#### Check for updates

#### **OPEN ACCESS**

EDITED BY Hongcai Shang, Beijing University of Chinese Medicine, China

REVIEWED BY Kuiwu Yao, China Academy of Chinese Medical Sciences, China Weijun Kong, Capital Medical University, China Ruiying Wang, Xiamen University Affiliated Cardiovascular Hospital, China

\*CORRESPONDENCE Ling-Chun Lv, Ivlingchun@medmail.com.cn

<sup>†</sup>These authors have contributed equally to this work

RECEIVED 13 February 2023 ACCEPTED 11 April 2023 PUBLISHED 16 May 2023

#### CITATION

Zhu P-C, Shen J, Qian R-Y, Xu J, Liu C, Hu W-M, Zhang Y and Lv L-C (2023), Effect of tanshinone IIA for myocardial ischemia/reperfusion injury in animal model: preclinical evidence and possible mechanisms. *Front. Pharmacol.* 14:1165212. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2023.1165212

#### COPYRIGHT

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

# Effect of tanshinone IIA for myocardial ischemia/reperfusion injury in animal model: preclinical evidence and possible mechanisms

## Peng-Chong Zhu<sup>1†</sup>, Jiayi Shen<sup>1†</sup>, Ren-Yi Qian<sup>1</sup>, Jian Xu<sup>1</sup>, Chong Liu<sup>1</sup>, Wu-Ming Hu<sup>1</sup>, Ying Zhang<sup>2</sup> and Ling-Chun Lv<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Cardiology, Lishui Hospital of Zhejiang University, The Fifth Affiliated Hospital of Wenzhou Medical University, Lishui Municipal Central Hospital, Lishui, China, <sup>2</sup>Department of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, The First Affiliated Hospital of Jiamusi University, Jiamusi, China

**Introduction:** Tanshinone IIA (Tan IIA), the major active lipophilic ingredient of *Radix Salviae Miltiorrhizae*, exerts various therapeutic effects on the cardiovascular system. We aimed to identify the preclinical evidence and possible mechanisms of Tan IIA as a cardioprotective agent in the treatment of myocardial ischemia/ reperfusion injury.

**Methods:** The study quality scores of twenty-eight eligible studies and data analyses were separately assessed using the CAMARADES 10-item checklist and Rev-Man 5.3 software.

**Results:** The study quality score ranged from 3/10 to 7/10 points. The present study provided preliminary preclinical evidence that Tan IIA could significantly decrease the myocardial infarct size, cardiac enzyme activity and troponin levels compared with those in the control group (p < 0.05).

**Discussion:** Tan IIA alleviated myocardial I/R injury via antioxidant, anti-inflammatory, anti-apoptosis mechanisms and improved circulation and energy metabolism. Thus, Tan IIA is a promising cardioprotective agent for the treatment of myocardial ischemia/reperfusion injury and should be further investigated in clinical trials.

#### KEYWORDS

tanshinone IIA, myocardial ischemia/reperfusion injury, preclinical evidence, possible mechanisms, meta-analysis

## **1** Introduction

Acute myocardial infarction (MI) is serious consequence of coronary artery disease and the leading cause of death and disability worldwide (Ibáñez et al., 2015; Tsao et al., 2022). The most effective and well-established therapeutic strategy for treating acute MI patients is timely reperfusion by primary percutaneous coronary intervention or thrombolysis, which limits myocardial infarct size, preserves left ventricular systolic function and prevents the onset of heart failure (Bulluck et al., 2016). However, the process of restoring coronary blood flow to the ischemic myocardium can cause myocardial ischemia/reperfusion (I/R) injury, including reperfusion arrhythmias, the no-reflow phenomenon and myocardial stunning (Yellon and Hausenloy, 2007). Several mechanical and pharmacological therapies have been



investigated to attenuate I/R injury over the past 30 years (Hausenloy and Yellon, 2013; Thind et al., 2015). Ischemic preconditioning and ischemic postconditioning are two major forms of mechanical strategies that apply transient episodes of myocardial ischemia and reperfusion either before or after the ischemic event, respectively, to protect the heart from I/R injury. (Hausenloy and Yellon, 2007). However, ischemic preconditioning (Heusch, 2013) is not feasible in the clinical setting because of the unpredictability of MI in patients, while the efficacy of ischemic postconditioning (Binder et al., 2015) is still inconclusive in clinical trials. In addition, pharmacological strategies failed to improve clinical trial outcomes (Frank et al., 2012; Perricone and Vander Heide, 2014; Ibáñez et al., 2015). Thus, a novel cardioprotective strategy is needed.

Radix Salviae Miltiorrhizae, the dried root and rhizome of Salvia miltiorrhiza Bge., a popular Chinese herbal medicine, has the function of activating blood flow circulation and dissipating blood stasis (Guo et al., 2020). It has been widely used in the treatment of various cardiovascular diseases for hundreds of years (Ansari et al., 2021). Tanshinone IIA (Tan IIA) (Figure 1), the major active lipophilic ingredient of Radix Salviae Miltiorrhizae, possesses antioxidant, anti-inflammatory (Kai et al., 2011), antiapoptosis and anti-proliferative pharmacological properties (Shao et al., 2018; Luo et al., 2019). Systematic research reviews of animal studies provide important insights into the validity of animal studies, the precision of the estimated effects and the explanations of underlying mechanisms, and these reviews assist in the determination of whether a certain drug should be evaluated in human clinical trials (Roberts et al., 2002; Sandercock and Roberts, 2002; Briel et al., 2013). Therefore, we reviewed the available preclinical evidence and possible mechanisms of Tan IIA as a cardioprotective agent for myocardial I/R injury.

## 2 Methods

This review complied with the guidelines of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement (Stewart et al., 2015).

## 2.1 Data sources and search strategy

We searched the following seven databases: PubMed, Cochrane Library, Embase, Wanfang database, China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), VIP database (VIP), and China Biology Medicine disc (CBM). The search time was limited from inception to the end of September 2022. The search terms used were "danshentong IIA OR tanshinone IIA OR tanshinone" AND "myocardial damage OR myocardial injury OR myocardial infarction OR myocardial ischemia OR myocardial ischemia reperfusion." The reference lists of potential articles were handsearched.

## 2.2 Eligibility criteria

To prevent bias, the inclusion criteria were as follows: 1) animal studies *in vivo*; 2) myocardial I/R model induced by coronary artery occlusion; 3) analyzed intervention received Tan IIA treatment only, comparator intervention received vehicle or no treatment; 4) primary outcomes were myocardial infarction (MI) size, cardiac enzymes or cardiac troponin T/I (cTnT/I) level, while secondary outcomes were serum indices or protein levels related to cardioprotection mechanisms. Studies in which other traditional Chinese medicines were administered with other additional pharmacological treatments, studies with no control group, duplicate publications and *in vitro* or *ex vivo* studies were excluded.

## 2.3 Data extraction

Data were extracted independently by two authors, and discrepancies were discussed in group consultation. The following details were recorded: the authors; study time; animal information (species, sex, number, and weight); and interventions, modeling methods, the dose of drugs, and outcomes. When various doses of the drug were used or outcomes were measured at different time points in trials, we adopted the highest dose and the final time measurements.

## 2.4 Risk of bias in individual studies

Quality evaluation of the included studies was conducted by the modified CAMARADES 10-point scoring scale (Macleod et al., 2004; Yu et al., 2017). The modifications are listed as follows: D, blinded induction of model; F, use of anesthetic without significant intrinsic cardioprotective activity; G, appropriate animal model (aged, diabetic, or hypertensive); disagreements were resolved through adjudication by the corresponding author.

## 2.5 Statistical analysis

Meta-analysis was performed using RevMan V.5.3 software. All data abstracted were classified into continuous variables and given an estimate of the combined overall effect sizes by utilizing the



standard mean difference (SMD) or mean difference (MD) with the effects model. Heterogeneity and the choice of effects model were assessed using the Cochrane Q statistic test and the I<sup>2</sup>-statistic test. A fixed-effects model was selected when statistical heterogeneity was identified (heterogeneity test, if  $I^2 < 50\%$  and p < 0.10), otherwise, a random effects model was used.

## **3** Results

After systematically searching the databases, 768 published articles were identified. According to the eligibility criteria, we excluded inappropriate studies, and 28 studies were ultimately included in the systematic review (Figure 2).

## 3.1 Characteristics of included studies

Twenty eight studies (19 studies in Chinese and 9 in English) were published between 1996 and 2021. Sprague–Dawley (SD) rats, Wistar rats, male/female rabbits, male New-Zealand rabbits, and male/female Japan-Sino hybridization white rabbits were used in these studies. Modeling in these studies included ligation of the left anterior descending coronary artery (LAD), the left ventricular coronary artery (LVA), the left circumflex coronary artery (LCA) and the left marginal branch (LMB). The dosage of TanIIA varied between 3 mg•kg<sup>-1</sup> and 70 mg•kg<sup>-1</sup>. Evaluated metrics included myocardial infarct size, myocardial cell apoptosis, arrhythmia score, lactate dehydrogenase (LDH), creatine kinase (CK), creatine kinase-MB (CK-MB), cTnI, superoxide dismutase (SOD), malondialdehyde (MDA), glutathione (GSH), glutathione peroxidase (GSH-Px), caspase-3, B-cell lymphoma-2 (Bcl-2), Bcl-2-Associated X (Bax), interleukin-6 (IL-6), tumor necrosis factor- $\alpha$ (TNF- $\alpha$ ), aspartate transaminase (AST), high mobility group box-1 protein (HMGB1), amplitude of T wave, ST-segment elevation, ejection fraction (EF), and fractional shorting (FS). The detailed characteristics of the studies are shown in Table 1.

