## MK-801 attenuates lesion expansion following acute brain injury in rats: a meta-analysis

Nan-Xing Yi<sup>1, 2, 3, #</sup>, Long-Yun Zhou<sup>2, 3, 4, #</sup>, Xiao-Yun Wang<sup>1</sup>, Yong-Jia Song<sup>1, 2, 3</sup>, Hai-Hui Han<sup>2, 5</sup>, Tian-Song Zhang<sup>6</sup>, Yong-Jun Wang<sup>2, 3</sup>, Qi Shi<sup>1, 2, 3, 5</sup>, Hao Xu<sup>1, 2, 3, \*</sup>, Qian-Qian Liang<sup>1, 2, 3, \*</sup>, Ting Zhang<sup>1, 2, \*</sup> 1 Longhua Hospital Affiliated to Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Shanghai, China

2 Institute of Spine, Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Shanghai, China

3 Key Laboratory of Theory and Therapy of Muscles and Bones, Ministry of Education, Shanghai, China

4 School of Rehabilitation Medicine, Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Shanghai, China

5 Guanghua Hospital Affiliated to Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Shanghai, China

6 Jing'an District Center Hospital, Fudan University, Shanghai, China

Funding: This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China, No. 81822050 (to QQL), 81873321 (to HX), 81673990 (to QQL), 81330085 (to QS), 81730107 (to YJW); the Shanghai Municipal Health and Family Planning Commission TCM Research Project of China, No. 2018JP014 (to HX); the Three-Year Action Plan to Promote Clinical Skills and Clinical Innovation in Municipal Hospitals of China, No. 16CR1017A (to YJW); the Shanghai Traditional Chinese Medicine Chronic Disease [Malignant Tumor, Bone Degenerative Disease] Clinical Medical Center of China, No. 2017ZZ01010 (to YJW); the National Ministry of Education Innovation Team of China, No. IRT1270 (to YJW); the Innovation Team of Key Fields of the Ministry of Science and Technology of China, No. 2015RA4002 (to YJW); the Outstanding Principle Investigator Project of Guanghua Hospital, Changning District, Shanghai, China, No. 2016-01 (to QS), 2016-06 (to YJW).

#### Abstract

OBJECTIVE: To evaluate the efficacy and safety of MK-801 and its effect on lesion volume in rat models of acute brain injury.

DATA SOURCES: Key terms were "stroke", "brain diseases", "brain injuries", "brain hemorrhage, traumatic", "acute brain injury", "dizocilpine maleate", "dizocilpine", "MK-801", "MK801", "rat", "rats", "rattus" and "murine". PubMed, Cochrane library, EMBASE, the China National Knowledge Infrastructure, WanFang database, the VIP Journal Integration Platform (VJIP) and SinoMed databases were searched from their inception dates to March 2018.

DATA SELECTION: Studies were selected if they reported the effects of MK-801 in experimental acute brain injury. Two investigators independently conducted literature screening, data extraction, and methodological quality assessments.

OUTCOME MEASURES: The primary outcomes included lesion volume and brain edema. The secondary outcomes included behavioral assessments with the Bederson neurological grading system and the water maze test 24 hours after brain injury.

RESULTS: A total of 52 studies with 2530 samples were included in the systematic review. Seventeen of these studies had a high methodological quality. Overall, the lesion volume (34 studies, n = 966, MD =-58.31, 95% CI: -66.55 to -50.07; P < 0.00001) and degree of cerebral edema (5 studies, n = 75, MD =-1.21, 95% CI: -1.50 to -0.91; P < 0.00001) were significantly decreased in the MK-801 group compared with the control group. MK-801 improved spatial cognition assessed with the water maze test (2 studies, n = 60, MD = -10.88, 95% CI: -20.75 to -1.00; P = 0.03) and neurological function 24 hours after brain injury (11 studies, *n* = 335, *MD* = −1.04, 95% *CI*: −1.47 to −0.60; *P* < 0.00001). Subgroup analysis suggested an association of reduction in lesion volume with various injury models (34 studies, n = 966, MD =-58.31, 95% CI: -66.55 to -50.07; P = 0.004). Further network analysis showed that 0-1 mg/kg MK-801 may be the optimal dose for treatment in the middle cerebral artery occlusion animal model.

CONCLUSION: MK-801 effectively reduces brain lesion volume and the degree of cerebral edema in rat models of experimental acute brain injury, providing a good neuroprotective effect. Additionally, MK-801 has a good safety profile, and its mechanism of action is well known. Thus, MK-801 may be suitable for future clinical trials and applications.

Key Words: nerve regeneration; acute brain injury; neurological function; spatial cognition; water maze test; lesion volume; brain edema; rat; systematic review; meta-analysis; neural regeneration

#### Chinese Library Classification No. R453; R364

#### Introduction

Acute brain injury (ABI) primarily attributed to vascular and traumatic events is one of the leading causes of mortality and disability worldwide (Jolliffe et al., 2018). Although the incidence of stroke appears to have decreased because of the increased use of antihypertensive treatments, the proportion of young patients has rapidly risen over the past few decades (Balabanski et al., 2018). According to a nationwide survey of 0.5 million adults, approximately 2.4 million new strokes and 1.1 million stroke-related deaths occur annually in China (Wang et al., 2017). Moreover, the incidence of traumatic brain injury, with the highest mortality rate among all injuries, continues to rise (Ao et al., 2017). Traumatic brain injury accounts for 30-40% of all injury-related deaths, and half the world's population is estimated to have one or more traumatic brain injuries in their lifetime (Maas et al., 2017). ABI and the associated complications are a substantial and persistent burden for individuals and society (Kunz et al., 2018). Despite our increasing understanding of the mechanisms of ABI, effective therapeutic strategies are still lacking (Ao et al., 2017).

\*Correspondence to:

Hao Xu, PhD, HOXU@163.com; Qian-Qian Liang, PhD, liangqianqiantcm@126.com; Ting Zhang, PhD, ztingdd@hotmail.com.

#These authors contributed equally to this work.

#### orcid:

0000-0002-8311-506X (Hao Xu) 0000-0001-8797-7778 (Qian-Qian Liang) 0000-0001-9399-4734 (Ting Zhang)

doi: 10.4103/1673-5374.259619

Received: January 9, 2019 Accepted: April 25, 2019



RESEARCH ARTICLE

The progression of ABI is complex. The primary physical insult triggers acute secondary injury, involving excitotoxicity, neuroinflammation, oxidative stress, neural cell death, vasogenic edema, ionic imbalance, autophagy disorder, and a range of cellular and molecular disturbances (Duris et al., 2018). Interestingly, excessive activation of the glutamate receptor underlies these varied changes (Milton and Smith, 2018). For example, hyperactivation of N-methyl-D-aspartate (NMDA) receptors, with resulting excessive influx of Na<sup>+</sup> and Ca<sup>2+</sup>, is associated with neuronal damage after stroke and traumatic injury (Song et al., 2018). The chronic NMDA receptor hyperactivity results in the loss of neurons in neurodegenerative disorders, such as Huntington's, Parkinson's and Alzheimer's disease (Song et al., 2018). Accordingly, knockout of microglial NMDAR subunits reduces neuroinflammation and neuronal cell death induced by ABI in the developing and mature brain (Kaindl et al., 2012).

MK-801, an NMDA receptor blocker, has been successfully used in experimental therapy for stroke, traumatic brain injury, Parkinson's and peripheral neuralgia (Song et al., 2018). Despite its efficacy, the adverse side effects, which probably result from its high affinity for the receptor and long dwell time, preclude its clinical application (Song et al., 2018). However, drug use in clinical practice is dependent on risk-benefit assessment, especially for diseases currently lacking effective therapies, such as ABI. Here, we perform a systematic review of available data to critically evaluate the efficacy of MK-801 in rat models of ABI, and we assess its potential for further clinical trials and applications.

#### Data and Methods

#### Literature search

PubMed, Cochrane library, EMBASE, the China National Knowledge Infrastructure, WanFang database, the VIP Journal Integration Platform (VJIP) and SinoMed databases were searched from their inception dates to March 2018. Key terms were "stroke", "brain diseases", "brain injuries", "brain hemorrhage, traumatic", "acute brain injury", "dizocilpine maleate", "dizocilpine", "MK-801", "MK801", "rat", "rats", "rattus" and "murine". Reference lists from the included articles were also searched to identify additional studies.

#### Identification of articles

Two reviewers (NXY and LYZ) selected the studies independently by screening the abstracts and full texts according to the eligibility criteria. Disagreement or ambiguities were resolved by consensus after discussion with a third reviewer (TZ).

#### Eligibility criteria

#### Types of studies

Controlled studies assessing the neurobiological effects of MK-801 on rats with brain injury were searched. All clinical case reports and solely *in vitro* studies were excluded. No language, publication date, or publication status restrictions were imposed.

#### Types of included animals

Laboratory rats of any age, gender or strain subjected to ABI by ischemia, hemorrhage or trauma were included. Studies featuring non-traumatic ischemia, genetically-modified animals, chronic brain injury models, radiation or electrical stimulation were excluded.

#### Types of treatment

All types of MK-801 treatment compared with a placebo control were included. Placebo control included dimethyl sulfoxide, saline, vehicle or no treatment. Studies with combined treatments, such as MK-801 along with memantine, were excluded.

#### Types of outcome measures

#### Primary outcomes

Lesion volume is a reliable indicator of injury severity, and is

related to neurological functional recovery. To accurately assess lesion volume, the dissected brain hemisphere usually includes all potential lesioned regions, and is cut into serial axial sections. By quantifying the lesioned area in each section, lesion volume can be calculated with software (*e.g.* Neurolucida or Stereo Investigator) or according to a specific formula. Brain edema can be used as an indicator of the brain injury process. Hours to days after the initial trauma, there is a progressive edema (swelling) of the damaged tissue. Studies reporting brain water content, as an outcome measure, using the formula [(wet weight–dry weight)/wet weight] × 100% were included in the analysis.

