Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Vivek P. Chavda, L. M. College of Pharmacy, India

REVIEWED BY Bacon Fung Leung Ng, Hospital Authority, Hong Kong SAR, China Hantong Hu, Third Affiliated Hospital of Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, China Kaushika Patel, LJ Institute of Pharmacy, India Amitkumar Chaudhari, L. M. College of Pharmcy (LMCP), India

*CORRESPONDENCE Wei Gu Sam6116@163.com Li-Na Wang rena1022@163.com

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

RECEIVED 24 August 2024 ACCEPTED 17 March 2025 PUBLISHED 31 March 2025

CITATION

Chen H-B, Zhang Y-D, Qin Y, Jiang H-Y, Wang L-N and Gu W (2025) Inhalation aromatherapy for the treatment of comorbid insomnia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front. Psychiatry* 16:1485693. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2025.1485693

COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Chen, Zhang, Qin, Jiang, Wang and Gu. 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.

Inhalation aromatherapy for the treatment of comorbid insomnia: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Hu-Bo Chen^{1†}, Yi-Dan Zhang^{1†}, Yang Qin¹, Hong-Yu Jiang¹, Li-Na Wang^{2*} and Wei Gu^{2*}

¹College of Basic Medicine, Naval Medical University, Shanghai, China, ²Department of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Naval Medical University, Shanghai, China

Objective: Meta-analysis can pool multiple studies to explore a particular area in depth, therefore this method was used to explore the clinical efficacy of inhalation aromatherapy for the treatment of comorbid insomnia and provide an empirical evidence for clinical treatment.

Methods: The PubMed, Web of Science, CNKI Database, Wanfang Database, and VIP Database were searched for randomized controlled trials on aromatherapy for the treatment of comorbid insomnia from inception to August 30, 2023. RevMan 5.3 was used for meta-analysis of the results.

Results: A total of 27 publications involving 2072 patients were included. The results of the meta-analysis showed that inhalation aromatherapy well relieved the symptoms of comorbid insomnia (MD -2.90, 95% CI: -3.85 to -1.95, p<0.00001) and the negative mental state of anxiety (MD -3.97, 95% CI: -5.88 to -2.06, p<0.0001) and depression (MD -9.58, 95% CI: -15.13 to -4.03, p=0.0007) in patients. Included studies were heterogeneous, and the factors influencing the heterogeneity were not identified. These studies commonly presented issues such as lack of blinding, and absence of independent testing for the purity or potency of herbs.

Conclusion: Inhalation aromatherapy can improve the sleep quality of patients with other disease states, with basically no adverse reactions and acceptable safety. Therefore, inhalation aromatherapy is expected to become an indispensable complementary therapy in clinical practice for most diseases. However, high-quality clinical trials are still needed to confirm these findings due to methodological weaknesses in blinding and independent testing for the purity and potency of herbs.

Systematic review registration: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/, identifier CRD42023455278.

KEYWORDS

aromatherapy, comorbid insomnia, insomnia, randomized controlled trial, meta-analysis

1 Introduction

Sleep quality surveys of different groups of people have shown that insomnia is common and mainly manifests as difficulty in falling asleep or staying asleep, with serious impairment of daytime function (1–5). In clinical practice, the symptoms of insomnia often do not appear alone but are accompanied by other mental or physical disorders. Therefore, insomnia can be divided into primary insomnia and secondary insomnia, but it is difficult to differentiate between the two in clinical practice (6). According to a scientific meeting of the National Institutes of Health, "secondary insomnia" was renamed "comorbid insomnia" (7). Psychological disorders, chronic pain, atrial fibrillation, and HIV infection are risk factors for comorbid insomnia (8–11).

Considering the underlying disease of comorbid insomnia, many drugs for the treatment of insomnia cannot be used in clinical practice (12, 13). There have been many reports that behavioral cognitive therapy, as an emerging field, can stably and effectively improve comorbid insomnia in various diseases, but this method requires much manpower and resources and cannot benefit most patients (14). Therefore, complementary and alternative medicine therapies can have advantages (15). Many young people alleviate their symptoms of comorbid insomnia through complementary and alternative medicine therapy (16).

Inhalation aromatherapy, as a complementary and alternative medicine, involves the absorption of volatile aromatic plant oils into the body through the respiratory mucosa to relieve mental stress, eliminate diseases, and promote human health (17). Studies on the extraction of aromatic oils from natural plants have shown that valerian oil, lavender oil, and chamomile oil can relieve the symptoms of insomnia (18–22). However, studies on insomnia secondary to other diseases have not been collated for systematic evaluation. This study is dedicated to exploring the therapeutic effects of aromatherapy in different disease types, and then determining whether aromatherapy can be applied as a universal clinical adjunct therapy.

To the best of our knowledge, there is no systematic review or meta-analysis summarizing the therapeutic effect of inhalation aromatherapy on comorbid insomnia. Given the high incidence of comorbid insomnia and the limitations of clinical work on it, it is important to accumulate current evidence on the effect of inhalation aromatherapy on comorbid insomnia. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to summarize the efficacy and safety of inhalation aromatherapy in the treatment of comorbid insomnia.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Study registration

We conducted and reported this systematic review according to the PRISMA statement (23). This systematic review has been registered (Reg. No. CRD42023455278) in PROSPERO.

2.2 Inclusion criteria

2.2.1 Types of studies

All the studies were publicly published randomized controlled trials (RCTs), with language restricted to Chinese or English, on the treatment of comorbid insomnia with inhalation aromatherapy.

2.2.2 Type of interventions

The treatment group was treated with inhalation aromatherapy. Inhalation aromatherapy is defined as a natural therapy in which the volatile oils of aromatic plants are absorbed into the body through breathing to relieve mental stress, eliminate disease, and promote human health. The control group received conventional treatment or placebo treatment.

2.2.3 Type of participants

All subjects met the diagnostic criteria for a disease established by modern medicine, tolerated the volatile oils of aromatic plants used in the study, had no history of using sleeping pills or sedative drugs, had no demand for such drugs during the study, and were in stable condition during the study. There were no other serious complications. All patients were over 18 years old, had a normal sense of smell, and provided informed consent for this study.

2.2.4 Outcome indicators

Primary outcomes: Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI).
Secondary outcomes: (1) Self-Rating Anxiety Scale (SAS); (2)
Self-Rating Depression Scale (SDS); (3) PSQI-sleep quality; (4) PSQI-time to falling asleep; (5) PSQI-sleep duration; (6) PSQI-sleep efficiency; (7) PSQI-sleep disorder; (8) PSQI-daytime function.

2.3 Exclusion criteria

 Nonclinical trial publications such as animal studies and review papers; (2) review papers or meta-analysis papers; (3) repeat publications (the first published was selected); (4) papers that did not clearly state the selection and method of use of aromatherapy;
 papers with nonstandardized experimental designs or inappropriate use of statistical methods; (6) papers without standards for efficacy evaluation or with unscientific study results.

2.4 Literature search strategy

The English databases PubMed and Web of Science and the Chinese databases CNKI Database, Wanfang Database, and VIP Database were searched. The literature search was limited to Chinese and English. The Chinese search terms used were "insomnia (不寐)", "insomnia (失眠)", "sleep disorders (睡眠障碍)" "sleep quality (睡眠质量)", "sachet (香囊)", "aromatherapy (芳香疗法)", "plant essential oil (植物精油)", and "aromatherapy (香薰疗法)". The English search terms used were "insomnia", "sleep disorder",

"sleep quality", "aromatherapy", and "essential oil". The retrieval time frame ranged from database inception to August 30, 2023.

2.5 Efficacy evaluation criteria

(1) Psychological state evaluation: The subjects selected in this study all had underlying disease. Underlying disease creates a negative psychological state which is closely related to sleep quality. Therefore, it was necessary to evaluate patients' psychological state. The SAS and SDS were used to evaluate the negative psychology of the patients. (2) Sleep quality: The PSQI was used to evaluate the sleep quality of the patients. A total of 18 items formed seven dimensions, each dimension having 0-3 points, for a total score of 21 points. The total score of the PSQI ranged from 0-21 points.

2.6 The GRADE approach

The GRADE (Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation) approach was applied to evaluate the level of evidence in the included literature (24, 25). The GRADE process includes all important and critical outcomes explicitly. The main domains used to assess the certainty of the evidence are risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness of evidence, imprecision, and publication bias. The factors that can increase the certainty of the evidence are dose-response gradient, large magnitude of an effect, and effect of plausible residual confounding. Finally, we could summarize the methodology in four grades (high, moderate, low, very low).

2.7 Literature screening and data extraction

Two reviewers (YQ and HYJ) independently screened all literature and extracted data using EndNote X9 software. The form was utilized to gather data on the included studies, including the first author, year of publication, region where the study was conducted, number of participants in each group, sex of the patients, interventions (category of essential oils and duration of treatment), and scores on the SAS, SDS, and PSQI. Differences of opinion were mediated by a third reviewer (HBC). The identification content mainly included whether aromatherapy was inhalation therapy, whether the experimental design was RCT, and whether insomnia was comorbidity.

2.8 Evaluation of literature quality

Two reviewers (YQ and HYJ) categorized the risk of bias for each trial as high, low, or unclear based on the Cochrane

Collaboration Risk of Bias Assessment Tool 1.0.15. The following risk of bias domains were evaluated: (1) random sequence generation (selection bias); (2) allocation concealment (selection bias); (3) blinding of participant and personnel (performance bias); (4) blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias); (5) incomplete outcome data (attrition bias), (6) selective reporting (reporting bias); and (7) any other bias. Differences of opinion were resolved by a third reviewer (HBC). All studies were assessed and categorized as high risk, low risk, or unclear risk according to their respective domains. If the number of evaluated trials exceeded five, funnel plots were employed to assess the presence of publication bias.

2.9 Synthesizing and examining data

Two reviewers independently used RevMan 5.3 software to synthesize and statistically analyze the efficacy data. Mean differences (MDs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were presented for continuous data, and data from studies were pooled using the inverse variance method. Dichotomous data were presented as odds ratios with 95% CIs and pooled using the Mantel-Haenszel method. The heterogeneity was assessed using the Q-test and I² statistic. The fixed-effects model was used in instances of low heterogeneity (I²<50%), while the random effects model was used in situations of moderate heterogeneity (I²>50%). Sensitivity analysis was used to observe the effect of a single article on heterogeneity. Subgroup analysis was performed according to the type of disease, duration of intervention, agents used, and control methods. P-values less than 0.05 were defined as statistically significant.

3 Results

3.1 Search results

According to the retrieval methods, a total of 1092 publications that met the inclusion criteria were found, including 699 publications in Chinese and 393 publications in English. After reading the titles and abstracts, the publications that did not meet the inclusion criteria were excluded, and a total of 27 publications (26–52) met the inclusion criteria (Figure 1). Of these, six papers (34, 36, 39, 41, 50, 51) were master's theses, and the other 21 papers were journal papers.

3.2 Basic information of the included studies

The 27 studies included a total of 2072 patients, including 1039 patients in the experimental group and 1033 patients in the control



group. The basic information of the included studies is listed in Table 1.

3.3 Evaluation of study quality

All 27 studies were RCTs. The studies all used correct randomization methods, including random number tables and permutation block randomization. The statistical methods of all the studies were correct, and the distribution between groups was balanced. Two studies (26, 28) reported blinding during the experiment, and six (27, 29, 33, 34, 50, 51) reported data loss, including loss to follow-up (Figures 2, 3).

3.4 Results of the meta-analysis

3.4.1 Anxiety level

Nine studies (32, 36, 38, 40, 42, 46–49) (802 patients) reported SAS scores. There was statistical heterogeneity among the studies (P<0.00001, $I^2 = 85\%$). A random-effects model was used to pool the effects for the meta-analysis (Figure 4). The results showed that the SAS scores of the patients in the experimental group were

significantly lower than those in the control group (Z=4.07, P<0.0001). Aromatherapy alleviated the anxiety of patients well. Due to the small number of included studies, subgroup analysis was not performed.

3.4.2 Depression level

Five studies (40, 42, 46–48) (458 patients) reported the SDS score. There was statistical heterogeneity among the studies (P<0.00001, $I^2 = 97\%$). A random-effects model was used to pool the effects for the meta-analysis (Figure 5). The results showed that the SDS scores of the patients in the experimental group were significantly lower than those in the control group (Z=3.38, P=0.0007). Aromatherapy also did well at improving the patients' depression status. Due to the small number of included studies, subgroup analysis was not performed.

3.4.3 Sleep quality index

Twenty-four studies (26–35, 37, 39–45, 47–52) (1864 patients) reported the total score on the PSQI. There was statistical heterogeneity among the studies (P<0.00001, $I^2 = 97\%$). A random-effects model was used to pool the effects for the meta-analysis (Figure 6). The PSQI scores of the patients in the experimental group were significantly lower than those in the

TABLE 1 Basic information of the included studies.

Included	Diagnostic criteria for	Region	Sample	Persons	Interve	ntions	Treatment	Testing of	Testing of	GRADE
studies	comorbid insomnia		size	lost to follow- up	Control group	Experimental group	duration (days)	purity	potency	approach
Hamzeh et al., 2020 (26)	Cancer patients	Iran	120	0	Mixing distilled water and 1% lavender essential oil for blinding	Lavender essential oil	7	low	high	low
Heydarirad et al., 2019 (27)	Cancer patients dissatisfied with their sleep quality	Iran	45	9	Routine care	Damascena rose essential oil	14	high	high	moderate
Özkaraman et al., 2018 (28)	Cancer patients receiving paclitaxel weekly	Turkey	70	NR	Routine care	Lavender essential oil	30	high	high	high
Muz et al., 2017 (29)	Hemodialysis patients with an VAS fatigue score≥3 and a PSQI score≥5.	Turkey	62	18	Routine care	1:1 mixture of lavender oil and sweet orange oil	30	high	high	low
Karadag et al., 2017 (30)	Patients with coronary artery disease and passed the first stage of the disease	Turkey	60	0	Routine care	Lavender essential oil	15	high	high	low
Hajibagheri et al., 2014 (31)	Cardiac patients	Iran	60	0	Routine care	Damascena rose essential oil	3	high	high	low
Dong et al., 2023 (32)	Patients with gastrointestinal malignancies undergoing chemotherapy	China	80	NR	Routine care	Lavender essential oil, peppermint essential oil, and bergamot essential oil were prepared as a blended essential oil at a ratio of 1:1:1.	6	middle	high	moderate
Chen et al., 2022 (33)	Breast cancer patients met the diagnostic criteria for insomnia according to both TCM and modern medicine, with a PSQI score>7, and were diagnosed with the TCM syndrome of heart-spleen deficiency	China	129	11	Routine care	Homemade lavender sachets	14	high	high	moderate
Duan et al., 2022 (34)	Patients with Alzheimer's disease and a CDR score<3	China	51	3	Aromatherapy spray	Essential oils of lavender, sweet orange and bergamot were prepared in a 1:1:1 ratio as an essential oil compound	84	high	high	moderate
Huang et al., 2022 (35)	Colorectal cancer patients	China	120	NR	Six-character formula qigong	Lavender essential oil	28	high	high	moderate
Si et al., 2022 (36)	Patients met the diagnostic criteria for functional dyspepsia according to both TCM and modern medicine,	China	126	NR	Acupoint wheat grain moxibustion	Lavender essential oil	14	high	high	moderate

(Continued)

TABLE 1 Continued

Included	Diagnostic criteria for	Region	Sample	Persons	Interve	ntions	Treatment	Testing of	Testing of	GRADE
studies			size	follow- up	Control group	Experimental group	(days)	purity	potency	approacn
	and were diagnosed with the TCM syndrome of liver stagnation and spleen deficiency									
Tang et al., 2022 (37)	Mild and moderate COVID- 19 patients	China	84	NR	Routine care	Lavender essential oil and wild orange essential oil were prepared at a dose of 1:1 to make essential oil compound	14	high	high	moderate
Yang et al., 2022 (38)	Elderly patients with hip fracture	China	60	NR	Solid air freshener	Homemade Chinese herbal sachet	10	high	high	low
Cui et al., 2021 (39)	Maintenance hemodialysis patients met the diagnostic criteria for insomnia according to both TCM and modern medicine, and were diagnosed with the TCM syndrome of heart-kidney disharmony	China	90	0	TCM massage	Homemade Chinese herbal sachet	28	high	high	moderate
Wang et al., 2021 (40)	Chronic kidney failure uremic patients undergoing maintenance hemodialysis	China	80	NR	Routine care	Essential oils of lavender, sweet orange and bergamot were prepared in a 1:1:1 ratio as an essential oil compound.	180	high	high	moderate
Zhao et al., 2021 (41)	Maintenance hemodialysis patients	China	87	NR	Routine care	Lavender essential oil	28	high	high	moderate
Zhong et al., 2021 (42)	Elderly patients with hip fracture	China	114	NR	Routine care	Lavender essential oil	30	high	high	moderate
Zhou et al., 2021 (43)	Patients with primary liver cancer undergoing transarterial chemoembolization	China	86	NR	Routine care	Lavender essential oil	NR	high	high	moderate
Huang et al., 2020 (44)	Fracture patients undergoing open reduction and internal fixation	China	120	NR	Routine care	Homemade lavender sachets	30	high	high	moderate
Li et al., 2020 (45)	Postoperative breast cancer patients in the perichemotherapy period with a PSQI score≥8	China	100	NR	Routine care	Lavender essential oil	NR	high	high	moderate
Xie et al., 2020 (46)	Schizophrenia patients in remission period	China	64	NR	Routine care	Lavender essential oil	90	high	high	moderate
										(Continued)

Frontiers in Psychiatry

Included	Diagnostic criteria for	Region	Sample	Persons	Interve	ntions	Treatment	Testing of	Testing of	GRADE
studies	comorbid insomnia		size	lost to follow- up	Control group	Experimental group	duration (days)	purity	potency	approach
Zhang et al., 2020 (47)	Postoperative thyroid cancer patients	China	120	NR	Physiological saline placebo	Lavender essential oil	7	middle	high	low
Zhou et al., 2020 (48)	Schizophrenia patients in remission period and a PSQI score≥7	China	80	NR	Routine care	Lavender essential oil	90	low	high	moderate
Li et al., 2018 (49)	Gastric cancer patients during perioperative period	China	120	NR	Routine care	Geranium essential oil	2	high	high	moderate
Xu et al., 2018 (50)	Patients with mild to moderate acute pancreatitis undergoing non operative treatment	China	67	5	Routine care	Lavender essential oil	7	low	high	moderate
Ma et al., 2017 (51)	Post stroke depression patients with a HAMA score of 7-20 and a HAMD score of 8-35	China	59	1	Routine care	Aromatic substance extract atomization absorption	56	high	high	moderate
Qi et al., 2016 (52)	Colorectal cancer patients during perioperative period	China	69	NR	Routine care	Three essential oils of lavender, geranium and bergamot were formulated according to the ratio of 1:2:3 to make essential	10	high	high	moderate

(1) NR, not mentioned in representative literature. (2) For the purity test, the study was assessed as high if it reported purity and source, middle if it reported purity only, and low if it did not report purity. (3) For the potency test, the study was assessed as high if it reported purity and source, middle if it reported purity only, and low if it did not report purity. (3) For the potency test, the study was assessed as high if it reported purity and source, middle if it reported purity only, and low if it did not report purity. (3) For the grand potency. (4) For the GRADE approach, the study was assessed as high, moderate, low, very low based on the confidence in the effectiveness estimation.

oil compound

Chen et al.