## 3.2 Study quality

The quality score of the studies ranged from 3 to 7. All studies were published in a peer-reviewed journal. They all described random allocation to treatment or control and used an anesthetic

#### TABLE 1 Characteristics of the 28 included studies.

Study (years)	Species (sex, n = experimental/ control group)	Weight	Model (method)	Anesthetic	Treatment group (method to Tan IIA)	Control group	Outcome index (time)	Intergroup differences
Ma et al., 2017	SD rats (male, 16/16)	180–220 g	Ligation of LAD for 30 min then reperfusion for	Phenobarbital Sodium (3%)	Gavaged with Tan IIA (20 mg/kg*d), once a day, for	Gavaged with isasteric normal saline, once a day	1. Infarct size (AAI/AAR)	1. <i>p</i> < 0.05
			180 min		5 days, before	for 5 days, before	2. cTnI	2. <i>p</i> < 0.05
					establishing model	establishing model	3. Cytc	3. $p < 0.05$
Dai et al., 2013	SD rats (male, 8/8)	240-320 g	Ligation of LAD for 40 min then	20% urethane (5 mL/kg)	Intravenous injected with Tan IIA	Intravenous injected with nothing, 3 min	1. Apoptosis index	1. <i>p</i> < 0.01
			120 min		before reperfusion	and 2 min after	2. CK	2. $p < 0.01$
					and 2 min after reperfusion	reperfusion	3. LDH	3. <i>p</i> < 0.01
							4. SOD	4. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							5. MDA	5. <i>p</i> < 0.05
Tang et al.,	SD rats (male, 10/10)	260–280 g	Ligation of LAD	3%	Intraperitoneal	Intraperitoneal	1. SOD	1. <i>p</i> < 0.01
2017			for 30 min then reperfusion for	pentobarbital sodium	injected with Tan IIA (30 mg/kg),	injected with isasteric normal	2. MDA	2. <i>p</i> < 0.01
			480 min	(30 mg/kg)	once a day, for 7 days, before	saline, once a day, for 7 days, before	3. CAT	3. <i>p</i> < 0.01
					establishing model	establishing model	4. GSH-Px	4. <i>p</i> < 0.01
							5. Nrf-2	5. <i>p</i> < 0.01
							6. HO-1	6. <i>p</i> < 0.01
Zheng et al., 2010	SD rats (male, 10/10)	200–300 g	Ligation of LAD for 60 min then	Pentobarbital sodium (2.5%)	Gavaged with Tan IIA (30 mg/kg*d),	Intravenous injected with isasteric normal	1. Apoptosis index	1. <i>p</i> < 0.05
			reperfusion for 120 min		once a day, for 7 days, before	saline, once a day, for 7 days, before	2. Caspase-3	2. <i>p</i> < 0.05
					establishing model	establishing model	3. Bcl-2	3. <i>p</i> < 0.01
Zhang and Zhang.	Wistar rats (male/ female, 20/20)	Not mentioned	Ligation of LAD for 30 min then	Diethyl ether	Gavaged with Tan IIA (15 mg/kg*d),	Gavaged with normal saline	1. Infarct size (AAI/LVA)	1. <i>p</i> < 0.05
2010			reperfusion for 120 min		once a day, for 3 days, before	(5 mL/kg), once a day, for 3 days,	2. CK	2. <i>p</i> < 0.05
					establishing model	before establishing model	3. LDH	3. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							4. AST	4. <i>p</i> < 0.01
							5. SOD	5. <i>p</i> < 0.01
							6. MDA	6. <i>p</i> < 0.001
							7. GSH-PX	7. <i>p</i> < 0.01
Han et al., 2016	SD rats (male, 8/8)	220–270 g	Ligation of LAD for 30 min then	Pentobarbital sodium (3%)	Intraperitoneal injected with Tan	Intraperitoneal injected with	1. Apoptosis index	1. <i>p</i> < 0.05
			180 min		IIA (40 mg/kg*d), once a day, for	sasteric distilled water, once a day,	2. P-Akt	2. <i>p</i> < 0.05
					7 days, before establishing model	for 7 days, before establishing model	3. Mfn2	3. <i>p</i> < 0.05
Wu and He. 2012	SD rats (male, 10/10)	280-320 g	Ligation of LAD for 30 min then	10% Chloral hydrate	Gavaged with Tan IIA (50 mg/kg*d),	Gavaged with normal saline	1. Infarct size (AAI/LVA)	1. <i>p</i> < 0.05
			reperfusion for 120 min	(300 mg/kg)	once a day, for 7 days, before establishing model	(2 mL/d), once a day, for 7 days, before establishing model	2. HR	2. <i>p</i> < 0.05
Zhou and Yang. 2012	Wistar rats (male, 16/16)	250–300 g	Ligation of LAD for 30 min then reperfusion for 60 min	3% pentobarbital sodium	Intraperitoneal injected with Tan IIA (10 mg/kg)	Intraperitoneal injected with isasteric normal	1. Infarct size (AAI weight/ whole weight)	1. <i>p</i> < 0.01

(Continued on following page)

#### TABLE 1 (Continued) Characteristics of the 28 included studies.

Study (years)	Species (sex, n = experimental/ control group)	Weight	Model (method)	Anesthetic	Treatment group (method to Tan IIA)	Control group	Outcome index (time)	Intergroup differences
				(0.15 mL/ 100 g)	before establishing model	saline before establishing model	2. Arrhythmia score	2. <i>p</i> < 0.01
							3. NF-KB	3. <i>p</i> < 0.01
							4. TNF-a	4. $p < 0.01$
Han. 2011	Wistar rats (male/ female, 10/10)	150–250 g	Ligation of LAD for 45 min then	20% Urethane (1 g/kg)	Intraperitoneal injected with Tan	Intraperitoneal injected with normal	1. amplitude of T wave	1. <i>p</i> < 0.05
			120 min		before establishing model	before establishing model	<ol> <li>2. incidence of</li> <li>2 h arrhythmia</li> </ol>	2. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							3. Bcl-2OD	3. $p < 0.05$
							4. BaxOD	4. $p < 0.05$
							5. Bcl-2/Bax	5. $p < 0.05$
Li et al., 2016a	SD rats (male, 13/13)	210–250 g	Ligation of LAD for 30 min then	Pentobarbital sodium	Intravenous injected with Tan IIA	Intravenous injected with nothing, before	1. Infarct size (AAI/AAR)	1. <i>p</i> < 0.05
			120 min	(60 mg/kg)	establishing model	establisning model	2. Apoptosis index	2. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							3. CK-MB	3. $p < 0.05$
							4. LDH	4. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							5. SOD	5. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							6. MDA	6. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							7. SDH	7. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							8. COX	8. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							9. H2O2	9. <i>p</i> < 0.05
Long et al., 2015	SD rats (male, 24/24)	200–250 g	Ligation of LAD for 45 min then	Pentobarbital sodium	Intravenous injected with Tan IIA	Intravenous injected with isasteric normal	1. Infarct size (AAI/AAR)	1. <i>p</i> < 0.001
			for 72 h	(40 mg/kg)	(8 mg/kg), 30 min before establishing	establishing model	2. EF	2. <i>p</i> < 0.001
					model and 24, 48 h after establishing model	and 24, 48 h atter establishing model	3. FS	3. <i>p</i> < 0.001
Pan et al., 2017	SD rats (male, 9/10)	Not mentioned	Ligation of LAD for 30 min then	10% Chloral hydrate	Intraperitoneal injected with Tan	Intraperitoneal injected with	1. Infarct size (AAI/AAR)	1. <i>p</i> < 0.05
			for 24 h	(350 mg/kg)	IIA (70 mg/kg), before establishing	isasteric normal saline, before	2. Caspase-3	2. <i>p</i> < 0.05
					model	establishing model	3. Bcl-2	3. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							4. Bax	4. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							5. Beclin-1	5. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							6. HMGB1	6. <i>p</i> < 0.05
Hu et al., 2015	SD rats (male, 10/10)	200–220 g	Ligation of LAD for 30 min then reperfusion for	Pentobarbital sodium (50 mg/kg)	Intraperitoneal injected with Tan IIA (40 mg/kg*d),	Intraperitoneal injected with vehicle, once a day, for	1. Infarct size (AAI weight/ whole weight)	1. <i>p</i> < 0.05
			120 min		14 days, before	14 days, before establishing model	2. CK	2. <i>p</i> < 0.05
					establishing model		3. AST	3. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							4. SOD	4. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							5. GSH-Px	5. <i>p</i> < 0.05

(Continued on following page)

#### TABLE 1 (Continued) Characteristics of the 28 included studies.

Study (years)	Species (sex, n = experimental/ control group)	Weight	Model (method)	Anesthetic	Treatment group (method to Tan IIA)	Control group	Outcome index (time)	Intergroup differences
							6. MDA	6. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							7. TNF-α	7. $p < 0.05$
							8. IL-6	8. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							9. iNOS	9. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							10. HMGB1	10. <i>p</i> < 0.05
Wei et al., 2014	SD rats (male, 8/8)	250-300 g	Ligation of LAD for 30 min then	Pentobarbital sodium	Intravenous injected with Tan IIA	Intravenous injected with isasteric normal	1. Infarct size (AAI/AAR)	1. <i>p</i> < 0.05
			for 24 h	(50 mg/kg)	(8 mg/kg), 4 h after reperfusion	reperfusion	2. CK-MB	2. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							3. AST	3. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							4. LDH	4. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							5. SOD	5. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							6. MDA	6. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							7. GSH-Px	7. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							8. GSH	8. <i>p</i> < 0.05
Li et al., 2010	Wistar rats (male, 8/8)	250-300 g	Ligation of LAD for 30 min then	10% Chloral hydrate	Tail intravenous injected with Tan	Tail intravenous injected with	1. Arrhythmia score	1. <i>p</i> < 0.01
			reperfusion for 60 min	(0.4 mL/100 g)	IIA (20 mg/kg), before establishing model	nothing before establishing model	2. IL-6	2. <i>p</i> < 0.01
Fu et al.,	SD rats (male, 13/13)	280-300 g	Ligation of LAD	Diethyl ether	Gavaged with Tan	Gavaged with 0.5%	1. SOD	1. <i>p</i> < 0.05
2007			for 45 min then reperfusion for		IIA (60 mg/kg*d), once a day, for	carboxymethyl cellulose sodium	2. MDA	2. <i>p</i> < 0.05
			240 min		14 days, before establishing model	(10 mg/kg*d), once a day, for 14 days,	3. Bcl-2	3. <i>p</i> < 0.05
						before establishing model	4. Bax	4. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							5. Caspase-3	5. <i>p</i> < 0.05
Zhang et al., 2010	SD rats (male, 20/20)	200–220 g	Ligation of LAD for 30 min then	3% isoflurane	Intraperitoneal injected with Tan	Intraperitoneal injected with	1. Infarct size (AAI/LVA)	1. <i>p</i> < 0.05
			180 min		once a day, for	saline, once a day,	2. EF	2. <i>p</i> < 0.05
					7 days, before establishing model	for 7 days, before establishing model	3. TNF-α	3. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							4. IL-6	4. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							5. Caspase-3	5. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							6. P-Akt	6. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							7. NF-KB	7. <i>p</i> < 0.05
Li et al.,	Wistar rats (male/	130–230 g	Ligation of LAD	2%	Tail intravenous	Tail intravenous	1. SOD	1. <i>p</i> < 0.05
20166	female, 8/8)		for 30 min then reperfusion for	Pentobarbital sodium	IIA (2 mL/100 g*d),	injected with isasteric normal	2. MDA	2. <i>p</i> < 0.05
			30 min. This process was		once a day, for 14 days, before	saline, once a day, for 14 days, before	3. CAT	3. <i>p</i> < 0.05
			repeated 3 times		establishing model	establishing model	4. VEGF	4. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							5. HIF-1	5. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							6. FLK-1	6. <i>p</i> < 0.05
Wang 2021	Wistar rats (male/ female, 8/8)	355.62 ± 20.3 g	Ligation of LAD for 45 min then		Intravenous injected with Tan IIA	Intravenous injected with isasteric normal	1. AAI/AAR	1. <i>p</i> < 0.05

(Continued on following page)

