhang 2014	123.46 53.25 60 172.46 58.56 60 5.49	% -49.00 [-69.03, -28.97] % 1 30 [-43 15 45 75]		Yang 2017 100.24 47.46 60 135.67 68.24 60 2.5% 534 5646, 514.40] Vino 2012 43,2 371 65 692 406 65 524 560 0137,1563
Subtotal (95% CI)	230 229 35.31	% -27.16 [-36.27, -18.05]	•	Zhang 2014 568 254 30 594 281 30 51% -2.60 [-16.5, 10.95]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	= 73.26; Chi ² = 22.66, df = 5 (P = 0.0004); i ² = 78% dt Z = 5.85 (P < 0.00001)			Subtotal (95% C1) 225 283 40.0% -18.72 [-26.33, -11.11] Heterogeneity, Tail = 62.29; Ch ² = 28.13, df = 6 (P < 0.0001); P = 79%, Totat for worder lifet → 2 = 8.97 (P < 0.0001)
2.1.2 FFBJRG				
Ai 2021	169.24 26.25 43 231.26 32.22 43 7.09	% -62.02 [-74.44, -49.60]		2.2.2 FFBJRG
Chen 2019	117.5 28.1 41 152.6 21.3 37 7.39	% -35.10 [-46.10, -24.10]		Chen 2019 187.1 16.3 41 199.8 15.7 37 8.4% -12.70[-19.81, -5.59]
Huang 2015 Liu 2020b	105.24 53.5 28 140.88 61.64 28 3.73 148.35 12.36 38 148.36 12.35 38 8.19	% -35.64 [-65.87, -5.41] % -0.01 [-5.57, 5.55]		Huang 2015 50.58 24.54 28 69.96 28.75 28 50.06 - 141.3 (-26.13, -0.13)
Pang 2017	102.32 50.12 25 140.21 52.08 25 4.09	% -37.89 [-66.22, -9.56]		Pang 2017 55.27 21.78 25 68.99 28.76 25 4.9% -13.72 [-27.86, 0.42]
Wang 2015a	104.9 51.7 39 139.6 60.4 39 4.59	% -34.70 [-59.65, -9.75]		Wang 2015a 54.9 24.3 39 70.2 26.4 39 6.2% 15.30 [-26.56, 4.04]
Wang 2020	107.82 12.38 36 132.69 11.68 36 8.19	% -24.87 [-30.43, -19.31]	-	Wang 2020 56.74 5.17 36 67.24 4.96 36 10.7% -10.50 [-12.84, -8.16]
Zhang 2015	119.59 30.24 32 141.34 28.63 32 6.69	% -21.75 [-36.18, -7.32]	Ψ ⁻	Zhang 2015 59.53 26.3 32 74.31 24.86 32 5.6% - 14.78 [-27.32, -2.24]
Subtotal (95% CI)	367 363 57.19	% -31.13 [-44.67, -17.58]	•	eductiona (05.8 G) Heteronomic (07.8 G) Heteronomic (07.8 G)
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect	= 359.50; Chi ² = 121.21, df = 8 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 93% t: Z = 4.50 (P < 0.00001)			Test for overall life Z = 4.56 (P < 0.00001)
2.1.3 ALHX				LLS PLINA
Wang 2015b	52 17 32 78 22 32 7.59	% -26 00 [-35 63 -16 37]	~	U 2013 49.9 35.1 30 56.2 30.2 30 3.0 4 -12.30 [20.34, 5.14] Wang 2015h 56 17 32 78 22 32 7.0% -22.00 [34] 6312.37]
Subtotal (95% CI)	32 32 7.5	% -26.00 [-35.63, -16.37]	•	Subtotal (95% Cl) 62 62 10.6% -19.85 [-28.35, -11.35]
Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	applicable t: Z = 5.29 (P < 0.00001)			Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.86; df = 1 (P = 0.35); P = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.58 (P < 0.00001)
Total (95% CI)	629 624 100.09	% -28.83 [-36.57, -21.10]	•	Total (95% CI) 586 580 100.0% -14.69 [-18.88, -10.50]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 183.34; Chi ² = 145.79, df = 15 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 90%	-	200 100 0 100 200	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 41.01; Ch ² = 65.34, df = 15 (P < 0.00001); P = 77%
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff	t: Z = 7.30 (P < 0.00001) fferences: Chi ² = 0.37. df = 2 (P = 0.83). I ² = 0%		Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	Test for overall effect: Z = 6.88 (P < 0.00001) - 100 - 300 - 300 - 100 - 300
С	Experimental Control	Mean Difference	Mean Difference	D Experimental Control Mean Difference Mean Difference
	Coperintential			
Study or Subaroup	p Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight	nt IV. Random, 95% CI	IV. Random. 95% Cl	
Study or Subgroup 2.3.1 FZHY	o Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weigh	nt IV. Random. 95% CI	IV. Random. 95% Cl	Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV. Random. 95% Cl IV. Random. 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup 2.3.1 FZHY Gao 2015 Liu 2020a	42.4 10.2 31 62.8 14.1 31 6.3%	nt IV. Random. 95% Cl % -20.40 [-26.53, -14.27] % -12.24 [-14.02 -10.46]	IV. Random. 95% Cl	
Study or Subaroup 2.3.1 FZHY Gao 2015 Liu 2020a Wu 2012	Control Control <t< td=""><td>t IV. Random. 95% Cl -20.40 [-26.53, -14.27] -12.24 [-14.02, -10.46] -11.00 [-15.03, -6.97]</td><td>IV. Random. 95% Cl</td><td>Study or Subgroup Mean SD. Total Weight W. Random. 95% Cl W. Random. 95% Cl 2.4.1 F2HY Jang 2019 442 11.25 41 68.17 14.11 41 6.8% -23.97 [-29.49, -18.45] Total Jung 2019 442 11.25 41 68.17 14.11 41 6.8% -23.97 [-29.49, -18.45] Total Liu 2020a 35.63 5.19 44 45.26 5.83 44 7.4% -5.06 [-17.3, 267] Total Wu 2012 36.6 6.3 0.418 5.2 0.73.2 (27) Total</td></t<>	t IV. Random. 95% Cl -20.40 [-26.53, -14.27] -12.24 [-14.02, -10.46] -11.00 [-15.03, -6.97]	IV. Random. 95% Cl	Study or Subgroup Mean SD. Total Weight W. Random. 95% Cl W. Random. 95% Cl 2.4.1 F2HY Jang 2019 442 11.25 41 68.17 14.11 41 6.8% -23.97 [-29.49, -18.45] Total Jung 2019 442 11.25 41 68.17 14.11 41 6.8% -23.97 [-29.49, -18.45] Total Liu 2020a 35.63 5.19 44 45.26 5.83 44 7.4% -5.06 [-17.3, 267] Total Wu 2012 36.6 6.3 0.418 5.2 0.73.2 (27) Total
Study or Subgroup 2.3.1 FZHY Gao 2015 Liu 2020a Wu 2012 Xie 2012	Despinit/Num SD Total Mean SD Total Weinh 42,4 10.2 31 62.8 14.1 31 6.3% 4102 2.28 44 63.26 5.58 44 7.5% 40.5 8.2 40 51.5 10.1 40 7.0% 33 5 15 38 9 14 6.6%	tt IV. Random. 95% Cl 6 -20.40 [-26.53, -14.27] 7 -12.24 [-14.02, -10.46] 7 -11.00 [-15.03, -6.97] 7 -5.00 [-10.35, 0.35]	IV. Random. 95% Cl	
Study or Subgroup 2.3.1 FZHY Gao 2015 Liu 2020a Wu 2012 Xie 2012 Yang 2017	December SD Total Mean SD SD SD	tt IV. Random. 95% Cl 6 -20.40 [-26.53, -14.27] 6 -12.24 [-14.02, -10.46] 7 -11.00 [-15.03, -6.97] 8 -5.00 [-10.35, 0.35] 8 -21.78 [-29.63, -13.93]	IV. Random. 95% Cl	Study or Studycorp. Mean SD. Total Mean SD. Total Weight W. Random. 95% CI W. Random. 95% CI 2.4.1 F2HY Jang 2019 44.2 112.5 41 6.85 -23.97 -23.48 -