Forest plot of the meta-analysis of the effect of aromatherapy on anxiety level.



control group (Z=5.98, P<0.00001). Thus, aromatherapy improved the patients' sleep quality.

factors affecting the heterogeneity.

3.4.4 Publication bias

Visual analysis of the funnel plots revealed asymmetry, thus suggesting potential publication bias in evaluating depressionanxiety levels (Figures 7A, B). When exploring the studies that included the sleep quality index score, the circles in the funnel plot were scattered, and there was no obvious symmetry, suggesting that there was a possibility of publication bias (Figure 7C). Due to the

3.4.5 Subgroup analysis of sleep quality

The sensitivity analysis showed that no single study had a great impact on heterogeneity, so the next step was to conduct subgroup analysis combined with the actual clinical work and experimental design differences. After screening the studies, we planned to conduct subgroup analysis based on the type of disease, duration of intervention, agents used, and control methods. The

high heterogeneity, subgroup analysis was needed to identify the

	Expe	erimen			ontroi	T . (.)		Wean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	lotal	Mean	SD	Total	weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Chen ying 2022	12.55	2.97	33	14.69	2.44	32	4.1%	-2.14 [-3.46, -0.82]	
Cui yanqiu 2021	7	1.48	30	6	1.48	30	4.4%	1.00 [0.25, 1.75]	
Dong jiaqian 2023	9	2.96	40	11.5	2.22	40	4.2%	-2.50 [-3.65, -1.35]	
Duan ran 2022	5.16	2.43	25	8.07	3.06	26	4.0%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40]	
hajibagheri 2014	5.63	5.13	30	9.26	3	30	3.7%	-3.63 [-5.76, -1.50]	
Hamzeh 2020	9.5	3.28	40	11.17	3.32	40	4.1%	-1.67 [-3.12, -0.22]	
heydarirad 2019	7.4	3.66	15	13.66	2.02	15	3.7%	-6.26 [-8.38, -4.14]	
Huang shengfei 2022	5.6	0.21	40	5.75	0.21	40	4.5%	-0.15 [-0.24, -0.06]	1
Huang yulou 2020	7.68	3.01	60	14.34	1.6	60	4.3%	-6.66 [-7.52, -5.80]	-
karadag 2015	7.6	2.83	30	9.38	2.6	30	4.1%	-1.78 [-3.16, -0.40]	
Li jiang 2018	6.13	3.12	60	8.03	3.93	60	4.2%	-1.90 [-3.17, -0.63]	
Li qiongyao 2020	9.8	3.8	52	15.1	3.1	48	4.1%	-5.30 [-6.65, -3.95]	(
Ma li 2017	3.655	1.61	29	5.633	1.974	30	4.3%	-1.98 [-2.90, -1.06]	
muz 2017	4.66	3.66	27	15.62	1.81	35	4.0%	-10.96 [-12.47, -9.45]	
ozkaraman 2018	3.86	3.18	30	7.15	3.23	20	3.9%	-3.29 [-5.11, -1.47]	<u> </u>
Qi haiyan 2016	8.85	2.34	34	9.91	2.03	35	4.3%	-1.06 [-2.09, -0.03]	
Tang xiaoyan 2022	2.86	2.54	42	5.31	4.25	42	4.0%	-2.45 [-3.95, -0.95]	
Wang tingting 2021	7.44	1.51	40	9.18	1.53	40	4.4%	-1.74 [-2.41, -1.07]	-
Xu hongyan 2018	7.79	1.58	33	8.53	2.06	34	4.3%	-0.74 [-1.62, 0.14]	
Zhang daiving 2020	10.53	2.47	60	13.63	2.31	60	4.3%	-3.10 [-3.96, -2.24]	
Zhao wenwen 2021	7	2.22	45	10	1.67	42	4.3%	-3.00 [-3.82, -2.18]	
Zhong hong 2021	7.5	1.4	57	11.2	2.3	57	4.4%	-3.70 [-4.40, -3.00]	-
Zhou aihua 2020	11.48	2.76	40	13.08	2.84	40	4.2%	-1.60 [-2.83, -0.37]	
Zhou feifeng 2021	9.23	2.65	43	12.45	1.99	43	4.3%	-3.22 [-4.21, -2.23]	
Total (95% CI)			935			929	100.0%	-2.90 [-3.85, -1.95]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	5.24; Chi ^a	² = 798	.78, df	= 23 (P	< 0.000	001); l ²	= 97%	_	
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 5.98 (P < 0.0	00001)	- (.		// -			-10 -5 0 5 10

Forest plot of the meta-analysis of the effect of aromatherapy on sleep quality index.



19 included publications (26-33, 35, 39-43, 45, 47-49, 52) were grouped into the cardiovascular group, cancer group, hemodialysis group, psychiatric disorder group, and after fracture surgery group (Figure 8). The results showed that the intragroup heterogeneity was high, and the intergroup heterogeneity was low (P=0.99, $I^2 = 0\%$), indicating that the disease type was not an influencing factor in the heterogeneity. Twenty-two publications (26-35, 37, 39-42, 44, 47-52) were included in this analysis. The publications were grouped into three treatment durations: up to one week (≤ 7 d), up to one month (7-30 d), and more than one month (>30 d) (Figure 9). The results showed that there was high intragroup heterogeneity and low intergroup heterogeneity (P=0.25, $I^2 = 27.0\%$), indicating that the duration of treatment was not an influencing factor for the heterogeneity. Twenty-two publications (26, 27, 29, 31-35, 37, 39-45, 47-52) were grouped by treatment agent into the lavender group, the compound group, the sachet group, and the other group (Figure 10). The results showed that both the intragroup and intergroup heterogeneity was high (P<0.00001, I² = 98.3%), indicating that the category of essential oils could not be excluded as not an underlying factor of the heterogeneity. Next, 23 studies (27-35, 37, 39-45, 47-52) were grouped by their control methods into the usual care group, the placebo group, or the other treatment group (Figure 11). The results showed that both the intragroup and intergroup heterogeneity was high (P<0.00001, $I^2 = 99.6\%$), so the control method could not be excluded as not an underlying factor of the heterogeneity.

3.4.6 Analysis of each dimension of sleep quality

Meta-analysis was performed on each dimension of the sleep quality index scale. The results showed that aromatherapy had significant beneficial effects on sleep quality (Figure 12A), time to falling asleep (Figure 12B), sleep efficiency (Figure 12C), sleep disorder (Figure 12D), daytime function (Figure 12E), and sleep duration (Figure 12F) (P<0.05).

4 Discussion

4.1 Summary of evidence and analysis

Twenty-seven articles were included in this study. Our metaanalysis showed that aromatherapy well relieved anxiety and depression in the patients and improve their sleep quality during

	Expe	erimen	tal	C	ontrol	_		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
2.1.1 Cardiovascular									_
hajibagheri 2014	5.63	5.13	30	9.26	3	30	39.9%	-3.63 [-5.76, -1.50]	
karadag 2015	7.6	2.83	30	9.39	2.6	30	60.1%	-1.79 [-3.17, -0.41]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			60			60	100.0%	-2.52 [-4.29, -0.76]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2	0.86; Chi Z = 2.80	² = 2.03 (P = 0.0	3, df = 005)	1 (P = 0	.15); l²	= 51%			
2.1.2 Cancer									
Chen ying 2022	12.55	2.97	33	14.69	2.44	32	10.0%	-2.14 [-3.46, -0.82]	
Dong jiaqian 2023	9	2.96	40	11.5	2.22	40	10.3%	-2.50 [-3.65, -1.35]	
Hamzeh 2020	9.5	3.28	40	11.17	3.32	40	9.8%	-1.67 [-3.12, -0.22]	
heydarirad 2019	7.4	3.66	15	13.66	2.02	15	8.6%	-6.26 [-8.38, -4.14]	
Huang shengfei 2022	5.6	0.21	40	5.75	0.21	40	11.2%	-0.15 [-0.24, -0.06]	•
Li jiang 2018	6.13	3.12	60	8.03	3.93	60	10.1%	-1.90 [-3.17, -0.63]	
Li qiongyao 2020	9.8	3.8	52	15.1	3.1	48	9.9%	-5.30 [-6.65, -3.95]	
ozkaraman 2018	3.86	3.18	30	7.15	3.23	20	9.1%	-3.29 [-5.11, -1.47]	
Qi haiyan 2016	8.85	2.34	34	9.91	2.03	35	10.4%	-1.06 [-2.09, -0.03]	
Zhang daiying 2020	10.53	2.47	60	13.63	2.31	60	10.6%	-3.10 [-3.96, -2.24]	
Zhou feifeng 2021	9.23	2.65	43	12.45	0	43		Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)			447			433	100.0%	-2.65 [-3.94, -1.36]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3 Test for overall effect: 2	3.88; Chi Z = 4.02	² = 177 (P < 0.0	7.32, df 0001)	= 9 (P <	< 0.000	001); l²	= 95%		
2.1.3 Hemodialysis									
Cui yangiu 2021	7	1.48	30	6	1.48	30	25.2%	1.00 [0.25, 1.75]	-
muz 2017	4.66	3.66	27	15.62	1.81	35	24.4%	-10.96 [-12.47, -9.45]	- - -
Wang tingting 2021	7.44	1.51	40	9.18	1.53	40	25.3%	-1.74 [-2.41, -1.07]	+
Zhao wenwen 2021 Subtotal (95% CI)	7	2.22	45 142	10	1.67	42 147	25.2% 100.0%	-3.00 [-3.82, -2.18] -3.61 [-7.12, -0.11]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = ² Test for overall effect: 2	12.54; Cł Z = 2.02 (ni² = 20 (P = 0.0	03.87, d 04)	f = 3 (P	< 0.00	0001); I	² = 99%		
2.1.4 Psychiatric diso	rder								
Zhong hong 2021	7.5	1.4	57	11.2	2.3	57	53.0%	-3.70 [-4.40 -3.00]	-
Zhou aihua 2020	11.48	2.76	40	13.08	2.84	40	47.0%	-1.60 [-2.83, -0.37]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		2.70	97	10.00	2.04	97	100.0%	-2.71 [-4.770.66]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 7 Test for overall effect: 2	1.95; Chi Z = 2.59 (² = 8.4 (P = 0.0	9, df = 010)	1 (P = 0	.004);	l ² = 889	%	• • •	
2.1.5 After fracture su	rgery								
Wang tingting 2021	7.44	1.51	40	9.18	1.53	40	50.2%	-1.74 [-2.41, -1.07]	-
Zhong hong 2021 Subtotal (95% CI)	7.5	1.4	57 97	11.2	2.3	57 97	49.8% 1 00.0%	-3.70 [-4.40, -3.00] -2.72 [-4.64, -0.80]	*
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = ² Test for overall effect: 2	1.80; Chi Z = 2.77 (² = 15. P = 0.	83, df = 006)	1 (P <	0.000); ² = 9	94%		
									-10 -5 0 5 10
Test for subaroup differ	ences: C	chi² = 0	.31. df	= 4 (P =	= 0.99)	. l² = 0°	%		Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
01105.0									
GURE 8	(()	ofaro	matho	rany or		aualit	v (tupo o	(discass)	

their illness. The funnel plot showed a scattered distribution of data, without obvious symmetry, suggesting that there is a certain possibility of publication bias. The pooled results were highly heterogeneous (I²>50%), indicating that some factors of the included studies affected the accuracy of the intragroup heterogeneity. Sensitivity analysis did not find that a single study significantly affected the heterogeneity. This indicated some stability in this result. Subgroup analysis of the sleep quality index score, which was performed in many of the included studies, confirmed that the type of disease and the duration of intervention were not

factors affecting the heterogeneity, and the category of essential oils and the control method could not be excluded as not underlying factors of the heterogeneity. The results of sensitivity and subgroup analyses suggested that the heterogeneity of this study was not methodologically or statistically induced. We suspect that it may be related to the different diagnostic criteria for inclusion in the study. A meta-analysis of the six dimensions of the PSQI showed that aromatherapy can improve sleep quality (MD -0.54, 95% CI: -0.77 to -0.32, p<0.00001), shorten the time to falling asleep (MD -0.58, 95% CI: -0.87 to -0.29, p=0.0001), improve sleep efficiency (MD

	Expe	erimen	tal	C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% CI
2.2.1 ≤ 7d									
Dong jiaqian 2023	9	2.96	40	11.5	2.22	40	17.7%	-2.50 [-3.65, -1.35]	
hajibagheri 2014	5.63	5.13	30	9.26	3	30	10.4%	-3.63 [-5.76, -1.50]	
Hamzeh 2020	9.5	3.28	40	11.17	3.32	40	15.1%	-1.67 [-3.12, -0.22]	
Li jiang 2018	6.13	3.12	60	8.03	3.93	60	16.6%	-1.90 [-3.17, -0.63]	
Xu hongyan 2018	7.79	1.58	33	8.53	2.06	34	20.0%	-0.74 [-1.62, 0.14]	
Zhang daiying 2020	10.53	2.47	60	13.63	2.31	60	20.2%	-3.10 [-3.96, -2.24]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			263			264	100.0%	-2.16 [-3.07, -1.26]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.86; Chi	² = 17.3	36, df =	5 (P =	0.004);	$I^2 = 71^{\circ}$	%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.69 ((P < 0.0	00001)						
2.2.2 7d~30d									
Chen ying 2022	12.55	2.97	33	14.69	2.44	32	8.3%	-2.14 [-3.46, -0.82]	
Cui yanqiu 2021	7	1.48	30	6	1.48	30	8.6%	1.00 [0.25, 1.75]	
heydarirad 2019	7.4	3.66	15	13.66	2.02	15	7.7%	-6.26 [-8.38, -4.14]	
Huang shengfei 2022	5.6	0.21	40	5.75	0.21	40	8.8%	-0.15 [-0.24, -0.06]	•
Huang yulou 2020	7.68	3.01	60	14.34	1.6	60	8.5%	-6.66 [-7.52, -5.80]	
karadag 2015	7.6	2.83	30	9.38	2.6	30	8.3%	-1.78 [-3.16, -0.40]	
muz 2017	4.66	3.66	27	15.62	1.81	35	8.2%	-10.96 [-12.47, -9.45]	
ozkaraman 2018	3.86	3.18	30	7.15	3.23	20	7.9%	-3.29 [-5.11, -1.47]	
Qi haiyan 2016	8.85	2.34	34	9.91	2.03	35	8.5%	-1.06 [-2.09, -0.03]	
Tang xiaoyan 2022	2.86	2.54	42	5.31	4.25	42	8.2%	-2.45 [-3.95, -0.95]	
Zhao wenwen 2021	7	2.22	45	10	1.67	42	8.6%	-3.00 [-3.82, -2.18]	-
Zhong hong 2021	7.5	1.4	57	11.2	2.3	57	8.6%	-3.70 [-4.40, -3.00]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			443			438	100.0%	-3.32 [-4.98, -1.67]	\bullet
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	8.15; Chi	² = 615	5.51, df	= 11 (P	< 0.000	001); l²	= 98%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.93	(P < 0.0	0001)						
2.2.3 >30d									
Duan ran 2022	5.16	2.43	25	8.07	3.06	26	9.6%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40]	
Ma li 2017	3.655	1.61	29	5.633	1.974	30	26.1%	-1.98 [-2.90, -1.06]	
Wang tingting 2021	7.44	1.51	40	9.18	1.53	40	49.6%	-1.74 [-2.41, -1.07]	+
Zhou aihua 2020	11.48	2.76	40	13.08	2.84	40	14.6%	-1.60 [-2.83, -0.37]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			134			136	100.0%	-1.89 [-2.36, -1.42]	♦
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Chi	² = 2.19	9, df = 3	3 (P = 0	.53); l² :	= 0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 7.91	(P < 0.0	00001)						
			,						
								-	
									Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for subaroup diffe	rences: C	2hi² = 2	2.74. df	= 2 (P =	0.25).	l² = 27.	0%		
GURE 9									
and a second									

-0.37, 95% CI: -0.64 to -0.11, p=0.006), relieve sleep disorder (MD -0.57, 95% CI: -0.84 to -0.30, p<0.0001), enhance daytime function (MD -0.44, 95% CI: -0.69 to -0.20, p=0.0004) and lengthen sleep duration (MD -0.51, 95% CI: -0.94 to -0.08, p=0.02).