#### Species (sex, Control group Intergroup group (method to Tan IIA) index (time) differences experimental/ control group) reperfusion saline, before 2. LDH 3% (20 mg/kg), before 2. p < 0.05for 24 h Pentobarbital establishing model establishing model sodium 3. apoptosis 3. p < 0.05index 4. ROS 4. p < 0.055. MDA 5. p < 0.056. SOD 6. p < 0.057. Bcl-2 7. p < 0.05200-300 g Li et al., SD rats (male, 9/9) Ligation of LAD Intraperitoneal 1. MDA 1. p < 0.05Chloral hydrate Intraperitoneal 2017 for 30 min then injected with Tan injected with normal reperfusion IIA (2 mL/kg). The saline (0.5 mL/kg). 2. SOD 2. p < 0.05for 2 h Tan IIA was The normal saline 3 LDH 3. p < 0.05administered once was administered every other day for once every other day 4. Bax 4. p < 0.058 weeks, after for 8 weeks, after establishing model establishing model 5. Bcl-2 5. p < 0.056. *p* < 0.05 6. apoptosis index 7. CTnI 7. p < 0.05200-210 g 10% chloral Gavaged with Tan Shen et al., SD rats (male, 7/7) Ligation of LAD Gavaged with 1. AAI/AAR 1. p < 0.052018 for 45 min then hydrate IIA (7.912 mg/kg), nothing, before 2. LDH 2. p < 0.05reperfusion before establishing establishing model for 2 h model 3. SOD 3. p < 0.054. MDA 4. p < 0.05Tao et al., Rabbits (male/ Ligation of LAD 3% Intravenous injected Intravenous injected Not 1. SOD 1. p < 0.001pentobarbital with nothing, before mentioned for 30 min then with Tan IIA 1996 female, 10/10) 2. MDA 2. p < 0.001reperfusion for sodium (5 mg/kg), before reperfusion 30 min reperfusion Wang New Zealand rabbits 2.2–2.7 Kg Ligation of LMB 3% Intravenous injected Intravenous injected 1. Infarct size 1. p < 0.05et al., 2016 (male, 10/10) for 90 min then Pentobarbital with Tan IIA with 25% Glu (AAI/LVA) (2 mL/kg), before reperfusion for sodium (5 mg/kg), before 2. CK 2. p < 0.05120 min (1.1 mL/kg) reperfusion reperfusion 3. CK-MB 3. p < 0.014. TNF-α 4. p < 0.05Ai 2013 Rabbits (male/ 2.0-2.5 Kg Ligation of LCA 20% Urethane Intravenous injected Intravenous injected 1. SOD 1. p < 0.05female, 10/10) for 30 min then (5 mL/kg) with Tan IIA with nothing before 2. MDA 2. p < 0.05reperfusion for (3 mg/kg), before establishing model establishing model 120 min Wang New Zealand rabbits Ligation of LMB 3% Intravenous injected Intravenous injected 2.2-2.7 Kg 1. CTnI 1. p < 0.01et al., 2012 (male, 10/10) for 90 min then Pentobarbital with 25% Glu with Tan IIA 2. SOD 2. p < 0.05reperfusion for sodium (5 mg/kg), before (2.0 mL/kg), before 120 min (1.1 mL/kg) reperfusion reperfusion Lin et al., New Zealand rabbits 2.5-3.0 Kg Ligation of LVA 3% Intravenous injected Intravenous injected 1. Infarct size 1. p < 0.052013 (male, 10/10) for 60 min then Pentobarbital (AAI/LVA) with Tan IIA with isasteric normal reperfusion for sodium (4 mg/kg), before saline, before 2. ST -segment (1.0 mL/kg) 2. p < 0.05120 min reperfusion reperfusion changes Wang Japan-Sino 2.28 ± Ligation of LCA Pentobarbital Intravenous injected Intravenous injected 1. CK 1. p < 0.01et al., 2007 hybridization whit e 0.31 Kg for 40 min then with Tan IIA with 25% Glu sodium (3 mg/kg), before (1.0 mL/kg), before 2. LDH 2. p < 0.01rabbits (male/female, reperfusion for (30 mg/kg)

#### TABLE 1 (Continued) Characteristics of the 28 included studies.

(Continued on following page)

3. p < 0.05

3. SOD

8/6)

establishing model

establishing model

60 min

TABLE 1 (Continued) Characteristics of the 28 included studies.

Study (years)	Species (sex, n = experimental/ control group)	Weight	Model (method)	Anesthetic	Treatment group (method to Tan IIA)	Control group	Outcome index (time)	Intergroup differences
							4. GSH-Px	4. <i>p</i> < 0.05
							5. MDA	5. <i>p</i> < 0.05
Liu et al.,	New Zealand rabbits	1.5–1.8 Kg	Ligation of LCA	Pentobarbital	Intravenous injected	Intravenous injected	1. CK-MB	1. <i>p</i> < 0.05
2017	(male/remale, 10/10)		reperfusion for	(1 mL/kg)	(5 mL/kg*d), once a	saline, once a day,	2. LDH	2. <i>p</i> < 0.05
			30 min. This process was repeated 3 times		day, for 7 days, before establishing model	for 7 days, before establishing model	3. SOD	3. <i>p</i> < 0.05

Note: AAI, area at infarct; AAR, area at risk; AST, aspartate transaminase; Bcl-2, B-cell lymphoma-2; Bax, Bcl-2-Associated X; cTnI, cardiac troponin I; CytC, cytochrome C; CAT, catalase; CK, creatine kinase; CK-MB, creatine kinase-MB; COX, cytochrome c oxidase; EF, ejection fraction; FS, fractional shorting; Glu, glucose injection; GSH, glutathione synthetase; GSH-Px, glutathione peroxidase; HMGB1, high mobility group box-1 protein; HO-1, hemeoxygenase-1; iNOS, inducible nitric oxide synthase; IL-6, interleukin-6; LAD, the left anterior descending coronary artery; LMB, the left marginal branch; LCA, the left circumflex coronary artery; LVA, the left ventricular coronary artery; LVA, left ventricular area; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; MDA, malondialdehyde; Nrf-2, nuclearfactor erythroid-2-related factor-2; Mfn2, mitofusin2; p-Akt, phosphothreonine kinase; SD rats, Sprague-Dawley; SOD, superoxide dismutase; TNF-α, tumor necrosis factor-α.

without substantial intrinsic vascular protection activity. Eleven studies (Fu et al., 2007; Fu et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2010; Wei et al., 2014; Hu et al., 2015; Long et al., 2015; Li Q. et al., 2016; Li X. Y. et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2017; Pan et al., 2017; Tang et al., 2017) reported control of temperature. One study (Zhang et al., 2010) mentioned an appropriate animal model. Eleven studies (Fu et al., 2007; Fu et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2010; Wei et al., 2014; Hu et al., 2015; Long et al., 2015; Li Q. et al., 2016; Li X. Y. et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2017; Pan et al., 2017; Tang et al., 2017) stated compliance with animal welfare regulations, and 10 studies (Fu et al., 2007; Fu et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2010; Hu et al., 2015; Long et al., 2015; Li Q. et al., 2016; Li X. Y. et al., 2016; Pan et al., 2017; Li et al., 2019) a statement of potential conflicts of interest. None of the studies mentioned blinded induction of the model, blinded assessment of outcome or sample size calculation. The methodological quality is shown in Table 2.

## 3.3 Effectiveness

#### 3.3.1 Primary outcome measures

#### 3.3.1.1 Myocardial infarct size

Twelve studies (Zhang et al., 2010; Zhang and Zhang, 2010; Wu and He, 2012; Lin et al., 2013; Wei et al., 2014; Long et al., 2015; Li Q. et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2016; Ma et al., 2017; Pan et al., 2017; Shen et al., 2018; Wang, 2021) used myocardial infarct size as an outcome measure. Meta-analysis of 12 studies that the Tan IIA-treated group exhibited significantly decreased myocardial infarct size compared with that of the control group (n = 145, MD -0.13, 95% CI [-0.18 to -0.09], p < 1000.00001; I<sup>2</sup>= 98%) (Figure 3). Owing to obvious heterogeneity, we conducted subgroup analysis according to the different calculation methods. 1) The meta-analysis of 5 studies (Zhang et al., 2010; Zhang and Zhang, 2010; Wu and He, 2012; Lin et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2016) showed that the Tan IIA-treated group exhibited a significantly decreased the area at infarct/left ventricular area (AAI/ LVA) compared with that of the control group (n = 60, MD -0.05, 95% CI [-0.07 to -0.04], p = 0.07;  $I^2 = 55\%$ ) (Figure 4); The meta-analysis of 7 studies (Fu et al., 2007; Wei et al., 2014; Long et al., 2015; Li Q. et al.,

2016; Ma et al., 2017; Shen et al., 2018; Wang, 2021) that Tan IIA significantly reduced the area at infarct/area at risk (AAI/AAR) (n = 76, MD -0.18, 95% CI [-0.20 to -0.15], p < 0.0001;  $I^2 = 83\%$ ) (Figure 4). Although the heterogeneity decreased after subgroup analysis, the heterogeneity in both subgroups was still high. Thus, further subgroup analysis was performed in the AAI/LVA and AAI/AAR groups. In the AAI/LVA studies, the different animal species (rats or rabbits) may have been the source of heterogeneity. The meta-analysis of 3 rats studies (Zhang et al., 2010; Zhang and Zhang, 2010; Wu and He, 2012) showed a significant effect of Tan IIA on decreasing the AAI/ LVA (n = 40, MD -0.06, 95% CI [-0.07 to -0.05], p = 0.14;  $l^2 = 49\%$ ) (Figure 5), and the meta-analysis of 2 rabbit studies (Lin et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2016) showed similar results (n = 20, MD -0.04, 95% CI  $[-0.06 \text{ to } -0.02], p = 0.24; I^2 = 26\%)$  (Figure 5). In the AAI/AAR studies, different routes of administration (intravenous injection and gavage) may have been the source of heterogeneity. The meta-analysis of the 4 studies (Wei et al., 2014; Long et al., 2015; Li Q. et al., 2016; Wang, 2021) that used intravenous injection indicated a significant effect of Tan IIA on reducing the AAI/AAR (n = 53, MD -0.18, 95% CI [-0.19 to -0.18], p = 0.13;  $I^2 = 47\%$ ) (Figure 6), and the meta-analysis on the 2 studies (Ma et al., 2017; Shen et al., 2018) that used gavage administration showed similar results (n = 23, MD -0.12, 95% CI  $[-0.14 \text{ to } -0.09], p = 0.23; l^2 = 30\%)$  (Figure 6).