Study or Subgroup 2.3.1 FZHY Gao 2015 Liu 2020a Wu 2012 Xie 2012 Yang 2017 Ying 2012 Tinge 2014	Description Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdescription< th=""></thdescription<></thdescription<>	tt IV. Random. 95% CI 6 -20.40 [-26.53, -14.27] 6 -12.24 [-14.02, -10.46] 7 -11.00 [-15.03, -6.97] 7 -5.00 [-10.35, 0.35] 7 -21.76 [-29.63, -13.93] 7 -20.20 [-23.84, -16.56] 7 -20.20 [-23.84, -16.56]	IV. Bandom. 35% Cl	Study or Subgroup Mean SD. Total Mean SD. Total Weight W. Random. 95% Cl W. Random. 95% Cl 2.4.1 F2HY 44.2 11.25 41 68.17 14.11 41 6.8% -23.97 [-29.49, -18.45] Liz 2020a 35.63 5.19 44 45.25 5.53 44 7.4% -68.5[+13.9, -7.37] ~ Wu 2012 36.66 6.3 0.41 5.22 47.7% -52.07 [-7.3, 2.67] ~ Xia 2012 46 6 15 5.4 1.4 6.5% -50.01 [-13.7, 2.67] ~ Zhang 2014 45.8 19.3 30 47.5 21.3 5.3% -17.01 [-11.90, 85.9] Subtick (IS% Cl) 170 168 33.7% -10.04 [-15.8, 4.49] •
Study or Subaroup 2.3.1 FZHY Gao 2015 Liu 2020a Wu 2012 Xie 2012 Yang 2017 Ying 2017 Zhang 2014 Subtotal (95% CI)	b Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight 42.4 10.2 31 62.8 14.1 31 6.3% 4102 2.28 44 53.6 5.88 44 7.5% 40.5 8.2 40 51.5 10.1 40 7.0% 33 5 15 38 9 14 6.6% 44.67 19.23 60 64.5 25.1 60 6.6 7.1% 42.2 19.4 30 51.2 2.4 30 45.2 24.4 30 51.2 24.4 30 51.2 24.4 30 51.2 24.4 30 51.2 24.4 30 51.2 24.4 44.8% 30 51.2 34.4 30 51.2 24.4 44.8% 30 51.2 34.4 30 51.2 34.4 30 51.2 34.4 30 51.2 34.4 30 51.2 34.4	 IV. Random. 95% Cl. -20.40 [-26.53, -14.27] -12.24 [-14.02, -10.46] -11.00 [-15.03, 6-9.7] -5.00 [-10.35, 0.35] -21.78 [-29.63, -13.93] -20.20 [-23.84, -16.56] -3.06 [-12.88, 8.81] -3.65 [-18.01, -9.29] 		Study of Subgroup. Mann. SD. Total Mann. SD. Total Weight V. Random. 85% CI V. Random. 85% CI 2.4.1 F2HY Jamp 2019 44.2.1 12.5 41.8.47.1 4.1 6.8%. 20.37 (23.46.48.46)
Study or Suboroup 2.3.1 FZHY Gao 2015 Liu 2020a Wu 2012 Xia 2012 Yang 2017 Ying 2012 Zhang 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec	b Department 0 Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight 41:02 2:18 62.8 14.1 31 6.39 41:02 2:28 44 53.8 5.8 44 7.59 40:5 8:2 40 51.5 10.4 7.09 33 5 15 38 9 14 66:4 46:7 10:2 60 64:5 7:14 10.6 65 7.19 42:12 23.4 30 512 23.4 30 512 23.4 30 52 22.6 44.89 252 22.0 14 44.89 24 44.99 252 22.0 14 44.81 24 44.91 252 22.4 44.89 24 44.91 25 28 24 44.91 25 28 44.81 24 44.91 25 28 14 46 16 16 16 16 16	IV. Random. 95% Cl. % -20.40 [26.53, -14.27] % -12.4 [-4.02, -10.66] % -11.00 [-15.03, -6.97] % -5.00 [-10.35, 0.35] % -21.0 [2.23.84, -16.56] % -20.20 [2.23.84, -16.56] % -20.42 [2.88, 8.88] % -13.65 [-18.01, -9.29]		Study or Subgroup Mean SD. Total Mean SD. Total Weight IV. Random. \$3% Cl IV. Random. \$3% Cl 2.4.1 F2HV Jang 2019 44.2 11.25 41 68.77 14.11 1 6.8% -23.97 [-29.49, -18.45] • Liz 2020a 35.63 5.19 44 45.26 5.53 44 7.4% -68.51 [-13.97, 3.267] • Wu 2012 36.6 6.3 0.41 5.2 47.73, 2.67] • Xia 2012 46 6 15 5.4 1.4 6.8% -50.01 (-13.73, 2.67) • Zhang 2014 45.8 19.3 30 47.5 21.3 5.5% -1.70 [-11.99, 5.69] Subtoal (5% Cl) 170 169 33.7% -1.0.4 [-15.59, -4.49] • Heterogeneity: Tul* \$2.21, 7.10 #* \$2.21, 7.10 #* \$2.21, 7.10 #* \$2.21, 7.10 #* \$2.21, 7.10 #* Test for ownall effect: Z = 3.55 (P = 0.0004) \$2.21, 7.21,
Study or Suboroup 2.3.1 FZHY Gao 2015 Liu 2020a Wu 2012 Yang 2017 Ying 2012 Zhang 2014 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² Test for overall effec	p Main SD Total Mean SD Total Weight 41.02 2.28 44 52.65 5.86 4.4 7.91 41.02 2.29 44 52.65 5.86 4.4 7.91 41.02 2.29 44 55.26 5.86 4.4 7.91 40.5 8.2 4.05 5.83 9 14 6.70 41.67 10.2 06.64.2 5.12 00 5.67 37.2 10.8 65 7.4 10.5 62 7.11 41.02 19.4 0.51.2 2.44 4.03 2.94 44.89 2.94 44.89 42.2 19.4 0.51.2 2.24 44.89 2.94 44.89 2.94 4.69 2.94 4.69 2.94 4.69 2.94 4.69 2.94 4.69 2.94 4.69 2.94 4.69 2.94 4.69 2.94 4.69 2.94 4.69 2.94 4.6	IV. Random. 35% CI. % -20.40 [:26.53, -14.27] % -12.24 [:14.02, -10.46] % -12.04 [:15.03, -6.37] % -20.10, -15.03, -0.37] % -20.20 [:23.24, -16.26] % -20.20 [:23.24, -16.26] % -20.20 [:23.24, -16.26] % -3.65 [:18.01, -9.29]		Study of Subgroup. Mean SD. Total Mean SD. Total Weight V. Random. 85% CI V. Random. 85% CI 2A.1 F2HY Jang 2019 44.2 112.5 41.8.47 14.1 6.8% 23.97 (23.46.16.45) ~ Lin 2000a 36.50 5.19 44.4 45.26 5.83 44 7.4% -9.65 (11.96.737) ~ Win 2012 36.8 6.3 40 1.85 2.03 (17.3, 2.67) ~ Zhang 2014 4.6 1.5 5.4 1.4 6.5% -4.00 (13.17, 2.83) ~ Zhang 2014 4.6 1.5 5.4 1.4 6.5% -4.00 (13.17, 2.83) ~ Zhang 2014 4.6 1.5 7.10 1.99 5.91 - - Subtoal (5% CI) 1.70 1.69 3.3.7% -1.00 (11.99.8.59] ~ - Heterogenety: Tas' = 2.371; Cht' = 39.18, df = 4.0 <<0.0001; P = 90%
Study or Suboroup 2.3.1 F2HY Gao 2015 Liu 2020a Wu 2012 Xia 2012 Yang 2012 Zhang 2014 Subtotal (85% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau' Test for overall effec	b Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight 41.02 2.18 62.8 14.1 31 6.3% 41.02 2.28 44 53.8 5.88 4.4 7.5% 41.02 2.28 44 53.8 9 14 64.7 41.02 2.28 44 53.8 9 14 66.7 41.67 16.2 06.64.5 57.4 10.6 67.7 10.4 67.7 41.67 12.0 66.45 57.4 10.6 67.7 10.4 69.7 24.4.8 42.2 19.4 61.9 51.2 23.4 44.8 28.5 24.4 44.8 24.4.8 24.4.8 24.5 44.6 10.0 60.00011; i* e5%. ct 2 = 51.4 (P < 0.00001)	 IV. Random. 35% CI. 20.40 [26.53, -14.27] 12.24 [-14.02, -10.46] -11.00 [-15.3, -6.37] 5.00 [-10.35, 0.35] 24.78 [29.63, -13.83] -20.21 [23.84, -16.56] -2.00 [-12.88, 8.88] -13.65 [-18.01, -9.29] 		Study of Subgroup Mean SD. Total Mean SD. Total Weight W. Random. 85% Cl V. Random. 85% Cl 2A.1 F2HY Jang 2019 44.2 11.25 41 68.17 14.11 1 6.8% 23.97 [-29.49, -18.45] Liz 2020a 35.63 5.19 44 45.25 5.53 44 7.4% -5.85 [-11.89, -7.37] Wu 2012 36.6 6.3 40 15 5.4 7.4% -5.20 [-7.3, 2.67] Xie 2012 46 6 15 5.4 14 6.5% -2.00 [-13.17, 2.67] Zhang 2014 45.8 19.3 30 7.21 30.5% -1.70 [-11.99, 6.59] Subtoal (6%, Cl) 170 169 33.7% -10.04 [-15.59, 4.49] ● Heitcorgonthyl Tur' = 23.7; Ch' = 33.18, (d' = 4 (P < 0.00001); P = 90%