Sleep problems are common in the modern world, classified from mild to severe into sleep disorders, sleep difficulties, and insomnia (53). Primary insomnia patients showing isolated symptoms account for only 10-20% of the total number of insomnia patients. Comorbid insomnia (i.e., insomnia combined with other diseases) makes up the bulk of insomnia cases. Comorbid insomnia has many causes, which involve complex diseases, neurological function, and other factors. Therefore, modern medicine has difficulty improving this symptom based on its etiology (54). Modern studies have shown that essential oils such as lavender, rose, sweet orange, and valerian, which have sleeppromoting, sedative, and anti-anxiety effects, all contain one or both of linalool and limonene (55). Inhalation of linalool and limonene essential oils can relieve insomnia and anxiety (56). This type of treatment has long been used in traditional medicine in China, most often involving the use of vectors such as sachets and medicated pillows for disease prevention and treatment. Aromatherapy is also widely used internationally (57), showing therapeutic effects on different types of patients in pain, nausea, anxiety, depression, insomnia, and other symptoms and also benefiting patients with preoperative anxiety, tumors, palliative care, hospice care, and end of life (58–67).

4.2 Recommendations for further studies

Future research should aim to determine the optimal formulation of the essential oil preparation, which may include the composition and the extraction method of essential oils, the amount of essential oils to be used, and the duration of oil use. In order to further validate the long-term efficacy of inhalation aromatherapy for the treatment of comorbid insomnia, future research needs to be conducted in the following areas. First, laboratory techniques need to used to clarify the effective ingredients of aromatic traditional Chinese medicines, innovate and improve the dosage form and method of use. At the same time,

	_			_					
a t 1 a i	Expe	erimen	tal	с с	ontrol	.		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
2.3.1 Lavender									
Hamzeh 2020	9.5	3.28	40	11.17	3.32	40	0.4%	-1.67 [-3.12, -0.22]	
Huang shengfei 2022	5.6	0.21	40	5.75	0.21	40	92.7%	-0.15 [-0.24, -0.06]	
Li qiongyao 2020	9.8	3.8	52	15.1	3.1	48	0.4%	-5.30 [-6.65, -3.95]	
muz 2017	4.66	3.66	27	15.62	1.81	35	0.3%	-10.96 [-12.47, -9.45]	
Xu hongyan 2018	7.79	1.58	33	8.53	2.06	34	1.0%	-0.74 [-1.62, 0.14]	
Zhang daiying 2020	10.53	2.47	60	13.63	2.31	60	1.1%	-3.10 [-3.96, -2.24]	
Zhao wenwen 2021	7	2.22	45	10	1.67	42	1.2%	-3.00 [-3.82, -2.18]	
Zhong hong 2021	7.5	1.4	57	11.2	2.3	57	1.6%	-3.70 [-4.40, -3.00]	-
Zhou aihua 2020	11.48	2.76	40	13.08	2.84	40	0.5%	-1.60 [-2.83, -0.37]	
Zhou feifeng 2021	9.23	2.65	43	12.45	1.99	43	0.8%	-3.22 [-4.21, -2.23]	<u> </u>
Subtotal (95% CI)			437			439	100.0%	-0.38 [-0.46, -0.29]	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4	168.01, di	f = 9 (F	° < 0.00	0001); l²	= 98%				
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 8.30 (P < 0.	00001)						
2.3.2 Compound									
Dong jiaqian 2023	9	2.98	40	11.5	2.22	40	14.3%	-2.50 [-3.65, -1.35]	
Duan ran 2022	5.16	2.43	25	8.07	3.06	26	8.3%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40]	
muz 2017	4.66	3.66	27	15.62	1.81	35	8.4%	-10.96 [-12.47, -9.45]	
Qi haiyan 2016	8.85	2.34	34	9.91	2.03	35	17.7%	-1.06 [-2.09, -0.03]	
Tang xiaoyan 2022	2.86	2.54	42	5.31	4.25	42	8.5%	-2.45 [-3.95, -0.95]	
Wang tingting 2021	7.44	1.51	40	9.18	1.53	40	42.8%	-1.74 [-2.41, -1.07]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			208			218	100.0%	-2.66 [-3.09, -2.22]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	133.58, di	f = 5 (F	o.00	0001); l²	= 96%				
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 11.96	(P < 0	0.00001)					
2.3.3 Sachet									
Chen ying 2022	12.55	2.97	33	14.69	2.44	32	15.5%	-2.14 [-3.46, -0.82]	
Cui yanqiu 2021	7	1.48	30	6	1.48	30	48.2%	1.00 [0.25, 1.75]	
Huang yulou 2020	7.68	3.01	60	14.34	1.6	60	36.3%	-6.66 [-7.52, -5.80]	- .
Subtotal (95% CI)			123			122	100.0%	-2.27 [-2.79, -1.75]	◆
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	172.77, di	f = 2 (F	o.00 > 1	0001); l²	= 99%				
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 8.56 (P < 0.	00001)						
2.3.4 Other									
hajibagheri 2014	5.63	5.13	30	9.26	3	30	9.8%	-3.63 [-5.76, -1.50]	_ -
hevdarirad 2019	7.4	3.66	15	13.66	2.02	15	9.9%	-6.26 [-8.38, -4.14]	
Li jiang 2018	6.13	3.12	60	8.03	3.93	60	27.5%	-1.90 [-3.170.63]	
Ma li 2017	3.655	1.61	29	5.633	1.974	30	52.7%	-1.98 [-2.90, -1.06]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	2.000		134	2.500		135	100.0%	-2.54 [-3.21, -1.88]	◆
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	15.30. df :	= 3 (P	= 0.002	2): $ ^2 = 8$	0%				
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 7.48 (P < 0	00001)	,,. 0	•				
									-10 -5 0 5 10
Test for subaroup diffe	rences [.] C	chi² = 1	81.28	df = 3 (F)	- < 0.00	0001) F	² = 98.3%		Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
	. o. 1000. C	1	01.20.	u. – 0 (i	- 0.00		00.070		
FIGURE 10									
Subgroup analysis of th	ne effect	of arc	omathe	erapy or	n sleep	quality	y (agent	class).	

large-scale clinical trials of aromatic Chinese medicines should be carried out to optimize these safe and efficient Chinese medicines. Second, syndrome analysis of traditional Chinese medicine should be conducted on secondary insomnia patients with different diseases, syndrome types and dialectical prescription should be summarized, and the clinical application potential of Chinese medicine essential oil compounds should be developed to promote the right, good, and active use of aromatherapy in firstline clinical practice. Third is to carry out more rigorous and detailed randomized controlled trial studies in China, focusing on the development of placebo oil to avoid data bias caused by breaking the blinding of patients in the control group. At the same time, patients can be guided to develop the habit of longterm use of aromatherapy, and long-term follow-up can be performed to determine its long-term efficacy.

4.3 Strengths and weaknesses

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first meta-analysis to investigate inhalation aromatherapy versus conventional treatment for comorbid insomnia. To reduce heterogeneity, we purposely excluded other treatment methods using aromatic essential oils. We performed subgroup analyses to identify

Churches and Cash market	Expe	erimen	tal	C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
2.4.1 Usual care									
Chen ying 2022	12.55	2.97	33	14.69	2.44	32	3.4%	-2.14 [-3.46, -0.82]	
Dong jiaqian 2023	9	2.96	40	11.5	2.22	40	4.5%	-2.50 [-3.65, -1.35]	
hajibagheri 2014	5.63	5.13	30	9.26	3	30	1.3%	-3.63 [-5.76, -1.50]	
heydarirad 2019	7.4	3.66	15	13.66	2.02	15	1.3%	-6.26 [-8.38, -4.14]	
Huang yulou 2020	7.68	3.01	60	14.24	1.6	60	8.0%	-6.56 [-7.42, -5.70]	-
karadag 2015	7.6	2.83	30	9.38	2.6	30	3.1%	-1.78 [-3.16, -0.40]	
Li jiang 2018	6.13	3.12	60	8.03	3.93	60	3.7%	-1.90 [-3.17, -0.63]	
Li giongyao 2020	9.8	3.8	52	15.1	3.1	48	3.2%	-5.30 [-6.65, -3.95]	
Ma li 2017	3.655	1.61	29	5.633	1.974	30	7.0%	-1.98 [-2.90, -1.06]	-
muz 2017	4.66	3.66	27	15.62	1.81	35	2.6%	-10.96 [-12.47, -9.45]	
ozkaraman 2018	3.86	3.18	30	7.15	3.23	20	1.8%	-3.29 [-5.11, -1.47]	
Qi haiyan 2016	8.85	2.34	34	9.91	2.03	35	5.5%	-1.06 [-2.090.03]	
Tang xiaoyan 2022	2.86	2.54	42	5.31	4.25	42	2.6%	-2.45 [-3.95, -0.95]	
Wang tingting 2021	7.44	1.51	40	9.18	1.53	40	13.3%	-1.74 [-2.41, -1.07]	+
Xu hongyan 2018	7.79	1.58	33	8.53	2.06	34	7.7%	-0.74 [-1.62. 0.14]	
Zhao wenwen 2021	7	2.22	45	10	1.67	42	8.8%	-3.00 [-3.82, -2.18]	-
Zhong hong 2021	7.5	1.4	57	11.2	2.3	57	12.1%	-3.70 [-4.40, -3.00]	-
Zhou aihua 2020	11 48	2.76	40	13.08	2.84	40	3.9%	-1 60 [-2 83 -0 37]	
Zhou feifeng 2021	9.23	2.65	43	12 45	1.99	43	6.0%	-3.22 [-4.21, -2.23]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)	0.120	2.00	740			733	100.0%	-3.00 [-3.24, -2.76]	♦
		r 10/	D . O C	10004	2 000				
Test for overall effect:	268.82, d Z = 24.16	f = 18 (5 (P < 0	P < 0.0 .00001	0001);)	² = 93%	Ď			
Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Placebo	268.82, d Z = 24.16	f = 18 (6 (P < 0	P < 0.0 .00001))	² = 93%	Ď			
Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Placebo Duan ran 2022	268.82, di Z = 24.16 5.16	f = 18 (5 (P < 0 2.43	P < 0.0 .00001 25	8.07	3.06	26	19.1%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40]	
Test for overall effect: . 2.4.2 Placebo Duan ran 2022 Hamzeh 2020	268.82, di Z = 24.16 5.16 9.5	f = 18 (6 (P < 0 2.43 3.28	P < 0.0 .00001 25 40	8.07 11.17	3.06 3.32	26 40	19.1% 21.0%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40] -1.67 [-3.12, -0.22]	
Test for overall effect: . 2.4.2 Placebo Duan ran 2022 Hamzeh 2020 Zhang daiying 2020 Subtotal (95% Cl)	268.82, d Z = 24.16 5.16 9.5 10.53	f = 18 (5 (P < 0 2.43 3.28 2.47	P < 0.0 .00001 25 40 60 125	8.07 11.17 13.63	3.06 3.32 2.31	26 40 60 126	19.1% 21.0% 59.9% 100.0%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40] -1.67 [-3.12, -0.22] -3.10 [-3.96, -2.24] -2.76 [-3.43, -2.10]	*
2.4.2 Placebo Duan ran 2022 Hamzeh 2020 Zhang daiying 2020 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi² = 2 Test for overall effect: 2	268.82, dt Z = 24.16 5.16 9.5 10.53 2.83, df = Z = 8.18 (f = 18 (6 (P < 0 2.43 3.28 2.47 2 (P = (P < 0.0	P < 0.0 .00001 25 40 60 125 0.24); 00001)	8.07 11.17 13.63 1 ² = 29%	3.06 3.32 2.31	26 40 60 126	19.1% 21.0% 59.9% 100.0%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40] -1.67 [-3.12, -0.22] -3.10 [-3.96, -2.24] -2.76 [-3.43, -2.10]	*
2.4.2 Placebo Duan ran 2022 Hamzeh 2020 Zhang daiying 2020 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi² = 2 Test for overall effect: 3 2.4.3 Other treatment	268.82, dt Z = 24.16 5.16 9.5 10.53 2.83, df = Z = 8.18 (f = 18 (6 (P < 0 2.43 3.28 2.47 2 (P = (P < 0.0	P < 0.0 .00001 25 40 60 125 0.24); 00001)	8.07 11.17 13.63	3.06 3.32 2.31	26 40 60 126	19.1% 21.0% 59.9% 100.0%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40] -1.67 [-3.12, -0.22] -3.10 [-3.96, -2.24] -2.76 [-3.43, -2.10]	•
Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Placebo Duan ran 2022 Hamzeh 2020 Zhang daiying 2020 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2 Test for overall effect: 2 2.4.3 Other treatment Cui yanqiu 2021	268.82, d' Z = 24.16 5.16 9.5 10.53 2.83, df = Z = 8.18 3 3 5 7	f = 18 (6 (P < 0 2.43 3.28 2.47 2 (P = (P < 0.0 1.48	P < 0.0 .00001 25 40 60 125 0.24); 00001) 30	10001);) 8.07 11.17 13.63 I ² = 29%	3.06 3.32 2.31 5	26 40 60 126 30	19.1% 21.0% 59.9% 100.0% 1.5%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40] -1.67 [-3.12, -0.22] -3.10 [-3.96, -2.24] -2.76 [-3.43, -2.10] 1.00 [0.25, 1.75]	
2.4.2 Placebo Duan ran 2022 Hamzeh 2020 Zhang daiying 2020 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi² = 2 Test for overall effect: 2 2.4.3 Other treatment Cui yanqiu 2021 Huang shengfei 2022	268.82, dr Z = 24.16 5.16 9.5 10.53 2.83, df = Z = 8.18 S 7 5.6	f = 18 (2.43 3.28 2.47 2 (P = (P < 0.0 1.48 0.21	P < 0.0 .00001 25 40 60 125 0.24); 00001) 30 40	8.07 11.17 13.63 1 ² = 29% 6 5.75	3.06 3.32 2.31 1.48 0.21	26 40 60 126 30 40	19.1% 21.0% 59.9% 100.0% 1.5% 98.5%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40] -1.67 [-3.12, -0.22] -3.10 [-3.96, -2.24] -2.76 [-3.43, -2.10] 1.00 [0.25, 1.75] -0.15 [-0.24, -0.06]	 •
2.4.2 Placebo Duan ran 2022 Hamzeh 2020 Zhang daiying 2020 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi² = 2 2.4.3 Other treatment Cui yanqiu 2021 Huang shengfei 2022 Subtotal (95% Cl)	268.82, dr Z = 24.16 5.16 9.5 10.53 2.83, df = Z = 8.18 s 7 5.6	f = 18 (2.43 3.28 2.47 2 (P = (P < 0.0 1.48 0.21	P < 0.0 .00001 25 40 60 125 0.24); 00001) 30 40 70	8.07 11.17 13.63 1 ² = 29% 6 5.75	3.06 3.32 2.31 1.48 0.21	26 40 60 126 30 40 70	19.1% 21.0% 59.9% 100.0% 1.5% 98.5% 100.0%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40] -1.67 [-3.12, -0.22] -3.10 [-3.96, -2.24] -2.76 [-3.43, -2.10] 1.00 [0.25, 1.75] -0.15 [-0.24, -0.06] -0.13 [-0.22, -0.04]	 * *
2.4.2 Placebo Duan ran 2022 Hamzeh 2020 Zhang daiying 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2 2.4.3 Other treatment Cui yanqiu 2021 Huang shengfei 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8	268.82, df Z = 24.16 9.5 10.53 2.83, df = Z = 8.18 f 5.6 8.92, df =	f = 18 (2.43 3.28 2.47 2 (P = (P < 0.0 1.48 0.21 1 (P =	P < 0.0 .00001 25 40 60 125 0.24); 00001) 30 40 70 0.003)	8.07 11.17 13.63 1 ² = 29% 6 5.75 ; 1 ² = 89	3.06 3.32 2.31 1.48 0.21	26 40 60 126 30 40 70	19.1% 21.0% 59.9% 100.0%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40] -1.67 [-3.12, -0.22] -3.10 [-3.96, -2.24] -2.76 [-3.43, -2.10] 1.00 [0.25, 1.75] -0.15 [-0.24, -0.06] -0.13 [-0.22, -0.04]	 * *
2.4.2 Placebo Duan ran 2022 Hamzeh 2020 Zhang daiying 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi² = 2 2.4.3 Other treatment Cui yanqiu 2021 Huang shengfei 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi² = 8 Test for overall effect: 2 2.4.3 Other treatment Cui yanqiu 2021 Huang shengfei 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi² = 8 Test for overall effect: 2	268.82, df Z = 24.16 9.5 10.53 2.83, df = Z = 8.18 5.6 8.92, df = Z = 2.85	f = 18 (2.43 3.28 2.47 2 (P = (P < 0.0) 1.48 0.21 1 (P = (P = 0.0)	P < 0.0 .00001 25 40 60 125 0.24); 00001) 30 40 70 0.003) 004)	8.07 11.17 13.63 1 ² = 29% 6 5.75 ; 1 ² = 89	3.06 3.32 2.31 , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	26 40 60 126 30 40 70	19.1% 21.0% 59.9% 100.0% 1.5% 98.5% 100.0%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40] -1.67 [-3.12, -0.22] -3.10 [-3.96, -2.24] -2.76 [-3.43, -2.10] 1.00 [0.25, 1.75] -0.15 [-0.24, -0.06] -0.13 [-0.22, -0.04]	 •
Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Placebo Duan ran 2022 Hamzeh 2020 Zhang daiying 2020 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2 2.4.3 Other treatment Cui yanqiu 2021 Huang shengfei 2022 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: 3	268.82, df Z = 24.16 9.5 10.53 2.83, df = Z = 8.18 5.6 8.92, df = Z = 2.85 (f = 18 (2.43 3.28 2.47 2 (P = (P < 0.0 1.48 0.21 1 (P = (P = 0.0	P < 0.0 .00001 25 40 60 125 0.24); 00001) 30 40 70 0.003) 004)	10001);) 8.07 11.17 13.63 1 ² = 29% 6 5.75 ; ² = 89	3.06 3.32 2.31 1.48 0.21	26 40 60 126 30 40 70	19.1% 21.0% 59.9% 100.0% 1.5% 98.5% 100.0%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40] -1.67 [-3.12, -0.22] -3.10 [-3.96, -2.24] -2.76 [-3.43, -2.10] 1.00 [0.25, 1.75] -0.15 [-0.24, -0.06] -0.13 [-0.22, -0.04]	
Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Placebo Duan ran 2022 Hamzeh 2020 Zhang daiying 2020 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2 Test for overall effect: 2.4.3 Other treatment Cui yanqiu 2021 Huang shengfei 2022 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: 2 Test for overall effect: 2 Test for overall effect: 2	268.82, df Z = 24.16 9.5 10.53 2.83, df = Z = 8.18 5.6 8.92, df = Z = 2.85 (f = 18 (0) 2.43 3.28 2.47 $2 (P = 0.0)$ 1.48 0.21 $1 (P = 0.0)$ $(P = 0.0)$ $(P = 0.0)$ $(P = 0.0)$ $(P = 0.0)$	P < 0.0 .00001 25 40 125 0.24); 00001) 30 40 70 0.003) 004)	10001);) 8.07 11.17 13.63 1 ² = 29% 6 5.75 ; 1 ² = 89 df = 2.0	3.06 3.32 2.31 1.48 0.21	26 40 60 126 30 40 70	19.1% 21.0% 59.9% 100.0% 1.5% 98.5% 100.0%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40] -1.67 [-3.12, -0.22] -3.10 [-3.96, -2.24] -2.76 [-3.43, -2.10] 1.00 [0.25, 1.75] -0.15 [-0.24, -0.06] -0.13 [-0.22, -0.04]	
Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Placebo Duan ran 2022 Hamzeh 2020 Zhang daiying 2020 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2 Test for overall effect: : 2.4.3 Other treatment Cui yanqiu 2021 Huang shengfei 2022 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: : Test for subaroup diffe	268.82, df Z = 24.16 9.5 10.53 2.83, df = Z = 8.18 (s 5.6 8.92, df = Z = 2.85 (crences: C	$ \begin{aligned} f &= 18 (i \\ S (P < 0 \\ 2.43 \\ 3.28 \\ 2.47 \\ 2 (P = \\ P < 0.0 \\ 1.48 \\ 0.21 \\ 1 (P = \\ P = 0.0 \\ Chi^2 = 5 \end{aligned} $	P < 0.0 .00001 25 40 60 125 0.24); 00001) 30 40 70 0.003) 004) 11.93.	00001);) 8.07 11.17 13.63 I ² = 29% 6 5.75 ; I ² = 89 df = 2 (I	3.06 3.32 2.31 1.48 0.21 %	26 40 60 126 30 40 70	19.1% 21.0% 59.9% 100.0% 1.5% 98.5% 100.0%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40] -1.67 [-3.12, -0.22] -3.10 [-3.96, -2.24] -2.76 [-3.43, -2.10] 1.00 [0.25, 1.75] -0.15 [-0.24, -0.06] -0.13 [-0.22, -0.04]	
Test for overall effect: 2.4.2 Placebo Duan ran 2022 Hamzeh 2020 Zhang daiying 2020 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2 Test for overall effect: 2.4.3 Other treatment Cui yanqiu 2021 Huang shengfei 2022 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: 2 Test for subaroup diffe SURE 11	268.82, df Z = 24.16 9.5 10.53 2.83, df = Z = 8.18 5.6 8.92, df = Z = 2.85 (rences: C		P < 0.0 .00001 25 40 60 125 0.24); 00001) 30 40 70 0.003) 004)	10001);) 8.07 11.17 13.63 1 ² = 29% 6 5.75 ; 1 ² = 89 df = 2 (1	3.06 3.32 2.31 1.48 0.21 %	26 40 60 126 30 40 70	19.1% 21.0% 59.9% 100.0% 1.5% 98.5% 100.0% ² = 99.6%	-2.91 [-4.42, -1.40] -1.67 [-3.12, -0.22] -3.10 [-3.96, -2.24] -2.76 [-3.43, -2.10] 1.00 [0.25, 1.75] -0.15 [-0.24, -0.06] -0.13 [-0.22, -0.04]	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