#### Secondary outcomes

Behavioral assessments with the Bederson neurological grading system or the water maze test were included. The Bederson neurological grading system (Bederson et al., 1986) is a well-documented and widely used scale with discrete values ranging from 0 to 3: Grade 0, no observable deficit; Grade 1, forelimb flexion; Grade 2, decreased resistance to lateral push (and forelimb flexion) without circling; Grade 3, same behavior as grade 2, with circling. Rats are held gently by the tail, suspended one meter above the floor, and observed for forelimb flexion. The water maze experiment documents the number of times that the pre-trained rat finds the platform and the swimming distance in the platform quadrant. It is a classic test used to evaluate spatial learning and spatial orientation abilities.

#### Data extraction

The data, including name of the first author, publication year, animal strain and gender, animal age and weight, number of animals, ABI model, MK-801 administration, and measured outcomes as the mean ± standard deviation (SD), were extracted from the studies. In studies with multiple intervention strategies, only data for MK-801 and negative control groups were included in the analyses. For data that were not described numerically in the text, the values from the graphs were estimated using commercial software (GetData Graph Digitizer 2.25; download from http://getdata-graph-digitizer.com). When related outcomes were reported without clearly presented data, the authors were contacted by email.

#### Methodological quality of individual studies

Stroke Therapy Academic Industry Roundtable (STAIR) guidelines (Fisher et al., 2009) were used to assess the quality and design of the studies, including the following: sample size calculation; inclusion and exclusion criteria; randomization; allocation concealment; reporting of animals excluded from analysis; blinded assessment of outcome; and potential conflicts of interest and study funding. Two investigators assessed the methodological quality. The bias was assessed as a low or high risk of bias, while "unclear" indicated that the risk of bias was not clear.

#### Statistical analysis

Pairwise meta-analyses and subgroup analyses were conducted using Review Manager 5.3 software (downloaded from https://community.cochrane.org). For all outcome measures, the significance was set at a level of 0.05 (two-tailed). Pooled data for each outcome were reported as the mean differences (*MD*) with 95% confidence intervals (*CIs*). The chi-square test and Cochrane's  $I^2$  were used to assess heterogeneity between studies and subgroups. Heterogeneity was considered significant for *P* values of Cochrane's *Q* statistic < 0.10 and  $I^2 > 50\%$ . The random effects model was used because instead of a single true effect size, the true effect sizes likely varied across the studies.

To examine the appropriate MK-801 dosage, a network meta-analysis method was conducted according to the Bayesian method using Stata software to synthesize direct and indirect treatment regimens simultaneously and compare the therapeutic effect between different doses. For every treatment dosage, we calculated the probability of its efficacy and ranked treatments by the surface under the cumulative ranking curve (SUCRA). The larger the SUCRA value for the treatment, the higher its rank among the network treatment regimens.

#### Results

#### Study selection

Our systematic search identified 1830 potentially relevant studies. After removal of duplicates and title/abstract screening, 72 papers were selected for full-text screening. Of 20 publications excluded at the full-text level, five used the newborn rat, four did not report an outcome that met the inclusion criteria, two combined MK-801 with another treatment, and the remaining were repeat publications or were excluded for other reasons. A total of 52 studies were finally included in this systematic review and meta-analysis (Park et al., 1988; Dirnagl et al., 1990; Bielenberg and Beck, 1991; Gill et al., 1991, 1992; Oh and Betz, 1991; Buchan et al., 1992; Iijima et al., 1992; Roussel et al., 1992; Hamm et al., 1993; Pschorn et al., 1993; Shapira et al., 1993; Dawson et al., 1994; Frazzini et al., 1994; Lo et al., 1994; Lyden and Lonzo, 1994; Xue et al., 1994; Green et al., 1995; Liu and Feng, 1995; Katsuta et al., 1995; Memezawa et al., 1995; Margaill et al., 1996; Relton et al., 1996; Onal et al., 1997; Bertorelli et al., 1998; Chen et al., 1998; Herz et al., 1998; Sarraf-Yazdi et al., 1998, 1999; Takamatsu et al., 1998; Ai et al., 2000; Gorgulu et al., 2000; Kawai et al., 2000; Mackensen et al., 2000; Hanon and Klitgaard, 2001; Uchida et al., 2001; Wexler et al., 2002; Pan and Li, 2003; Shen et al., 2003; Shirasaki et al., 2004; Allahtavakoli et al., 2007; Moyanova et al., 2007, 2009; Regan et al., 2007; Cam et al., 2008; Ashioti et al., 2009; Foster et al., 2009; Han et al., 2009; Nategh et al., 2010; Hu et al., 2015; Qian et al., 2016; Sommer et al., 2017; Figure 1).



Figure 1 Summary of the literature identification and selection process.

### Characteristics of the included studies in the meta-analysis

Of the 52 publications from 1988 to 2017, 48 were in English, while four were in Chinese (Liu and Feng, 1995; Wenbin et al., 2000; Pan and Li, 2003; Shen et al., 2003). The sample size (number of animals) ranged from 10 to 121. Among the studies, 41 had ABI induced by middle cerebral artery occlusion (MCAO), five used a weight-drop injury model (Hamm et al., 1993; Shapira et al., 1993; Wenbin et al., 2000; Han et al., 2009; Sommer et al., 2017), and the remaining used a hemorrhage model. Half of the studies reported the source of MK-801. The controls included saline, dimethyl sulfoxide, or no treatment. The dose of MK-801 ranged from 0.04 to 10 mg/kg, and 36 studies used intraperitoneal injection, while the remaining used intravenous injection. Pre-operation administration of MK-801 was performed in 22 studies, while the majority of the remaining studies treated ABI within 30 minutes of injury (**Additional Table 1**).

#### Risk of bias within studies

Overall, the methodological quality of the studies was relatively low. Only two of the studies reported more than 50% of the details in the STAIR list (Lyden and Lonzo, 1994; Mackensen et al., 2000). No study performed a sample size calculation. About half of the studies reported randomization, blinding to assessors and potential conflicts of interest (**Table 1**).

#### Overall analysis of the effects of MK-801

From histopathological analysis, lesion volume (mm<sup>3</sup>) expansion was notably decreased in the MK-801 group compared with the control group (34 studies, n = 966, MD = -58.31, 95% *CI*: -66.55 to -50.07, P < 0.00001; **Figure 2**). The pooled lesion volume (percentage to hemisphere volume) results revealed a protective effect of MK-801 (10 studies, n = 225, MD = -10.44, 95% *CI*: -13.60 to -7.28, P < 0.00001; **Table 2** and **Additional Figure 1**). Five studies reported brain water content as outcome. MK-801 significantly decreased brain water content compared with the control group (5 studies, n = 75, MD = -1.21, 95% *CI*: -1.50 to -0.91, P < 0.00001; **Figure 3**).

For functional evaluation, 11 studies assessed neurological scores 24 hours after brain injury. Although three trials reported that MK-801 had no beneficial effect on neurological score, our meta-analysis revealed that MK-801 significantly improved neurological function in rats with ABI (11 studies, n = 335, MD = -1.04, 95% *CI*: -1.47 to -0.60, P < 0.00001; **Figure 4** and **Table 2**). The pooled water maze test results showed a significant improvement in MK-801-treated animals compared with control (two studies, n = 60, MD = -10.88, 95% *CI*: -20.75 to -1.00, P = 0.03; **Figure 5** and **Table 2**). Substantial heterogeneity in treatment effects between the studies was observed. Given that different models and administration parameters may be associated with this heterogeneity, we conducted subgroup analyses on these factors.

#### Subgroup analysis of the effects of MK-801

MK-801 produced a notable reduction in lesion volume compared with control, in both MCAO and hemorrhage models, irrespective of administration dose, route and timing. There were no differences in the reduction in infarct volume among the different ABI models. There were also no differences among the 0–1, 1–3 and 5–10 mg/kg doses, between intraperitoneal and intravenous injection, or between pretreatment and posttreatment (**Figure 6, Table 3** and **Additional Figures 2–4**).

## Sub-subgroup analysis of the effects of MK-801 in the MCAO model

Given the large number of studies, sub-subgroup analysis for the MCAO subgroup was performed. Sub-subgroup analyses showed that controlling multiple variables produced more reliable and accurate results. Sub-subgroup analyses revealed that the reduction in lesion volume was associated with administration dose (P = 0.03), but not with administration route or timing (**Figure 7**, **Table 4** and **Additional Figures 5** and **6**).

### Network analysis of the effects of different administration doses of MK-801

To identify the optimum treatment regimen, network analysis of the effects of different administration doses of MK-801 was performed. Forest plots of studies of all injury models or MCAO models indicated that there were no differences in lesion volume between the 0-1, 1-3 and 5-10 mg/kg doses. Probability analysis of all injury models suggested that the effect of the 1-3 mg/kg dose had the highest probability of occupying the first ranking, with the 0-1 mg/kg dose occupying the second ranking. Probability analysis