Study or Subaroup 2.3.1 F2HY Gao 2015 Liu 2020a Wu 2012 Xia 2012 Yang 2017 Ying 2012 Zhang 2014 Subtotal (85% CI) Heterogeneiky. Tau' Test for overall effec 2.3.2 FFBJRG Chen 2019 Humo 2015	b Dependence b Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight 41.02 2.28 44.53 5.58 44.7 13.1 6.39 41.02 2.28 44.53 5.58 44 7.59 41.02 2.28 44.53 5.58 44 7.59 40.5 8.2 4.0 5.10 1.00 7.09 30 5 15 3.8 9 14 66.4 46.7 10.6 66 5.74 10.6 65 7.19 42.2 10.4 60 65 5.74 10.6 65 7.19 42.2 10.4 65 67.4 10.6 65 7.19 42.4 44.89 2.85 6.20.0001) 2.85 6.20.0001) 1.4 6.50 7.94 8.94 9.02 17.6 41 101.3 15.3 37 5.99 4.89 2.49 1.50<	tt V. Random. 85% CI % -20.40 (28:53, -14.27) % -12.04 (14.02, -10.46) % -12.04 (14.02, -10.46) % -11.00 (-15.03, -6.87) % -5.00 (-10.35, 0.35) % -20.20 (-23.84, -16.56) % -20.07 (-23.88, -18.84) % -20.07 (-23.88, -18.84) % -13.65 (-18.01, -9.29) % -11.10 [-18.40, -3.80] % -18.40, -3.80]	V. Random 35% Cl	Study of Subgroup. Man. SD. Total Man. SD. Total Weight W. Random. 85% Cl. V. Random. 85% Cl. 2.4.1 F2HY Jamp 2019 44.2 112.5 41.8.47 14.1 6.8%. 22.97 72.94.6.18.46] • Lin 2006 3.65.6 5.19 44.65.5 6.33 47.4%. 6.32.11.73.2.67] • Via 2012 36.6 6.3 40.41.8 5.2 40.74.5%. 2.02.17.73.2.67] • Zhing 2014 45.8 19.4 30.5 5.3%. -1.70.11.09.8.58] • • Zhing 2014 45.8 19.3 30 47.5 21.3 0.5%. • • Subtotal (6% Cl) 10 109 33.7%. •10.04.17.7.28] • • Test for overal effect Z = 3.58. (f = 4.00 6.00.0001); * e50%. •10.04.17.16.5.98, -4.49] • • 2.42 FFB.JRO All 20.5 18.2 33.75.10.42 •2.77.9 [-31.66, -24.22] • - Ohm 2019 0.55.14.8 10.55.18.2 3.75.19.92 57.9.4
Study or Subaroup 2.3.1 F2HY Gao 2015 Liu 2020a Wu 2012 Xia 2017 Ying 2017 Ying 2017 Ying 2017 Ying 2017 Xia 2017 Ying 2017 Xia 2017 Ying 2017 Liu 2020 Heterogeneity: Tau' Test for overall effec Chen 2019 Huang 2015 Liu 2020	p Main SD Total Mean SD Total Weight 41.02 2.23 45.25 5.58 1.41 31 6.37 41.02 2.23 44.53 6.58 4.4 7.57 41.02 2.24 45.55 6.58 4.4 7.57 41.05 2.24 45.55 0.58 4.4 7.57 41.67 12.23 0.51 5.33 9 14 6.67 41.67 12.0 0.64.5 5.57 40 6.57 7.19 42.1 19.4 0.65 5.74 10.5 6.57 7.19 42.2 10.5 0.52 2.24 4.4.89 2.25 2.24 4.4.89 2.25 2.24 4.4.89 2.25 2.24 4.4.89 2.25 2.24 4.21 1.25 2.25 2.24 4.21 2.21 1.25 2.21 2.21 2.21 2.21 4.21 2.21 4.21 2.21	 V. Random. 85% CI 20.40 (28.53, -14.27) -12.40 (1-40, -10.46) -11.00 [-15.03, -8.07) -20.17.8 (2-96.3, -13.23) -20.20 (2-3.84, -16.56) -20.20 (2-3.84, -16.56) -13.65 [-18.01, -8.29] -11.10 [-18.40, -3.80] -21.46 (3-32, 2-0.46) 	V. Bandom 35% Cl	Study or Studyczny Mam SD. Total Man SD. Total Weight N. Random. 85% CI V. Random. 85% CI 2A.1 F2HY Jang 2019 44.2 112.5 41 8.17 14.11 6.8% -29.17 (23.46, -18.46) • Liu 2020a 35.63 5.19 44 45.26 5.83 44 7.4% -9.63 (-11.89, -7.37) • Wu 2012 36.6 5.3 40 41.8 5.2 40 7.4% -5.20 (-7.3, 2.67) • Xie 2012 46 6 15 5.4 8 14 6.5% -0.00 (-13.17, 2.83) • Zhang 2014 45.8 19.3 30.47 (-21.23 5.3% -1.70 (-11.99, 8.59) • • Heitrogrammetry. Tut* = 23.71; Ch* = 39.18, dit = 40 < 0.00001; h* = 93.5%
Study or Subaroup 2.3.1 FZHY Gao 2015 Liu 2020a Wu 2012 Xia 2012 Yang 2017 Yang 2017 Zhang 2014 Subtota (6% C) Heterogeneity: Tau' Test for overall effec 2.3.2 FFBJRG Chen 2019 Huang 2015 Liu 2020b Pang 2017	Description Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdescription< th=""></thdescription<></thdescription<>	11 1/2, Random, 92% CI 6 -0.01 (>26.53, -1.62.7) 7 -2.22 (+1.60, -1.64.6) 6 -11.00 (-15.03, -6.97) 6 -0.01 (>3.5, 0.33) 6 -2.717 (>25.63, -12.62.7) 7 -2.00 (-12.84, -18.58, 8) 7 -2.00 (-12.84, -18.58, 8) 7 -2.00 (-12.84, -18.58, 8) 7 -1.16 (+3.42, -3.80) 6 -1.14 (+3.82, -5.60) 6 -1.24 (+3.22, -5.60) 6 -4.12 (+3.22, -5.60) 6 -4.62 (+2.17, 12.87)		Study or Studycorp. Mann. SD. Total. Main. SD. Total. Weight W. Random. 85% Cl. V. Random. 85% Cl. 2.4.1 F2hY Jang 2019 44.2 11.25 41 68.17 14.11 41 6.8% 23.97 [-29.49, -18.45] • Liz 2020a 35.63 5.19 44 45.26 5.53 44 7.4% -5.32 [-17.3, 26.7] • Wu 2012 46 6 15 5.4 14 6.5% -20.07 [-17.3, 26.7] • Xie 2012 46 6 15 5.1 44 45.25 -7.73, 26.7] • Xie 2012 46 6 15 5.1 4 6.5% -10.01/19.08, 53.9] • Studtoal (6%, C1) 17.0 169 33.7% ·10.04 [-15.59, -4.49] • Heitcorpoint, Turi = 25.70 (-12.07 = 33.18, df = 4 (P < 0.00001); P = 90%
Study of Subaroup 2.3.1 F2HY Gao 2015 Liu 2020a Wu 2012 Xing 2012 Xing 2012 Xing 2017 Ying 2012 Zhang 2014 Subbola (65% Cf) Heterogeneily Tau Test for overall effec 2.3.2 FFBJRG Chen 2019 Huang 2015 Liu 2020b Pang 2017	Defail Start <	1 1/2, Random, \$2%, Cl. 6 20.40 (265, 33, -14.27) 7 12.24 (1-40, 265, 33, -14.27) 8 -11.00 (1-50, 3, 4.37) 8 -5.00 (1-0.35, 0.35) 9 -2.00 (1-2.86, 3-1.30) 8 -11.10 (1-5.40, -3.80) 6 -1.05 (1-5.40, -3.80) 6 -1.26 (1-3.25, 0.50) 6 -2.00 (1-2.86, 1.88) 6 -2.00 (1-2.86, 1.88) 6 -2.00 (1-2.86, 1.88) 6 -2.00 (1-2.86, 1.88) 6 -2.00 (1-2.86, 1.88) 7 -1.45 (1-8.40, -3.80) 6 -2.00 (1-2.86, 1.88) 7 -1.45 (1-3.26, -4.88) 7 -2.80 (1-3.93, 3.59)		Study of Subgroup Main SD: Total Wass SD: Total Weight IV. Random. 85% CI IV. Random. 85% CI 2.4.1 F2HY Jamp 2019 44.2 112.5 41 83.7 41.1 16.8% 23.97 12.44 16.8% 72.97 12.46.61 T Lin 2020a 35.65 51.9 44.65 65.3 47.44 63.11.19.47.22.81 T T T T Via 2012 46.6 6 15 54 84.46.94.49.05.11.37.7.2.831 T T T T T T 10.90.5.91 T