#### 3.3.1.2 Cardiac enzymes and troponin

The meta-analysis of 9 studies (Fu et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2007; Zhang and Zhang, 2010; Dai et al., 2013; Wei et al., 2014; Li Q. et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2017; Li et al., 2019; Wang, 2021) showed that the Tan IIA-treated group exhibited a significant decrease in LDH levels compared with those in the control group (n = 81, SMD –2.49, 95% CI [–2.94 to –2.04], p = 0.05;  $I^2 = 49\%$ ). As a result of the obvious heterogeneity, we conducted subgroup analysis according to the different animal species (rats or rabbits). The two rabbit studies (Wang et al., 2007; Liu et al., 2017) showed a significant effect of Tan IIA on decreasing LDH (n = 16, SMD –2.92, 95% CI [–3.96 to –1.87], p = 0.45;  $I^2 = 0\%$ ) (Figure 7). The seven rat studies (Fu et al., 2007; Zhang and Zhang, 2010; Dai et al., 2013; Wei et al., 2014; Li Q. et al., 2016; Li et al., 2019; Wang, 2021) showed a significant effect of Tan IIA on decreasing

Study	А	В	С	D	E	F	G	н			Total
Ma et al., 2017			$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$					3
Dai et al., 2013			$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$					3
Tang et al., 2017		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$					6
Zheng et al., 2010			$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$					3
Zhang and Zhang. 2010			$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$					3
Han et al., 2016			$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$				$\checkmark$	4
Wu and He. 2012			$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$				$\checkmark$	4
Zhou and Yang. 2012			$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$				$\checkmark$	4
Han. 2011	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$					3
Li et al., 2016a	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$				$\checkmark$	6
Long et al., 2015		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$		6
Pan et al., 2017	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$				$\checkmark$	6
Hu et al., 2015		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$		6
Wei et al., 2014	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$					5
Li et al., 2010	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$				$\checkmark$	4
Fu et al., 2007	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$				$\checkmark$	6
Zhang et al., 2010	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$	7
Li et al., 2016b	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	6
Wang 2021	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$					3
Li et al., 2017	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$				$\checkmark$	4
Shen et al., 2018		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$		6
Tao et al., 1996	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$					3
Wang et al., 2016			$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$					4
Ai 2013	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$					3
Wang et al., 2012	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$				$\checkmark$	4
Lin et al., 2013	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$				$\checkmark$	4
Wang et al., 2007	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$					3
Liu et al., 2017	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$			$\checkmark$		6

#### TABLE 2 Risk of bias of the included studies.

Note: Studies fulfilling the criteria of: A: peer reviewed publication; B: control of temperature; C: random allocation to treatment or control; D: blinded induction of model; E: blinded assessment of outcome; F: use of anesthetic without significant intrinsic cardioprotective activity; G: appropriate animal model (aged, diabetic, or hypertensive); H: sample size calculation; I: compliance with animal welfare regulations; J: statement of potential conflict of interests. Compliant item was given one point using a tick to indicate.

LDH (n = 63, SMD –2.39, 95% CI [–2.89 to –1.89], p = 0.03;  $l^2 = 58\%$ ). We performed a sensitivity analysis by sequentially excluding each study in the rat group. After removing one study (Zhang and Zhang, 2010) in which the dosage of Tan IIA administered before establishing the model was much higher than that in other studies, the meta-analysis of the remaining 6 rat studies (Fu et al., 2007; Dai et al., 2013; Wei et al., 2014; Li Q. et al., 2016; Li et al., 2019; Wang, 2021) showed that Tan IIA decreased LDH levels (n = 53, SMD –2.82, 95% CI [–3.40 to –2.23], p = 0.25;  $l^2 = 25\%$ ) (Figure 7). Three rat studies (Zhang and Zhang, 2010; Dai et al., 2013; Hu et al., 2015) used CK as the outcome metric. After removing the study (Dai et al., 2013) in which the ligation time was distinct from that in the other studies, the meta-analysis of the

2 remaining studies (Zhang and Zhang, 2010; Hu et al., 2015) showed that the Tan IIA-treated group exhibited significantly decreased CK levels compared with those in the control group (n = 20, SMD -0.89, 95% CI [-1.55 to-0.23], p = 0.68;  $l^2 = 0\%$ ) (Figure 8A). Moreover, the meta-analysis of 2 rabbit studies (Wang et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2016) showed that Tan IIA reduced CK levels (n = 18, SMD -1.51, 95% CI [-2.33 to -0.68], p = 0.31;  $l^2 = 4\%$ ) (Figure 8B). Two studies (Wei et al., 2014; Li Q. et al., 2016) showed that the Tan IIA-treated group had decrease CK-MB levels compared with those in the control group (n = 21, SMD -1.78, 95% CI [-2.53 to -1.03], p = 0.27;  $l^2 = 18\%$ ) (Figure 8C). The meta-analysis of 3 studies showed (Zhang and Zhang, 2010; Wei et al., 2014; Hu et al., 2015) that the Tan-IIA

Mean 0.245 0.2624	<b>SD</b> 0.014 0.0201	Total 13	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	N/ D	N/ D I OF
0.245 0.2624	0.014 0.0201	13	0.438			weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
0.2624	0.0201		0.400	0.031	13	8.8%	-0.19 [-0.21, -0.17]	-
0.0640		10	0.3052	0.0175	10	8.8%	-0.04 [-0.06, -0.03]	-
0.0043	0.0101	24	0.2449	0.0162	24	8.9%	-0.18 [-0.19, -0.17]	-
0.39145	0.0401	16	0.5025	0.0428	16	8.6%	-0.11 [-0.14, -0.08]	
0.1054	0.0546	9	0.3835	0.0436	10	8.2%	-0.28 [-0.32, -0.23]	
0.2593	0.0931	7	0.4228	0.0576	7	6.9%	-0.16 [-0.24, -0.08]	
0.3525	0.0612	10	0.3662	0.0421	10	8.2%	-0.01 [-0.06, 0.03]	
0.3891	0.0422	8	0.6131	0.062	8	8.0%	-0.22 [-0.28, -0.17]	
0.2792	0.0296	8	0.4859	0.0445	8	8.4%	-0.21 [-0.24, -0.17]	
0.1118	0.0088	10	0.164	0.0128	10	8.9%	-0.05 [-0.06, -0.04]	-
0.225	0.064	10	0.287	0.087	10	7.5%	-0.06 [-0.13, 0.00]	
0.252	0.038	20	0.327	0.027	20	8.8%	-0.08 [-0.10, -0.05]	
		145			146	100.0%	-0.13 [-0.18, -0.09]	•
Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6	94.09, df	f = 11 (	P < 0.000	001); l <sup>2</sup> =	98%		-	
.75 (P <	0.00001)	)						-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2
								Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
	0.1054 0.2593 0.3525 0.3891 0.2792 0.1118 0.225 0.252 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6 75 (P <	$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	$\begin{array}{ccccc} 0.1054 & 0.0546 & 9 \\ 0.2593 & 0.0931 & 7 \\ 0.3525 & 0.0612 & 10 \\ 0.3891 & 0.0422 & 8 \\ 0.2792 & 0.0296 & 8 \\ 0.1118 & 0.0088 & 10 \\ 0.225 & 0.064 & 10 \\ 0.252 & 0.038 & 20 \\ \hline & & & & \\ Chi^2 = 694.09,  df = 11  (175  (P < 0.00001)) \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{cccccc} 0.1054 & 0.0546 & 9 & 0.3835 \\ 0.2593 & 0.0931 & 7 & 0.4228 \\ 0.3525 & 0.0612 & 10 & 0.3662 \\ 0.3831 & 0.0422 & 8 & 0.6131 \\ 0.2792 & 0.0296 & 8 & 0.4859 \\ 0.1118 & 0.0088 & 10 & 0.164 \\ 0.225 & 0.064 & 10 & 0.287 \\ 0.252 & 0.038 & 20 & 0.327 \\ \hline \\ \textbf{145} \\ Chi^2 = 694.09, df = 11 (P < 0.00075 (P < 0.00001) \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0.1054 & 0.0546 & 9 & 0.3835 & 0.0436 \\ 0.2593 & 0.0931 & 7 & 0.4228 & 0.0576 \\ 0.3525 & 0.0612 & 10 & 0.3662 & 0.0421 \\ 0.3891 & 0.0422 & 8 & 0.6131 & 0.062 \\ 0.2792 & 0.0296 & 8 & 0.4859 & 0.0445 \\ 0.1118 & 0.0088 & 10 & 0.164 & 0.0128 \\ 0.225 & 0.064 & 10 & 0.287 & 0.087 \\ 0.252 & 0.038 & 20 & 0.327 & 0.027 \\ \hline 145 \\ Chi^2 = 694.09, df = 11 (P < 0.00001); l^2 = 75 (P < 0.00001) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

The forest plot: effects of Tan IIA for decreasing the myocardial infarction size compared with control group.

	Expe	erimenta		C	control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% CI
1.6.1 aai/lva									
Lin 2013	0.2624	0.0201	10	0.3052	0.0175	10	9.6%	-0.04 [-0.06, -0.03]	-
Wang 2016	0.3525	0.0612	10	0.3662	0.0421	10	8.9%	-0.01 [-0.06, 0.03]	
Wu 2012	0.1118	0.0088	10	0.164	0.0128	10	9.7%	-0.05 [-0.06, -0.04]	-
Zhang and Zhang 2010	0.225	0.064	10	0.287	0.087	10	8.1%	-0.06 [-0.13, 0.00]	
Zhang et al 2010	0.252	0.038	20	0.327	0.027	20	9.6%	-0.08 [-0.10, -0.05]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			60			60	45.9%	-0.05 [-0.07, -0.04]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.	00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8	8.79, df =	4 (P =	0.07); l <sup>2</sup>	= 55%				
Test for overall effect: Z	= 7.03 (P <	0.00001							
1.6.2 aai/aar									
Li 2016 a	0.245	0.014	13	0.438	0.031	13	9.6%	-0.19 [-0.21, -0.17]	-
Long 2015	0.0649	0.0101	24	0.2449	0.0162	24	9.7%	-0.18 [-0.19, -0.17]	-
Ma 2017	0.39145	0.0401	16	0.5025	0.0428	16	9.4%	-0.11 [-0.14, -0.08]	
Shen 2018	0.2593	0.0931	7	0.4228	0.0576	7	7.5%	-0.16 [-0.24, -0.08]	
Wang 2021	0.3891	0.0422	8	0.6131	0.062	8	8.7%	-0.22 [-0.28, -0.17]	
Wei 2014	0.2792	0.0296	8	0.4859	0.0445	8	9.2%	-0.21 [-0.24, -0.17]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			76			76	54.1%	-0.18 [-0.20, -0.15]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.	00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 2	8.90, df	= 5 (P <	< 0.0001	); I <sup>2</sup> = 83%	6			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 13.70 (P ·	< 0.0000	1)						
Total (95% CI)			136			136	100.0%	-0.12 [-0.17, -0.07]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.	01; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6	49.01, d	= 10 (	P < 0.00	001); l <sup>2</sup> =	98%			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 5.07 (P <	0.00001	ì		,				
Test for subaroup differe	nces: Chi <sup>2</sup> :	= 70.86.	df = 1 (	P < 0.000	001). I <sup>2</sup> =	98.6%			Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
FIGURE 4									
The forest plot: effects	of Tan IIA	for redu	cing th	ne myoc	ardial inf	arctio	n size (ar	ea at infarct/left ventric	ular area, area at infarct/area at risk) compared:
with control group.									

treated group exhibited significantly reduced AST levels compared with those in the control group (n = 28, SMD -1.23, 95% CI [-1.81 to -0.66], p = 0.84;  $l^2 = 0\%$ ) (Figure 8D). One study (Ma et al., 2017) used cTnI as the outcome measure and showed that the Tan IIA-treated group exhibited decreased cTnI levels compared with those in the control group (p < 0.05).