#### Table 1 Risk of bias summary

Study	Sample size calculation	Inclusion and exclusion criteria	Randomization	Allocation concealment	Reporting of animals excluded from analysis	Blinded assessment of outcomes	Reporting potential conflicts of interest and study funding
Sommer et al. (2017)	U	U	L	U	U	L	L
Qian et al. (2016)	U	U	L	U	U	L	L
Hu et al. (2015)	U	U	L	U	L	L U	L
Nategh et al. (2010)	U	U	U	U	L	U	L
Han et al. (2009)	U	U	L	U	U	U	L
Foster et al. (2009)	U	U	U	U	U	L	L
Ashioti et al. (2009)	U	U	L	U	U	L	L
Cam et al. (2008)	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Regan et al. (2007)	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Moyanova et al. (2007)	U	U	U	U	L	U	L
Moyanova et al. (2007) Moyanova et al. (2009)	U	U	U	U	L	L	L U
Allahtavakoli et al. (2009)	U	U	U	U	L U	L	U
Shirasaki et al. (2007)	U	U	U	U	U	L U	U
Shen et al. (2003)	U	U	L	U	U	U	U
	U	U	L	U	U	U	U
Pan and Li (2003)							
Wexler et al. (2002)	U	U	U	U	U	L	U
Uchida et al. (2001)	U	U	L	U	U	L	U
Hanon and Klitgaard (2001)	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Ai et al. (2000)	U	U	L	U	U	U	U
Mackensen et al. (2000)	U	U	L	U	L	L	L
Kawai et al. (2000)	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Gorgulu et al. (2000)	U	U	L	U	U	L	L
Sarraf-Yazdi et al. (1999)	U	U	L	U	U	L	L
Takamatsu et al. (1998)	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Sarraf-Yazdi et al. (1998)	U	U	L	U	U	L	L
Herz et al. (1998)	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Chen et al. (1998)	U	U	L	U	U	L	L
Bertorelli et al. (1998)	U	U	L	U	U	U	U
Onal et al. (1997)	U	U	L	U	U	L	L
Relton et al. (1996)	U	U	L	U	U	L	L
Margaill et al. (1996)	U	U	L	U	U	L	L
Liu and Feng (1995)	U	U	L	U	U	U	L
Memezawa et al. (1995)	U	U	U	U	L	U	L
Katsuta et al. (1995)	U	U	U	U	U	U	L
Green et al. (1995)	U	U	L	U	L	U	L
Xue et al. (1994)	U	U	L	U	L	U	L
Lyden and Lonzo (1994)	U	U	L	U	L	L	L
Lo et al. (1994)	U	U	L	U	U	U	L
Frazzini et al. (1994)	U	U	U	U	U	L	U
Dawson et al. (1994)	U	U	U	U	U	U	L
Shapira et al. (1993)	U	U	L	U	L	U	U
Pschorn et al. (1993)	U	U	U	U	U	U	L
Hamm et al. (1993)	U	U	U	U	U	U	L
Roussel et al. (1992)	U	U	L	U	L	U	L
Iijima et al. (1992)	U	U	U	U	U	L	U
Gill et al. (1992)	U	U	U	U	U	L	L
Buchan et al. (1992)	U	U	U	U	L	L	L
Oh and Betz (1991)	U	U	U	U	L	U	L
Gill et al. (1991)	U	U	U	U	U	L	L
Bielenberg and Beck (1991)	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Dirnagl et al. (1990)	U	U	U	U	U	L	L
Park et al. (1988)	U	U	U	U	U	U	L

U: Unknown; L: low.

Table 2 Summary of the meta-analysis of lesion volume, brain water content, brain edema, neurological scores and latency in the water maze
test

			Mean difference (MD)	Heteroger	Heterogeneity		
Outcome title	No. of studies	No. of animals	MD (95% CI)	P-value	$I^2$	P-value	
1. Lesion volume (mm <sup>3</sup> )	34	966	-58.31 (-66.55, -50.07)	< 0.00001	94	< 0.00001	
2. Lesion volumes (%)	10	225	-10.44 (-13.60, -7.28)	< 0.00001	97	< 0.00001	
3. Brain water content (%)	5	75	-1.21 (-1.50, -0.91)	< 0.00001	56	0.060	
4. 24-Hour neurological scores	11	335	-1.04(-1.47, -0.60)	< 0.00001	98	< 0.00001	
5. Latency in water maze (second)	4	76	-10.15 (-16.81, -3.50)	0.003	78	0.003	

No.: Number.

#### Table 3 Summary of subgroup analysis on lesion volume

			Mean difference (MD)		Heterogeneity		Subgroup
Subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of animals	MD (95% CI)	P-value	$I^2$	P-value	<ul> <li>difference</li> <li>(P-value)</li> </ul>
1. Administration dose	34	984	-57.38 (-65.35, -49.42)	< 0.00001	93	< 0.00001	0.060
1.1 Dose (0, 1)	22	521	-59.10 (-68.79, -49.40)	< 0.00001	89	< 0.00001	
1.2 Dose (1, 3)	10	282	-62.00 (-84.92, -39.08)	< 0.00001	97	< 0.00001	
1.3 Does (5, 10)	6	181	-43.35 (-53.33, -33.38)	< 0.00001	54	0.040	
2. Administration routes	33	974	-56.15 (-64.06, -48.24)	< 0.00001	93	< 0.00001	0.930
2.1 Intraperitoneally	21	653	-55.81 (-67.19, -44.43)	< 0.00001	94	< 0.00001	
2.2 Intravenously	12	321	-55.15 (-66.07, -44.22)	< 0.00001	88	< 0.00001	
3. Administration time	32	848	-57.37 (-66.33, -48.40)	< 0.00001	94	< 0.00001	0.690
3.1 Pretreatment	14	400	-55.00 (-72.49, -37.50)	< 0.00001	94	< 0.00001	
3.2 Posttreatment (0, 15 min)	9	230	-53.36 (-70.77, -35.94)	< 0.00001	94	< 0.00001	
3.3 Posttreatment (15, 30 min)	9	191	-64.88 (-79.24, -50.51)	< 0.00001	93	< 0.00001	
3.4 Posttreatment (30, 60 min)	2	27	-42.38 (-111.17, 26.42)	0.230	56	0.130	
4. Injury model	34	966	-58.31 (-66.55, -50.07)	< 0.00001	94	< 0.00001	0.004
4.1 MCAO	31	888	-60.37 (-68.98, -51.76)	< 0.00001	94	< 0.00001	
4.2 Hemorrhage	3	78	-31.58 (-48.90, -14.26)	0.0004	38	0.200	

MCAO: Middle cerebral artery occlusion; min: minutes; No.: Number.

#### Table 4 Summary of sub-subgroup analysis of the middle cerebral artery occlusion model

			Mean difference (MD)		Hetero	geneity	Sub-subgroup
Sub-subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of animals	MD (95% CI)	P-value	$I^2$	P-value	<ul> <li>difference (P-value)</li> </ul>
1. Administration dose	31	934	-60.74 (-69.17, -52.31)	< 0.00001	94	< 0.00001	0.030
1.1 Dose (0, 1)	20	453	-60.77 (-70.98, -50.56)	< 0.00001	90	< 0.00001	
1.2 Dose (1, 3)	9	272	-66.55 (-90.89, -42.21)	< 0.00001	98	< 0.00001	
1.3 Does (5, 10)	7	181	-43.35(-53.33, -33.38)	< 0.00001	54	0.040	
2. Administration routes	31	888	-60.37 (-68.98, -51.76)	< 0.00001	94	< 0.00001	0.440
2.1 Intraperitoneally	20	603	-62.25 (-75.06, -49.44)	< 0.00001	95	< 0.00001	
2.2 Intravenously	11	285	-55.52 (-66.55, -44.50)	< 0.00001	89	< 0.00001	
3. Administration time	30	786	-59.20 (-68.26, -50.14)	< 0.00001	94	< 0.00001	0.800
3.1 Pretreatment	14	406	-57.16 (-73.32, -41.00)	< 0.00001	94	< 0.00001	
3.2 Posttreatment (0, 15 min)	8	180	-56.58 (-75.72, -37.44)	< 0.00001	95	< 0.00001	
3.3 Posttreatment (15, 30 min)	8	173	-65.46 (-80.52, -50.41)	< 0.00001	94	< 0.00001	
3.4 Posttreatment (30, 60 min)	2	27	-42.38 (-111.17, 26.42)	0.23	56	0.130	

min: Minutes; No.: Number.

of the MCAO models showed that the effect of the 0-1 mg/kg dose ranked first, followed by the 1-3 mg/kg dose (**Figure 8**).

#### Funnel plot of the effects of MK-801 on brain injury

To analyze publication bias, funnel plots of the effects of MK-801

(Figure 9A) in brain injury or MCAO models (Figure 9B) were constructed. Most of the data points in this study were located above the funnel and were evenly distributed on both sides of the red indicator line, suggesting the presence of a small publication bias. A few scattered points were located on the right side of the

Yi NX, Zhou LY, Wang XY, Song YJ, Han HH, Zhang TS, Wang YJ, Shi Q, Xu H, Liang QQ, Zhang T (2019) MK-801 attenuates lesion expansion following acute brain injury in rats: a meta-analysis. Neural Regen Res 14(11):1919-1931. doi:10.4103/1673-5374.259619