potential sources of heterogeneity. While these analyses reduced heterogeneity between studies, our review was not without potential limitations (1): The methodological quality of the included trials was found to be low, and detailed descriptions of blinded conduct, allocation concealment, attrition, and lost cases were lacking, especially the lack of blinded design may cause a large bias in this study; (2) Most of the included trials were of short duration and did not examine the long-term efficacy of inhalation aromatherapy. Therefore, high-quality methods, further studies with large samples, and long-term interventions are still needed to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of inhalation aromatherapy in improving comorbid insomnia; (3) The level of certainty of the evidence was considered to be average; (4) The diagnostic criteria for comorbid insomnia had not been standardized at this stage. There are limitations in the studies themselves, which may have an impact on the results. Therefore, the results of this meta-analysis should be treated with caution.

5 Conclusion

In summary, this article provides a systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of inhalation aromatherapy in treating comorbid insomnia. Studies have shown that aromatherapy has good clinical efficacy in treating comorbid insomnia, improving the quality of life of patients during the disease period. Moreover, the safety of clinical application of aromatherapy is relatively high, and no adverse reactions have been reported in the selected literature. Due to the low quality evaluation of the included studies, this conclusion still needs to be approached with caution. In addition, there is a lack of blinding and independent testing of the purity and efficacy of aromatic essential oils in the design of research methods, which still needs large scale clinical research and high quality evidence in the future to confirm this conclusion. We call on more medical workers to invest in this research direction and truly address the urgent needs of patients.