## 3.3.1.3 The level of ST-segment elevation and cardiac function

One study (Li et al., 2019) reported that compared to the control, Tan IIA can reduce ST-segment elevation (p < 0.05) and 2 studies (Zhang et al., 2010; Long et al., 2015) showed that Tan

IIA-treated group had significantly improved left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) compared with that in the control group (p < 0.05).

#### 3.3.2 Secondary outcome measures

The meta-analysis of 9 studies (Fu et al., 2007; Fu et al., 2007; Zhang and Zhang, 2010; Dai et al., 2013; Wei et al., 2014; Hu et al., 2015; Li Q. et al., 2016; Tang et al., 2017; Wang, 2021) showed that the Tan IIA-treated group rats exhibited significantly increased SOD levels compared to those in control group rats (n = 87, SMD 1.46, 95% CI [0.96 to 1.96]; p = 0.05;  $I^2 = 49\%$ ) (Figure 9A); 4 studies (Wang et al., 2007; Tan

	Exp	erimenta	al	c	Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
1.7.1 rats									
Wu 2012	0.1118	0.0088	10	0.164	0.0128	10	61.5%	-0.05 [-0.06, -0.04]	<b>•</b>
Zhang and Zhang 2010	0.225	0.064	10	0.287	0.087	10	1.3%	-0.06 [-0.13, 0.00]	
Zhang et al 2010	0.252	0.038	20	0.327	0.027	20	13.7%	-0.08 [-0.10, -0.05]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			40			40	76.4%	-0.06 [-0.07, -0.05]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 3.9	94, df = 2	(P = 0.14	);  ² = 4	9%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 12.81 (F	<b>P</b> < 0.000	01)						
1.7.2 rabbits									
Lin 2013	0.2624	0.0201	10	0.3052	0.0175	10	20.9%	-0.04 [-0.06, -0.03]	
Wang 2016	0.3525	0.0612	10	0.3662	0.0421	10	2.7%	-0.01 [-0.06, 0.03]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			20			20	23.6%	-0.04 [-0.06, -0.02]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.3	86, df = 1	(P = 0.24	); I <sup>2</sup> = 2	6%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 4.98 (P	< 0.0000	1)						
Total (95% CI)			60			60	100.0%	-0.05 [-0.06, -0.04]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8.7	'9, df = 4	(P = 0.07)	); l <sup>2</sup> = 5	5%				-	
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 13.61 (F	< 0.000	01)						-0.1 -0.05 0 0.05 0.1
Test for subaroup differen	nces: Chi	<sup>2</sup> = 3.49.	df = 1 (	P = 0.06	). I <sup>2</sup> = 71.	4%			Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
FIGURE 5									

The forest plot: effects of Tan IIA for reducing the myocardial infarction size in rats/rabbits compared with control group.

	Expe	erimenta	I	0	Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
1.8.1 intravenous inj	ection								
Li 2016 a	0.245	0.014	13	0.438	0.031	13	13.0%	-0.19 [-0.21, -0.17]	+
Long 2015	0.0649	0.0101	24	0.2449	0.0162	24	76.1%	-0.18 [-0.19, -0.17]	
Wang 2021	0.3891	0.0422	8	0.6131	0.062	8	1.6%	-0.22 [-0.28, -0.17]	
Wei 2014	0.2792	0.0296	8	0.4859	0.0445	8	3.2%	-0.21 [-0.24, -0.17]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			53			53	94.0%	-0.18 [-0.19, -0.18]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	5.66, df = 3	3 (P = 0.1	3); l² =	47%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 52.32	(P < 0.00)	001)						
1.8.2 gavage									
Ma 2017	0.39145	0.0401	16	0.5025	0.0428	16	5.4%	-0.11 [-0.14, -0.08]	-
Shen 2018	0.2593	0.0931	7	0.4228	0.0576	7	0.7%	-0.16 [-0.24, -0.08]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			23			23	6.0%	-0.12 [-0.14, -0.09]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	1.43, df = 1	1 (P = 0.2	23); l <sup>2</sup> =	30%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 8.46 (F	> < 0.000	01)						
									.
Total (95% CI)			76			76	100.0%	-0.18 [-0.19, -0.17]	
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	28.90, df =	5 (P < 0	.0001);	l² = 83%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 52.79	(P < 0.00)	001)						-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2
Test for subaroup diffe	erences: Cl	hi² = 21.8	1. df =	1 (P < 0.	00001).	<sup>2</sup> = 95.	4%		r avours [experimental] Favours [control]
IGURE 6									

The forest plot: effects of Tan IIA for reducing the myocardial infarction size in different routes of administration group compared with control.

et al., 1996; Wang et al., 2012; Ai, 2013; Wang et al., 2016; Li et al., 2019) showed that Tan IIA increased the SOD levels in rabbits (n = 38, SMD 1.80, 95% CI [1.14 to 2.47], p = 0.25;  $I^2 = 27\%$ ) (Figure 9B); 13 studies (Tao et al., 1996; Fu et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2007; Zhang and Zhang, 2010; Ai, 2013; Dai et al., 2013; Wei et al., 2014; Hu et al., 2015; Li Q. et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2017; Tang et al., 2017; Shen et al., 2018; Wang, 2021) showed that Tan IIA reduced MDA levels (n = 137, SMD -3.40, 95% CI [-4.39 to -2.41]; p < 0.00001;  $I^2 = 85\%$ ); 5 studies (Zhang and Zhang, 2010; Wei et al., 2017; Tang et al., 2017; Showed that Tan IIA increased GSH-Px levels; 5 studies (Zheng et al., 2010; Dai et al., 2013; Li Q. et al., 2016;

Han et al., 2016; Wang, 2021) that Tan IIA decreased the myocardial cell apoptotic index; 4 studies (Fu et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2010; Zheng et al., 2010; Pan et al., 2017) showed that Tan IIA reduced caspase-3 levels (p < 0.05); 1 study (Li Q. et al., 2016) showed that Tan IIA increased the expression levels of PI3K (p < 0.05) and p-Akt/Akt ratio; 1 study (Han et al., 2016) showed that Tan IIA increased the expression levels of p-Akt (p < 0.05); 4 studies (Zhang et al., 2010; Zhou and Yang, 2012; Hu et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2016) showed that Tan IIA reduced TNF-a levels (p < 0.05); 2 studies (Hu et al., 2015; Pan et al., 2017) showed that Tan IIA reduced HMGB1 levels; 3 studies showed that Tan IIA increased the ratio of Bcl-2/Bax proteins (Fu et al., 2015)

	Exp	erimental		C	ontrol		:	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
2.1.1 LDH rabbits									
_iu 2017	9.9	2.41	10	22.58	4.61	10	12.7%	-3.30 [-4.74, -1.86]	
Nang 2007	1,555.6	283.7	8	3,249	926.3	6	11.4%	-2.49 [-4.01, -0.97]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			18			16	24.0%	-2.92 [-3.96, -1.87]	•
leterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	0.57, df = 1	(P = 0.45)	;  ² = 0°	%					
fest for overall effect:	Z = 5.48 (F	< 0.00001	)						
2.1.2 LDH rats									
Dai 2013	961.3	102.9	8	1,512.3	133.5	8	6.6%	-4.37 [-6.37, -2.37]	
i 2016 a	1,660.72	441.86	13	2,804.65	511.63	13	24.8%	-2.32 [-3.35, -1.29]	-
i 2017	1,693.81	309.52	9	3,669.52	571.43	9	8.3%	-4.09 [-5.87, -2.32]	
3hen 2018	3.8544	0.0436	7	4.0189	0.06667	7	10.4%	-2.73 [-4.32, -1.15]	
Wang 2021	880	170	8	1,440	160	8	10.1%	-3.21 [-4.82, -1.60]	
Vei 2014	7,515.79	1,031.58	8	9,660.79	905.31	8	15.8%	-2.09 [-3.38, -0.80]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			53			53	76.0%	-2.82 [-3.40, -2.23]	•
leterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	6.68, df = 5	(P = 0.25)	; 12 = 2	5%					
est for overall effect:	Z = 9.40 (F	e < 0.00001	)						
otal (95% CI)			71			69	100.0%	-2.84 [-3.35, -2.33]	•
leterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	7.28, df = 7	(P = 0.40)	;  ² = 4°	%				-	
est for overall effect:	Z = 10.88 (	P < 0.0000	1)						Favours [experimental] Eavours [control]
est for subaroup diffe	erences: Ch	i <sup>2</sup> = 0.03. d	f = 1 (F	P = 0.87). I	2 = 0%				
CLIPE 7									
JUNE /									

The forest plot: effects of Tan IIA for decreasing lactate dehydrogenase in rats/rabbits compared with control group.



The forest plot: effects of Tan IIA for decreasing creatine kinase (A) rats group; (B) rabbits group; (C) creatine kinase-MB; (D) aspartate transaminase compared with control group.