MK-801         Control         Mean Difference         Mean Difference           Study or Subgroup         Mean         SD         Total         Mean         SD         Total         No.           Pschorn U1993         75.97         10.85         5         250.52         41.8         5         2.0%         +174.65         [21.23,-136.87]	
Study or Subgroup         Mean         SD         Total         Weight         IV. Random, 95% Cl         IV. Random, 95% Cl           Pschorn U 1993         76.97         10.85         5         250.52         41.6         5         2.0%         -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87]           Memezawa H 1995         27.01         46.49         8         157.76         83.78         7         1.0%         -130.75 [-200.68, -60.82]	
Memezawa H 1995 27.01 46.49 8 157.76 83.78 7 1.0% -130.75 [-200.68, -60.82]	
Bushan M 1002 41 10 0 150 42 0 23% 100 00 (120 71 70 20)	
Hanon E 2001 107 22.3 9 211 23.8 12 2.8% -104.00 [-123.84, -84.16]	
Herz RC 1998 54.23 17.46 7 154.41 20.22 7 2.8% -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39]	
Mackensen GB 2000 35 35 16 125 72 16 1.9% -90.00 [-129.23, -50.77]	
Foster KA 2009 112.82 20.5 41 200.71 23.88 41 3.2% -87.89 [-97.52, -78.26]	
Moyanova SG 2007 85.5 5.2 13 170.5 22.7 24 3.2% -85.00 [94.51, -75.49]	
Sarraf-Yazdi S 1999 81 60 18 163 36 12 2.1% -82.00 [+16.40,-47.60]	
Sana-razar S 1850 105 55 16 162 65 16 1.570 -62.56 [125.62]-46.16]	
Regan HK 2007 130 24 20 211 28 17 3.0% -81.00 [-97.96, -64.04]	
Shen SY 2003 60.8 7.76 18 140.6 14.81 18 3.3% -79.80 [-87.52, -72.08]	
Takamatsu H 1998 126.1 20.3 8 202.4 8.5 9 3.0% -76.30 [-91.42, -61.18]	
Gorgulu A 2000 90.55 8.49 10 162.29 16.31 10 3.2% -71.74 [-83.14, -60.34]	
Margaill I 1996 169 30 9 239 30 9 2.5% -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28]	
Lo EH 1994 49 27 6 118 44 6 1.8% -69.00 [-110.31, -27.69]	
Dirnagl U 1990 165 63 15 231 22 13 2.1% -66.00 [-100.05,-31.95]	
Uchida K 2001 61 38 9 119 38 9 2.1% -58.00 [-93.11, -22.89]	
Katsuta K 1995 89.38 42.54 24 145.99 36.46 9 2.4% -56.61 [-85.89, -27.33]	
Relton JK 1996 26.87 6.37 8 78.88 13.06 8 3.2% -52.01 [-62.08, -41.94]	
Pan DQ 2003 94.29 8.94 5 144.65 7.37 5 3.2% -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20]	
lijima T 1992 58 11.5 6 108 38.5 6 2.2% -50.00 [-82.15, -17.85]	
Cam E 2008 23.12 21.1 5 73.12 23.2 5 2.5% -50.00 [-77.49,-22.51]	
Olii R 1991 92.47 10.15 24 141.97 4.06 24 3.3% -49.50 [-50.25, -42.77]	
Park CK 1988 79.71 8.49 14 127 7 6 3.3% -47.29 [54.44, -40.14]	
Heiz RC 1998 45.90 3.08 0 92.83 3.68 0 3.4% -40.87 [-51.03, -42.71]	
Buchan Awi 1992 145.29 11.05 31 180.25 7.80 31 3.4% -40.94 [-45.71, -30.17]	
Giirk 1992 121.32 19.62 10 159.6 20.7 10 5.1% = 36.46 [-02.52, =24.44]	
Roussel's 1992 73.81 26.47 21 110.71 22.62 19 3.0% -36.90 [-52.12,-21.68]	
Bielenberg GW 1991 66.36 28.13 14 99.1 26.9 9 2.7% -32.74 [55.67.9.81]	is
Lyden PD 1994 88.54 26.09 23 118.19 39.13 27 2.9% -29.65 [-47.86, -11.44]	
	1)
Ade D 1994 170 33 11 181 32 19 2.0% -11.00[50.30, 14.30]	
Dimagi∪1990 186 33 12 197 51 11 2.1% -11.00[46.45, 24.45] injury.	
Margaill 1996 200 40 8 209 14 8 2.4% -9.00 [-38.37, 20.37]	aat
	iat
Onal MZ 1997 179.1 78.5 7 175.2 89.3 8 0.7% 3.90 [81.02, 88.82] MK-801 decreases les	on
	un
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 520.31; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 580.86, df = 37 (P < 0.00001); I <sup>2</sup> = 94% Test for overall effect: Z = 13.87 (P < 0.00001) Favours during	
Test for overall effect: Z = 13.87 (P < 0.00001) Favours MK-801 Favours control injury in rats.	

	M	K-801		C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl	_ Figure 3 Meta-analysis
Shapira Y 1993	80.82	0.1	5	82.42	0.49	5	20.8%	-1.60 [-2.04, -1.16]		of brain water content
Shirasaki Y 2004	80.38	1.01	10	81.86	0.63	6	9.8%	-1.48 [-2.28, -0.68]		in rats after brain
Oh SM 1991	81.99	0.18	15	83.29	0.18	8	35.3%	-1.30 [-1.45, -1.15]	<b>+</b>	
Gorgulu A 2000	84.83	0.71	8	85.7	0.2	8	17.8%	-0.87 [-1.38, -0.36]		injury.
Kawai N 2000	80.95	0.35	5	81.65	0.52	5	16.4%	-0.70 [-1.25, -0.15]		Most studies show that
Total (95% CI)			43			32	100.0%	-1.21 [-1.50, -0.91]	◆	MK-801 decreases brain
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	= 0.06; CI	ni² = 9	.07, df=	= 4 (P =	0.06);	l² = 569	%			<ul> <li>water content after acute</li> </ul>
Test for overall effect	: Z = 8.10	(P < (	0.00001	)					Favours MK-801 Favours control	brain injury in rats.

	м	K-801		с	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Di	fference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Rando	m, 95% Cl	
Nategh M 2010	1	0.22	8	3	0.38	8	9.0%	-2.00 [-2.30, -1.70]			
Sarraf-Yazdi S 1999	0	0.5	18	2	1.25	12	7.4%	-2.00 [-2.74, -1.26]			
Allahtavakoli M 2007	2.5	0.36	8	4	0.22	8	9.0%	-1.50 [-1.79, -1.21]			
Nategh M 2010	2	0.26	8	3.5	0.32	8	9.0%	-1.50 [-1.79, -1.21]			
Shen SY 2003	2.83	0.82	18	4.17	0.75	18	8.3%	-1.34 [-1.85, -0.83]			
Ashioti M 2009	2.86	1.2	15	4.07	1.55	13	6.1%	-1.21 [-2.25, -0.17]			
Katsuta K 1995	1.79	1.07	24	3	0.36	9	8.4%	-1.21 [-1.70, -0.72]			
Gorgulu A 2000	1.38	0.94	26	2.5	0.81	26	8.4%	-1.12 [-1.60, -0.64]			Figure 4 Meta-analysis
Hu ZC 2015	2.33	0.73	10	2.88	0.83	10	7.6%	-0.55 [-1.24, 0.14]		-	of 24-hour neurological
Moyanova SG 2007	2.48	0.14	13	2.83	0.13	24	9.4%	-0.35 [-0.44, -0.26]	-		scores in rats after brain
Sarraf-Yazdi S 1998	1	1	18	1	0.75	18	8.1%	0.00 [-0.58, 0.58]			
Onal MZ 1997	2	0.02	7	1.84	0.02	8	9.4%	0.16 [0.14, 0.18]		•	injury.
											Most studies show that
Total (95% CI)			173			162	100.0%	-1.04 [-1.47, -0.60]	-		MK-801 improves neu-
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.52; Ch	i² = 66	6.83, d	f = 11 (F	° < 0.0	0001);	l² = 98%				rological function after
T		-	00004						-2 -1	J I Z	rongreat randenon arter

ò Favours MK-801 Favours control



Figure 5 Meta-analysis of latency in the water maze test in rats after brain injury. Most studies show that MK-801 improves spatial learning and memory after acute brain injury in rats.

acute brain injury in rats.

Test for overall effect: Z = 4.70 (P < 0.00001)

		K-801			ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
8.1.1 Dose (0, 1]									
Pschorn U 1993		10.85	5	250.52	41.6	5		-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87]	
Memezawa H 1995	27.01		8	157.76	83.78	7	0.9%	-130.75 [-200.68, -60.82]	
Hanon E 2001	107	22.3	9	211	23.8	12	2.7%	-104.00 [-123.84, -84.16]	
Herz RC 1998		17.46	7	154.41	20.22	7	2.7%	-100.18 [-119.97, -80.39]	
Mackensen GB 2000	35	35	16	125	72	16	1.8%	-90.00 [-129.23, -50.77]	
Sarraf-Yazdi S 1998	100	65	18	182	63	18	1.7%	-82.00 [-123.82, -40.18]	
Sarraf-Yazdi S 1999	81	60	18	163	36	12	2.0%	-82.00 [-116.40, -47.60]	
Takamatsu H 1998	126.1	20.3	8	202.4	8.5	9	2.9%	-76.30 [-91.42, -61.18]	
Gorgulu A 2000	90.55	8.49	10		16.31	10	3.0%	-71.74 [-83.14, -60.34]	
Margaill   1996	169	30	9	239	30	9	2.3%	-70.00 [-97.72, -42.28]	
Lo EH 1994	49	27	6	118	44	6	1.7%	-69.00 [-110.31, -27.69]	
Uchida K 2001	61	38	9	119	38	9	2.0%	-58.00 [-93.11, -22.89]	
Pan DQ 2003	94.29	8.94	5	144.65	7.37	5	3.0%	-50.36 [-60.52, -40.20]	
Katsuta K 1995	95.96	43.05	17	145.99	36.46	9	2.1%	-50.03 [-81.43, -18.63]	
Gill R 1991	92.47	16.15	24	141.97	4.68	24	3.1%	-49.50 [-56.23, -42.77]	~
Park CK 1988	79.71	8.49	14	127	7	6	3.1%	-47.29 [-54.44, -40.14]	~
Herz RC 1998	45.96	3.68	6	92.83	3.68	6	3.2%	-46.87 [-51.03, -42.71]	*
Bielenberg GW 1991	58	23.1	8	99.1	26.9	9	2.5%	-41.10 [-64.87, -17.33]	
Roussel S 1992	73.81	29.76	9	110.71	22.62	10	2.5%	-36.90 [-60.87, -12.93]	
Lyden PD 1994	88.54	26.09	23	118.19	39.13	27	2.7%	-29.65 [-47.86, -11.44]	
Xue D 1994	170	33	11	181	32	15	2.4%	-11.00 [-36.35, 14.35]	
Margaill   1996	200	40	8	209	14	8	2.2%	-9.00 [-38.37, 20.37]	
Dawson DA 1994	50.71	15.71	9	59.06	11.43	10	3.0%	-8.35 [-20.82, 4.12]	-4
Onal MZ 1997	179.1	78.5	7	175.2	89.3	8	0.7%	3.90 [-81.02, 88.82]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			264			257	56.0%	-59.10 [-68.79, -49.40]	♦
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 4 Test for overall effect: 2				= 23 (P <	< 0.0000	1);  ²=	89%		
			,						
8.1.2 Dose (1, 3]									
Buchan AM 1992	41	19	9	150	43	9	2.2%	-109.00 [-139.71, -78.29]	
Foster KA 2009	112.82	20.5	41	200.71	23.88	41	3.0%	-87.89 [-97.52, -78.26]	
Moyanova SG 2007	85.5	5.2	13	170.5	22.7	24	3.1%	-85.00 [-94.51, -75.49]	~
Regan HK 2007	130	24	20	211	28	17	2.8%	-81.00 [-97.96, -64.04]	
Shen SY 2003	60.8	7.76	18	140.6		18	3.1%	-79.80 [-87.52, -72.08]	~
lijima T 1992	58	11.5	6	108	38.5	6	2.1%	-50.00 [-82.15, -17.85]	
Cam E 2008	23.12		5	73.12	23.2	5	2.3%	-50.00 [-77.49, -22.51]	
Gill R 1992	121.32		16	159.8	20.7	16	2.9%	-38.48 [-52.52, -24.44]	~
Kawai N 2000	66.4	13.02	5	86.6	20.7	5	2.6%	-20.20 [-41.96, 1.56]	
Bertorelli R 1998	24.6	4	4	44.5	20.7	4	3.2%	-19.90 [-24.80, -15.00]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)	24.0	4	137	44.0	3	145	27.2%	-62.00 [-84.92, -39.08]	
	1271 00.0			If = 0 /P /	. 0 0000			-02.00 [-84.92, -59.08]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1 Test for overall effect: 2				n – 9 (P 4	- 0.000U	0,114	3770		
restion overall effect. 2	0.30 (F	~ 0.000	,01)						
8.1.3 Dose [5,10]									
Katsuta K 1995	73 20	39.68	7	145.99	36.46	9	1.9%	-72.60 [-110.43, -34.77]	
Dirnagl U 1990	165	39.00 63	15	231	22	13	2.0%	-66.00 [-100.05, -31.95]	
Relton JK 1996	26.87	6.37	15	78.88	13.06	8	2.0%		
							3.0%	-52.01 [-62.08, -41.94]	-
Buchan AM 1992	145.29		31		7.86	31		-40.94 [-45.71, -36.17]	
Roussel S 1992	73.81	25.1		110.71	22.62	9	2.6%	-36.90 [-57.40, -16.40]	
Bielenberg GW 1991	77.5	32.4	6	99.1	26.9	9	2.1%	-21.60 [-52.92, 9.72]	
Dirnagl U 1990 Subtatal (05% CI)	186	33	12	197	51	11	2.0%	-11.00 [-46.45, 24.45]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	20 44. 05	2-404	91		41.17.	90	16.8%	-43.35 [-53.33, -33.38]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1 Test for overall effect: 2				6 (P = 0.0	14); I* = (	04%			
						402	100.0%	E7 20 [ GE 2E 40 40]	▲
Total (95% CI)		- CO	492	10 (5			100.0%	-57.38 [-65.35, -49.42]	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 5				= 40 (P 4	.0.0000	0,1-=	93%0		-200 -100 0 100 200
Test for overall effect: 2				a (n. a)	00) 17	01.70			Favours MK-801 Favours control
Test for subaroup diffe	rences: C	ni*= 5.8	ov. df=	2 (P = 0.)	ບຫ). l* =	04.7%			