Study or Subarouz 2.3.1 FZHY Gao 2015 Liu 2202a Wu 2012 Yang 2017 Yang 2017 Yang 2017 Zhang 2017 Subtotal (6%C) Heterognankhy. Tau' Test for overall effec 2.3.2 FFBJRG Chen 2019 Huang 2015 Zhang 2015 Zhang 2015 Zhang 2015 Zhang 2015	p Main SD Total Mean SD Total Weight 41.02 2.23 46.25 5.38 1.41 31 6.37 41.02 2.23 44.53 5.58 4.41 31 6.37 41.02 2.23 44.53 5.58 4.41 31 6.37 41.02 2.23 44.53 5.58 4.41 70.73 7.67 31.5 15 38 9 14 66.74 7.51 60 5.67 41.01 7.07 42.2 19.4 66.5 5.74 10.6 65 7.17 44.89 2.25 2.24 44.89 2.25 2.26 0.0001); 1.7 2.85% 5.27 2.83 4.57 2.85 5.59 7.69 2.54 7.69 2.54 7.69 2.54 7.69 2.54 7.69 2.24 4.19 7.22 15.9 9.25 5.89 2.21 1.12 2.25 5.89 <	 V. Random, 95% CI. 2040 (2653, 1-627) 2024 (1-402, -10.46) 41224 (1-402, -10.46) 4100 (1-503, -6.97) 5200 (1-203, 50, -10.36) 2200 (1-228, -16.36) 2200 (1-228, -16.36) 2200 (1-28, -16.36) 420, -124, -14.36) 4200 (1-28, -14.36) 420, -124, -14.36) 4214 (1-32, -4.46) 424 (1-32, -4		Study or Studyczny Mam SD. Total Main SD. Total Weight N. Random. 85% CI V. Random. 85% CI 2.4.1 F2NY Jang 2019 44.2 112.5 11.8,17 14.11 6.5% 22.97 [23:46,-18.45]
Study or Studenous 2.11 F2HV Gao 2015 Liu 2020a Wu 2012 Xie 2012 Ying 2017 Zhang 2014 Test for overall effect Chen 2019 Heterogeneily: Tau ² Test for overall effect Chen 2019 Hang 2015 Subtrate (6% CT) Hang 2015 Subtrate (6% CT) Hang 2015 Subtrate (6% CT) Hang 2015 Subtrate (6% CT) Hang 2015 Subtrate (6% CT) Subtrate (6% CT) Subtrate (6% CT) Subtrate (6% CT) Subtrate (6% CT)	Warn SD Total Mean SD Total Weight 42.4 10.2 31 62.8 14.1 31 6.37 41.02 2.28 44 53.80 5.88 44 7.57 41.02 2.28 44 53.80 5.88 44 7.57 41.02 2.28 44 53.80 5.88 44 7.57 41.67 16.2 0.51 10.1 7.07 33 5 15 3.8 9 14 6.67 41.67 16.20 0.664.5 57.4 10.6 65 7.4 10.4 65 7.19 91.2 11.4 30 51.2 2.8.3 15.27 2.8.5% 2.24 4.4.89 2.24 4.4.93 2.24 4.4.93 2.24 4.27 5.89 2.21 11.27 2.5 5.89 2.21 11.27 2.5 8.7 2.24 1.27 2.5 3.24 2.23 2.27	III. IV. Random, \$2% CI. 4. 20.40 [-26.53, -16.27] 4. 20.41 [-16.30, -8.97] 4. 22.24 [-16.42, -10.46] 4. -10.16 [-16.30, -8.97] 4. -50.0 [-10.35, 0.35] 4. -50.0 [-10.35, 0.35] 4. -50.0 [-10.35, 0.35] 4. -71.0 [-16.30, -8.97] 4. -20.0 [-12.86, 8.88] 4. -1.45 [-16.01, -8.29] 5. -1.86 [-13.01, -8.29] 5. -1.86 [-14.01, -8.29] 5. -1.86 [-14.21, 2.87] 5. -1.41 [-16.65, 3.84] 5. -1.41 [-16.65, 3.84] 5. -1.41 [-16.65, 3.84] 5. -1.41 [-16.65, 3.84] 5. -1.41 [-16.65, 3.84] 5. -1.41 [-16.65, 3.84] 5. -1.41 [-16.65, 3.84] 5. -1.41 [-16.65, 3.84] 5. -1.41 [-16.65, 3.84] 5. -1.41 [-16.65, 3.84]		Study of Subgroup Man SD Total Mandom SSS CI VL Random SSS CI 2.4.1 F2HY 2.4.1 F2HY 4.4.2 1.2.5 4.4.2 1.2.5 2.4.1 F2HY 4.4.2 1.2.5 1.4.6.1<
Study or Subarous 2.3.1 FZHY Gao 2015 Liu 2203a Wu 2012 Xiag 2017 Ying 2017 Ying 2017 Zhang 2014 Subtotal (695: C1) Heterogeneity: Tau ³ Test for overall effec Chen 2019 Huang 2015 Subtotal (695: C1) Heterogeneity: Tau ⁴ Test for overall effec	p Main SD Total Mean SD Total Weight 41.02 2.23 46.25 5.58 14.1 31 6.37 41.02 2.23 44.53 5.58 4.4 7.57 41.02 2.24 44.53 5.58 4.4 7.57 41.02 2.28 44.53 5.58 4.4 7.57 41.65 8.2 4.51 10.1 07.07 33 5 15 38 9 14 66 57.4 10.6 66 57.1 10.5 65 57.4 10.6 67 11 10.3 4.53 4.4 4.97 4.23 14.4 4.97 4.23 4.43 4.57 2.23 4.43 4.57 2.24 4.4.97 4.23 4.43 4.57 2.24 4.4.97 2.25 2.24 4.4.97 2.24 4.25 5.97 2.24 2.24 3.2 2.25 3.27 2.25 3.97 2.24	11 1/2, Random, 95% CL 6 20.40 (26.53, -14.27) 12 24.140 (26.53, -14.27) 5 20.17 (26.53, -14.27) 5 20.17 (26.26, -15.36) 5 20.17 (26.26, -15.36) 5 -20.17 (26.26, -16.36) 5 -20.17 (26.26, -16.36) 5 -20.17 (26.36, -16.37) 5 -20.17 (26.37, -16.37) 5 -20.17 (26.37, -16.37) 5 -20.17 (26.37, -16.37) 5 -20.17 (26.37, -16.37) 5 -20.17 (26.37, -16.37) 6 -11.10 (-18.40, -3.80) 5 -12.10 (-26.37, -26.37) 6 -2.41 (-26.37, -26.37) 5 -1.41 (-26.37, -26.37) 5 -1.41 (-26.37, -26.37) 5 -2.45 (-26.36, -0.45) 6 -2.45 (-26.36, -0.45)		Study or Studycznych Man SD. Total Man SD. Total Weight W. Random. 35% Cl W. Random. 35% Cl 2.4.1 F2NY Jang 2019 44.2 112.5 41 8.5, 71 41.1 16.8% -23.97 -23.48.1
Study or Subarouz 2.3.1 F2HY Gao 2015 Liu 2020a Wu 2012 Xie 2012 Ying 2014 Ying 2014 Ying 2014 Ying 2014 Subbotal (6% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau' Test for overall effec 2.3.2 FEB/G Chen 2016 Chen 2016 Yang 2015 Subbotal (6% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau' Test for overall effec 2.3.3 ALHX	Mann 50 Total Mean 50 Total Weigh 42.4 10.2 31 €2.8 14.1 31 €33 41.0 22.8 14.1 31 €33 41.0 22.8 14.1 31 €33 41.0 22.8 14.5 51.5 €3.4 7.59 41.0 15.5 €3.6 14 7.59 32.1 05.6 €5.5 €4 7.59 37.2 10.8 €5.57 4 10.6 €5.74 41.0 15.5 €3.1 22.8 44.83 42.1 9.4 25 51.2 23.4 4.43 42.2 19.4 25 51.2 23.4 4.43 42.2 19.4 25 51.2 23.4 4.43 42.2 19.4 25 21.2 5.2 85.8 7.69 24.5 11.1 2.2 5 21.83 15.27 35 8.57 24.5 11.27 25 27.83 15.42 25 38 7.69 23.1 11.27 25 27.83 15.42 25 38 7.69 23.1 11.27 25 27.83 15.42 25 38 7.69 24.43 9.2 23.28 27.45 13.6 22 24.30 9.2 23.2 83.4 12.23 32 6.69 71.4 10.13 15.3 37 5.99 24.5 11.15 28 27.45 13.6 23 38 7.69 23.1 41.5 28 27.45 13.6 23 38 7.69 23.2 11.27 25 27.83 15.42 25 38 7.69 23.2 11.27 25 27.83 15.42 25 38 7.69 23.2 11.27 25 27.83 15.42 25 38 7.69 23.2 11.27 25 27.83 15.42 25 38 7.69 23.2 12.27 6.01, d=5 (P-0.00); P=17% dt z=2.76 (P-0.00)	1 1/2. Anadom, 52% CL 4 20.4 (1-625, 3, -14.27) 4 20.4 (1-63, 3, -637) 5 20.6 (1-53, 0, -637) 5 5 5 0.7 (1-53, 0, -637) 5 0.7 (1-53, 0, -637) 5 0.7 (1-53, 0, -637) 5 0.7 (1-53, 0, -637) 5 0.7 (1-53, 0, -637) 5 0.7 (1-53, 0, -637) 5 0.7 (1-53, 0, -637) 5 0.7 (1-53, 0, -637) 5 0.7 (1-53, 0, -637) 5 0.7 (1-53, 0, -637) 6 0.7 (1-53, 0, -637) 6 0.7 (1-53, 0, -637) 6 0.7 (1-53, 0, -637) 6 0.7 (1-53, 0, -637) 6 0.7 (1-53, 0, -637) 6 0.7 (1-53, 0, -637) 7 1.6 (1-63, 0, -637) 6 -2.6 (1-63, 0, -635) 7 1.4 (1-64, 0, -637) 7 1.4 (1-64, 0, -637) 7 1.4 (1-64, 0, 0, -637) 7 1.4 (1-64, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0,		Study of Subgroup Main SD. Total Weight IV. Random. 