	Exp	erimental		C C	Control		1	Std. Mean Difference		Std. Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% C	1	IV, Random, 95% Cl	
ai 2013	101.5	15.2	8	86.2	10.9	8	11.2%	1.09 [0.02, 2.17]			
u 2007	75.55	9.67	13	58.14	9.56	13	12.9%	1.75 [0.83, 2.68]			
łu 2015	224.58	24.56	10	152.68	14.38	10	7.6%	3.42 [1.95, 4.89]			
i 2016 a	102.41	19.277	13	73.494	14.4578	13	13.1%	1.64 [0.73, 2.55]			
hen 2018	0.565217	0.097826	7	0.363478	0.021739	7	7.0%	2.67 [1.10, 4.23]			
ang 2017	26.54	6.41	10	21.07	7.32	10	13.0%	0.76 [-0.15, 1.68]			
/ang 2021	99.6429	10.7147	8	84.6429	12.8571	8	11.0%	1.20 [0.11, 2.29]			
√ei 2014	2.01596	0.13986	8	1.88106	0.27652	8	11.9%	0.58 [-0.43, 1.59]			
hang and Zhang 2010	5.65	0.99	10	4.48	0.85	10	12.3%	1.21 [0.24, 2.19]		-	
			87			87	100.0%	1.46 [0.96, 1.96]		•	
otal (95% CI)			01								
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.2 Test for overall effect: Z =	27; Chi² = 15 5.77 (P < 0	.57, df = 8 .00001)	(P = 0.0	5); I² = 49%	6				-10 Favo	-5 0 5 urs [control] Favours [experir	10 nental]
otal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Tau² = 0.2 est for overall effect: Z =	7; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 15 5.77 (P < 0	.57, df = 8 .00001)	(P = 0.0	5); l <sup>2</sup> = 49%	ó		Std. M	ean Difference	-10 Favo	td Mean Difference	10 mental]
otal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.2 est for overall effect: Z =	27; Chi² = 15 5.77 (P < 0 Experi	.57, df = 8 .00001) mental	(P = 0.0)	5); l <sup>2</sup> = 49% Contro	bl D. Total	Weigh	Std. M	lean Difference	-10 Favo	td. Mean Difference	10 mental]
otal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.2 est for overall effect: Z = tudy or Subgroup	27; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 15 5.77 (P < 0 Experi Mean	.57, df = 8 .00001) imental <u>SD To</u>	(P = 0.05	5); I <sup>2</sup> = 499 Contro ean <u>S</u>	bl D Total	Weigh	Std. M	lean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	-10 Favo	td. Mean Difference	10 nental]
otal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.2 est for overall effect: Z = etudy or Subgroup i 2013	7; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 15 5.77 (P < 0 Experi <u>Mean</u> 114.6	.57, df = 8 ( .00001) imental <u>SD To</u> 13.6	(P = 0.05 tal <u>M</u>	5); I <sup>2</sup> = 499 Contro ean S 90.3 12	6 D Total 4 10	Weigh 28.2%	Std. M	lean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI 1.79 [0.72, 2.86]	-10 Favo	td. Mean Difference	10 nental]
otal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.2 rest for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup Ai 2013 rao 1996	7; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 15 5.77 (P < 0 Experi <u>Mean</u> 114.6 76.3	.57, df = 8 ( .00001) imental <u>SD To</u> 13.6 13.2	(P = 0.09 tal Me 10 9	5); I <sup>2</sup> = 499 <b>Contro</b> <b>ean S</b> 90.3 12 43.7 6	6 <b>D Total</b> .4 10 .8 10	Weigh 28.2% 17.7%	Std. M	lean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% Cl 1.79 [0.72, 2.86] 2.97 [1.62, 4.32]	-10 Favo	td. Mean Difference	10 nental]
otal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.2 est for overall effect: Z = <u>tudy or Subgroup</u> i 2013 ao 1996 /ang 2007	7; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 15 5.77 (P < 0 Experi <u>Mean</u> 114.6 76.3 126.99	.57, df = 8 .00001) imental <u>SD To</u> 13.6 13.2 16.6	(P = 0.04 tal <u>Ma</u> 10 9 10 4 8 109	5); l <sup>2</sup> = 499 <b>Contro</b> <u>ean S</u> 90.3 12 43.7 6 9.78 5.0	5 <b>1</b> D Total .4 10 .8 10 .4 6	<u>Weigh</u> 28.2% 17.7% 23.0%	Std. M	lean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% Cl 1.79 [0.72, 2.86] 2.97 [1.62, 4.32] 1.23 [0.04, 2.42]	-10 Favo	td. Mean Difference	10 nental]
iotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.2 iest for overall effect: Z = itudy or Subgroup vi 2013 iao 1996 Vang 2007 Vang 2012	7; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 15 5.77 (P < 0 <b>Experi</b> <u>Mean</u> 114.6 76.3 126.99 113.888	.57, df = 8 .00001) mental <u>SD To</u> 13.6 13.2 16.6 8.3	(P = 0.05 tal <u>Ma</u> 10 9 10 4 8 109 10 97.1	5); I <sup>2</sup> = 499 <b>Contro</b> <b>ean S</b> 90.3 12 43.7 6 9.78 5.0 254 12.3	6 <b>D Total</b> 4 10 8 10 14 6 19 10	Weigh 28.29 17.79 23.09 31.19	Std. M	lean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% Cl 1.79 [0.72, 2.86] 2.97 [1.62, 4.32] 1.23 [0.04, 2.42] 1.51 [0.49, 2.53]	-10 Favo	td. Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl	10 nental]
Total (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.2 Test for overall effect: Z = Study or Subgroup Ni 2013 Tao 1996 Nang 2007 Nang 2012 Total (95% CI)	27; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 15 5.77 (P < 0 Experi Mean 114.6 76.3 126.99 113.888	.57, df = 8 .00001) imental <u>SD To</u> 13.6 13.2 16.6 8.3	(P = 0.05 tal <u>Ma</u> 10 9 10 97.3 38	<b>Contro</b> <u>ean S</u> 90.3 12 43.7 6 9.78 5.0 254 12.3	6 <b>D</b> Total 4 10 4 10 4 6 9 10 36	Weigh 28.2% 17.7% 23.0% 31.1% 100.0%	Std. M 5 5 5 5 6 6 6 6 6	lean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% Cl 1.79 [0.72, 2.86] 2.97 [1.62, 4.32] 1.23 [0.04, 2.42] 1.51 [0.49, 2.53] 1.78 [1.21, 2.35]	-10 Favo	td. Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	10 nental]
otal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.2 est for overall effect: Z = <b>Study or Subgroup</b> i 2013 'ao 1996 Vang 2007 Vang 2012 <b>Study CI</b> eterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 4	7; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 15 5.77 (P < 0 Experi Mean 114.6 76.3 126.99 113.888	.57, df = 8 (	(P = 0.05) (T = 0.05)	<b>Contro</b> ean <u>S</u> 90.3 12 43.7 6 9.78 5.0 254 12.3 7%	5 D Total 4 10 8 10 44 6 99 10 36	Weigh 28.2% 17.7% 23.0% 31.1% 100.0%	Std. M 6 6 6	lean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI 1.79 [0.72, 2.86] 2.97 [1.62, 4.32] 1.23 [0.04, 2.42] 1.51 [0.49, 2.53] 1.78 [1.21, 2.35]	-10 Favo	td. Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	10 nental]
iotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.2 iest for overall effect: Z = <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Ai 2013 iao 1996 Vang 2007 Vang 2012 <b>Total (95% CI)</b> Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 4 Jest for overall effect =	I7; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 15 5.77 (P < 0 <u>Experi Mean</u> 114.6 76.3 126.99 113.888 1.09, df = 3 7 = 6.14 (P	.57, df = 8 ( .00001) imental <u>SD To</u> 13.6 13.2 16.6 8.3 : (P = 0.25) < 0.00002	$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{F} = 0.05 \\ \mathbf{F} = 0.05 \\ \mathbf{F} = 0.05 \\ \mathbf{H} = 0.$	Contru           ean         S           90.3         12           43.7         6           9.78         5.0           2254         12.3           7%         7%	51 D Total 4 10 8 10 14 6 19 10 36	Weigh 28.29 17.79 23.09 31.19 <b>100.0</b> 9	Std. M t 6 6 6 6 6	lean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% Cl 1.79 [0.72, 2.86] 2.97 [1.62, 4.32] 1.23 [0.04, 2.42] 1.51 [0.49, 2.53] 1.78 [1.21, 2.35] -1	-10 Favo S	td. Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% C1 0 5	10 nental]



2007; Han, 2011; Pan et al., 2017). A schematic of the studied mechanisms by which Tan IIA protects against myocardial I/R injury is provided (Figure 10).

## 4 Discussion

### 4.1 Summary of the evidence

The present study demonstrated that Tan IIA exerted potential cardioprotective functions mainly through antioxidant, antiinflammatory, and anti-apoptosis mechanisms and improved circulation and energy metabolism in myocardial I/R models.

## 4.2 Limitations

There are several limitations that should be considered. First, a certain degree of selective bias is inevitable because the search strategy was limited to Chinese and English databases (Nolting et al., 2012), and negative findings are rarely published (Franco et al., 2014). Second, no study mentioned calculation of sample size, blinding of model establishment and outcome measurement. Moderate methodological quality will affect the accuracy of the results (Landis et al., 2012). Third, MI generally occurs in patients with comorbidities such as old age, diabetes or hypertension (Blankstein et al., 2012), and only 1 study (Zhang et al., 2010) constructed an animal model in diabetic rats. Finally, some studies used only female animals. The sensitivity and responses of animals of different sexes to the same drug or stimuli are quite different, especially in the cardiovascular system, which could interfere with the experimental results (Barp et al., 2002; Bae and Zhang, 2005).

## 4.3 Implications

Systematic reviews of animal studies can contribute to the improvement in the methodological quality of experiments (de Vries et al., 2014). In the present study, the methodological quality was moderate. Most of the deducted points were because of failures in sample size calculation and blinding in group allocation and outcome assessment, which are considered the core standards of research design. Studies with a lower quality tended to show better outcomes, resulting in global overestimation of the effect (García-Bonilla et al., 2012). For animal research, the "Reporting in vivo experiments (ARRIVE) guidelines" (Kilkenny et al., 2012) were proposed and are continuously improved to provide guidance on the complete and transparent reporting of *in vivo* animal research and to improve the quality of research reports. Thus, it is suggested that higher quality study design and reporting for Tan IIA should be executed according to the ARRIVE guidelines. Moreover, some aspects, such as calculation of sample size and blinding of group allocation and outcome assessment, should be specifically focused on.

In the present study, the vast majority of the included studies used young and healthy animals. However, in contrast to these young and healthy animal models, patients with MI usually have multiple cardiovascular risk factors and comorbidities, such as hypertension, hyperlipidemia, diabetes, hyperglycemia, heart failure, altered coronary circulation, and aging (Ferdinandy et al., 2014). These cardiovascular risks and comorbidities need to be treated in both the short and long term and contribute to the development of IR injury and complicate therapy (Rossello and Yellon, 2016). In addition, inappropriate selection of animal models could contribute to spurious or inconsistent results as well as unnecessary animal use (Lecour et al., 2014). Therefore, we propose the following suggestions: 1) choosing animal models that have similar anatomy and physiology to those of humans; 2) experiments with animal models that include risk factors and comorbidities; and 3) setting endpoints of animal studies closely resembling clinical settings. Furthermore, inconsistencies were particularly obvious in congenital heart disease (CHD) studies that used animals of different sexes (Barrett-Connor, 2013). Estrogen has been observed to have a cardioprotective effect both in clinical and preclinical studies, although the specific mechanism remains to be explored (Menazza et al., 2017). We suggest that sex differences in animals should be considered in experimental design.

Infarct size is the most robust primary outcome that is invariably used in animal experimental studies to evaluate the efficacy of various pharmacological or non-pharmacological strategies in preventing reperfusion injury, and it is usually analyzed after a short-term reperfusion or after a few days in an acute experiment (Ndrepepa et al., 2017). However, it is rarely tested clinically due to the limited diagnostic means, which is not helpful for intuitively evaluating the effect of different treatment strategies on cardiac function and determining the prognosis of patients. With the development of single-photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) and cardiac magnetic resonance (CMR), we propose that patients with acute coronary syndrome, especially ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI), should be have their infarct size measured (Gibbons and Araoz, 2016) to stratify the risk of heart failure in patients and develop appropriate treatment strategies.