Figure 6 Lesion volume subgroup analysis of administration dose after brain injury. Most studies show that MK-

801 at various doses reduces lesion volume after acute brain injury in rats.

funnel, indicating the presence of small sample effects. However, because of the systematic search and the large number of studies, the publication bias was relatively small.

#### Discussion

Despite the enormous funding and research into treatments for ABI, there are very few effective therapies available in the clinic. For translation to the clinic, treatments must have satisfactory efficacy, have high safety, with minor or no side effects, and have a well-defined molecular mechanism of action. Given the reported beneficial roles of MK-801 in ABI, we performed a systematic review of all available studies to critically assess its potential for clinical translation.

#### Summary of evidence

Using a sensitive and exhaustive literature search strategy, we identified 52 eligible studies. The methodological quality of these studies is relatively low. Random-effects meta-analysis suggested that MK-801 has beneficial effects in ABI. It reduced lesion volume and brain edema, and improved neurological scores. Treatment with MK-801 led to a 58.31 mm<sup>3</sup> reduction in lesion volume, a 1.21% reduction in brain water content, and better spatial cognition.

Our subgroup analysis revealed no significant difference in

reduction of lesion volume between the various injury models, administration routes, timings or doses. The sub-subgroup analysis of the MCAO model showed that reduction in lesion volume was associated with administration dose. Reduction of lesion volume was greater with the 0–1 mg/kg dose than with the 5–10 mg/kg dose. Further network meta-analysis confirmed this finding.

#### Injury type

The studies reported that MK-801 reduces lesion size, alleviates cerebral edema and improves cognition in traumatic brain injury and ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke models. Our subgroup analysis indicated that MK-801 reduces lesion size in both ischemic and hemorrhagic stroke models, and has a better effect in MCAO models. However, only three studies using this model were included in the analysis (Lyden and Lonzo, 1994; Kawai et al., 2000; Uchida et al., 2001), and therefore, further study is needed to clarify the effects of MK-801 in hemorrhagic stroke.

#### MK-801 dose

Optimal dose is critical for treating any disease. The dose of MK-801 in the studies ranged from 0.04 to 10 mg/kg, and most used a dose of 1 mg/kg. Although all doses have been reported to have positive effects on ABI, doses above 5 mg/kg were associated with high mortality with obvious side effects, while 2.5 mg/kg was associated with low mortality (Dawson et al., 1994). We found that reduction of lesion volume was not significantly different among the 0-1, 1-3 and 5-10 mg/kg doses, but a relatively low effect size was found for 5 mg/kg. Sub-subgroup analysis of the MCAO model suggested that reduction of lesion volume was more pronounced in studies using doses of 0-1 mg/kg than 5-10 mg/kg. Moreover, network analysis indicated that the 0-1 mg/kg dose is more effective in comparison with the 1-3 and 5-10 mg/kg doses. These findings suggest that a low dose with few side effects should be recommended, especially for brain ischemic disease.

#### Timing of MK-801 administration

The pathogenesis of ABI follows a distinct temporal sequence of events, and therefore, the timing of treatment is critical for effective therapy. One study reported a greater reduction in infarct volume in animals given post-occlusion treatment with MK-801 compared with animals given pretreatment (Shapira et al., 1993). In another study, pretreatment alone failed to reduce neocortical damage after focal cerebral ischemia (Dawson et al., 1994). As the occurrence of ABI is unpredictable, pre-administration is not clinically feasible, except in situations such as cardiothoracic surgery, which may induce ischemic ABI. Our subgroup and sub-subgroup analyses showed that lesion volume reduction was not significantly different among the various administration timings (i.e. pretreatment, and 0-15, 15-30 and 30-60 minutes post-injury). Early treatment of secondary damage in ABI is crucial for improving the later regeneration of injured neurons and for the recovery of neurological function. Therefore, early administration of MK-801 should be more neuroprotective.

#### Administration route

MK-801 given by intravenous injection exerted neuroprotective effects in various studies on ABI. Our subgroup analysis suggested that infarct volume was not associated with administration route (intraperitoneal or intravenous injection). In the clinic, intravenous injection may therefore be an appropriate choice if MK-801 makes it to clinical trial.

#### Safety

Although high-dose MK-801 for treating ABI is associated with certain side effects, the concept of safety takes into consideration not only adverse reactions, but also the ratio of median effective dose to median lethal dose. In animal studies, doses of 0.04-10 mg/ kg have been shown to be neuroprotective, and only minor side effects were reported with initial administration of 2.5 mg/kg MK-801 followed by 1.25 mg/kg at 6 and 14 hours (Buchan et al., 1992). Hence, there is a large separation between the effective and risk doses.

Behavioral impairment and neuronal degeneration following MK-801 administration have been reported in a large number of studies. However, most of these studies used normal animals given chronic MK-801 administration. Although hyperactivation of NMDA receptors is a key pathological event in central nervous system injury, the normal physiological function of the receptor is critical for neuronal excitability and homeostasis. The loss of physiological NMDA receptors leads to robust neuroinflammation, death of neural cells and neuronal degeneration. In ABI, MK-801 likely reduces the hyperactivation of NMDA receptors, rather than inhibiting their normal function.

In ABI, MK-801 primarily serves to reverse the acute damage, with a relatively low risk of inhibiting the normal physiological function of NMDA receptors. However, it also alleviates secondary damage in a therapeutically safe manner. The beneficial effects of MK-801 therefore seem to far outweigh the risk. Derivatives of MK-801, produced by structural modification, might further enhance safety and may be even more suitable for future clinical translation.

Excessive activation of NMDA receptors is associated with key pathological changes in ABI. Given that MK-801 is an NMDA receptor antagonist, it may act via a number of different mechanisms to protect against ABI (Kaindl et al., 2012; Olmos and Lladó, 2014; Figure 10).

#### **Reduction of neuronal loss**

Potential therapeutic mechanisms

Glutamate release in the area of primary damage and the subsequent inflammation stimulate neuronal NMDA receptors and leads to excessive cell death (Ye et al., 2013; Matute, 2007). MK-801 reduces lesion volume, neuronal cell loss and brain edema by lessening neurotoxicity induced by the intracellular accumulation of Na<sup>+</sup> and Ca<sup>2+</sup> (Bakiri et al., 2008; Han et al., 2009; Dong et al., 2017). Activation of mitogen-activated protein kinases (MAPKs), endoplasmic reticulum stress and the caspase proteins are strongly linked to cell death (Dong et al., 2017; Tran et al., 2017). MK-801 has been shown to affect c-Jun N-terminal kinase, p38 MAPK, caspase-3 and Bax signaling (Wang et al., 2011; Sanchez et al., 2016; Tran et al., 2017). Furthermore, MK-801 protects against oligodendrocyte death and demyelination by reducing Ca<sup>2+</sup> overload in the cytosol (Matute, 2007).