85% CI IV. Random. 85% CI 2.4.1 F2HY Jamp 2019 44.2 112.5 41.8 11.4 16.8%, 22.97 [23.46, -18.46] — Lin 2006 36.56 51.9 44.65 53.4 44.65 53.4 44.7 Via 2012 36.6 63.4 41.45 52.4 0.7.4% -53.011.83, -73.7 — Via 2012 36.6 63.4 41.45 52.40 7.4% -53.011.73, 2.67] — Zheng 2014 45.8 19.3 30.47.5 21.3 0.5% -1.70[11.99.8.59] — Subtotal (95% CI) 10 109 33.7% -10.04[1.5.59, -4.49] — Via 2012 63.5 62.8 43.5 18.3 37.2% -7.79[-31.86, -24.22] — Test for overal effect Z = -3.50 (P = 0.0004) 2 2 -7.79[-31.86, -24.22] — — All 2012 63.55 62.8 43.57 19.9 85.7% -8.79[-45.69, -0.65]
Study or Subarouz 2.14 F2HY Gao 2015 Liu 2020a Wu 2012 Xing 2012 Xing 2012 Xing 2012 Xing 2014 Subtotal (85% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau' Test for overall effec 2.3.2 FFBJRG Chen 2015 Wang 2015 Zhang 2015	b Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Mean 41.02 2.23 44 52.85 5.86 44 75.9 41.02 2.23 44 52.85 5.86 44 75.9 41.02 2.23 44 52.85 5.86 44 75.9 41.02 2.24 44 52.85 5.86 44 75.9 40.5 8.2 44 51.5 10.4 67.7 43 14 67.9 44.67 14.2 10.6 66 67.4 10.5 62 7.87 42.1 19.4 616 7.4 10.5 63 4.4.9 42.2 19.4 616 57.4 10.5 57.7 28 58 42.2 13.15 28 28.38 15.27 28 58 7.64 23.1 15.2 28.23 15.27 28 58 7.64 23.3 19	 V. Random, 95% CI. W. 2040 (2653), 14:27 V. 204 (14:0253), 14:27 V. 1224 (14:02, 10:46) V. 100 (15:03, 6:37) V. 500 (1-03:0, 0:35) V. 218 (14:03, 14:05) V. 2020 (12:28, 14:05) V. 100 (12:28, 14:05) V. 110 (18:40, -3.80) V. 14:65 (14:05) V. 216 (12:28, 24:06) V. 216 (12:28, 25:06) V. 2		Study of Studycorup Main SD Total Main SD Total Weight W. Random. 35% Cl W. Random. 35% Cl 2A.1 F2HY Jang 2019 44.2 1125 41 84.7 14.11 41 65% 25% Cl 7.45% 7.45% Jang 2019 44.2 1125 41 85.7 14.11 41 65% 25.7 [26:46,-18.45] ************************************
Study or Subarous 2.3.1 FZHY Gao 2015 Liu 2202a Wu 2012 Yang 2017 Yang 2017 Yang 2017 Yang 2017 Zhang 2017 Subtotal (6%C) Heterogeneiky: Tau' Test for overall effec 2.3.2 FFB./RG Chen 2016 Huang 2015 Subtotal (6%C) Heterogeneiky: Tau' Test for overall effec 2.3.3 LHX Liu 2015 Wang 2015b	p Main SD Total Mean SD Total Mean 41.02 21 62.8 14.1 31 6.3% 41.02 22.8 44.53 5.58 44.4 7.5% 41.02 22.8 44.53 5.58 44.7 7.6% 41.02 22.8 44.53 5.58 44.7 7.6% 41.65 82.4 63.55 0.6 65.7 10.4 67.0% 41.67 162.3 0.6.64.5 52.1 0.5 67.4 10.6 67.71 42.2 19.4 66.5 57.4 10.6 67.71 41.0 10.3 15.2 24.4 4.89 42.2 19.4 (#.6 0.00001) 12.8 37.6 59.9% 24.3 13.2 28.3 12.7 25.5 38 7.6% 22.1 11.27 25.7.83 15.47 38 87.9% 24.33 22.63 12.33 2.6%	III. IV. Random, \$2%, CI. 0.20, 01, 268, 53, -16, 27		Study of Subgroup Main SD Total Main SD Total Weight N. Random. 82% CI N. Random. 82% CI 2.4.1 F2HY Jamp 2019 44.2 12.5 41.8 11.4 16.8% 22.87 [22.48, -18.45] Total Main 2019 44.2 11.25 41.4 11.4 6.8% 22.87 [22.48, -18.45] Total Total Main 2010 35.6 5.3 41.4 4.55 11.63 7.37 Total Total Main 2012 36.6 6.3 40.41.8 5.2 40 7.4% -5.20 [7.73, 2.67] Total Total Total Total Solidoral (19.5% CI) Total
Stuty or Subarous 2.1 F2HV Ga 2015 Liu 2020 Wu 2012 Xang 2017 Yang 2012 Zharg 2014 Zharg 2014 Subotal (8% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau' Test for overall effect 2.3.2 FFBJRG Chen 2019 Huang 2015 Zubotal (8% CI) Heterogeneity: Test for overall effect 2.3.3 ALHX Li 2013 Qiu 2015 Subtotal (8% CI) Wang 2015 Subtotal (8% CI)	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	11 1/0. Random, 95% CL 6 20.40 (26.53, -14.27) 7 12.24 (-14.02, -10.46) 6 -1.02 (-15.03, -9.37) 6 -5.00 (-10.35, 0.35) 6 -5.00 (-10.35, 0.35) 6 -7.00 (-15.03, -4.97) 6 -2.00 (-12.86, -18.88) 6 -1.05 (-3.25, -1.65) 6 -2.00 (-12.86, -1.88) 7 -1.35 (-15.01, -0.29) 6 -1.86 (-3.25, -5.60) 6 -2.00 (-12.86, -1.88) 7 -1.86 (-3.23, -5.60) 6 -2.00 (-12.86, -1.88) 7 -1.86 (-3.87, -0.27) 7 -1.85 (-2.94) 6 -1.41 (-5.80, -3.80) 7 -1.41 (-5.80, -3.81) 6 -1.46 (-29.47, 0.27) 6 -1.45 (-12.70, 0.27) 6 -1.45 (-12.70, 0.27) 6 -1.45 (-12.70, 0.27) 6 -1.45 (-15.47, 0.27) 6 -1.45 (-15.47, 0.27) 7 -1.53 (-15.47, -1.53)		Study of Subgroup Main SD. Total Main SD. Total Weight IV. Random. 82% CI IV. Random. 82% CI 2.4.1 F2HY Jamp 2019 44.2 112.5 41 83.7 14.1 6.5% 2.57 12.34 14.65 Lin 2020a 36.56 51.9 44.65 63.4 14.74 46.85 19.67 7.7 Via 2012 36.6 63 40 41.8 5.2 40.74% 43.01 13.0 7.7 Via 2012 46 6 15 54 44.6 4.68.4 4.00 1.13.7 2.83 1.70 11.98.59 Juntol 14.58.5 1.70 11.98.59 Juntol 14.58.5 1.70 11.98.59 Juntol 14.58.5 1.68 3.7% 1.00.41.15.98.59 Juntol 14.58.5 1.70 11.98.59 Juntol 14.58.55 1.68.41 Juntol 14.58.7 1.70 11.98.59 Juntol 14.58.55 Juntol 14.58.7 1.77 1.77 1.78 2.77 1.38.5.24.22 Juntol 14.58.55 Juntol 14.58.55 Juntol 14.58.57 <td< td=""></td<>