Recorded in the famous Traditional Chinese Medicine Classic "Compendium of Materia Medica," the function of S. miltiorrhiza is described as invigorating the circulation of blood, dredging the collateral vessels on the pericardium and heart surface and treating colic. As the major active lipophilic ingredient of S. miltiorrhiza, Tan IIA is considered as the main contributor to the above efficacy. In Chinese medicine theory, it is used as a drug for promoting blood circulation and resolving blood stasis for cardiovascular ischemic diseases. However, the molecular and biological mechanisms of the cardioprorective effects of Tan IIA have not been fully elucidated. Experimental research has shown that myocardial I/R injury is related to pathophysiological features, including several the inflammatory response, endothelial dysfunction, generation of oxygen free radicals, mitochondrial dysfunction, myocardial cell apoptosis and autophagy (Heusch and Gersh, 2017). According to the present study, the possible mechanisms through which Tan IIA prevents myocardial I/R injury are as follows: 1) Antiapoptosis: Tan IIA can increase the ratio of Bcl-2/Bax, downregulate the protein expression of Bax, decrease the expression level of caspase-3, upregulate autophagic markers (Beclin-1 and the ratio of LC3B/LC3A) and downregulate the

expression of Mfn2, leading to anti-apoptosis effects against myocardial I/R injury by regulating the PI3K/AKT/mTOR, Ras-PI3K/Akt, JNK, ERK1/2, and PI3K/Akt/FOXO3A/Bim pathways. 2) Improving energy metabolism: Tan IIA can increase glucose oxidation; augment ATP restoration and production; improve the activities of Na+/K+-ATPase, Ca2+-ATPase and Mg2+-ATPase; alleviate the consumption of energy charge; reverse Ca<sup>2+</sup> overload; and protect the function of mitochondria. 3) Antioxidation: Tan IIA can promote the process of oxidative phosphorylation; increase the levels of antioxidants such as SOD, SDH, COX, GSH-Px, and CAT; and increase the release of NO, which simultaneously reduces free radical generation such as reactive oxidative species (O2-, HO-, and H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>); Tan IIA also regulates the mitochondrial permeability transition pore (MTPT), suppresses chondriokinesis, and reduces the release of cytochrome c and malondialdehyde (MDA), resulting in antioxidation effects against myocardial I/R injury by regulating the Nrf2/ARE/HO-1, Ras/MAPK, and PI3K/Akt signaling pathways. 4) Antiinflammation: Tan IIA can inhibit the expression of inflammation-related cytokines, such as IL-1, IL-6, TNF-a, and ICAM-1; upregulate the expression of EPOR; decrease the activation of NF-KB (p50 and p65); inhibit FGL2 and MPO expression; ameliorate microvascular obstruction (MVO); downregulate the mRNA expression of iNOS; and downregulate HMGB1 expression, leading to an antiinflammatory effect against myocardial I/R injury by activating NF-KB and regulating the JAK2/STAT5 and FGL2thrombin/PAR-1 pathways. 5) Improve circulation: Tan IIA can promote the expression of VEGF and EPO and facilitate the proliferation and differentiation of vascular cells to help vascular repair by the PI3K-Akt/mTOR and HIF-1a/VEGF pathways.

## 4.5 Conclusion

Tan IIA exerts cardioprotective function in myocardial I/R injury mainly through antioxidant, anti-inflammatory, and antiapoptosis mechanisms and improving the circulation and energy

## References

Ai, D. (2013). Protective role of tanshinone IIA in cardiac function of ischemicreperfused rabbits and its mechanism. *J. Hubei Univ. Sci. Technol. Med. Sci.* 27, 465–468.

Ansari, M. A., Khan, F. B., Safdari, H. A., Almatroudi, A., Alzohairy, M. A., Safdari, M., et al. (2021). Prospective therapeutic potential of Tanshinone IIA: An updated overview. *Pharmacol. Res.* 164, 105364. doi:10.1016/j.phrs.2020.105364

Bae, S., and Zhang, L. (2005). Gender differences in cardioprotection against ischemia/reperfusion injury in adult rat hearts: Focus on akt and protein kinase C signaling. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 315, 1125–1135. doi:10.1124/jpet. 105.090803

Barp, J., Araújo, A. S., Fernandes, T. R., Rigatto, K. V., Llesuy, S., Belló-Klein, A., et al. (2002). Myocardial antioxidant and oxidative stress changes due to sex hormones. *Braz. J. Med.* 35, 1075–1081. doi:10.1590/s0100-879x2002000900008

Barrett-Connor, E. (2013). Gender differences and disparities in all-cause and coronary heart disease mortality: Epidemiological aspects. *Clin. Endocrinol. metabolism* 27, 481–500. doi:10.1016/j.beem.2013.05.013

Binder, A., Ali, A., Chawla, R., Aziz, H. A., Abbate, A., and Jovin, I. S. (2015). Myocardial protection from ischemia-reperfusion injury post coronary metabolism. Thus, Tan IIA is a promising cardioprotective agent that should be further tested in MI clinical trials.

## 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 author.

## Author contributions

JS, R-YQ, and P-CZ: study conception and design. P-CZ, JX, CL, W-MH, and YZ: acquisition, analysis, and/or interpretation of data. P-CZ and L-CL: final approval and overall responsibility for this published work.

## Funding

This project was supported by the grant of Zhejiang Traditional Chinese Medicine Research Fund Project (2022ZB405).

## 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.

revascularization. Expert Rev. Cardiovasc. Ther. 13, 1045–1057. doi:10.1586/14779072.2015.1070669

Blankstein, R., Ahmed, W., Bamberg, F., Rogers, I. S., Schlett, C. L., Nasir, K., et al. (2012). Comparison of exercise treadmill testing with cardiac computed tomography angiography among patients presenting to the emergency room with chest pain: The rule out myocardial infarction using computer-assisted tomography (ROMICAT) study. *Cardiovasc. imaging* 5, 233–242. doi:10.1161/CIRCIMAGING.111.969568

Briel, M., Müller, K. F., Meerpohl, J. J., von Elm, E., Lang, B., Motschall, E., et al. (2013). Publication bias in animal research: A systematic review protocol. *Syst. Rev.* 2, 23. doi:10.1186/2046-4053-2-23

Bulluck, H., Yellon, D. M., and Hausenloy, D. J. (2016). Reducing myocardial infarct size: Challenges and future opportunities. *Heart (British Card. Soc.* 102, 341–348. doi:10. 1136/heartjnl-2015-307855

Dai, N. H., Chen, W., Zheng, Z. F., and Zang, Q. W. (2013). The protective effect of tanshinon 1I A postconditioning on myocardial ischemica/reperfusion injury in rats. *Chin. J. Cardiovasc. Res.* 11 (5), 549–551.

de Vries, R. B., Wever, K. E., Avey, M. T., Stephens, M. L., Sena, E. S., and Leenaars, M. (2014). The usefulness of systematic reviews of animal experiments

for the design of preclinical and clinical studies. *ILAR J.* 55, 427–437. doi:10.1093/ ilar/ilu043

Ferdinandy, P., Hausenloy, D. J., Heusch, G., Baxter, G. F., and Schulz, R. (2014). Interaction of risk factors, comorbidities, and comedications with ischemia/ reperfusion injury and cardioprotection by preconditioning, postconditioning, and remote conditioning. *Pharmacol. Rev.* 66, 1142–1174. doi:10.1124/pr.113. 008300

Franco, A., Malhotra, N., and Simonovits, G. (2014). Social science. Publication bias in the social sciences: Unlocking the file drawer. *Sci. (New York, N.Y.)* 345, 1502–1505. doi:10.1126/science.1255484

Frank, A., Bonney, M., Bonney, S., Weitzel, L., Koeppen, M., and Eckle, T. (2012). Myocardial ischemia reperfusion injury: From basic science to clinical bedside. Seminars Cardiothorac. Vasc. Anesth. 16, 123–132. doi:10.1177/ 1089253211436350

Fu, J., Huang, H., Liu, J., Pi, R., Chen, J., and Liu, P. (2007). Tanshinone IIA protects cardiac myocytes against oxidative stress-triggered damage and apoptosis. *Eur. J. Pharmacol.* 568, 213–221. doi:10.1016/j.ejphar.2007.04.031

García-Bonilla, L., Campos, M., Giralt, D., Salat, D., Chacón, P., Hernández-Guillamon, M., et al. (2012). Evidence for the efficacy of statins in animal stroke models: A meta-analysis. *J. Neurochem.* 122, 233–243. doi:10.1111/j.1471-4159.2012. 07773.x

Gibbons, R. J., and Araoz, P. (2016). Does infarct size matter? J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 67, 1684–1686. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2016.02.022

Guo, R., Li, L., Su, J., Li, S., Duncan, S. E., Liu, Z., et al. (2020). Pharmacological activity and mechanism of tanshinone IIA in related diseases. *Drug Des. Dev. Ther.* 14, 4735–4748. doi:10.2147/DDDT.S266911

Han, D. (2011). Study the effect of tanshinone IIA on apoptosis of myocardial cells of ischemia -reperfusion rats. *Mod. Prev. Med.* 38, 2572–2574.

Han, P., Feng, J., and Chen, H. W. (2016). The effect of tanshinone II A on cardiomyocyte apoptosis after myocardial lschemia/reperfusion injury in rats. *ZHONGGUO ZHONGYI JIZHENG* 25, 1844–1846+1873.

Hausenloy, D. J., and Yellon, D. M. (2013). Myocardial ischemia-reperfusion injury: A neglected therapeutic target. *J. Clin. investigation* 123, 92–100. doi:10. 1172/JCI62874

Hausenloy, D. J., and Yellon, D. M. (2007). Preconditioning and postconditioning: United at reperfusion. *Pharmacol. Ther.* 116, 173–191. doi:10.1016/j.pharmthera.2007. 06.005

Heusch, G. (2013). Cardioprotection: Chances and challenges of its translation to the clinic. *Lancet (London, Engl.* 381, 166–175. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12) 60916-7

Heusch, G., and Gersh, B. J. (2017). The pathophysiology of acute myocardial infarction and strategies of protection beyond reperfusion: A continual challenge. *Eur. heart J.* 38, 774–784. doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehw224

Hu, H., Zhai, C., Qian, G., Gu, A., Liu, J., Ying, F., et al. (2015). Protective effects of tanshinone IIA on myocardial ischemia reperfusion injury by reducing oxidative stress, HMGB1 expression, and inflammatory reaction. *Pharm. Biol.* 53, 1752–1758. doi:10.3109/13880209.2015.1005753

Ibáñez, B., Heusch, G., Ovize, M., and Van de Werf, F. (2015). Evolving therapies for myocardial ischemia/reperfusion injury. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* 65, 1454–1471. doi:10. 1016/j.jacc.2015.02.032

Kai, G., Xu, H., Zhou, C., Liao, P., Xiao, J., Luo, X., et al. (2011). Metabolic engineering tanshinone biosynthetic pathway in Salvia miltiorrhiza hairy root cultures. *Metab. Eng.* 13, 319–327. doi:10.1016/j.ymben.2011.02.003

Kilkenny, C., Browne, W. J., Cuthi, I., Emerson, M., and Altman, D. G. (2012). Improving bioscience research reporting: The ARRIVE guidelines for reporting animal research. *Veterinary Clin. pathol.* 41, 27–31. doi:10.1111/j.1939-165X.2012. 00418.x

Landis, S. C., Amara, S. G., Asadullah, K., Austin, C. P., Blumenstein, R., Bradley, E. W., et al. (2012). A call for transparent reporting to optimize the predictive value of preclinical research. *Nature* 490, 187–191. doi:10.1038/ nature11556

Lecour, S., Bøtker, H. E., Condorelli, G., Davidson, S. M., Garcia-Dorado, D., Engel, F. B., et al. (2014). ESC working group cellular biology of the heart: Position paper: Improving the preclinical assessment of novel cardioprotective therapies. *Cardiovasc. Res.* 104, 399–411. doi:10.1093/cvr/cvu225

Li, L. J., Jia, J. H., Sun, X. G., and Fh, Z. (2010). Influence of dingxin recipe and tanshinone IIA on IL-6 level in rat model of myocardial ischemia/reperfusion injury. *J. GUIYANG Med. Coll.* 35, 118–122.