#### Neuroinflammation modulation

Rapid activation of microglia and astrocytes following the initial trauma induces the inflammatory response, further leading to disruption of the blood-brain barrier and the recruitment of peripheral immune cells in the lesion area (Kuhlmann et al., 2009; Kaindl et al., 2012). The NMDA receptor has been argued to play an important role in microglial activation (Li et al., 2017). Glutamate, NMDA, interleukin-1 $\beta$  and tumor necrosis factor- $\alpha$  promote microglial activation by directly or indirectly activating NMDA receptors (Matute, 2007; Ye et al., 2013; Olmos and Lladó, 2014). Blocking NMDA receptors with MK-801 prevents the inflammation triggered by microglial activation and the ensuing neurotoxicity (Streit et al., 1992; Morkuniene et al., 2015). MAPK, protein kinase C, nuclear factor-kappa B (NF-KB), Janus kinase (JAK)/signal transducer and activator of transcription 3 (STAT3) are important downstream effectors of the NMDA receptor that are involved in microglial M1 polarization. These signaling effectors are downregulated by MK-801 in vivo and in vitro (Kawamoto et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2017; Ding et al., 2018). Therefore, MK-801 may reduce neuroinflammation by inhibiting activation of the NMDA receptor and its downstream effectors (de Sá Lima et al., 2013; Li et al., 2017).

#### Antioxidant stress

Oxidative stress, primarily resulting from mitochondrial or endoplasmic reticulum dysfunction, is a key factor in various pathological and functional changes (Dong et al., 2017; Chien et al., 2018). Excessive reactive oxygen species production can lead to inflammation, perturbation of ionic homeostasis, DNA damage and cell death in the central nervous system (Kaindl et al., 2012; Milton and Smith, 2018; Nagalakshmi et al., 2018). Hyperactivation of NMDA receptors contributes to excessive Ca2+ influx, a decrease in superoxide dismutase, and an increase in oxidative stress (Zieminska et al., 2017). MK-801 protects against mitochondrial and endoplasmic reticulum dysfunction by inhibiting oxidative stress and reactive oxygen species production (Massari et al., 2016; Dong et al., 2017). Although the underlying molecular mechanisms are still unclear, MK-801 may exert neuroprotection by reducing Ca<sup>2+</sup> influx and inhibiting protein kinase C signaling (Liu et al., 2017; Zieminska et al., 2017).

Hyperactivation of NMDA receptors leads to astrogliosis and glial scarring (Ebrahimi et al., 2012). MK-801 treatment in neuropathic pain models inhibits astrocyte activation and glial fibrillary acidic protein expression (Wang et al., 2017; Jha et al., 2018). The extracellular signal-regulated kinase or JAK/STAT3 signal associated with

the NMDA receptor may be involved in the anti-astrogliotic effect of MK-801 (Sutton and Chandler, 2002; Sriram et al., 2004).

#### **Regulation of neurotrophic factors**

Brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF), a member of the neurotrophin family of signaling molecules, plays a key role in neuroplasticity and neuroregeneration (Garraway et al., 2016). Pro-BDNF, the precursor protein, may exert some effects that are opposite to those of mature BDNF (Zhao et al., 2017). A variety of studies have reported an upregulation of BDNF mRNA associated with the activation of NMDA reporter in the cerebral cortex and hippocampus during the early stage of traumatic brain injury and ischemic stroke (Hughes et al., 1993; Felderhoff-Mueser et al., 2002; Sönmez et al., 2015; Zhao et al., 2017). Transcriptional activation of the BDNF gene increases production of pro-BDNF, leading to activation of p75NTR, which may exacerbate brain injury (Garraway et al., 2016). MK-801 administration in rats with brain injury suppresses the excessive increase in BDNF mRNA, and might therefore reduce the production of pro-BDNF to inhibit the events leading to microglial proliferation, oxidative stress and neural cell death (Dietrich et al., 2000; Zhu et al., 2015). Following the acute phase, the expression of BDNF mRNA and protein gradually decreases (Al-Amin et al., 2011). It was suggested that stroke patients in the chronic stage have lower BDNF levels compared with healthy participants (Pascotini et al., 2018). Interestingly, MK-801 administration was reported to reverse the lower expression of BDNF protein in rats with neuropathy during the subacute and chronic stages, and to be neuroprotective against neuronal loss and the associated cognitive impairment (Sönmez et al., 2015). The neuroprotective effect of MK-801 might involve BDNF-mediated CREB activation (You et al., 2019). However, the complex relationship between MK-801 and BDNF is still poorly understood.

#### Strengths and limitations

To our knowledge, our present study is the first meta-analysis to quantitatively evaluate MK-801 efficacy, in an effort to assess its potential for clinical trials and translation. An understanding of the optimal timing and route of administration, dose, efficacy, safety and mechanism of action of a drug is crucial for effective clinical translation. Here, we combined systematic review and traditional review to comprehensively analyze these parameters for MK-801.

Controlling variables is key to assessing the effects of a drug. Traditional subgroup analysis can only control for a single variable, and the remaining heterogeneity can diminish the credibility of the pooled results. Therefore, subgroup analysis is a feasible method for reducing heterogeneity and obtaining more reliable results. Given the high heterogeneity in subgroup analysis, we conducted sub-subgroup analysis for the MCAO subgroup. Despite no obvious reduction in heterogeneity, our findings show that MK-801 is effective for ischemic brain injury. Furthermore, our analyses suggest that the NMDA receptor is a promising pharmacological target for ABI treatment. Our findings should advance our understanding of the underlying pathological mechanisms and promote the development of new effective therapies for ABI.

Substantial between-study heterogeneity for treatment effect was identified in our review, which may seem a barrier to a meaningful analysis. Heterogeneity is usually a complicated problem. Complex variables likely contribute to the heterogeneity. It is difficult to reduce the heterogeneity by subgroup analysis, which can only limit one or two variables. The use of meta-analysis for heterogeneous studies is akin to comparing apples with oranges. However, a large number of studies with a consistent result can enhance reliability.

Unfortunately, studies of traumatic brain injury or hemorrhagic brain injury are limited. The pooled meta-analysis results mirrored the efficacy of MK-801 in the MCAO model. The neuroprotective effects of MK-801 in traumatic brain injury and hemorrhagic brain injury remain to be confirmed by high-quality studies. Finally, as most journals publish articles with positive results, and as some authors may selectively report the beneficial over adverse outcomes, there is a potential treatment bias in the present study.

In this study, data points in the funnel plots did not observe a fully symmetric distribution, indicating a small publication bias. The bias may occur in the original study or in the selection process for inclusion in the study. Additionally, most journals publish articles with positive results, and some authors selectively report the beneficial outcomes over adverse outcomes, which may also contribute to the publication bias. The reporting bias in studies is an important factor impacting the reliability of the pooled results. Finally, financial funding is an important source of heterogeneity, and some of the studies did not report potential conflicts of interest.

MK-801 is an old drug that has been investigated for many years, and therefore has an advantage over new drugs that are not well characterized. Our current findings suggest that MK-801 has a clear neuroprotective action in models of ABI. As a corollary, our findings also suggest that the NMDA receptor is a promising pharmacological target for ABI treatment. The beneficial effects of MK-801 appear to far outweigh its adverse effects. MK-801 is therefore likely suitable for further clinical trials and may have therapeutic efficacy in the clinical treatment of ABI. However, the results should be interpreted in light of the limitations in experimental design and methodological quality of the studies included in the meta-analysis.

Author contributions: Review conception: NXY, HX, TZ; electronic literature search: NXY, LYZ; manual literature search: YJS, XYW; study selection and data extraction: NXY, LYZ, QQL; quality implementation: QQL, TSZ; external advisers: YJW, QS; data analysis: NXY, LYZ, HX, TZ; initial draft writing: NXY, LYZ, XYW, YJS, HHH; manuscript revision: QQL, HX, TZ. All authors approved the final version of the paper.

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Financial support: This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China, No. 81822050 (to QQL), 81873321 (to HX), 81673990 (to QQL), 81330085 (to QS), 81730107 (to YJW); the Shanghai Municipal Health and Family Planning Commission TCM Research Project of China, No. 2018JP014 (to HX); the Three-Year Action Plan to Promote Clinical Skills and Clinical Innovation in Municipal Hospitals of China, No. 16CR1017A (to YJW); the Shanghai Traditional Chinese Medicine Chronic Disease [Malig-nant Tumor, Bone Degenerative Disease] Clinical Medical Center of China, No. 2017ZZ01010 (to YJW); the National Ministry of Education Innovation Team of China, No. IRT1270 (to YJW); the Innovation Team of Key Fields of the Ministry of Science and Technology of China, No. 2015RA4002 (to YJW); the Outstanding Principle Investigator Project of Guanghua Hospital, Changning District, Shanghai, China, No. 2016-01 (to QS), 2016-06 (to YJW). The funding bodies played no role in the study design, in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data, in the writing of the paper, and in the decision to submit the paper for publication.

Reporting statement: This study followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement.

Ćopyright license agreement: The Copyright License Agreement has been signed by all authors before publication.

Data sharing statement: The datasets analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Plagiarism check: Checked twice by iThenticate. Peer review: Externally peer reviewed.

Open access statement: This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-ShareAlike 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and

the new creations are licensed under the identical terms. Open peer reviewer: Laura Romina Caltana, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina.

#### Additional files:

Additional Table 1: Characteristics of studies included in the meta-analysis.

Additional Figure 1: Lesion volume (%) meta-analysis of rats after brain injury. Additional Figure 2: Lesion volume subgroup analysis concerning administration routes after brain injury.

Additional Figure 3: Lesion volume subgroup analysis concerning administration time after brain injury.

Additional Figure 4: Lesion volume subgroup analysis concerning injury model after brain iniurv.

Additional Figure 5: MCAO sub-subgroup analysis concerning administration routes after brain injury. Additional Figure 6: MCAO sub-subgroup analysis concerning administration

time after brain injury

Additional file 1: Open peer review report 1.



#### Figure 8 Network analysis of the effects of MK-801 administration dose.

(A) Forest plot of pairwise comparison of different MK-801 doses according to subgroup. (B) Probability analysis of different sequences in studies of all injury models. (C) Forest plot of pairwise comparison of different MK-801 doses according to sub-subgroup. (D) Probability analysis of different sequences in studies of MCAO models. 1: Control; 2: 0-1 mg; 3: 1-3 mg; 4: 5-10 mg.





#### Figure 9 Funnel plot analysis.

(A) Funnel plot analysis of the effects of MK-801 on brain injury. (B) Funnel plot analysis of the effects of MK-801 in the middle cerebral artery occlusion model subgroup.