Study or Subarroup 2.3.1 FZHY Gao 2015 Liu 2203a Wu 2012 Xiag 2017 Ying 2017 Ying 2017 Zhang 2014 Subtotal (6%C 0) Heterogeneity: Tau ³ Test for overall effec Chen 2019 Huang 2015 Subtotal (6%C 0) Heterogeneity: Tau ³ Test for overall effec 2.3.3 FEJRG Chen 2019 Heterogeneity: Tau ³ Test for overall effec 2.3.3 ALHX Li 2015 Subtotal (6%C 0) Heterogeneity: Tau ³ Test for overall effec	p Main SD Total Mean SD Total Weight 41.02 21 62.8 14.1 31 6.39 741.02 22.8 44.53 5.58 44.7 74.7 74.02 22.8 44.53 5.58 44.7 74.02 74.04 75.0	1 1/1. Rendem, \$2%, Cl. 4 20.4 (action, \$2, \$2, \$3, \$1, \$2, \$1, \$2, \$2, \$1, \$1, \$2, \$2, \$1, \$1, \$2, \$2, \$1, \$2, \$2, \$1, \$2, \$2, \$1, \$2, \$2, \$1, \$1, \$2, \$1, \$2, \$2, \$1, \$2, \$2, \$2, \$2, \$2, \$2, \$2, \$2, \$2, \$2		Study of Substration Main SD Total Weight W. Random, 92% Cl. W. Random, 92% Cl. 2.4.1 F2HY Jamp 2019 44.2 112.5 16.8.1 17.2.2.4.1 16.4.5 Lin 2020a 3.56.5 51.9 44.5.5 53.9.4 44.8.3.7.3.7.1 17.2.2.4.1 16.4.6.1 Via 2012 3.66 6.3 40.4.18 52.4 0.7.4.% 45.0.1.1.3.7.2.6.7.1 17.2.2.6.7.1 Via 2012 4.66 15 54.8 44.9.8.4 4.0.0.1.3.7.7.2.6.7.1 19.3.3.7.4 1.0.0.4.1.7.2.8.1.1 Subted 16% CD 170 169 33.7.8 1.0.0.4.1.7.2.8.1.1 19.9.2.7.4.4.0.1 Via 2012 6.5.5 6.2.4 3.5.4.1.4 10.1.5 43.7.4.4.0.1 19.9.3.7.4.1.0.4.1.5.5.9.4.4.0.1 Haterogenety: Tau" = 32.7.1.C.W = 33.18. dt = 4.(P < 0.0.0001); P = 90%
Study or Subarous 2.3.1 F2HV Gas 2015 Liu 2020a Wu 2012 Xia 2017 Yang 2017 Yang 2017 Zhang 2017 Zhang 2017 Zhang 2017 Chen 2019 Haterogenehy, Tau' Test for overall effec 2.3.2 FFBJRG Chen 2019 Haung 2015 Zhang 2015 Test for overall effec 2.3.3 ALHX Li 2013 Giu 2015 Subtotal (65% Cf)	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	IV. Random, 95% CL 4: 0.0. Rendom, 95% CL 4: 0.20 (-16.03, -0.27) 4: 0.20 (-16.03, -0.37) 5: 0.0 (-10.35, 0.35) 4: 2.10 (-16.03, -0.37) 4: 0.20 (-12.88, -0.38) 4: 0.20 (-12.88, -0.38) 4: 0.20 (-12.88, -0.38) 4: 0.20 (-12.88, -0.38) 4: 0.20 (-12.88, -0.38) 4: 0.20 (-12.88, -0.38) 4: 0.20 (-12.88, -0.38) 5: 0.20 (-23.82, -0.38) 4: 0.20 (-12.88, -0.38) 5: 0.20 (-23.93, -0.39) 5: 0.20 (-23.93, -0.39) 5: 0.20 (-23.93, -0.39) 5: 0.20 (-23.94, -0.38) 5: 0.20 (-23.94, -0.38) 5: 0.20 (-23.04, -0.38) 5: 0.14.50 (-25.47, 0.27) 5: 0.14.50 (-25.47, 0.27) 5: 0.14.50 (-25.47, 0.27) 5: 0.14.50 (-25.47, 0.27) 5: 0.14.50 (-25.47, 0.27) 5: 0.14.50 (-25.47, 0.27) 5: 0.14.50 (-25.47, 0.27) 5: 0.14.50 (-25.47, 0.27) 5: 0.14.50 (-25.47, 0.27) 5: 0.15.50 (-25.47, 0.27) 5: 0.15.50 (-25.47, 0.27) 5: 0.15.50 (-25.47, 0.27) 5: 0.15.50 (-25.44, -4.50)<		Study of Subscroup Main SD Total Main SD Total Weight W. Random. 85% Cl W. Random. 85% Cl 2.4.1 F2HY Jamp 2019 44.2 1125 418.17 4.11 416.85% 239.7 [26:46, -18.45] Lin 2000 356.5 51.91 44.55 65.34 47.4% 453.1 [139, 37.37] Via 2012 36.6 6.3 40.41.8 52.40 7.4% 453.0 [139, 7.32] Via 2012 46 6.15 54 44.64 453.9 [13.97, 7.28] - Zhang 2014 45.8 19.3 0.475 21.3 30.55% -170[1139, 8.59] Subtoal (8% Cl) 170 170 169.33% +100[1139, 8.59] - Subtoal (8% Cl) 2.17, Ch* 33.18, d* 40 9.43 18.3 7.2% -27/9 [31.36, -24.22] - Chan 2019 8.15 14.8 41 9.53 18.3 7.2% -27/9 [31.36, -24.22] - Chan 2019 8.15 14.8 9.35 18.9 2.6% -15.14.8.4.1 19.7 (24.2.27/9 [31.36, -
Study of Subarous 2.3.4 F27W Gao 2015 Gao 2015 Gao 2012 Viang 2012 Xiang 2014 Viang 2017 Yang 2017 Zhang 2014 Subtotal (BSV CI) Heterogeneily: Tau' Test for overall effec Chen 2019 Huang 2015 Chen 2015 Wang 2015 Subtotal (BSV CI) Heterogeneily: Tau' Test for overall effec 2.3.3 ALHX U 2013 Oliv 2015 Subtotal (BSV CI) Heterogeneily: Tau' Test for overall effec Subtotal (BSV CI) Heterogeneily: Tau' Test for overall effec Subtotal (BSV CI)	$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	11 1/2, Random, 95% CI 6 20.40 (265.3), 46.27 12.24 (1-40.265.3), 46.27 12.24 (1-40.27, 10.46) 6 -10.20 (1-50.3, 6.37) 4 -10.20 (1-50.3, 6.37) 5 -10.40 (1-50.3, 6.37) 5 -10.40 (1-50.3, 6.37) 5 -10.40 (1-50.3, 6.37) 5 -10.40 (1-50.3, 6.37) 5 -10.40 (1-50.3, 6.37) 6 -20.0 (1-2.80, 8.80) 6 -20.0 (1-2.80, 8.80) 6 -20.0 (1-2.80, 8.80) 6 -20.0 (1-2.80, 8.80) 7 -2.40 (1-3.82, -0.46) 6 -2.40 (1-3.82, -0.46) 7 -2.40 (1-3.82, -0.46) 7 -2.40 (1-3.82, -0.46) 7 -2.40 (1-3.82, -0.46) 7 -2.40 (1-3.82, -0.46) 7 -2.40 (1-3.82, -0.46) 7 -2.40 (1-3.82, -0.46) 8 -1.41 (1-4.86, 3.84) 9 -2.40 (1-3.26, -0.27) 14 -1.45 (1-4.74, -1.13) 14 -1.45 (1-4.74, -1.13) 1	.V. Bandom 35% Cl 	$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$
Study or Subserved 2.3.1 F2/W or Subserved Gase 2015 Liu 2020s Wig 2012 Xia 2012 Xia 2012 Yang 2017 Zhang 2014 Zhang 2017 Zhang 2017 Zhang 2017 Subtoal (5% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau' Test for overall effoc 2.3.2 FERRG Chan 2016 Huang 2015 Subtoal (5% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau' Test for overall effoc 2.3.3 ALVK Liu 2015 Subtoal (5% CI) Heterogeneilty: Tau' Test for overall effoc 2.3.3 ALVK Liu 2015 Subtoal (5% CI) Heterogeneilty: Tau' Test for overall effoc Toal (5% CI) Heterogeneilty: Tau' Test for overall effoc Toal (5% CI) Heterogeneilty: Tau' Test for overall effoc Toal (5% CI) Heterogeneilty: Tau'		1 1/k. Rendom, \$2%, Cl. 4 20.40 (268.5), -16.27 4 20.40 (268.5), -16.27 4 22.24 (-16.40, -16.50, -9.87 5 5.00 (-10.50, -9.87 4 5.00 (-10.50, -9.87 4 7.00 (-15.02, -9.87 4 7.00 (-15.02, -9.87 4 7.10 (-15.02, -9.87 4 7.10 (-15.02, -9.87 4 7.10 (-15.02, -9.87 5 2.02 (-12.28, -18.88) 4 -1.45 (-14.22, -5.06) 5 -1.28 (-15.22, -5.06) 4 -1.28 (-12.42, -12.87) 4 -1.47 (-13.85, -3.84) 4 -1.42 (-12.48, -3.84) 4 -1.42 (-12.42, -4.87) 4 -1.42 (-12.42, -4.87) 4 -1.42 (-12.48, -3.84) 4 -1.42 (-12.42, -4.87) 5 -1.42 (-12.42, -4.87) 5 -1.42 (-12.42, -4.7) 5 -1.41 (-12.40, -10.42) 6 -1.42 (-12.42, -4.7) 5 -1.42 (-12.42, -4.7) 6 -1.42 (-1	V. Random, 95%, Cl	Study of Substration Main SD. Total Weight W. Random. 85% Cl W. Random. 85% Cl 2.4.1 F2HY Jamp 2019 44.2 112.5 11.4 11.6 58% C2 7.8.1 8.8.1 7.8.1 <t< td=""></t<>