Li, M., Wang, Z. J., Liu, J. Y., and Qin, L. (2019). Regulatory effect of sodium tanshinone IIA sulfonate on cardiac function and immune response in rats with myocardial ischemia-reperfusion injury. *Chin. J. Clin. Anat.* 37, 397–402.

Li, Q., Shen, L., Wang, Z., Jiang, H. P., and Liu, L. X. (2016a). Tanshinone IIA protects against myocardial ischemia reperfusion injury by activating the PI3K/Akt/mTOR signaling pathway. *Biomed. Pharmacother.* = *Biomedecine Pharmacother.* 84, 106–114. doi:10.1016/j.biopha.2016.09.014

Li, X. Y., Du, C. F., Xiao, M., Xia, J. L., Zhao, J., and He, H. Q. (2016b). Effect of sodium sulfonate IIA sulfonate injection on VEGF of rats with acute myocardial ischemia preconditioning. *WORLD Chin. Med.* 11, 2105–2108.

Lin, D. M., Huang, S. W., Lu, M., Cen, M. Q., Dou, L. P., and Wang, L. L. (2013). Effect of tanshinon IIA on No-reflow after reperfusion of acute myocardial infarction in rabbits. *Chin. ARCHIVES TRADITIONAL Chin. Med.* 31, 1649–1651+1740.

Liu, J. J., Wu, S., Li, L. Z., and Ao, J. B. (2017). Protective effect of danshen A sodium sulfonate injection on vascular endothelial injury after ischemic preconditioning in rabbits with myocardial ischemia preconditioning. *WORLD Chin. Med.* 12, 618–622.

Long, R., You, Y., Li, W., Jin, N., Huang, S., Li, T., et al. (2015). Sodium tanshinone IIA sulfonate ameliorates experimental coronary no-reflow phenomenon through down-regulation of FGL2. *Life Sci.* 142, 8-18. doi:10. 1016/j.lfs.2015.10.018

Luo, H., Vong, C. T., Chen, H., Gao, Y., Lyu, P., Qiu, L., et al. (2019). Naturally occurring anti-cancer compounds: Shining from Chinese herbal medicine. *Chin. Med.* 14, 48. doi:10.1186/s13020-019-0270-9

Ma, C. X., Sun, Y., Chen, X. B., and Zhang, L. (2017). Effects of tanshinone IIA preconditioning on myocardial ischemia reperfusion injury. *SHANXI YIXUE ZAZHI* 46, 1358–1359.

Macleod, M. R., O'Collins, T., Howells, D. W., and Donnan, G. A. (2004). Pooling of animal experimental data reveals influence of study design and publication bias. *Stroke* 35, 1203–1208. doi:10.1161/01.STR.0000125719.25853.20

Menazza, S., Sun, J., Appachi, S., Chambliss, K. L., Kim, S. H., Aponte, A., et al. (2017). Non-nuclear estrogen receptor alpha activation in endothelium reduces cardiac ischemia-reperfusion injury in mice. *J. Mol. Cell. Cardiol.* 107, 41–51. doi:10.1016/j. yjmcc.2017.04.004

Ndrepepa, G., Colleran, R., and Kastrati, A. (2017). Reperfusion injury in ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: The final frontier. *Coron. artery Dis.* 28, 253–262. doi:10.1097/MCA.00000000000468

Nolting, A., Perleth, M., Langer, G., Meerpohl, J. J., Gartlehner, G., Kaminski-Hartenthaler, A., et al. (2012). GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidence: Publication bias. Z. fur Evidenz, Fortbild. Qual. im Gesundheitswes. 106, 670–676. doi:10.1016/j.zefq.2012.10.015

Pan, Y., Qian, J. X., Lu, S. Q., Chen, J. W., Zhao, X. D., Jiang, Y., et al. (2017). Protective effects of tanshinone IIA sodium sulfonate on ischemia-reperfusion-induced myocardial injury in rats. *Iran. J. basic Med. Sci.* 20, 308–315. doi:10.22038/ijbms. 2017.8361

Perricone, A. J., and Vander Heide, R. S. (2014). Novel therapeutic strategies for ischemic heart disease. *Pharmacol. Res.* 89, 36–45. doi:10.1016/j.phrs.2014. 08.004

Roberts, I., Kwan, I., Evans, P., and Haig, S. (2002). Does animal experimentation inform human healthcare? Observations from a systematic review of international animal experiments on fluid resuscitation. *BMJ Clin. Res. ed.*) 324, 474–476. doi:10. 1136/bmj.324.7335.474

Rossello, X., and Yellon, D. M. (2016). Cardioprotection: The disconnect between bench and bedside. *Circulation* 134, 574–575. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.116. 022829

Sandercock, P., and Roberts, I. (2002). Systematic reviews of animal experiments. Lancet (London, Engl. 360, 586. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(02)09812-4

Shao, H., Li, M., Chen, F., Chen, L., Jiang, Z., and Zhao, L. (2018). The efficacy of danshen injection as adjunctive therapy in treating angina pectoris: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Heart, lung circulation* 27, 433–442. doi:10.1016/j.hlc. 2017.10.016

Shen, W. L., Yu, F., Xu, L., Chen, C., Cao, Y. N., Liu, S., et al. (2018). Protective effects of tanshinone IIA derivative on myocardial ischemia/reperfusion injury in rats. *J. Chin. Pharm. Sci.* 27, 1–13. doi:10.5246/jcps.2018.01.001

Stewart, L. A., Clarke, M., Rovers, M., Riley, R. D., Simmonds, M., Stewart, G., et al. (2015). Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analyses of individual participant data: The PRISMA-IPD statement. *Jama* 313, 1657–1665. doi:10.1001/jama. 2015.3656

Tang, S. M., Wu, Y. M., Zhou, Y. T., Li, X. Y., Meng, X. B., and Zhang, H. (2017). The protective effect of Tanshinone IIA on oxidative stress induced by myocardial ischemia reperfusion iniury of rats. *China Med. Her.* | *Chin. Med. Her.* 14, 8-11.

Tao, J., Wang, Z. Q., Liu, Q. Y., and Fang, G. X. (1996). Sodium Tonshione IIA sulfonat against myocardial reperfusion injury. Shijiazhuang City of Hebei Province: Chinese joural of Anesthesiology, 202–204.

Thind, G. S., Agrawal, P. R., Hirsh, B., Saravolatz, L., Chen-Scarabelli, C., Narula, J., et al. (2015). Mechanisms of myocardial ischemia-reperfusion injury and the cytoprotective role of minocycline: Scope and limitations. *Future Cardiol.* 11, 61–76. doi:10.2217/fca.14.76

Tsao, C. W., Aday, A. W., Almarzooq, Z. I., Alonso, A., Beaton, A. Z., Bittencourt, M. S., et al. (2022). Heart disease and stroke statistics-2022 update: A report from the

American heart association. *Circulation* 145, e153–e639. doi:10.1161/CIR. 000000000001052

Wang, H., Jiang, Y. Q., Song, G. Y., Zhang, Z. L., and Ma, Y. Q. (2007). Influences of sodium tanshinone IIA on lipidperoxidation of myocardial ischemia reperfusion injury in rabbits. *Chin. J. Gerontology*, 2095–2097.

Wang, L. L., Hang, S. W., Dou, L. P., Che, Q., Lu, M., Wang, Y., et al. (2012). Beneficial effects and the potential oxidative stress mechanism of tanshinone IIA on the No-reflow phenomenon in rabbits after acute myocardial infarction and reperfusion. *Chin. ARCHIVES TRADITIONAL Chin. Med.* 30, 2513–2516+2601.

Wang, L. L., Huang, S. W., Dou, L. P., Lu, M., Hu, P. F., Bo, G., et al. (2016). Cardiac protective effect of tanshinone IIA sodium sulfonate on rabbit model of myocardial infarction reperfusion with No-reflow. *Chin. ARCHIVES TRADITIONAL Chin. Med.* 34, 678–682.

Wang, Y. (2021). Protective effect of tanshinone IIA on myocardial ischemiareperfusion injury and its effect on JAK2/STAT3 pathway. *Chin. J. Integr. Med. Cardio-/Cerebrovascuiar Dis.* 19, 1290–1296.

Wei, B., Li, W. W., Ji, J., Hu, Q. H., and Ji, H. (2014). The cardioprotective effect of sodium tanshinone IIA sulfonate and the optimizing of therapeutic time window in myocardial ischemia/reperfusion injury in rats. *Atherosclerosis* 235, 318–327. doi:10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2014.05.924

Wu, X. Q., and He, L. S. (2012). Effect of Tanshinone IIA pretreatment on myocardial ischemia/reperfusion injury in rats. J. Trop. Med. 12, 917–919+912.

Yellon, D. M., and Hausenloy, D. J. (2007). Myocardial reperfusion injury. N. Engl. J. Med. 357, 1121–1135. doi:10.1056/NEJMra071667

Yu, L. J., Zhang, K. J., Zhu, J. Z., Zheng, Q., Bao, X. Y., Thapa, S., et al. (2017). Salvianolic acid exerts cardioprotection through promoting angiogenesis in animal models of acute myocardial infarction: Preclinical evidence. *Oxidative Med. Cell. Longev.* 2017, 8192383. doi:10.1155/2017/8192383

Zhang, L. P., and Zhang, J. (2010). Effects of tanshinone IIA on myocardial ischemia reperfusion injury. *Chin. COMMUNITY Dr.* 12, 28.

Zhang, Y., Wei, L., Sun, D., Cao, F., Gao, H., Zhao, L., et al. (2010). Tanshinone IIA pretreatment protects myocardium against ischaemia/reperfusion injury through the phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase/Akt-dependent pathway in diabetic rats. *Diabetes, Obes. metabolism* 12, 316–322. doi:10.1111/j.1463-1326.2009.01166.x

Zheng, Y. M., Yu, X., and Hu, M. (2010). Effect of tanshinone IIA on expression of BCL-2 and caspase-3 during myocardial ischemia-reperfusion. *J. HUANGSHI Inst. Technol.* 26, 59–61+64.

Zhou, Y. P., and Yang, P. (2012). Expression of EPOR in ischemia-reperfusion injured myocardium and intervention effect of tanshinone II A. *LIAONING J. TRADITIONAL Chin. Med.* 39, 175–177.