#### Figure 10 Potential molecular mechanisms underlying the neuroprotective action of MK-801 against acute brain injury.

Under pathological conditions, excessive activation of glutamate receptors or Ca2+ influx induces oxidative stress, glial cell activation, and neuronal or oligodendrocyte cell death by affecting downstream signaling pathways, such as PKC, MAPK and PI3K/AKT. MK-801, an antagonist of the NMDA receptor, downregulates PKC and MAPK to suppress neuroinflammation. It also inhibits the JNK and p38 MAPK pathways and downstream apoptosis-related molecules to alleviate neural cell loss, reduce oxidative stress and promote functional recovery. Interestingly, MK-801 seems to have opposing effects on BDNF expression. MK-801 can prevent the excessive increase in BDNF mRNA in the early stage of brain injury and increase BDNF levels in the chronic stage. These contrasting effects reduce acute injury and promote the survival and regeneration of neural cells. IL-1ß: Interleukin 1 beta; MAPK: mitogen-activated protein kinase; STAT3: signal transducer and activator of transcription 3; TNFR: tumor necrosis factor receptor; TNF-a: tumor necrosis factor a; JNK: c-Jun N-terminal kinase; Bax: Bcl-2-associated X; BDNF: brain-derived neurotrophic factor; PI3K: phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase; ERK: extracellular signal-regulated kinase; PKC: protein kinase C; ROS: reactive oxygen species.

Yi NX, Zhou LY, Wang XY, Song YJ, Han HH, Zhang TS, Wang YJ, Shi Q, Xu H, Liang QQ, Zhang T (2019) MK-801 attenuates lesion
expansion following acute brain injury in rats: a meta-analysis. Neural Regen Res 14(11):1919-1931. doi:10.4103/1673-5374.259619

	Expe	erimenta	ıl	С	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
12.1.1 dose (0,1]									
Pschorn U 1993	75.97	10.85	5	250.52	41.6	5	2.0%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87]	
Memezawa H 1995	27.01	46.49	8	157.76	83.78	7	1.0%	-130.75 [-200.68, -60.82]	
Hanon E 2001	107	22.3	9	211	23.8	12	2.9%	-104.00 [-123.84, -84.16]	
Herz RC 1998		17.46	7	154.41	20.22	7	2.9%	-100.18 [-119.97, -80.39]	
Mackensen GB 2000	35	35	16	125	72	16	1.9%	-90.00 [-129.23, -50.77]	
Sarraf-Yazdi S 1998	100	65	18	182	63	18	1.8%	-82.00 [-123.82, -40.18]	
Sarraf-Yazdi S 1999	81	60	18	163	36	12	2.2%	-82.00 [-116.40, -47.60]	
Takamatsu H 1998	126.1	20.3	8	202.4	8.5	9	3.1%	-76.30 [-91.42, -61.18]	
Gorgulu A 2000	90.55	8.49		162.29		10	3.2%	-71.74 [-83.14, -60.34]	
Margaill   1996	169	30	9	239	30	9	2.5%	-70.00 [-97.72, -42.28]	
Lo EH 1994	49	27	6	118	44	6	1.9%	-69.00 [-110.31, -27.69]	
Pan DQ 2003	94.29	8.94		144.65	7.37	5 9	3.3%	-50.36 [-60.52, -40.20]	
Katsuta K 1995		43.05		145.99	36.46		2.3%	-50.03 [-81.43, -18.63]	+
Gill R 1991	92.47 79.71	16.15 8.49	24 14	141.97 127	4.68	24 6	3.4% 3.4%	-49.50 [-56.23, -42.77]	-
Park CK 1988 Herz RC 1998	45.96	3.68	6	92.83	7 3.68	6	3.4%	-47.29 [-54.44, -40.14] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71]	-
Bielenberg GW 1991	40.50	23.1	8	99.1	26.9	9	2.7%	-41.10 [-64.87, -17.33]	
Roussel S 1992	73.81		9	110.71	22.62	10	2.7%	-36.90 [-60.87, -12.93]	
Xue D 1994	170	33	11	181	32	15	2.6%	-11.00 [-36.35, 14.35]	
Margaill   1996	200	40	8	209	14	8	2.4%	-9.00 [-38.37, 20.37]	
Dawson DA 1994	50.71		9		11.43	10	3.2%	-8.35 [-20.82, 4.12]	
Onal MZ 1997	179.1	78.5	7	175.2	89.3	8	0.7%	3.90 [-81.02, 88.82]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		10.0	232		00.0	221	55.3%	-60.77 [-70.98, -50.56]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 41	5.69: CI	hi² = 203		= 21 (P <	< 0.0000				
Test for overall effect: Z =						.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
12.1.2 dose (1,3]									
Buchan AM 1992	41	19	9	150	43	9	2.3%	-109.00 [-139.71, -78.29]	
Foster KA 2009	112.82	20.5	41	200.71		41	3.3%	-87.89 [-97.52, -78.26]	+
Moyanova SG 2007	85.5	5.2	13	170.5	22.7	24	3.3%	-85.00 [-94.51, -75.49]	-
Regan HK 2007	130	24	20	211	28	17	3.0%	-81.00 [-97.96, -64.04]	
Shen SY 2003	60.8	7.76	18	140.6	14.81	18	3.3%	-79.80 [-87.52, -72.08]	-
lijima T 1992	58	11.5	6	108	38.5	6	2.3%	-50.00 [-82.15, -17.85]	
Cam E 2008	23.12	21.1	5	73.12	23.2	5	2.5%	-50.00 [-77.49, -22.51]	
Gill R 1992	121.32	19.82	16	159.8	20.7	16	3.1%	-38.48 [-52.52, -24.44]	
Bertorelli R 1998	24.6	4	4	44.5	3	4	3.4%	-19.90 [-24.80, -15.00]	• •
Subtotal (95% CI)			132			140	26.5%	-66.55 [-90.89, -42.21]	<b>•</b>
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 12				lf = 8 (P <	< 0.0000	01); l² =	98%		
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 5.36 (P	' < 0.000	101)						
12.1.3 dose [5,10]									
Katsuta K 1995	73.39	39.68	7	145.99	36.46	9	2.0%	-72.60 [-110.43, -34.77]	
Dirnagl U 1990	165	63	15	231	22	13	2.2%	-66.00 [-100.05, -31.95]	
Relton JK 1996	26.87	6.37	8	78.88	13.06	8	3.3%	-52.01 [-62.08, -41.94]	+
Buchan AM 1992	145.29			186.23	7.86	31	3.4%	-40.94 [-45.71, -36.17]	-
Roussel S 1992	73.81	25.1		110.71		9	2.8%	-36.90 [-57.40, -16.40]	
Bielenberg GW 1991	77.5	32.4	6	99.1	26.9	9	2.3%	-21.60 [-52.92, 9.72]	
Dirnagl U 1990	186	33	12	197	51	11	2.1%	-11.00 [-46.45, 24.45]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			91			90	18.1%	-43.35 [-53.33, -33.38]	▼
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 73 Test for overall effect: Z =				6 (P = 0.0	14); l² = 1	54%			
rescior overall ellett. Z -	- 0.02 (F	0.000	,						.
Total (95% CI)			455				100.0%	-59.23 [-67.53, -50.93]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 52				= 37 (P <	0.0000	01); l² =	94%		-200 -100 0 100 200
Test for overall effect: Z =									Favours MK-801 Favours control
Toot for outparoun difford	mana: A	hiz - 7 0	4 46-	2/D = 0	DOX 12 -	74 604			

#### Figure 7 MCAO sub-subgroup analysis of administration dose after brain injury. Most studies show that MK-

801 decreases lesion volume in the rat MCAO model. MCAO: Middle cerebral artery occlusion.

### References

Al-Amin H, Sarkis R, Atweh S, Jabbur S, Saadé N (2011) Chronic dizocilpine or apomorphine and development of neuropathy in two animal models II: effects on brain cytokines and neurotrophins. Exp Neurol 228:30-40.

Test for subgroup differences; Chi<sup>2</sup> = 7.01, df = 2 (P = 0.03), l<sup>2</sup> = 71.5%

- Allahtavakoli M, Shabanzadeh A, Roohbakhsh A, Pourshanazari A (2007) Combination therapy of rosiglitazone, a peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor-gamma ligand, and NMDA receptor antagonist (MK-801) on experimental embolic stroke in rats. Basic Clin Pharmacol Toxicol 101:309-314.
- Ao K, Ho C, Wang C, Wang J, Chio C, Kuo J (2017) The increased risk of stroke in early insomnia following traumatic brain injury: a population-based cohort study. Sleep Med 37:187-192.
- Ashioti M, Beech JS, Lowe AS, Bernanos M, McCreary A, Modo MM, Williams SC (2009) Neither in vivo MRI nor behavioural assessment indicate therapeutic efficacy for a novel 5HT1A agonist in rat models of ischaemic stroke. BMC Neurosci 10:82.
- Bakiri Y, Hamilton NB, Káradóttir R, Attwell D (2008) Testing NMDA receptor block as a therapeutic strategy for reducing ischaemic damage to CNS white matter. Glia 56:233-240.
- Balabanski AH, Newbury J, Leyden JM, Arima H, Anderson CS, Castle S, Cranefield J, Paterson T, Thrift AG, Katzenellenbogen J, Brown A, Kleinig TJ (2018) Excess stroke incidence in young Aboriginal people in South Australia: pooled results from two population-based studies. Int J Stroke 13:811-814
- Bederson JB, Pitts LH, Tsuji M, Nishimura MC, Davis RL, Bartkowski H (1986) Rat middle cerebral artery occlusion: evaluation of the model and development of a neurologic examination. Stroke 17:472-476.

Bertorelli R, Adami M, Di Santo E, Ghezzi P (1998) MK 801 and dexamethasone reduce both tumor necrosis factor levels and lesion volume after focal cerebral ischemia in the rat brain. Neurosci Lett 246:41-44.