Study or Subarour	Mean	SD T	otal	Contro Mean SD	Total	Weight	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Duan ran 2022	0.52	0.59	25	1.35 0.63	26	9.5%	-0.83 [-1.16, -0.50]	
hajibagheri 2014	0.66	0.8	30	1.13 0.62	30	9.2%	-0.47 [-0.83, -0.11]	
Huang shengfei 2022	2.06	0.79	15 40	2.93 0.88	15 40	6.5% 11.9%	-0.87 [-1.47, -0.27] 0.02 [-0.00, 0.04]	
muz 2017	0.85	0.9	35	2.6 0.65	27	8.9%	-1.75 [-2.14, -1.36]	
Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021	1.41	0.92	34	1.91 0.87	35	8.4%	-0.50 [-0.92, -0.08]	
Xie xiaoling 2020	1.21	0.22	32	1.69 0.51	32	10.8%	-0.32 [-0.47, -0.17]	-
Zhong hong 2021	0.7	0.2	57	1 0.3	57	11.7%	-0.30 [-0.39, -0.21]	7
Zhou feifeng 2021	1.14	0.23	43	1.56 0.21	43	11.7%	-0.42 [-0.51, -0.33]	
Total (95% CI)			351		345	100.0%	-0.54 [-0.77, -0.32]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	0.11; Chi ⁴ Z = 4.72 (° = 259.10 P < 0.000	0, df = 001)	= 9 (P < 0.00	001); 1²	= 97%		-2 -1 0 1 2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
	Expe	rimental		Contro	I		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD T	otal	Mean SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Duan ran 2022	0.72	0.74	30 25	1.23 0.82	30 26	8.7%	-0.51 [-0.95, -0.07]	
hajibagheri 2014	1.03	1.24	30	2.6 0.67	30	7.8%	-1.57 [-2.07, -1.07]]
Huang shengtei 2022 muz 2017	1.43	0.11	40 35	2.94 0.23	40 27	10.1%	-0.02 [-0.06, 0.02] -2 13 [-2 47 -1 79]	I
Qi haiyan 2016	1.38	0.85	34	1.51 0.98	35	8.3%	-0.13 [-0.56, 0.30]	
Wang tingting 2021	1.52	0.62	40	1.88 0.42	40	9.5%	-0.36 [-0.59, -0.13]	-
Zhao wenwen 2021	2	0.74	45	2 0.74	42	9.1%	0.00 [-0.31, 0.31]	+-
Zhong hong 2021	1.6	0.4	57	2.3 0.3	57	9.9%	-0.70 [-0.83, -0.57]	
∠nou teiteng 2021	1.37	0.22	43	1.94 0.25	43	10.0%	-0.57 [-0.67, -0.47]	
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² -	0.22 06	= 344 2	411 5 df -	= 10 (P < 0.0	402	100.0%	-0.58 [-0.87, -0.29]	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.88 (P = 0.00	0, ur = 01)	- 10 (F < U.L	JUU 1); I	- 3170		-2 -1 0 1 2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
;	Expe	rimental		Contro	i		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD T	otal	Mean SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV. Random. 95% Cl
Duan ran 2022	1	0.5	25	1.34 0.56	26	10.0%	-0.34 [-0.63, -0.05]	
najibagneri 2014 Huang shenofei 2022	0.8	1.29	30 40	0.5 0.11	30 40	0.6% 11.3%	-1.03 [-1.70, -0.36] -0.15 [-0.19, -0.11]	•
muz 2017	0.62	0.63	35	2.68 0.79	27	9.4%	-2.06 [-2.42, -1.70]	I
Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021	1.5	0.67	34	1 0.69	35	9.7%	0.50 [0.18, 0.82]	+ -
Xie xiaoling 2021	1.02	0.31	40 32	1.69 0.48	40	10.9%	-0.36 [-0.54, -0.22] -0.67 [-0.89, -0.45]	-
Zhao wenwen 2021	2	0.74	45	1 0.74	42	9.8%	1.00 [0.69, 1.31]	
∠nong nong 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021	1.7 1.12	0.7	57 43	2.1 0.5	57 43	10.5% 11.2%	-0.40 [-0.62, -0.18] -0.49 [-0.58, -0.40]	÷
Total (95% CI)			284		272	100 09/	.0 37 [.0 64 0 44]	
i otal (95% CI)			381		\$72	(1111 11%)	-0.37 1-0.640.111	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	0.16; Chi ² 7 = 2.75 (P = 0.00	7, df =	= 9 (P < 0.00	001); l ²	= 96%		-2 -1 0 1 2
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	0.16; Chi ² Z = 2.75 (Expe	² = 248.0 P = 0.00 rimental	7, df = 6)	= 9 (P < 0.00 Contro	001); l ²	= 96%	Mean Difference	A control Cont
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup	0.16; Chi ² Z = 2.75 (Expe Mean	P = 248.0 P = 0.000 rimental SD T	7, df = 6)	= 9 (P < 0.00 Contro <u>Mean SD</u>	001); I ²	Weight	Mean Difference	Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> hajibagheri 2014 Huang shenofei 2022	0.16; Chi ² Z = 2.75 (Expe <u>Mean</u> 0.66 0.8	P = 0.000 P = 0.000 rimental <u>SD T</u> 0.6 0.13	7, df = 6) I <u>otal</u> 30 40	Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.08	001); I ² I Total 30 40	<u>Weight</u> 12.1% 13.4%	Mean Difference <u>IV. Random, 95% CI</u> -0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 !-0.18 -0.08]	A control of the second control of the
Heterogeneify: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfei 2022 muz 2017	0.16; Chi ² Z = 2.75 (<u>Expe</u> <u>Mean</u> 0.66 0.8 1.11	$P = 248.0^{\circ}$ $P = 0.000^{\circ}$ primental <u>SD Tr</u> 0.6 0.13 0.5	7, df = 6) I <u>total</u> 30 40 35	Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.08 2.02 0.38	001); I ² I Total 30 40 27	Weight 12.1% 13.4% 12.4%	Mean Difference <u>IV. Random, 95% CI</u> -0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.91 [-1.13, -0.69]	A constraints of the second se
Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfei 2022 muz 2017 Qi hajyan 2016 Wang Jineting 2021	0.16; Chi ² Z = 2.75 (<u>Expe</u> <u>Mean</u> 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.35 1.21	P = 0.000 P = 0.000 SD T 0.6 0.13 0.5 0.73 0.22	7, df = 6) I <u>total</u> 30 40 35 34	Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.08 2.02 0.38 1.94 0.84	I Total 30 40 27 35 40	Weight 12.1% 13.4% 12.4% 10.9% 12.6%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.59 [-0.95, -0.23] -0.59 [-0.95, -0.23]	Arrow Start
Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfei 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Xie xiaoling 2020	0.16; Chi ² Z = 2.75 (<u>Mean</u> 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.35 1.21 1.03	rimental SD Tr 0.6 0.13 0.5 0.73 0.32 0.35	7, df = 6) 1 30 40 35 34 40 32	Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.08 2.02 0.38 1.94 0.8 1.44 0.54 1.82 0.51	I Total 30 40 27 35 40 32	Weight 12.1% 12.4% 12.4% 12.6% 12.4%	Mean Difference IV. Random, <u>95% CI</u> -0.27 (-0.52, -0.02) -0.91 (-1.13, -0.69) -0.91 (-1.13, -0.69) -0.59 (-0.95, -0.23) -0.23 (-0.42, -0.04) -0.79 (-1.00, -0.58)	Arrow Several Arrows (and the
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfei 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhong hong 2021	0.16; Chi ² Z = 2.75 (Mean 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.35 1.21 1.03 1	rimental SD Tr 0.6 0.13 0.5 0.73 0.32 0.35 0.2	7, df = 6) i otal 30 40 35 34 40 32 57	Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.08 2.02 0.38 1.94 0.8 1.44 0.54 1.82 0.51 2 0.6	I Total 30 40 27 35 40 32 57	Weight 12.1% 13.4% 10.9% 12.6% 12.4% 12.8%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.27 (-0.52, -0.02) -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.91 [-1.13, -0.69] -0.59 [-0.95, -0.23] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.58] -1.00 [-1.16, -0.84]	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfei 2022 muz 2017 Oi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Xie xiaoling 2020 Zhong hong 2021	0.16; Chi ² Z = 2.75 (<u>Mean</u> 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.35 1.21 1.03 1 1.29	rimental SD T 0.6 0.13 0.73 0.32 0.35 0.2 0.24	7, df = 6) 30 40 35 34 40 32 57 43	Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.86 0.93 0.08 2.02 0.38 1.94 0.54 1.82 0.51 2 0.6 1.93 0.13	I Total 30 40 27 35 40 32 57 43	Weight 12.1% 13.4% 12.6% 12.6% 12.8% 13.3%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.27 [-0.52,-0.02] -0.13 [-0.18,-0.08] -0.59 [-0.95,-0.25] -0.23 [-0.42,-0.04] -0.79 [-1.00,-0.56] -1.00 [-1.16,-0.84] -0.64 [-0.72,-0.56]	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengefa 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heteropencity Tur ² =	0.16; Chi ² Z = 2.75 (<u>Expe</u> <u>Mean</u> 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.35 1.21 1.03 1 1.29	rimental SD T 0.6 0.13 0.5 0.32 0.35 0.2 0.24	7, df = 6) 30 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 311 3, cf =	Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 2.02 0.38 1.94 0.8 1.44 0.54 1.42 0.51 2 0.6 1.93 0.13	I Total 30 40 27 35 40 32 57 43 304 001): P	Weight 12.1% 13.4% 12.4% 10.9% 12.6% 12.6% 12.8% 13.3% 100.0% 97°	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.27 [-0.52,-0.02] -0.13 [-0.18,-0.08] -0.59 [-0.95,-0.23] -0.23 [-0.42,-0.04] -0.23 [-0.42,-0.04] -0.23 [-0.42,-0.04] -0.79 [-1.00,-0.58] -0.64 [-0.72,-0.56] -0.57 [-0.84,-0.30]	Avours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> hajbagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou pingting 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	0.16; Chi ² Z = 2.75 (<u>Mean</u> 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.03 1.21 1.03 1 1.29 0.14; Chi ² Z = 4.09 (<pre>2 = 248.0' P = 0.000 rimental SD T: 0.6 0.13 0.5 0.73 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.24 : = 235.9: P < 0.000</pre>	7, df = 6) 1 30 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 01)	Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.08 1.94 0.8 1.94 0.8 1.94 0.54 1.82 0.51 2 0.6 1.93 0.13	0001); I ² 1 Total 30 40 27 35 40 27 35 40 32 57 43 304 001); I ²	Weight 12.1% 12.4% 12.4% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.8% 13.3% 100.0% = 97%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.91 [-1.13, -0.69] -0.59 [-0.95, -0.23] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.58] -1.00 [-1.16, -0.84] -0.64 [-0.72, -0.56] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30]	Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfei 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingfung 2021 Xie xiaoling 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	0.16; Chi ² Z = 2.75 (<u>Expe</u> <u>Mean</u> 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.35 1.21 1.29 0.14; Chi ² Z = 4.09 (P = 248.0 P = 0.000 SD Tr 0.6 0.13 0.73 0.32 0.35 0.2 0.24 F = 235.93 P < 0.000	7, df = 6) 1 30 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 01)	Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 2.02 0.38 1.94 0.8 1.82 0.51 2 0.6 1.93 0.13 7 (P < 0.00	0001); I ² I Total 30 40 27 35 40 32 57 43 304 001); I ²	Weight 12.1% 13.4% 12.4% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.8% 13.3% 100.0% = 97%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.27 [-0.520.02] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.59 [-0.95, -0.23] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.58] -0.054 [-0.72, -0.56] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference	Avours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference
Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfei 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhong hong 2021 Zhong hong 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	0.16; Chi ² Z = 2.75 (<u>Expe</u> <u>Mean</u> 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.35 1.21 1.29 0.14; Chi ² Z = 4.09 (<u>Expe</u> <u>Mean</u>	P = 248.0° P = 0.000 SD T 0.6 0.13 0.5 0.73 0.32 0.35 0.2 0.24 F = 235.9? P < 0.000	7, df = 6) 1 30 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 01) 1 0 01	E 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.08 2.02 0.38 1.94 0.8 1.94 0.8 1.44 0.54 1.82 0.51 2 0.6 1.93 0.13 = 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD	I Total 30 40 27 35 40 32 57 43 304 001); I ²	Weight 12.1% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 13.3% 100.0% 97% Weight Weight	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.59 [-0.95, -0.23] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.56] -0.64 [-0.72, -0.56] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI	Avours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 55% Cl -2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl
Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> hajbagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Duan ran 2022	0.16; Chi ² Z = 2.75 (<u>Mean</u> 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.35 1.21 1.29 0.14; Chi ² Z = 4.09 (<u>Expe</u> <u>Mean</u> 1.2 0.49	rimental SD T 0.6 0.73 0.35 0.2 0.24 = 235.9: P < 0.000 rimental SD T 0.5 0.5 0.5	7, df = 6) 30 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 01) 1 1 1 25 01)	■ 9 (P < 0.00 Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.93 2.02 0.38 1.44 0.54 1.82 0.51 2 0.61 1.93 0.13 ■ 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 1.19 0.49 0.1 0.49 0.1 0.49 0.1 0.49 0.1 0.49	I Total 300 40 27 35 40 32 57 43 304 001); I ² I Total 26 001	Weight 12.1% 13.4% 12.4% 10.9% 12.6% 12.4% 13.3% 100.0% 97% Weight 11.1%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI -0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.59 [-0.95, -0.23] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.58] -1.00 [-1.16, -0.84] -0.76 [-1.00, -0.56] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI -0.31 [-0.26, 0.28] -0.31 [-0.26, 0.28]	Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou leifeng 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou leifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: ; <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022	0.16; Chi ² Z = 2.75 (<u>Mean</u> 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.35 1.21 1.03 1 1.29 0.14; Chi ² Z = 4.09 (<u>Expe</u> <u>Mean</u> 1.2 0.43 1.38	rimental <u>SP</u> T = 248.0° rimental <u>SP</u> T = 0.00 0.5 0.73 0.5 0.73 0.32 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.	7, df = 6) 30 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 01)	 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.08 2.02 0.38 1.94 0.84 1.44 0.54 1.93 0.13 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Contro D 1.19 0.49 0.1 0.3 1.25 0.09 	I Total 300 400 277 350 400 322 577 43 304 0001); I ² I Total 26 304 400 400 400 400 400 400 400	Weight 12.1% 13.4% 10.9% 12.4% 10.9% 12.4% 12.8% 13.3% 100.0% = 97% Weight 11.1% 10.7%	Mean Difference IV. Random. <u>95%</u> CI -0.27 [-0.520.02] -0.31 [-0.180.08] -0.91 [-1.130.69] -0.23 [-0.420.04] -0.79 [-1.000.56] -0.05 [-0.420.04] -0.64 [-0.720.56] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference IV. Random. <u>95%</u> CI 0.31 [-0.17.0.43]	Avours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfei 2022 muz 2017 Oi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhour fuefieng 2021 Zhour feifeng 2021 Zhour feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: . Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfei 2022 muz 2017	0.16; Chi ² Z = 2.75 (rimental <u>SD T</u> 0.6 0.73 0.5 0.24 (325.9) 0.24 (325.9) 0.24 (325.9) 0.24 (325.9) 0.24 (325.9) 0.24 (325.9) 0.24 (325.9) 0.24 (325.9) 0.25 (325.9) (325	7, df = 6) 1 30 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 01) 1 25 30 40 35 31 43 311	■ 9 (P < 0.00 Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.08 1.94 0.83 1.94 0.84 1.94 0.84 1.93 0.13 2 0.6 1.93 0.13 = 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.1 0.3 1.19 0.49 0.1 0.3 1.25 0.09 2.62 0.48	I Total 30 40 27 35 40 32 57 43 304 40 001); I ² I Total 26 30 40 001); I ²	Weight 12.1% 12.1% 13.4% 12.4% 10.9% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 13.3% 100.0% 97% Weight 11.1% 10.5% 9.9%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.27 [-0.52,-0.02] -0.13 [-0.18,-0.08] -0.59 [-0.95,-0.23] -0.23 [-0.42,-0.04] -0.79 [-1.00,-0.58] -0.64 [-0.72,-0.56] -0.57 [-0.84,-0.30] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 0.31 [-0.7, 0.43] -0.31 [-0.7, 0.43] -1.59 [-1.96,-1.22]	Avours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI
Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhoun felfeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect : Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2014	0.16; Chi ³ Z = 2.75 (<u>Mean</u> 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.35 1.21 1.03 1 1.29 0.14; Chi ³ Z = 4.09 (<u>Expe</u> <u>Mean</u> 1.2 2 .43 1.38 1.03 1.35 1.04	rimental <u>SD</u> T 0.6 0.13 0.5 0.24 2 = 235.92 P < 0.004 rimental <u>SD</u> T 0.5 0.24 0.32 0.34 0.32 0.32 0.35 0.24 0.35 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.24 0.65 0.73 0.5 0.5 0.24 0.85 0.85 0.85 0.85 0.97 0.9	7, df = 6) 30 40 35 33 44 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 01) 25 30 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35	 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.08 0.93 0.08 2.02 0.38 1.94 0.84 1.82 0.51 2 0.66 1.93 0.13 a 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 1.19 0.49 0.1 0.3 1.25 0.09 2.62 0.49 2.03 0.92 2.62 0.49 	I Total 30 40 27 35 40 304 40 27 43 304 40 27 43 304 40 27 35 43 304 40 27 36 40 40 27 43 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40	Weightt 12.1% 13.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.6% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 13.3% 00.0% 97% Weightt 11.1% 0.5% 9.9% 9.9% 9.17%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.18 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.59 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.59 [-0.95, -0.23] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.56] -0.64 [-0.72, -0.56] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 0.31 [-0.1, 0.65] 0.33 [-0.1, 0.55] 0.33 [-0.1, 0.55] 0.35 [-0.1, 0.55] 0.35 [-0.1, 0.55] 0.35 [-0.1	Avours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 55% Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl K. Random,
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: hajbagheri 2014 Huang shenglei 2022 muz 2017 Gi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou faifang 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect : Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Gi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021	0.16; Chi'hi Z = 2.75 (Mean 0.66 0.8 1.35 1.21 1.29 0.14; Chi'i 1.29 0.14; Chi'i Z = 4.09 (Mean 1.2 Z = 4.09 (Mean 1.3 1.35 1.31 1.33 1.33 1.35 1.36 1.36 1.36 1.36 1.36 1.36 1.37 1.37 1.37 1.36 1.36 1.37 1.37 1.37 1.37 1.37 1.37 1.37 1.37	P = 248.0 0 P = 0.001 rimental SD T 0.6 0 0.13 0.53 0.22 0.24 rimental SD T 0.20 0.24 rimental SD T 0.53 0.22	7, df = 6) 30 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 01) 25 30 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 32	 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 1.94 0.82 1.94 0.84 1.93 0.13 2 0.61 1.93 0.13 = 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Contro	I Total 300 40 27 35 40 22 57 43 304 0001); I ² I Total I Total 0 27 35 43 304 0 27 35 43 304 0 27 35 43 304 0 27 35 43 304 0 27 35 43 304 0 27 35 43 304 0 27 35 43 304 0 27 35 43 304 0 27 35 43 304 0 27 35 43 304 0 27 35 43 304 0 27 35 43 304 0 27 35 43 304 0 27 35 43 304 0 0 27 35 43 304 0 0 27 35 43 304 0 0 27 35 43 304 0 0 27 35 43 304 0 0 27 35 43 304 0 0 27 35 43 304 1 27 305 43 304 43 304 43 304 43 304 43 304 43 304 43 304 43 304 43 304 43 304 43 304 43 304 43 305 43 304 43 305 43 305 43 305 43 307 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43	Weight 12.1% 13.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.6% 12.8% 13.3% 100.0% = 97% Weight 11.1% 0.5% 0.7% 9.2% 12.3%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%. CI. -0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.91 [-1.13, -0.69] -0.59 [-0.96, -0.23] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.58] -1.00 [-1.16, -0.34] -0.64 [-0.72, -0.56] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%. CI. 0.01 [-0.26, 0.28] 0.33 [0.01, 0.65] 0.13 [-0.17, 0.43] -1.59 [-1.96, -1.22] -0.68 [-1.11, -0.25] -0.48 [-0.69, -0.27]	Avours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI Mean Difference
Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou fingting 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou fong 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou fong 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou fong 2020	0.16; Chiřich Expee Mean 0.66 0.86 0.81 1.11 1.23 1.21 1.23 0.14; Chiři 1.22 0.14; Chiři 1.22 0.14; Chiři 1.23 1.23 1.24 1.23 1.24 1.23 1.24 1.25 1.24 1.25 1.21 1.25 1.21 1.25 1.21 1.25 1.21 1.25 1.21 1.25 1.21 1.25 1.21 1.25 1.21 1.25 1.21 1.25 1.21 1.25	P = 248.0 0 r/mental SD 17 0.6 0.13 0.5 0.73 0.32 0.24 2 2.235.9: P < 0.001 r/mental SD 17 0.85 0.97 0.92 0.53 0.22 0.24	7, df = 6) 1 30 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 01) 1 25 30 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 1 25 30 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 1 25 30 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 1 25 30 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 1 25 30 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 1 25 30 40 32 57 43 30 40 32 57 43 30 40 40 32 57 43 30 40 40 32 57 43 30 40 40 32 57 43 30 40 40 32 57 43 30 40 40 32 57 43 30 40 40 30 57 43 30 40 40 30 57 43 30 40 40 30 40 30 57 40 30 57 40 30 40 30 40 30 30 40 30 30 40 30 30 40 32 30 40 32 30 40 32 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 57 40 35 57 40 35 57 40 35 57 40 35 57 40 35 57 40 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57	 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.06 0.93 0.06 0.93 0.06 0.93 0.06 1.94 0.8 1.44 0.54 2 0.66 1.93 0.13 2 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 1.19 0.49 0.1 0.3 1.25 0.09 2.03 0.22 1.26 0.49 2.03 0.22 1.52 0.44 1.62 0.34 1.62 0.34 1.62 0.34 1.62 0.34 	I Total 300 400 277 355 400 227 43 304 0001); I ² I Total I Total 0 277 355 400 277 355 400 277 355 400 277 355 400 277 355 400 277 355 400 277 355 400 277 355 400 277 355 400 277 355 400 277 355 400 277 355 400 277 355 400 277 355 400 277 355 400 277 355 400 277 304 400 277 355 400 277 304 400 277 355 400 277 403 204 400 277 304 400 277 304 400 277 304 400 277 304 400 277 304 400 277 305 400 277 304 400 277 305 400 277 304 400 277 305 400 277 304 400 277 305 400 277 304 400 277 355 400 400 277 355 400 400 277 355 400 400 407 407 407 407 407 407	Weight 12.1% 13.4% 12.4% 12.6% 12.6% 12.8% 13.3% 10.9% 97% Weight 11.1% 10.5% 10.5% 10.5% 10.5% 10.5% 10.5% 10.5% 10.5% 10.5% 10.5% 10.5% 10.5% 10.5% 12.4% 12.4% 13.3% 13.3% 10.9% 13.2% 13.3% 10.5% 10	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.27 [-0.520.02] -0.31 [-0.180.08] -0.31 [-0.180.08] -0.35 [-0.950.23] -0.23 [-0.420.04] -0.79 [-1.000.56] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 0.31 [-0.170.43] -0.59 [-1.96.+0.23] -0.35 [-1.7043] -0.58 [-1.96.+1.22] -0.68 [-1.110.25] -0.68 [-0.700.62] -0.68 [-0.690.27] -0.68 [-0.690.27] -0.68 [-0.690.27] -0.68 [-0.690.27] -0.68 [-0.690.27] -0.57 [-0.690.22] -0.56 [-0.640.36] -0.57 [-0.690.27] -0.56 [-0.640.36] -0.57 [-0.580.57] -0.58 [-0.57 [-0.580.57] -0.58 [-0.58 [-0.58 [-0.58	Avours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfei 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou feifeng 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou feifeng 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: ; Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfei 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Xiex taoling 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021	0.16; Chiřic Chiři Expeed Mean 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.35 1.21 1.23 1.29 0.14; Chiři 1.29 0.14; Chiři 1.20 0.14; Chiři 1.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20	rimental SP = 248.0 P = 0.00 rimental 0.6 0.73 0.2 0.24 0.35 0.2 0.24 rimental SD T 0.5 0.2 0.24 rimental SD T 0.5 0.2 0.24 0.35 0.32 0.34 0.35 0.35 0.35 0.32 0.34 0.35 0.35 0.32 0.34 0.35 0.32 0.34 0.35 0.32 0.34 0.35 0.32 0.34 0.35 0.32 0.34 0.35 0.32 0.34 0.35 0.32 0.34 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.37 0.35 0.35 0.35 0.35 0.37 0.31 0.31 0.31 0.31 0.31 0.31 0.32 0.31 0.3	7, df = 6) 30 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 01) 25 30 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 32 57 43	 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 1.94 0.8 1.44 0.54 1.42 0.54 1.43 0.54 1.44 0.54 1.42 0.54 1.44 0.54 1.42 0.54 1.42 0.54 1.42 0.54 1.42 0.54 1.42 0.54 1.42 0.54 1.19 0.49 0.1 0.3 1.25 0.99 2.62 0.49 2.03 0.92 2.03 0.92 2.03 0.92 1.2 0.55 1.81 0.22 	I Total 300 40 27 35 43 304 001); I ² I Total 26 60 40 027 43 304 001); I ² 77 43 304 001); I ² 77 43 304 100 101; I ² 77 43 304 400 27 43 304 400 27 77 43 304 400 27 77 43 304 400 27 77 43 35 43 40 43 77 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 75	Weight 12.1% 13.4% 12.1% 10.9% 12.6% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 10.00% 97%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%. CI -0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.59 [-0.95, -0.24] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.56] -0.02 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.70 [-1.16, -0.84] -0.64 [-0.72, -0.56] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%. CI 0.01 [-0.26, 0.28] 0.33 [0.01, 0.65] -0.35 [-1.70, 0.43] -1.59 [-1.96, -1.22] -0.68 [-1.11, -0.25] -0.57 [-0.89, -0.27] -0.76 [-0.90, -0.62] -0.57 [-0.50, -0.64, -0.36] -0.59 [-0.66, -0.38]	Pavours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 Zhong heng 2014 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI)	0.16; Chiříh Z = 2.75 (Mean 0.66 0.8 0.8 0.14 1.21 1.23 0.14; Chiříh 0.3 1.21 1.23 0.14; Chiříh 0.3 1.21 1.23 0.14; Chiříh 0.6 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.8 0.8	rimental SD T:0.60.320.350.24rimentalSD T:0.320.320.320.320.320.320.320.32	7, df = 6) 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.08 0.93 0.08 2.02 0.38 1.94 0.8 1.44 0.54 2 0.66 1.93 0.13 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 1.19 0.43 0.1 0.3 1.25 0.09 2.62 0.49 2.62 0.49 2.62 0.49 2.62 0.49 2.62 0.44 1.22 0.51 1.81 0.22 	I Total 300 40 27 35 57 43 304 001); I ² I Total 266 300 400 27 43 304 001); I ² 43 304 001); I ² 43 304 100 101 101 101 101 101 101 1	Weight 12.1% 13.3% 12.6% 12.1% 10.9% 12.6% 12.4% 100.0% 97% Weight 11.1% 10.5% 9.2% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.27 [-0.52,-0.02] -0.13 [-0.18,-0.08] -0.59 [-0.96,-0.23] -0.23 [-0.42,-0.04] -0.23 [-0.42,-0.04] -0.23 [-0.42,-0.04] -0.23 [-0.42,-0.04] -0.23 [-0.42,-0.04] -0.24 [-0.72,-0.56] -0.57 [-0.84,-0.30] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 0.01 [-0.26, 0.28] 0.33 [0.01, 0.65] 0.13 [-0.77, 0.26, 0.28] 0.33 [0.01, 0.65] 0.13 [-0.77, 0.46, 0.28] -0.48 [-0.68,-0.27] -0.56 [-0.64,-0.36] -0.49 [-0.60,-0.38] -0.44 [-0.69,-0.20]	Pavours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou felfeng 2021 Zhou felfeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou felfeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	0.16; Chiří Expe Mean 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.35 1.21 1.35 1.21 1.35 1.21 1.32 0.14; Chiří Mean 1.29 0.14; Chiří Mean 1.29 0.14; Chiří Mean 1.35 1.21 1.35 1.35 1.35 1.35 1.35 1.35 1.35 1.3	rimental SD T: 0.5 0.35 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.24 rimental SD T: 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.32 0.35 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.	7, df = 6) 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 ■ 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 1.94 0.88 1.44 0.54 1.93 0.13 1.94 0.84 1.42 0.51 2 0.61 1.93 0.13 = 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Contro<	I Total 300 27 40 27 43 304 001); I ² I Total 26 304 001); I ² 1 7 43 304 001); I ² 304 001); I ²	Weight 12.1% 13.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.6% 13.3% 100.0% 9.7% Weight 11.1% 10.5% 10.5% 10.5% 10.5% 10.5% 10.5% 10.5% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.6% 13.3% 10.5% 10.5% 12.7% 12.4% 12.4% 12.7% 12.7% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.7% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.7% 12.4% 13.7% 12.4% 13.7% 12.4% 13.7% 13.7% 13.7% 13.7% 13.7% 13.7% 13.7% 13.7% 13.7% 12.4% 13.7% 13.7% 13.7% 13.7% 13.7% 13.7% 13.7% 12.4% 13.7% 12.4% 13.7%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI -0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 [-0.16, -0.08] -0.59 [-0.95, -0.23] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.58] -1.00 [-1.16, -0.84] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.58] -1.00 [-1.16, -0.84] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] -0.15 [-1.96, -1.22] -0.48 [-0.68, -0.27] -0.48 [-0.68, -0.28] -0.44 [-0.69, -0.20]	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] -2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou felfeng 2021 Zhou felfeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: . Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 Zhong heng 2021 Zhou felfeng 2021 Zhou felfeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect :	$0.16; Chi2(i) \\ Z = 2.75 (i) \\ \frac{Expec}{Mean} \\ 0.66 \\ 0.61 \\ 1.35 \\ 1.21 \\ 1.35 \\ 1.21 \\ 1.35 \\ 1.21 \\ 1.35 \\ 1.21 \\ 1.35 \\ 1.21 \\ 1.35 \\ 1.21 \\ 1.32 \\$	$rimental \\ SD T \\ 0.6 \\ 0.73$	7, df = 6) 1 30 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 01) 25 30 40 32 57 33 40 32 57 34 43 311 25 30 40 32 43 34 43 34 43 34 43 34 43 34 43 57 43 34 43 57 44 35 57 43 57 43 57 57 43 57 57 57 43 57 57 57 57 43 57 57 34 40 35 57 34 40 35 57 34 40 35 57 34 40 35 57 43 35 57 43 35 57 43 32 57 43 32 57 43 32 57 43 32 57 43 32 57 43 33 43 33 57 43 33 57 43 33 57 43 33 57 57 43 33 57 57 43 33 67 57 57 43 336 67 57 57 43 336 67 57 57 43 336 67 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40	 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.08 2.02 0.38 1.94 0.8 1.44 0.54 2 0.66 1.93 0.13 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 1.19 0.49 2.62 0.49 2.63 0.92 2.62 0.49 2.62 0.49 2.63 0.92 2.62 0.49 2.63 0.92 2.63 0.92 2.63 0.92 3.81 0.22 8 (P < 0.00 	I Total 30 40 27 43 304 40 27 43 304 40 27 43 304 40 27 43 304 40 27 43 304 40 27 57 57 43 304 40 27 57 43 304 400 27 57 43 304 400 27 57 43 304 400 27 57 43 304 400 27 57 57 43 330 400 27 57 43 330 400 27 57 43 330 400 27 57 57 43 330 40 27 57 57 43 330 40 27 57 57 57 43 330 40 27 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 5	Weight 12.1% 13.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 13.3% 100.0% 97% Weight 11.1% 10.5% 9.9% 9.2% 12.2% 12.2% 12.3% 12.3% 12.4% 12.3% 12.3% 12.4% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.4% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 10.9% 12.3% 13.3% 13.	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.27 [-0.52,-0.02] -0.13 [-0.18,-0.08] -0.59 [-0.95,-0.23] -0.23 [-0.42,-0.04] -0.79 [-1.00,-0.58] -0.23 [-0.42,-0.04] -0.79 [-1.00,-0.58] -0.64 [-0.72,-0.56] -0.57 [-0.84,-0.30] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI 0.01 [-0.26, 0.28] 0.03 [0.01, 0.65] 0.13 [-0.7, 0.43] -1.59 [-1.96, -1.22] -0.68 [-1.11,-0.25] -0.48 [-0.68,-0.27] -0.76 [-0.90,-0.62] -0.49 [-0.60,-0.38] -0.44 [-0.69,-0.20]	Pavours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Hetergeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou feifeng 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou feifeng 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou feifeng 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: :	0.16; Chiří Z = 2.75 (Mean. 0.66 1.11 1.29 0.14; Chiří Mean. 1.2 0.14; Chiří 1.29 0.14; Chiří 0.2 = 4.09 (Expe Mean. 1.2 0.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1	rimental SD T. 0.6 0.73 0.73 0.73 0.2 0.35 0.2 0.35 0.2 0.24 1.2 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.97 0.	7, df = 6) 1 300 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 32 57 43 30 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 1.94 0.8 1.44 0.54 2 0.66 1.93 0.13 2 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 1.19 0.49 0.1 0.3 1.25 0.99 2.03 0.92 1.52 0.44 1.62 0.34 1.2 0.56 1.81 0.22 a (P < 0.00 	I Total 30 40 27 35 40 027 35 40 027 35 40 027 35 40 027 35 40 001); I ² I Total 26 30 40 027 43 304 43 304 43 304 43 304 43 304 43 305 43 43 304 43 305 43 43 304 43 43 304 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 4	Weight 12.1% 13.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.6% 12.4% 12.6% 97% 97% 10.0% 97% 11.1% 10.5% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 100.0% 92% Weisht	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%. CI -0.27 [-0.520.02] -0.13 [-0.180.08] -0.59 [-0.950.23] -0.25 [-0.420.04] -0.79 [-1.000.56] -0.64 [-0.720.56] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.64 [-0.69, -0.27] -0.64 [-0.69, -0.28] -0.36 [-0.17, 0.43] -1.59 [-1.96, -1.22] -0.68 [-0.64, -0.36] -0.55 [-0.64, -0.36] -0.55 [-0.64, -0.36] -0.56 [-0.56, -0.20] -0.56 [-0.56, -0.20]	Pavours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference V. Random, 95% Cl
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup hajibaghei 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: . Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 huajibaghei 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 Zhou feifeng 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: . Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: . Study or Subgroup Dong jiaqian 2023	0.16; Chirl Z = 2.75 (Mean 0.66 1.13 1.35 1.21 1.29 0.14 2.2 3.21 1.29 0.14 2.2 3.21 1.29 0.14 2.2 3.51 1.21 1.29 0.14 2.2 3.51 1.21 1.29 0.14 2.2 3.51 1.21 1.25 1.25	$\begin{aligned} rimental \\ SD T \\ rimental \\ r$	7, df = 6) 1 300 40 335 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 37 43 311 1 3, df = 01) 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.08 0.93 0.08 1.94 0.8 1.44 0.54 1.42 0.54 2 0.66 1.93 0.13 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.10 0.3 1.25 0.09 2.62 0.49 0.13 0.92 1.25 0.09 2.62 0.49 0.1 0.3 1.25 0.09 2.62 0.44 1.2 0.55 1.81 0.22 a (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD Mean SD Contro 	I Total 30 40 027 35 43 304 0001); I ² I Total 26 30 40 001); I ² 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Weight 12,1% 13,4% 12,24% 12,24% 12,24% 12,26% 97% 97% 97% 97% 92% 92%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.59 [-0.95, -0.23] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.55] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] -0.57 [-0.94, -0.30] -0.57 [-0.94, -0.30] -0.51 [-0.64, -0.27] -0.56 [-0.64, -0.36] -0.59 [-0.60, -0.38] -0.44 [-0.69, -0.20] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -1.00 [-1.22, -0.68]	Pavours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou falfeng 2021 Zhou falfeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 hong shengfel 2022 Mag shengfel 2022 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou falfeng 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou falfeng 2021 Xei xalaing 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou falfeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Duan tan 2022 Mag Study or Subgroup Doan jacian 2022	0.16; Chiříh Expe Mean 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.35 1.21 1.35 1.21 1.32 0.14; Chiříh 1.29 0.14; Chiříh 1.29 0.14; Chiříh 1.29 0.14; Chiříh 1.29 0.14; Chiříh 1.35 1.21 1.35 1.22 1.35 1	$rimental \\ rimental $	7, df = 7, df = 6) 1 30 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 311 3, df = 01) 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 1.44 0.54 1.42 0.51 2 0.61 1.93 0.13 1.44 0.54 1.42 0.51 2 0.61 1.93 0.13 a 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Mana SD 1.49 0.49 0.1 0.3 1.25 0.90 2.03 0.92 1.52 0.44 1.62 0.34 1.2 0.5 1.81 0.22 a a (P < 0.00 Contro Mana SD Mana SD 2 0.74 1.08 0.68 	I Total 30 40 27 35 57 43 304 001); I ² I Total 266 30 40 32 57 43 304 001); I ² I Total 266 300 40 001); I ²	Weight 12.1% 12.3% 12.4% 12.4% 12.6% Weight 12.6% 97% 97% Weight 11.1% 10.0% 97% 9.2% 92% Weight 9.4% 9.2% 9.2%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI -0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.59 [-0.96, -0.23] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.58] -1.00 [-1.16, -0.84] -0.64 [-0.72, -0.56] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI 0.01 [-0.26, 0.28] 0.33 [0.01 [-0.26, 0.28] 0.38 [-0.48, -0.38] -0.49 [-0.69, -0.20] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI -1.00 [-1.32, -0.68] -0.56 [-0.44, -0.18]	Avours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: hajbagheri 2014 Huang shenglei 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou faifeng 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Huang shenglei 2024 Zhou feifeng 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	0.16; Chiříh Expee Mean 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.29 0.14; Chiří 1.29 0.14; Chiří Mean 1.2 0.43 1.35 1.21 1.29 0.14; Chiří Mean 1.2 0.14; Chiří Mean 1.2 0.13; Chiří 1.32 0.12; Chiří 1.32 0.12; Chiří 1.32 0.12; Chiří Mean 1.35 1.35 1.32	rimental SD T SD T 0.6 0.73 0.2 0.24 0.24 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.97 0.6 0.5 0.97 0.6 0.97 0.6 0.97 0.92 0.24 0.13 0.2 0.24 0.2 0.24 0.2 0.24 0.2 0.3 0.5 0.8 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.5 0.8 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.97 0.73 0.97 0.73 0.97 0.73 0.97 0.73 0.97 0.73 0.73 0.97 0.73 0.73 0.73 0.73 0.74 0.75 0.77 0.71 1.7 1.	7, df = 7, df = 6) 1 300 400 35 34 400 35 34 400 35 37 400 35 301 1 25 300 301 1 25 300 311 33, df = 011 1 25 300 400 35 34 400 35 34 400 35 34 400 35 34 400 35 34 400 35 34 400 35 34 400 35 34 400 35 35 36 400 35 37 400 35 36 400 35 37 400 35 36 400 35 37 400 35 37 400 35 30 400 35 30 400 35 30 400 35 30 400 35 30 400 35 30 400 35 30 400 35 30 400 35 30 400 35 30 400 35 30 400 35 30 400 35 34 400 35 34 400 35 34 400 35 34 400 35 34 400 35 34 400 35 34 400 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 35 57 40 35 57 40 35 57 40 35 57 40 35 57 40 35 57 40 35 57 40 35 57 40 35 57 40 35 57 40 40 35 57 40 40 35 57 40 40 35 57 40 40 35 57 40 40 35 40 35 57 40 40 35 40 35 40 40 35 40 40 35 40 40 35 40 40 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	= 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 2.02 0.38 1.94 0.8 1.44 0.54 2 0.61 2 0.61 1.42 0.54 2 0.61 1.42 0.54 2 0.61 1.42 0.54 2 0.61 2 0.61 1.42 0.54 2 0.61 1.42 0.54 2 0.61 1.42 0.54 2 0.61 2 0.61 1.42 0.54 2 0.61 1.42 0.54 2 0.61 1.42 0.54 2 0.61 1.42 0.54 1.42 0.54 1.82 0.44 1.82 0.54 1.82 0.54 1.82 0.54 1.82 0.54 1.81 0.22 Contro Mean SD 2 0.74 1.08 0.68 1.73 1.14 0.55 1.54 0.55 1.54 0.55 1.55 0.55 0.55 0.55 0.55 0.55 0.55 0.55 0.55 0.55 0.5	I Total 300 400 27 35 57 43 304 001); I ² I Total 266 300 400 27 35 43 304 001); I ² I Total 330 400 27 43 330 400 27 43 330 400 27 57 57 43 330 400 27 57 57 43 304 400 32 57 57 43 32 57 43 32 57 40 32 57 57 43 304 400 32 57 57 43 304 400 32 57 57 43 304 400 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 30 40 001); I ² 40 30 40 001); I ² 40 30 40 001); I ² 40 30 40 001); I ² 40 30 40 001); I ² 40 30 40 001); I ² 40 30 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 32 57 57 40 30 40 30 40 30 40 30 40 30 4 40 30 4 4 30 40 30 4 4 30 30 4 4 30 4 4 30 4 4 30 4 4 30 4 4 30 4 4 30 4 4 30 4 4 30 4 4 30 4 4 30 4 4 30 4 4 30 4 4 30 4 4 30 4 4 30 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57	Weight 12.1% 13.1% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 13.3% 10.0% 97% Weight 11.1% 10.7% 9.9% 9.2% 12.4% 10.0% 9.2% 8.1% 9.2% 8.1% 6.07	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.31 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.31 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.59 [-0.95, -0.23] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -1.68, -0.28] -0.05 [-0.64, -0.72, -0.56] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.59 [-1.96, -1.22] -0.58 [-1.11, -0.25] -0.48 [-0.69, -0.27] -0.59 [-0.64, -0.38] -0.76 [-0.90, -0.62] -0.76 [-0.90, -0.72] -0.76 [-0.90, -0.72]	Pavours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl
Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfei 2022 muz 2017 Ol haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhong hong 2021 Zhong hong 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: bajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfei 2022 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Zhong hong 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Dong jaqian 2022 Dong jaqian 2023 Duan ran 2022 Dong jaqian 2023 Duan ran 2022 Huang shengfei 2024 Huang shengfei 2014	0.16; Chiří Z = 2.75 (Mean. 0.66 1.11 1.29 0.14; Chiří Mean. 1.2 0.14; Chiří Mean. 1.2 0.14; Chiří 0.2 = 4.09 (Mean. 1.2 0.14; Chiří 1.32 0.12; Chiří 0.2 = 3.51 (Expec. Mean. 1.32 0.12; Chiří 0.132; Chiří 0.132; Chiří 0.132; Chiří 0.133; Chiří 0.133; Chiří 0.133; Chiří 0.134; Chiří 0.145;	rimental <u>SP</u> T = 248.0° P = 0.000 rimental <u>SP</u> T = 0.60 0.13 0.52 0.35 0.22 0.35 0.22 0.35 0.22 0.35 0.2 2.35 P < 0.000 rimental <u>SP</u> T = 0.28 P = 0.000 rimental <u>SP</u> T = 0.28 P = 0.000 rimental <u>SP</u> T = 0.28 P = 0.000 rimental 0.73 0.22 0.35 0.22 0.35 0.22 0.35 0.22 0.35 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.	7, df = 6) 1 30 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 311 25 30 40 32 57 43 311 25 30 40 32 57 43 30 01) 1 0 01) 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 1.94 0.8 1.44 0.54 2 0.66 1.93 0.13 2 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 1.19 0.49 0.1 0.3 1.25 0.99 2.2 0.44 1.26 0.30 2.26 0.48 2.33 0.42 0.42 0.68 0.42 0.68 	I Total 300 400 27 35 57 43 304 40 32 27 43 304 40 32 27 43 304 40 001); I ² 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Weight 12.1% 13.4% 13.2% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.6% 12.4% 12.6% 13.3% 90.0% 13.3% 10.0% 9.7% 9.7% 11.1% 10.7% 9.2% 11.7% 12.3% 12.3% 12.4% 12.3% 12.3% 9.2% 9.2% Weight 9.4% 9.4% 9.2% 9.8% 8.1% 6.0% 9.9%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%. CI -0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.59 [-0.95, -0.23] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.56] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.57 [-0.84, -0.38] -0.59 [-1.96, -1.22] -0.64 [-0.59, -0.26] -0.59 [-1.96, -1.22] -0.64 [-0.64, -0.38] -0.59 [-0.64, -0.38] -0.59 [-0.64, -0.38] -0.59 [-0.64, -0.38] -0.59 [-0.64, -0.38] -0.59 [-0.64, -0.38] -0.59 [-0.64, -0.38] -0.56 [-0.64, -0.38] -0.56 [-0.64, -0.38] -0.56 [-0.54, -0.58] -0.56 [-0.54,	Pavours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference V. Random, 95% Cl
Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou felfeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect : Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou felfeng 2021 Zhou felfeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect : Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 Anajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou felfeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect : Study or Subgroup Dong jiaqian 2023 Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 heydarirad 2019 Huang shengfel 2022	0.16; Chiří Expe Mean 0.66 1.11 1.29 0.14; Chiří 1.29 0.14; Chiří Mean 1.2 0.14; Chiří Mean 1.2 0.12; Chiří 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2	$\label{eq:response} \begin{split} rel &= 248.0 \\ P &= 0.00 \\ \hline rrimental \\ SP & T. \\ 0.6 \\ 0.73 \\ 0.73 \\ 0.73 \\ 0.73 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.74 \\ 0.74 \\ 0.74 \\ 0.75 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.75 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.75 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.75 \\ 0.25 $	7, df = 6) 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 1.94 0.88 1.44 0.54 1.82 0.51 1.93 0.13 7 (P < 0.00 Contros Contros Contros Contros 1.94 0.49 0.1 0.33 1.52 0.33 1.52 0.34 1.20 0.44 1.20 0.51 1.81 0.22 E (P < 0.00 Contros Mean SD 2 0.74 1.06 0.68 1.73 11.4 0.42 0.08 2.74 0.55 	I Total 300 400 277 55 400 400 277 57 40 304 304 304 001); I ² I Total 26 26 30 400 27 57 43 304 001); I ²	Weight 12.1% 13.1% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 13.3% 9.7% 9.2% 9.2% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 9.2% 9.2% 9.2% 6.0% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI 0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.59 [-0.95, -0.23] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.58] -1.00 [-1.16, -0.84] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.58] -1.00 [-1.16, -0.84] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI 0.01 [-0.26, 0.28] 0.33 [-0.17, 0.43] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] -0.58 [-1.11, -0.25] -0.48 [-0.69, -0.22] -0.49 [-0.69, -0.32] -0.44 [-0.69, -0.20] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI -0.49 [-0.69, -0.38] -0.44 [-0.69, -0.20] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI -0.49 [-0.69, -0.20] -0.49 [-0.69, -0.38] -0.49 [-0.69, -0.38] -0.49 [-0.69, -0.30] -0.49 [-0.69, -0.30] -0.49 [-0.69, -0.30] -0.49 [-0.69, -0.30] -0.49 [-0.69, -0.20]	Pavours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou falfang 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Like ixaoling 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Dong jacjan 2022 Anog hong 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: heydariad 2019 Huang shengfel 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Hwang tingting 2021 Qi haiyan 2016	0.16; Chiříh Expeo Mean 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.29 0.14; Chiříh 1.29 0.14; Chiříh 2 = 4.09 (Expeo Mean 1.2 1.35 1.21 1.35 1.22 1.35 1.32 1.35 1.32 1.32 1.32 1.32 1.32 1.35 1.32 1.35 1.32 1.35 1.32 1.35 1.32 1.35	rimental SD T 0.74 0.6 0.73 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2	7, df = 6) 1 30 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 311 25 30 40 32 57 43 311 25 30 01) 1 25 30 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 336 0, df = 04) 1 25 336 40 35 34 34 33 33 40 35 34 34 33 33 40 35 34 34 33 33 34 33 33 34 33 33 34 33 33	 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 1.94 0.8 2 0.61 1.93 0.13 2 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Contro Contro 1.19 0.49 0.1 0.3 1.25 0.99 2.62 0.49 1.26 0.99 2.62 0.49 1.81 0.22 52 0.44 1.82 0.34 1.2 0.51 1.81 0.22 Contro Mean SD 2 0.74 1.08 0.68 1.73 1.14 4.26 1.46 0.42 0.86 0.27 0.66 1.20 0.66 1.21 0.54 	I <u>Total</u> 300 400 27 32 57 43 304 400 32 57 43 304 400 301; i ² I <u>Total</u> 40 001); i ² I <u>Total</u> 304 40 001); i ²	Weight 12.1% 12.1% 12.4% 12.4% 12.6% 12.28% 13.3% 100.0% = 97% Weight 11.1% 10.7% 9.9% 9.2% 812.4% Weight 10.7% 9.2% 81% 9.2% 9.2% 9.2% 9.2% 9.2% 9.2% 9.2% 9.2% 9.2% 9.2% 9.2% 9.2% 9.2% 9.2% 9.2% 9.2% 9.2%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%. CI. -0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.91 [-1.13, -0.69] -0.59 [-0.96, -0.23] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.58] -1.00 [-1.16, -0.84] -0.64 [-0.72, -0.56] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%. CI 0.01 [-0.26, 0.28] 0.33 [-0.1, 0.43] -0.58 [-1.96, -1.22] -0.48 [-0.69, -0.20] -0.49 [-0.60, -0.38] -0.44 [-0.69, -0.20] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%. CI -1.00 [-1.32, -0.68] -0.56 [-0.94, -0.18] -0.56 [-0.94, -0.18]	Hean Difference N. Random, 95% CI Favours [experimental] F
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: hajbagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Gi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou faifeng 2021 Zhou faifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect : Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Gi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Atotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect : Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Gi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Xie xiaoling 2021 Xie xiaoling 2021 Xie xiaoling 2021 Xie xiaoling 2021	0.16; Chiří	$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	7, df = 6) 1 0tal 30 40 35 33 4 40 35 33 4 40 32 57 43 33, df = 01) 1 0 1) 1 0 1 0 1) 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1	 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 1.94 0.8 1.42 0.54 2 0.66 1.93 0.13 2 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 1.19 0.49 0.1 0.3 1.25 0.99 2.02 0.48 1.20 0.51 1.81 0.22 1.81 0.22 52 0.44 1.81 0.22 2 0.74 1.81 0.22 1.81 0.22<	I <u>Total</u> 304 001); I ² 1 <u>Total</u> 304 0001); I ² 1 <u>Total</u> 1 1 <u>Total</u> 330 0001); I ² 1 <u>Total</u> 1 1 <u>Total</u> 330 0001); I ²	Weight 12.1% 13.1% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 13.3% 00.0% = 97% Weight 11.1% 10.7% 9.9% 9.9% 9.2% Weight 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.27 [-0.520.02] -0.13 [-0.180.08] -0.31 [-0.180.08] -0.31 [-0.180.08] -0.31 [-0.180.08] -0.23 [-0.42,-0.04] -0.79 [-1.00,-0.58] -0.23 [-0.42,-0.04] -0.79 [-1.00,-0.58] -0.57 [-0.84,-0.30] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -0.51 [-0.78,-0.28] -0.31 [-0.17,-0.43] -1.59 [-1.96,-1.22] -0.68 [-1.11,-0.25] -0.48 [-0.69,-0.27] -0.68 [-0.11,-0.25] -0.48 [-0.69,-0.20] -0.49 [-0.60,-0.38] -0.44 [-0.69,-0.20] -1.00 [-1.32,-0.68] -0.56 [-0.94,-0.18] -0.56 [-0.94,-0.18] -0.56 [-0.94,-0.18] -0.56 [-0.94,-0.18] -0.56 [-0.94,-0.18] -0.56 [-0.44,-0.18] -0.56 [-0.44,-0.18] -0.56 [-0.44,-0.18] -0.56 [-0.43,-0.18] -0.56 [-0.43,-0.18] -0.55 [-0.54,-0.18] -0.56 [-0.43,-0.18] -0.56 [-0.53,-0.31] -0.56 [-0.53,-0.31] -0.56 [-0.53,-0.31] -0.56 [-0.53,-0.31] -0.56 [-0.53,-0.31] -0.56 [-0.53,-0.31] -0.56 [-0.54,-0.38] -0.56 [-0.54,-0.38]	Pavours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup hijbagheri 2014 Huang shengfei 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou Fallerg 2021 Zhou Fellerg 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 Duag shengfei 2022 Zhou felleng 2021 Zhou felleng 2021 Zhou felleng 2021 Zhou felleng 2021 Zhou felleng 2021 Zhou felleng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : Study or Subgroup Dong jiaqian 2023 Duan ran 2022 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: : Study or Subgroup Dong jiaqian 2023 Duan ran 2022 Majibagheri 2014 heydarirad 2019 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou felleng 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou follog 2021 Zhou felleng 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou follog 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou follog 2021 Zhou follog 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou follog 2021 Zhou follog 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou felleng 2020 Zhou felleng 2020 Zhou felleng 2020 Zhou felleng 2020 Zhou felleng 2020 Zhou felleng 2020 Zhong hong 2021 Zhou felleng 2020 Zhou felleng 2020 Zho	0.16; Chiří Z = 2.75 (Expe Mean. 0.66 0.8 1.11 1.29 0.14; Chiří 1.29 0.14; Chiří 1.29 0.12; Chiří 1.29 0.12; Chiří 1.29 0.12; Chiří 1.29 0.12; Chiří 1.29 0.14; Chiří 1.29 0.12; Chiří 1.29 0.14; Chiří 1.29 0.14; Chiří 1.29 0.14; Chiří 1.29 0.14; Chiří 1.29 0.14; Chiří 1.29 0.14; Chiří 1.29 0.14; Chiří 1.29 0.12; Chiří 1.49 0.12; Chiří 1.49 0.45;	rimental <u>SD</u> T. 0.6 0.73 0.2 0.35 0.2 0.35 0.2 0.2 0.35 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.35 0.2 0.2 0.35 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.35 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.3 0.2 0.2 0.3 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.3 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2	7, df = 6) 1 0tal 30 40 35 33 4 40 32 57 43 311 25 7 43 311 25 30 40 35 33, df = 01) 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0	 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 1.94 0.8 1.82 0.51 2 0.66 1.93 0.13 7 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 1.94 0.8 1.25 0.90 2.03 0.92 1.52 0.44 1.62 0.34 1.26 0.32 1.52 0.44 1.62 0.34 1.20 0.5 1.81 0.22 5 8 (P < 0.00 Contro Contro Mean SD 2 0.74 1.68 0.68 1.73 1.14 4.26 1.46 0.42 0.68 1.21 0.59 1.21 0.54 1.21 0.54 1.24 0.55 1.21 0.44 1.26 1.46 0.42 0.68 1.21 0.59 1.21 0.44 	I Total Total 300 400 27 355 40 322 7 43 304 40 322 7 43 304 40 304 40 001); I ² 1 Total 40 26 30 001; I ²	Weight 12.1% 12.1% 12.4% 12.4% 12.6% 12.4% 12.6% 97% 97% 97% 92% 92% 92% 92% 92% 93% 9.4% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.4% 9.3% 9.3% 9.3% 9.4% 9.3% 9.3%	Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%. CI -0.27 [-0.520.02] -0.13 [-0.18,-0.08] -0.29 [-0.42,-0.04] -0.79 [-1.00,-0.56] -0.29 [-0.42,-0.04] -0.79 [-1.00,-0.56] -0.75 [-0.84,-0.30] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95%. CI -0.64 [-0.72,-0.56] -0.37 [-0.74,-0.30] -0.57 [-0.84,-0.30] -0.57 [-0.84,-0.30] -0.38 [-0.71,-0.43] -0.64 [-0.69,-0.27] -0.68 [-11,-0.25] -0.68 [-0.41,-0.26] -0.68 [-0.41,-0.26] -0.68 [-0.64,-0.36] -0.55 [-0.64,-0.36] -0.55 [-0.64,-0.36] -0.56 [-0.64,-0.36] -0.56 [-0.64,-0.36] -0.56 [-0.54,-0.36] -0.56 [-0.54,-0.36] -0.76 [-1.32,-0.68] -0.76 [-1.32,-0.68] -0.76 [-1.32,-0.68] -0.76 [-1.32,-0.68] -0.76 [-1.32,-0.57] -0.48 [-0.79,-0.17] -0.52 [-0.73,-0.31] -0.50 [-0.57,-0.31] -0.50 [-0.67,-0.30]	Pavours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou feifeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 Zhong hong 2021 Zhong hong 2021 Zhong fong 2021 Zhong fong 2021 Zhong hong 2021 Zhong fong 2021 Zhong fong 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 Zhong hong 2021 Zhong hong 2021	0.16; Chiří Z = 2.75 (Mean. 0.66 1.13 1.35 1.21 1.35 1.21 1.32 0.14; Chiří 1.32 0.14; Chiří 1.32 0.14; Chiří 1.32 0.14; Chiří 1.33 1.35 1.21 1.29 0.14; Chiří 1.32 1.33 1.33 1.35 1.32	$\label{eq:response} \begin{split} rimental \\ \underline{SD \ T} \\ 0.6 \\ 0.73 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.74 \\ 0.74 \\ 0.75 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.74 \\ 0.75 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.74 \\ 0.75 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.35 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.35 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.35 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.35 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.35 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.35 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.35 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.36 \\ 0.97 \\ 0.97 \\ 0.92 \\ 0.23 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.36 \\ 0.97 \\ 0.97 \\ 0.92 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.97 \\ 0.97 \\ 0.92 \\ 0.23 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.97 \\ 0.97 \\ 0.92 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.35 \\ 0.97 \\ 0.97 \\ 0.92 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.35 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.35 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.31 \\ 0.35 \\ 0.31 $	7, df = 6) 30 40 40 35 34 40 35 34 40 32 57 43 311 25 30 40 40 40 35 34 40 40 40 40 25 57 43 335 34 40 40 25 57 43 336 0, df = 25 30 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40	 P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 1.94 0.88 1.44 0.54 1.82 0.51 1.93 0.13 T (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 1.9 0.49 0.1 0.33 1.52 0.34 1.20 0.44 1.81 0.22 E (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 2.03 0.92 1.81 0.22 E (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 2.0.74 1.80 0.68 1.73 114 1.21 0.59 1.62 0.34 1.21 0.59 1.62 0.44 1.81 0.38 	I Total 30001); I ² 30001); I ² 3004 32 57 400027 3304 304 3001); I ² I Total 26 30000 27 35 300001); I ² I Total 330 0001); I ²	Weight 12.1% 13.1% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 13.3% 9.7% 9.2% 11.1% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 9.9% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.3% 9.4% 9.3% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI 0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.59 [-0.95, -0.23] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.58] -1.00 [-1.16, -0.84] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.58] -1.00 [-1.16, -0.84] -0.64 [-0.72, -0.56] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI 0.01 [-0.26, 0.28] 0.33 [-0.17, 0.43] -1.59 [-1.96, -1.22] -0.48 [-0.48, -0.36] -0.48 [-0.60, -0.38] -0.48 [-0.69, -0.20] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI -0.48 [-0.69, -0.20] -0.49 [-0.66, -0.38] -0.44 [-0.69, -0.20] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI -0.49 [-0.63, -0.20] -0.49 [-0.63, -0.20] -0.49 [-0.64, -0.38] -0.44 [-0.69, -0.71] -0.52 [-0.73, -0.31] -0.48 [0.14, 0.82] -0.48 [0.74, -0.43] -0.48 [0.74, -0.43] -0.48 [-0.74, -0.33] -0.48 [-0.76, -0.33] -0.48 [-0.76, -0.33] -0.59 [-0.57, -0.33] -0.39 [-0.53, -0.25]	Pavours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: hajibagheri 2014 Huang shengfel 2022 muz 2017 Qi haiyan 2016 Wang tingting 2021 Zhou felfeng 2021 Zhou felfeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Budy or Subgroup Duan ran 2022 Ang shengfel 2014 Huang shengfel 2012 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Lou felfeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Duan ran 2022 Ang hong 2021 Zhou felfeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Study or Subgroup Dong jaqian 2023 Diana ran 2022 hajibagheri 2014 Heydarirad 2019 Huang shengfel 2022 Zhong hong 2021 Zhonu felfeng 2021 Total (95% CI) Huang shengfel 2022 Zhong hong 2021 Zhonu felfeng 2021	0.16; Chiří	rimentalSD T0.730.220.240.250.240.250.240.250.240.240.250.240.240.240.240.240.240.240.24	7, df = 6) 30 40 35 33 4 40 35 33 4 40 32 57 43 33 4 40 25 30 40 32 57 43 33 4 40 25 33 40 32 57 40 33 57 40 33 6 77 43 336 0, 0 40 0 40 35 32 35 35 30 40 32 25 30 40 32 32 34 40 32 25 30 40 32 34 40 35 30 40 32 32 34 40 32 35 34 40 35 35 35 35 35 35 35 35 35 35 35 35 35	 9 (P < 0.00 Contro Mean SD 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 0.93 0.36 1.94 0.82 1.94 0.84 1.93 0.13 2 0.61 1.93 0.13 a.7 (P < 0.00 Contro Contro 1.19 0.49 0.1 0.3 1.25 0.90 2.10 0.49 0.1 0.3 1.25 0.90 2.62 0.49 2.10 0.49 1.81 0.22 Contro Mean SD 2 0.74 1.08 0.68 1.24 0.88 2.74 0.55 1.20 0.86 1.21 0.39 1.21 0.39 1.21 0.39 1.21 0.59 	I Total 300 1 Total 300 40 27 304 40 322 57 43 304 40 001); I ² I Total 40 001); I ² I Total 40 300 40 27 43 300 15 17 43 300 27 43 300 27 43 300 27 43 300 27 43 300 27 43 300 27 43 300 27 43 300 27 43 300 27 43 300 27 57 43 300 27 57 43 300 27 57 43 300 27 57 43 300 27 57 43 300 27 57 43 43 300 27 57 43 43 300 27 57 43 43 300 27 57 43 43 300 27 57 43 43 300 27 57 43 43 30 27 57 43 43 30 27 57 57 43 43 30 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43	Weight 12.1% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 12.4% 13.3% 12.6% 13.3% 100.0% = 97% Weight 11.1% 10.7% 9.9% 9.2% 11.7% 12.4% 10.0.0% = 92% Weight 0.00.9% 9.2% 8.1% 9.2% 9.4% 9.4% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7% 9.7%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI -0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.13 [-0.18, -0.08] -0.59 [-0.96, -0.23] -0.23 [-0.42, -0.04] -0.79 [-1.00, -0.58] -1.00 [-1.16, -0.84] -0.64 [-0.72, -0.56] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI 0.01 [-0.26, 0.28] 0.33 [-0.1, 0.43] -0.57 [-0.84, -0.30] 0.33 [-0.1, 0.43] -0.58 [-1.96, -1.22] -0.48 [-0.69, -0.20] -0.49 [-0.60, -0.38] -0.44 [-0.69, -0.20] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI -1.00 [-1.32, -0.68] -0.44 [-0.69, -0.20] -0.44 [-0.69, -0.20] -0.44 [-0.40, -0.38] -0.56 [-0.94, -0.18] -0.56 [-0.94, -0.18] -0.59 [-0.54, -0.25] -0.54 [-0.94, -0.08]	Pavours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