FIGURE 5

Forest plot of meta-analysis of liver function (A) alkaline phosphatase; (B) gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase (C) alanine aminotransferase; and (D) aspartate aminotransferase.

3.7 Liver fibrosis

Nine trials reported the serum LN and IV-C levels, and we performed a subgroup analysis on these. The findings revealed that the LN (MD = -19.67, 95% CI: -22.73, -16.61) and IV-C (MD = -18.01, 95% CI: -20.96, -15.06) notably decreased after treatment with the combination of anti-fibrotic CMPs plus UDCA (p < 0.00001) (Figures 6A, B).

HA levels were reported in four clinical studies, and PC-III was reported as an outcome indicator in six. After testing for heterogeneity, HA was analyzed using a fixed-effects model (p = 0.22, $I^2 = 32\%$) and PC-III (p = 0.51, $I^2 = 0$) levels. The experimental group showed a greater decrease in serum HA (MD = -22.33, 95% CI: -31.69, -12.96) and PC-III (MD = -15.19, 95% CI: -19.61, -10.77) levels than the control group (p < 0.00001) (Figures 6C, D).

3.8 Immune function

3.8.1 Immunoglobulin M and immunoglobulin G

The IgG data were processed using a fixed-effects model based on the heterogeneity test (p = 0.96, $I^2 = 0\%$), and a random-effects model was used for the IgM data with high heterogeneity (p = 0.03, $I^2 = 63\%$). The MD (95% CI) of IgG and IgM were -2.86 (-3.63, -2.08) and -1.28 (-1.62, -0.94), respectively. Compared with UDCA alone, the additional use of anti-fibrosis CPMs was more effective in reducing IgG and IgM levels (Figures 7A, B).

3.9 Symptom score

Three trials reported Symptom Score Change as the main outcome. The fixed-effects model was adopted because of the

FIGURE 6

Forest plot of meta-analysis of liver fibrosis (A) laminin; (B) type IV collagen (C) hyaluronic acid; and (D) type III procollagen.

absence of heterogeneity (p = 0.62, $I^2 = 0\%$). The improvement in the Symptom Score Change was better in the experimental group than in the control group (MD = -4.89, 95% CI: -5.24, -4.54; p < 0.00001) (Figure 8).

3.10 Adverse events

Adverse events were described in seven studies. Three articles reported a total of nine patients who developed mild diarrhea and

nausea after taking CPM; however, these symptoms were not severe and did not require treatment. Four studies reported no adverse reactions.

3.11 Publication bias

An inverted funnel plot analysis of the clinical efficacy rate revealed that there may be publication bias in the asymmetric distribution of these publications (Figure 9).

4 Discussion

PBC is the most common autoimmune cirrhotic hepatic disease, occurring in all ethnic groups worldwide (Lv et al., 2020). The prognosis of patients with PBC mostly depends on the degree of liver fibrosis and its complications (Lammers et al., 2015). Patients with PBC tend to seek additional pharmacological treatments because UDCA is not uniformly effective (Lammers et al., 2015). In recent years, TCM has been widely studied and discussed as a complementary therapy. Many studies have shown that TCM plus UDCA has diverse advantages in relieving the clinical symptoms and improving the prognosis of PBC.

This meta-analysis validated the advantages of FZHY, FFBJRG, and ALHX combined with UDCA in the treatment of PBC. Compared with UDCA treatment alone, anti-fibrotic CPMs plus UDCA improved efficacy rates. Furthermore, liver function tests are widely used in clinical practice as indicators of the degree of liver damage. ALP, ALT, AST, and GGT levels decreased after combined treatment with anti-fibrotic CPMs and UDCA. LN, IV-C, PC-III, and HA are indicators for the detection of liver fibrosis, and the addition of anti-fibrosis CPMs to UDCA resulted in decreased levels of these compared with UDCA treatment alone. Moreover, immunological indicators (IgM and IgG) and clinical symptoms also notably improved with the combined treatment of anti-fibrotic CPMs and UDCA. In conclusion, anti-fibrotic CPMs combined with UDCA in the treatment of PBC effectively relieved various clinical indicators. These results provide hope for the treatment and prevention of liver fibrosis and cirrhosis in the future.

The pathobiology of PBC is characterized by inflammation, bile duct damage, and fibrosis (You et al., 2022), of which fibrosis appears in stage II. It is believed that TCM is hepatoprotective and anti-inflammatory and suppresses the activation of hepatic stellate cells, which is advantageous in the treatment of liver fibrosis. Additionally, TCM may have multilevel, multi-pathway, and multi-target pharmacological actions on the comprehensive pathogenesis of PBC. For example, P. notoginseng is an ingredient in FFBJRG and ALHX, and P. notoginseng saponins are its main active constituent, which play an immunomodulatory role by reducing the levels of pro-inflammatory cytokines (Jiang et al., 2013). Furthermore, Ophiacordyceps sinensis, as a duplicate herb in FZHY and FFBJRG, can attenuate liver inflammation and fibrosis by regulating the expression of the TGF-β/MAPK pathway (Fu et al., 2021). Moreover, a mechanistic study has revealed that FZHY can decrease the expression levels of α-SMA, CTGF, TIMP-1, TGF-β1, and Smads, thereby reducing hepatic apoptosis, acute liver injury, and liver fibrosis (Cheng et al., 2013; Xie et al., 2013). An animal experiment reported that FFBJRG ameliorates hepatic disease by reducing the serum collagen levels of LN, HA, and IV-C and downregulating TGF-β-Smad pathway fibroblast signal transduction (Yang et al., 2013). The possible mechanism of ALHX for the inhibition of hepatic fibrosis is related to enhancing MMP2 activity in liver tissue and promoting extracellular matrix degradation by hepatoprotective enzymes (Tan et al., 2010). In brief, certain evidence support the anti-inflammatory and anti-fibrosis effects of FZHY, FFBJRG, and ALHX as the appropriate CPMs for treating PBC.

However, this meta-analysis had some limitations. First, the 22 studies included had a small sample size, all were Chinese, and only a small number of studies reported several outcome indicators. Second, most publications only mentioned random assignment, and only one-third of the studies described a specific randomization method, such as a random number table. Therefore, the findings need to be further evaluated using high-quality trials. Third, different studies had different experimental periods, ranging between 12 and 48 weeks, which may be a source of heterogeneity. Fourth, although anti-fibrosis CPMs were always used in the experimental group, there were three different types—FZHY, FFBJRG, and ALHX, which could also be a source of heterogeneity. Finally, because half of the studies did not mention adverse events, the safety of CPMs as an anti-fibrosis therapy for PBC should be further evaluated, and caution is needed when drawing conclusions.

5 Conclusion

Our research shows that the combination of anti-fibrosis CPMs and UDCA is more effective than UDCA alone in treating PBC in improving clinical efficacy rate, liver fibrosis, liver function, immune function, and symptom score. This systematic review and metaanalysis provides reliable clinical evidence for PBC treatment. Antifibrotic CPMs are a promising therapeutic approach to supplement the conventional treatment of PBC. However, further evidence from high-quality and multi-center studies with larger samples is warranted to confirm the curative effect of anti-fibrosis CPMs during follow-up periods.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary Materials, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

References

Ai, Y. G. (2021). The effect of ursodeoxycholic acid combined with compound Biejia ruangan tablet on liver function and immune function of PBC/AI yuanguang. *Chin. Foreign Med. Res.* 19, 49–51.

Chen, J. L., Yang, X., Zhang, Q., Liu, Y., and Wang, X. B. (2018). Effect of ursodeoxycholic acid with traditional Chinese medicine on biochemical response in patients with primary biliary cholangitis: A real-world cohort study. *Chin. J. Hepatol.* 26, 900–915.

Chen, M. M., Duan, X. Y., and Cao, H. X. (2019). Therapeutic effect of Biejia Ruangan Tablet on patients with primary biliary cirrhosis. J. Pract. Hepatology 22, 880–882.

Cheng, Q., Li, N., Chen, M., Zheng, J., Qian, Z., Wang, X., et al. (2013). Fuzheng Huayu inhibits carbon tetrachloride-induced liver fibrosis in mice through activating hepatic NK cells. *J. Ethnopharmacol.* 145, 175–181. doi:10.1016/j.jep.2012.10.047

Cheung, A. C., Lapointe-Shaw, L., Kowgier, M., Meza-Cardona, J., Hirschfield, G. M., Janssen, H. L., et al. (2016). Combined ursodeoxycholic acid (UDCA) and fenofibrate in primary biliary cholangitis patients with incomplete UDCA response may improve outcomes. *Aliment. Pharmacol. Ther.* 43, 283–293. doi:10.1111/apt.13465

European Association For The Study Of The Liver (2017). EASL Clinical Practice Guidelines: The diagnosis and management of patients with primary biliary cholangitis. *J. Hepatol.* 67, 145–172. doi:10.1016/j.jhep.2017.03.022

Fu, X. L., Xiao, J., and Niu, L. (2021). Cordyceps sinensis alleviating CCl4-induced liver inflammation and fibrosis in rats by regulating MAPK pathway. *China Pharm.* 24, 1657–1664.

Author contributions

XW and YB designed the study. KS and JC contributed to the data collection and analysis. The results were interpreted by YB. KS drafted the original manuscript. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

Funding

This study was supported by the Beijing Municipal Science Technology Commission (no. Z191100006619033). Beijing Ditan Hospital scientific research fund project (DTYM202102).