FIGURE 12

Forest plot of the meta-analysis of the effect of aromatherapy on each dimension of the sleep quality index scale (A) sleep quality, (B) time to falling asleep, (C) sleep efficiency, (D) sleep disorder, (E) daytime function, (F) sleep duration.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/supplementary material. Further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding authors.

Author contributions

H-BC: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – original draft. Y-DZ: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – original draft. YQ: Investigation, Validation, Writing – original draft. H-YJ: Investigation, Validation, Writing – original draft. L-NW: Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing – review & editing. WG: Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing – review & editing.

Funding

The author(s) declare that financial support was received for the research and/or publication of this article. This work was supported by the Special Project for Enhancing the Capacity of Traditional Chinese Medicine Services (2021ZY002) and Shanghai Municipal

References

1. Iliescu EA, Coo H, McMurray MH, Meers CL, Quinn MM, Singer MA, et al. Quality of sleep and health-related quality of life in haemodialysis patients. *Nephrology dialysis transplantation: Off Publ Eur Dialysis Transplant Assoc - Eur Renal Assoc.* (2003) 18:126–32. doi: 10.1093/ndt/18.1.126

2. O'Donnell JF. Insomnia in cancer patients. *Clin cornerstone*. (2004) 6 Suppl 1D: S6–14. doi: 10.1016/s1098-3597(05)80002-x

3. Savard J, Davidson JR, Ivers H, Quesnel C, Rioux D, Dupéré V, et al. The association between nocturnal hot flashes and sleep in breast cancer survivors. *J Pain symptom Manage*. (2004) 27:513–22. doi: 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2003.1 0.013

4. Savard J, Simard S, Hervouet S, Ivers H, Lacombe L, Fradet Y. Insomnia in men treated with radical prostatectomy for prostate cancer. *Psycho-oncology*. (2005) 14:147–56. doi: 10.1002/pon.830

5. Sateia MJ. International classification of sleep disorders-third edition: highlights and modifications. *Chest.* (2014) 146:1387–94. doi: 10.1378/chest.14-0970

6. Nowell PD, Buysse DJ, Reynolds CF 3rd, Hauri PJ, Roth T, Stepanski EJ, et al. Clinical factors contributing to the differential diagnosis of primary insomnia and insomnia related to mental disorders. *Am J Psychiatry*. (1997) 154:1412–6. doi: 10.1176/ ajp.154.10.1412

7. Kraus SS, Rabin LA. Sleep America: managing the crisis of adult chronic insomnia and associated conditions. *J Affect Disord.* (2012) 138:192–212. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2011.05.014

8. Barbotin B, Hoertel N, Olfson M, Blanco C, Sanchez-Rico M, Lejoyeux M, et al. Sleep complaints among adults with major depressive episode are associated with increased risk of incident psychiatric disorders: Results from a population-based 3-year prospective study. *J Clin Psychiatry*. (2022) 84:21m14236. doi: 10.4088/JCP.21m14236

9. Guo H, Zhou J, Chen H, Cao X. Prevalence and associated factors of poor sleep quality among Chinese retirees: A multicenter cross-sectional study. J Affect Disord. (2023) 320:42–7. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2022.09.130

10. Mookerjee N, Schmalbach N, Antinori G, Thampi S, Windle-Puente D, Gilligan A, et al. Comorbidities and risk factors associated with insomnia in the elderly population. *J primary Care Community Health*. (2023) 14:21501319231168721. doi: 10.1177/21501319231168721

11. Petrakis V, Steiropoulos P, Papanas N, Trypsianis G, Papazoglou D, Panagopoulos P. Quality of sleep in people living with HIV in the era of highly active antiretroviral treatment. *Int J STD AIDS.* (2023) 34:191–202. doi: 10.1177/09564624221146608

Health Commission Traditional Chinese Medicine Science and Technology Project (2022QN018).

Acknowledgments

We thank all the supporters for the systematic review.

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.

12. Capiau A, Huys L, van Poelgeest E, van der Velde N, Petrovic M, Somers A. Therapeutic dilemmas with benzodiazepines and Z-drugs: insomnia and anxiety disorders versus increased fall risk: a clinical review. *Eur geriatric Med.* (2023) 14:697–708. doi: 10.1007/s41999-022-00731-4

13. Pan B, Ge L, Lai H, Hou L, Tian C, Wang Q, et al. The comparative effectiveness and safety of insomnia drugs: A systematic review and network meta-analysis of 153 randomized trials. *Drugs*. (2023) 83:587–619. doi: 10.1007/s40265-023-01859-8

14. Matthews EE, Arnedt JT, McCarthy MS, Cuddihy LJ, Aloia MS. Adherence to cognitive behavioral therapy for insomnia: a systematic review. *Sleep Med Rev.* (2013) 17:453–64. doi: 10.1016/j.smrv.2013.01.001

15. Li S, Xue Q, Zhong Y, Liao P, Ji Q, Yang X, et al. Research trends in complementary and alternative treatments for insomnia over the past decade: A bibliometrics analysis. *Medicine*. (2023) 102:e34346. doi: 10.1097/md.00000000034346

16. Pearson NJ, Johnson LL, Nahin RL. Insomnia, trouble sleeping, and complementary and alternative medicine: Analysis of the 2002 national health interview survey data. *Arch Internal Med.* (2006) 166:1775–82. doi: 10.1001/archinte.166.16.1775

17. Cui J, Li M, Wei Y, Li H, He X, Yang Q, et al. Inhalation aromatherapy via braintargeted nasal delivery: natural volatiles or essential oils on mood disorders. *Front Pharmacol.* (2022) 13:860043. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2022.860043

18. Cao X, Zhou J, Liu J, Chen H, Zheng W. Aromatherapy in anxiety, depression, and insomnia: A bibliometric study and visualization analysis. *Heliyon.* (2023) 9: e18380. doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e18380

19. Lee KB, Latif S, Kang YS. Differences in neurotransmitters level as biomarker on sleep effects in dementia patients with insomnia after essential oils treatment. *Biomolecules Ther*. (2023) 31:298–305. doi: 10.4062/biomolther.2023.014

 Şahin F, Özkaraman A, Irmak Kaya Z. The effect of a combined treatment of foot soak and lavender oil inhalation therapy on the severity of insomnia of patients with cancer: Randomized interventional study. *Explore (New York NY)*. (2023) 19:426–33. doi: 10.1016/j.explore.2022.09.003

21. Lucena L, Santos-Junior JG, Tufik S, Hachul H. Effect of a lavender essential oil and sleep hygiene protocol on insomnia in postmenopausal women: A pilot randomized clinical trial. *Explore (New York NY)*. (2024) 20:116–25. doi: 10.1016/ j.explore.2023.07.004

22. Zick SM, Wright BD, Sen A, Arnedt JT. Preliminary examination of the efficacy and safety of a standardized chamomile extract for chronic primary insomnia: a

randomized placebo-controlled pilot study. BMC complementary Altern Med. (2011) 11:78. doi: 10.1186/1472-6882-11-78

23. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ (Clinical Res ed)*. (2021) 372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

24. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ (Clinical Res ed).* (2008) 336:924–6. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD

25. Balshem H, Helfand M, Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol*. (2011) 64:401–6. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.07.015

26. Hamzeh S, Safari-Faramani R, Khatony A. Effects of aromatherapy with lavender and peppermint essential oils on the sleep quality of cancer patients: A randomized controlled trial. *Evidence-Based complementary Altern medicine: eCAM*. (2020) 2020:7480204. doi: 10.1155/2020/7480204

27. Heydarirad G, Keyhanmehr AS, Mofid B, Nikfarjad H, Mosavat SH. Efficacy of aromatherapy with Rosa damascena in the improvement of sleep quality of cancer patients: A randomized controlled clinical trial. *Complementary therapies Clin Pract.* (2019) 35:57–61. doi: 10.1016/j.ctcp.2019.01.017

28. Ozkaraman A, Dügüm Ö, Özen Yılmaz H, Usta Yesilbalkan Ö. Aromatherapy: The effect of lavender on anxiety and sleep quality in patients treated with chemotherapy. *Clin J Oncol Nurs*. (2018) 22:203–10. doi: 10.1188/18.Cjon.203-210

29. Muz G, Taşcı S. Effect of aromatherapy via inhalation on the sleep quality and fatigue level in people undergoing hemodialysis. *Appl Nurs research: ANR.* (2017) 37:28–35. doi: 10.1016/j.apnr.2017.07.004

30. Karadag E, Samancioglu S, Ozden D, Bakir E. Effects of aromatherapy on sleep quality and anxiety of patients. *Nurs Crit Care.* (2017) 22:105–12. doi: 10.1111/nicc.12198

31. Hajibagheri A, Babaii A, Adib-Hajbaghery M. Effect of Rosa damascene aromatherapy on sleep quality in cardiac patients: a randomized controlled trial. *Complementary therapies Clin Pract.* (2014) 20:159–63. doi: 10.1016/j.ctcp.2014.05.001

32. Jiaqian D, Shu X, Yuanyuan C, Xiuyue Q. Study on the effect of aromatherapy on relieving anxiety and sleep status of patients with gastrointestinal cancer undergoing chemotherapy. *Zhejiang Clin Med J.* (2023) 25:747–9.

33. Ying C, Xiaojie C, Shujie W, Dandan W, Kanfei Y, Xuehua Z. Effect of lavender aromatic therapy combined with emotional freedom techniques on insomnia cancer breast patients with heart and spleen deficiency. *Chin J Nurs.* (2022) 57:651–8. doi: 10.3761/j.issn.0254-1769.2022.06.002

34. Ran D. The effect study of aromatherapy application in Alzheimer's disease. China: Chengdu Medical College (2022).

35. Shengfei H, Fang L, Yanyan W, Yanhong S. Effects of Liuzijue Qigong combined with aromatherapy on sleep quality and negative emotion in patients with colorectal cancer. *Pract Clin Med.* (2022) 23:59–63. doi: 10.13764/j.cnki.lcsy.2022.06.019

36. Haiyan S. Intervention effect research on effect of wheat grain moxibustion combined with aromatherapy in patients with functional dyspepsia due to liver depression and spleen deficiency. China: Zhejiang Chinese Medical University (2022).

37. Xiaoyan T, Xiuyu Y. Study on the intervention effect of aromatherapy on psychological state and sleep of patients with COVID-19. *Fujian Med J.* (2022) 44:149–51. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1002-2600.2022.06.052

38. Xi Y, Yi L, Zhijun Q, Dan D, Qun S, Kerong G, et al. Clinical effects of characteristic sachets with traditional Chinese medicine on postoperative mental state improvement in elderly patients with hip fracture. *China Pharmacist.* (2022) 25:278–80 +320. doi: 10.19962/j.cnki.issn1008-049X.2022.02.014

39. Yanqiu C. Study on the effect of aromatherapy combined with acupoint massage on insomnia in maintenance hemodialysis patients. China: Huzhou University (2021).

40. Tingting W, Zhou Z, Yanjuan L, Zhazha L. Study on the intervention effect of inhaled aromatherapy on sleep disorders, symptom distress, quality of life and negative psychology in maintenance hemodialysis patients. *Chin Gen Pract Nurs.* (2021) 19:3950–3. doi: 10.12104/j.issn.1674-4748.2021.28.015

41. Wenwen Z. Study on the intervention effect of aromatherapy on sleep quality and fatigue of maintenance hemodialysis patients. China: Hunan Normal University (2021).

42. Hong Z. Effects of traditional Chinese medicine aromatherapy on postoperative rehabilitation training and sleep quality in elderly patients with hip fracture. *Modern Pract Med.* (2021) 33:1101–3. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1671-0800.2021.08.059

43. Feifeng Z, Yan W, Qingyue C, Wenqin Z, Xiaoying L. Effect of aromatherapy on cancer-related fatigue and sleep quality in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma after transarterial chemoembolization. *Chin And Foreign Med Res.* (2021) 19:191–3. doi: 10.14033/j.cnki.cfmr.2021.10.071

44. Yulou H. Study on the nursing effect of lavender aromatherapy for postoperative sleep quality of patients with fracture. *World J Sleep Med.* (2020) 7:878–9. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.2095-7130.2020.05.054

45. Qiongyao L, Houliang C, Danxing T, Jianshuang Z, Lingling Z. Effects of tuina therapy of Yinyang Ruyin combined with aromatherapy on insomnia and quality of life

in patients receiving perichemotherapy for breast cancer. Chin J Modern Nurs. (2020) 26:3893–8. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.cn115682-20200420-02865

46. Xiaoling X, Xiaohui X. The influence of aromatherapy on negative emotions and sleep quality in female patients with schizophrenia in remission. *J Qiqihar Med Coll.* (2020) 41:2614–5. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1002-1256.2020.20.041

47. Daiying Z, Xue W, Ruichen L, Qingmei F, Xian D. Effects of lavender aromatherapy on postoperative negative emotion and sleep quality of thyroid cancer patients. *Med And Hygiene*. (2020) 11):31–3.

48. Aihua Z, Xiuli Z, Xianxiang M, Ai X, Qiang Z. Effects of lavender aromatherapy on negative emotions and sleep quality of female patients with schizophrenia in remission. *Guangxi Med J.* (2020) 42:779–81. doi: 10.11675/j.issn.0253-4304.2020.06.30

49. Jiang L, Wei Q, Fang L. Effects of aromatherapy on improving perioperative anxiety and sleep in patients with gastric cancer. *Chin J Modern Nurs*. (2018) 24:2093–6. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.1674-2907.2018.17.025

50. Hongyan X. Study on the effect of inhalation aromatherapy in non operative treatment of patients with mild to moderate acute pancreatitis. China: University of South China (2018).

51. Li M. Effect of aromatherapy for post stroke depressive disorder in participants. China: Hebei Medical University (2017).

52. Haiyan Q, Julan Y, Chenxia W, Shuli L. The influence of auricular acupressure combined with aromatherapy on quality of sleep of the patients with colorectal cancer during perioperative period. *Western J Traditional Chin Med.* (2016) 29:112–4. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1004-6852.2016.04.039

53. Riemann D, Baglioni C, Bassetti C, Bjorvatn B, Dolenc Groselj L, Ellis JG, et al. European guideline for the diagnosis and treatment of insomnia. *J sleep Res.* (2017) 26:675–700. doi: 10.1111/jsr.12594

54. Riemann D, Spiegelhalder K, Espie C, Pollmächer T, Léger D, Bassetti C, et al. Chronic insomnia: clinical and research challenges–an agenda. *Pharmacopsychiatry*. (2011) 44:1–14. doi: 10.1055/s-0030-1267978

55. Shuyuan S, Qin Z, Pengfei Y, Pengyi H, Xiaoying H, Shanshan L, et al. Research progress on mechanism of aromatic Chinese medicine and their active ingredients in refreshing the brain. *Chin Traditional Herbal Drugs*. (2021) 52:6403–12. doi: 10.7501/j.issn.0253-2670.2021.20.031

56. Linck VM, da Silva AL, Figueiró M, Piato AL, Herrmann AP, Dupont Birck F, et al. Inhaled linalool-induced sedation in mice. *Phytomedicine: Int J phytotherapy phytopharmacology*. (2009) 16:303–7. doi: 10.1016/j.phymed.2008.08.001

57. Farrar AJ, Farrar FC. Clinical aromatherapy. Nurs Clinics North America. (2020) 55:489–504. doi: 10.1016/j.cnur.2020.06.015

58. Bertone AC, Dekker RL. Aromatherapy in obstetrics: A critical review of the literature. *Clin obstetrics gynecology*. (2021) 64:572-88. doi: 10.1097/grf.00000000000622

59. Son HK, So WY, Kim M. Effects of aromatherapy combined with music therapy on anxiety, stress, and fundamental nursing skills in nursing students: A randomized controlled trial. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. (2019) 16:4185. doi: 10.3390/ ijerph16214185

60. Tabatabaeichehr M, Mortazavi H. The effectiveness of aromatherapy in the management of labor pain and anxiety: A systematic review. *Ethiopian J Health Sci.* (2020) 30:449–58. doi: 10.4314/ejhs.v30i3.16

61. Hines S, Steels E, Chang A, Gibbons K. Aromatherapy for treatment of postoperative nausea and vomiting. *Cochrane Database systematic Rev.* (2018) 3: Cd007598. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD007598.pub3

62. Gong M, Dong H, Tang Y, Huang W, Lu F. Effects of aromatherapy on anxiety: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Affect Disord.* (2020) 274:1028–40. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2020.05.118

63. Ebrahimi H, Mardani A, Basirinezhad MH, Hamidzadeh A, Eskandari F. The effects of Lavender and Chamomile essential oil inhalation aromatherapy on depression, anxiety and stress in older community-dwelling people: A randomized controlled trial. *Explore (New York NY)*. (2022) 18:272–8. doi: 10.1016/j.explore.2020.12.012

64. Guo P, Li P, Zhang X, Liu N, Wang J, Yang S, et al. The effectiveness of aromatherapy on preoperative anxiety in adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Int J Nurs Stud.* (2020) 111:103747. doi: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2020.103747

65. Liu T, Cheng H, Tian L, Zhang Y, Wang S, Lin L. Aromatherapy with inhalation can effectively improve the anxiety and depression of cancer patients: A meta-analysis. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry*. (2022) 77:118–27. doi: 10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2022.05.004

66. Kreye G, Wasl M, Dietz A, Klaffel D, Groselji-Strele A, Eberhard K, et al. Aromatherapy in palliative care: A single-institute retrospective analysis evaluating the effect of lemon oil pads against nausea and vomiting in advanced cancer patients. *Cancers*. (2022) 14:2131. doi: 10.3390/cancers14092131

67. Louis M, Kowalski SD. Use of aromatherapy with hospice patients to decrease pain, anxiety, and depression and to promote an increased sense of well-being. *Am J hospice palliative Care.* (2002) 19:381–6. doi: 10.1177/10499 0910201900607