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/fphar.2023.1159222/ full#supplementary-material

Gao, F., Xun, J., and Jiao, J. L. (2015). Clinical observation of Fuzhenghuayu capsules combined with ursodeoxycholic acid capsules in the treatment of primary biliary cirrhosis. *J. Shanxi Med. Coll. Continuing Educ.* 25, 17–19.

Huang, L. Y., Zhou, Z. H., Sun, X. H., and Gao, Y. Q. (2015). Clinical efficacy of Biejiaruangan compound tablets in treatment of primary biliary cirrhosis. *J. Clin. Hepatol.* 31, 181–184.

Ji, D., Chen, Y., Bi, J., Shang, Q., Liu, H., Wang, J. B., et al. (2022). Entecavir plus Biejia-Ruangan compound reduces the risk of hepatocellular carcinoma in Chinese patients with chronic Hepatitis B. *J. Hepatol.* 77, 1515–1524. doi:10.1016/j.jhep.2022. 07.018

Jiang, H., Wang, Y. Z., Liu, X. C., and Xue, X. (2013). Effect of Panax notoginseng saponins on cytokines in liver fibrosis rats. J. Chin. Med. Mater. 36, 1123–1127.

Jiang, X. Y., Wu, W. J., and Ou, Y. (2019). Therapeutic effect of Fuzheng huayu capsule combined with ursodeoxycholic acid on primary biliary cholangitis. *Pub Med. Forum Mag.* 23, 3667–3668.

Lammers, W. J., Hirschfield, G. M., Corpechot, C., Nevens, F., Lindor, K. D., Janssen, H. L. A., et al. (2015). Development and validation of a scoring system to predict outcomes of patients with primary biliary cirrhosis receiving ursodeoxycholic acid therapy. *Gastroenterology* 149, 1804–1812.e4. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2015.07.061

Li, Z. Q., and Wu, D. 2013. Clinical observation of Anluo Huaxian pill combined with ursodeoxycholic acid in the treatment of primary biliary cirrhosis. *Chin. J. Integr. Traditional West. Med. Liver Dis.*, 23, 277–278. Liu, F. (2020a). Clinical effect of Compound Biejia Ruangan Tablet on patients with primary biliary cirrhosis. *Chin. Health Care* 38, 5–6.

Liu, F. (2020b). Influence of fuzheng huayu capsule on liver function and immune function in patients with primary biliary cirrhosis. *Guangming J. Chin. Med.* 35, 304–306.

Liu, H. L., Lv, J., Zhao, Z. M., Xiong, A. M., Tan, Y., Glenn, J. S., et al. (2019). Fuzhenghuayu Decoction ameliorates hepatic fibrosis by attenuating experimental sinusoidal capillarization and liver angiogenesis. *Sci. Rep.* 9, 18719. doi:10.1038/ s41598-019-54663-4

Lu, W., Gao, Y. H., Wang, Z. Z., Zhang, H., Yang, Y. Q., Miao, Y. Q., et al. (2017). Effect of Anluo huaxian Wan on transforming growth factor β 1 and its signal pathway in rats with liver fibrosis Chin. *J. Hepatol.* 25, 257–262. doi:10.3760/cma.j.issn.1007-3418.2017.04.005

Lv, T., Chen, S., Li, M., Zhang, D., Kong, Y., and Jia, J. (2020). Regional variation and temporal trend of primary biliary cholangitis epidemiology: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. Gastroenterology Hepatology* 36, 1423–1434. doi:10.1111/jgh. 15329

Page, M. J., Moher, D., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., et al. (2021). PRISMA 2020 explanation and elaboration: Updated guidance and exemplars for reporting systematic reviews. *Bmj* 29, n160. doi:10.1136/bmj. n160

Pang, Y. M. (2017). Clinical research of Biejia Ruangan tablets combined with ursodeoxycholic acid in treatment of the primary biliary cirrhosis. *Aero Med.* 28, 880–882.

Prince, M., Chetwynd, A., Newman, W., Metcalf, J. V., and James, O. F. (2002). Survival and symptom progression in a geographically based cohort of patients with primary biliary cirrhosis: Follow-up for up to 28 years. *Gastroenterology* 123, 1044–1051. doi:10.1053/gast.2002.36027

Qiu, H. Q., and Rao, L. P. (2015). Anluo huaxian pill in treatment of primary biliary cirrhosis patients and influence on Index of immunology. *Chin. Archives Traditional Chin. Med.* 33, 2922–2925.

Tan, X. H., Li, C. Q., Zou, S. R., Xie, M., Zhang, A. M., Li, W. L., et al. (2010). Inhibitory effect of anluohuaxianwan on experimental hepatic fibrosis in rats. *Zhonghua Gan Zang Bing Za Zhi* 18, 9–12. doi:10.3760/cma.j.issn.1007-3418.2010.01.003

Wang, D. T. (2015). Observation of curative effect Biejia Ruangan tablets combined with ursodeoxycholic acid on the primary biliary cirrhosis. *Contem Med. Forum* 13, 138–139.

Wang, J. (2020). Clinical effect of compound Biejia Ruangan Tablet on patients with primary biliary cirrhosis. *Front. Med.* 223.

Wang, W., Tian, Y., Li, Y. F., and Lu, Y. J. (2015). Observation of curative effects of Anluohuaxian pills combined with ursodeoxycholic acid capsules on patients with primary biliary cirrhosis. *Chin. J. Liver Dis. Version*) 7, 100–102.

Wang, X. B., Liu, Y., and Wang, X. B. (2020). Biochemical response and integrated traditional Chinese and Western medicine therapy for primary biliary cholangitis. *J. Clin. Hepatol.* 36, 26–30.

Wu, Y., Yao, D. K., and Zhu, L. (2012). Clinical observation on the safety and efficacy of ursodeoxycholic acid and Fuzheng huayu capsule in the treatment of primary biliary cirrhosis. *Chin. J. Integr. Trad. West Med.* 32, 1477–1482.

Xie, H., Tao, Y., Lv, J., Liu, P., and Liu, C. 2013. Proteomic analysis of the effect of fuzheng huayu recipe on fibrotic liver in rats. *Evid. Based Complement. Altern. Med.*, 2013, 972863, doi:10.1155/2013/972863

Xie, X. R., Hu, B., and Du, W. X. (2012). Clinical efficacy of ursodeoxycholic acid tablets combined with Biejia Ruangan tablets on primary biliary cirrhosis. *Shanxi Med. J.* 25, 257–262.

Yang, F. R., Fang, B. W., and Lou, J. S. (2013). Effects of Fufang Biejia ruangan pills on hepatic fibrosis *in vivo* and *in vitro*. *World J. Gastroenterol*. 19, 5326–5333. doi:10.3748/ wjg.v19.i32.5326

Yang, Z. G. (2017). Curative effect of Fuzheng Huayu capsule combined with ursodeoxycholic acid capsule on primary biliary cirrhosis. *Psychol. Dr.* 23, 175–176.

Ying, H. J. (2012). Observation and nursing of the short-term effect of ursodeoxycholic acid and Fuzheng huayu capsule on primary biliary cirrhosis. *Strait Pharm. J.* 24, 217–218.

You, H., Ma, X., Efe, C., Wang, G., Jeong, S. H., Abe, K., et al. (2022). APASL clinical practice guidance: The diagnosis and management of patients with primary biliary cholangitis. *Hepatol. Int.* 16, 1–23. doi:10.1007/s12072-021-10276-6

Zhang, F. C., Wang, L., Shuai, Z. W., Wu, Z. L., Zhang, W., Zhang, Z. L., et al. (2021). Recommendations for diagnosis and treatment of primary biliary cholangitis in China. *Zhonghua Nei Ke Za Zhi* 60, 709–715. doi:10.3760/cma.j.cn112138-20210520-00360

Zhang, H., Wang, J. B., Liu, X. B., and Yin, X. Y. (2020). Effect of compound Biejia Ruangan tablet combined with ursodeoxycholic acid on primary biliary cirrhosis. *Med. Front.* 10.

Zhang, J. Y., Zhang, Y. P., and Zhang, L. (2014). Clinical research of Fuzheng huayu capsule and ursodeoxcholic acid in the treatment of primary biliary cirrhosis. *Chin. J. Hepatol.* 6, 63–66.

Zhang, S.-S., Li, Y., and Xu, F. (2015). Clinical effects of ursodeoxycholic acid combined with compound Biejia Ruangan tablets in treatment of the early- or midstage primary biliary cirrhosis. *World Chin. J. Dig.* 23, 4251. doi:10.11569/wcjd.v23.i26. 4251

Zhang, W. (2021). Clinical effect of compound Biejia ruangan tablets combined with ursodeoxycholic acid on primary biliary cirrhosis. *Pract. Clin. Med.* 22.

Zhang, X. D. (2019). Clinical observation of ursodeoxycholic acid tablets combined with compound Biejia Ruangan tablets in the treatment of 85 cases of primary biliary cirrhosis. *Chin. Pract. Med.* 14, 9–10.