- Bielenberg GW, Beck T (1991) The effects of dizocilpine (MK-801), phencyclidine, and nimodipine on Lesion size 48 h after middle cerebral artery occlusion in the rat. Brain Res 552:338-342.
- Buchan AM, Slivka A, Xue D (1992) The effect of the NMDA receptor antagonist MK-801 on cerebral blood flow and Lesion volume in experimental focal stroke. Brain Res 574:171-177.
- Cam E, Yulug B, Ozan E (2008) MK 801: a possible neuroprotective agent by poststroke depression? J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci 20:367-368.
- Chen HSV, Wang YF, Rayudu PV, Edgecomb P, Neill JC, Segal MM, Lipton SA, Jensen FE (1998) Neuroprotective concentrations of the N-methyl-D-aspartate open-channel blocker memantine are effective without cytoplasmic vacuolation following post-ischemic administration and do not block maze learning or long-term potentiation. Neuroscience 86:1121-1132.
- Chen S, Dong Z, Cheng M, Zhao Y, Wang M, Sai N, Wang X, Liu H, Huang G, Zhang X (2017) Homocysteine exaggerates microglia activation and neuroinflammation through microglia localized STAT3 overactivation following ischemic stroke. J Neuroinflammation 14:187.
- Chien L, Liang MZ, Chang CY, Wang C, Chen L (2018) Mitochondrial therapy promotes regeneration of injured hippocampal neurons. Biochim Biophys Acta 1864:3001-3012.
- Dawson DA, Graham DI, McCulloch J, Macrae IM (1994) Anti-ischaemic efficacy of a nitric oxide synthase inhibitor and a N-methyl-d-aspartate receptor antagonist in models of transient and permanent focal cerebral ischaemia. Br J Pharmacol 113:247-253.

- de Sá Lima L, Kawamoto EM, Munhoz CD, Kinoshita PF, Orellana AMM, Curi R, Rossoni LV, Avellar MCW, Scavone C (2013) Ouabain activates NFκB through an NMDA signaling pathway in cultured cerebellar cells. Neuropharmacology 73:327-336.
- Dietrich WD, Truettner J, Prado R, Stagliano NE, Zhao W, Busto R, Ginsberg MD, Watson BD (2000) Thromboembolic events lead to cortical spreading depression and expression of c-fos, brain-derived neurotrophic factor, glial fibrillary acidic protein, and heat shock protein 70 mRNA in rats. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab 20:103-111.
- Ding Y, Qian J, Li H, Shen H, Li X, Kong Y, Xu Z, Chen G (2018) Effects of SC99 on cerebral ischemia-perfusion injury in rats: selective modulation of microglia polarization to M2 phenotype via inhibiting JAK2-STAT3 pathway. Neurosci Res doi: 10.1016/j.neures.2018.05.002.
- Dirnagl U, Tanabe J, Pulsinelli W (1990) Pre- and post-treatment with MK-801 but not pretreatment alone reduces neocortical damage after focal cerebral ischemia in the rat. Brain Res 527:62.
- Dong Y, Kalueff AV, Song C (2017) N-methyl-D-aspartate receptor-mediated calcium overload and endoplasmic reticulum stress are involved in interleukin-1beta-induced neuronal apoptosis in rat hippocampus. J Neuroimmunol 307:7-13.
- Duris K, Splichal Z, Jurajda M (2018) The role of inflammatory response in stroke associated programmed cell death. Curr Neuropharmacol 16:1365-1374.
- Ebrahimi F, Koch M, Pieroh P, Ghadban C, Hobusch C, Bechmann I, Dehghani F (2012) Time dependent neuroprotection of mycophenolate mofetil: effects on temporal dynamics in glial proliferation, apoptosis, and scar formation. J Neuroinflammation 9:89.
- Felderhoff-Mueser U, Sifringer M, Pesditschek S, Kuckuck H, Moysich A, Bittigau P, Ikonomidou C (2002) Pathways leading to apoptotic neurodegeneration following trauma to the developing rat brain. Neurobiol Dis 11:231-245.
- Fisher M, Feuerstein G, Howells DW, Hurn PD, Kent TA, Savitz SI, Lo EH (2009) Update of the stroke therapy academic industry roundtable preclinical recommendations. Stroke 40:2244-2250.
- Foster KA, Regan HK, Danziger AP, Detwiler T, Kwon N, Rickert K, Lynch JJ, Regan CP (2009) Attenuation of edema and Lesion volume following focal cerebral ischemia by early but not delayed administration of a novel small molecule KDR kinase inhibitor. Neurosci Res 63:10-16.
- Frazzini VI, Winfree CJ, Choudhri HF, Prestigiacomo CJ, Solomon RA (1994) Mild hypothermia and MK-801 have similar but not additive degrees of cerebroprotection in the rat permanent focal ischemia model. Neurosurgery 34:1040-1045.
- Garraway SM, Huie JR (2016) Spinal plasticity and behavior: BDNF-induced neuromodulation in uninjured and injured spinal cord. Neural Plast 2016:1-19.
- Gill R, Andiné P, Hillered L, Persson L, Hagberg H (2016) The effect of MK-801 on cortical spreading depression in the penumbral zone following focal ischaemia in the rat. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab 12:371-379.
- Gill R, Brazell C, Woodruff GN, Kemp JA (1991) The neuroprotective action of dizocilpine (MK-801) in the rat middle cerebral artery occlusion model of focal ischaemia. Br J Pharmacol 103:2030-2036.
- Gorgulu A, Kins T, Cobanoglu S, Unal F, Izgi NI, Yanik B, Kucuk M (2000) Reduction of edema and Lesionion by Memantine and MK-801 after focal cerebral ischaemia and reperfusion in rat. Acta Neurochir (Wien) 142:1287-1292.
- Green EJ, Pazos AJ, Dietrich WD, McCabe PM, Schneiderman N, Lin B, Busto R, Globus MY, Ginsberg MD (1995) Combined postischemic hypothermia and delayed MK-801 treatment attenuates neurobehavioral deficits associated with transient global ischemia in rats. Brain Res 702:145-152.
- Hamm RJ, O'Dell DM, Pike BR, Lyeth BG (1993) Cognitive impairment following traumatic brain injury: the effect of pre- and post-injury administration of scopolamine and MK-801. Brain Res Cogn Brain Res 1:223-226.
- Han R, Hu J, Weng Y, Li D, Huang Y (2009) NMDA receptor antagonist MK-801 reduces neuronal damage and preserves learning and memory in a rat model of traumatic brain injury. Neurosci Bull 25:367-375.
- Hanon E, Klitgaard H (2001) Neuroprotective properties of the novel antiepileptic drug levetiracetam in the rat middle cerebral artery occlusion model of focal cerebral ischemia. Seizure 10:287-293.
- Herz RC, Kasbergen CM, Versteeg DH, De Wildt DJ (1998) The effect of the adrenocorticotropin-(4-9) analogue, ORG 2766, and of dizolcipine (MK-801) on Lesion volume in rat brain. Eur J Pharmacol 346:159-165.
- Hu Z, Ma H, Fan Q, Yin J, Wei M, Lin Y, Fan M, Sun C (2014) A new method for evaluation of motor injury after acute brain ischemic damage. Int J Neurosci 125:298-306.
- Hughes P, Beilharz E, Gluckman P, Dragunow M (1993) Brain-derived neurotrophic factor is induced as an immediate early gene following N-methyl-D-aspartate receptor activation. Neuroscience 57:319-328.

- Iijima T, Mies G, Hossmann KA (2016) Repeated negative DC deflections in rat cortex following middle cerebral artery occlusion are abolished by MK-801: effect on volume of ischemic injury. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab 12:727-733.
- Jha MK, Jo M, Kim J, Suk K (2018) Microglia-astrocyte crosstalk: an intimate molecular conversation. Neuroscientist doi: 10.1177/1073858418783959.
- Jolliffe L, Lannin NA, Cadilhac DA, Hoffmann T (2018) Systematic review of clinical practice guidelines to identify recommendations for rehabilitation after stroke and other acquired brain injuries. BMJ Open 8:e018791.
- Kaindl AM, Degos V, Peineau S, Gouadon E, Chhor V, Loron G, Le Charpentier T, Josserand J, Ali C, Vivien D, Collingridge GL, Lombet A, Issa L, Rene F, Loeffler JP, Kavelaars A, Verney C, Mantz J, Gressens P (2012) Activation of microglial N-methyl-D-aspartate receptors triggers inflammation and neuronal cell death in the developing and mature brain. Ann Neurol 72:536-549.
- Katsuta K, Nakanishi H, Shirakawa K, Yoshida K, Takagi K, Tamura A (2016) The neuroprotective effect of the novel noncompetitive NMDA antagonist, FR115427 in focal cerebral ischemia in rats. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab 15:345-348.
- Kawai N, Nakamura T, Okauchi M, Nagao S (2000) Effects of hypothermia on intracranial hemodynamics and ischemic brain damage-studies in the rat acute subdural hematoma model. Acta Neurochir Suppl 76:529-533.
- Kawamoto EM, Lima LS, Munhoz CD, Yshii LM, Kinoshita PF, Amara FG, Pestana RRF, Orellana AMM, Cipolla-Neto J, Britto LRG, Avellar MCW, Rossoni LV, Scavone C (2012) Influence of N-methyl-D-aspartate receptors on ouabain activation of nuclear factor-κB in the rat hippocampus. J Neurosci Res 90:213-228.
- Kuhlmann CRW, Zehendner CM, Gerigk M, Closhen D, Bender B, Friedl P, Luhmann HJ (2009) MK801 blocks hypoxic blood-brain-barrier disruption and leukocyte adhesion. Neurosci Lett 449:168-172.
- Kunz WG, Hunink MG, Dimitriadis K, Huber T, Dorn F, Meinel FG, Sabel BO, Othman AE, Reiser MF, Ertl-Wagner B, Sommer WH, Thierfelder KM (2018) Cost-effectiveness of endovascular therapy for acute ischemic stroke: a systematic review of the impact of patient age. Radiology 288:518-526.
- Li L, Wu Y, Bai Z, Hu Y, Li W (2017) Blockade of NMDA receptors decreased spinal microglia activation in bee venom induced acute inflammatory pain in rats. Neurol Res 39:271-280.
- Liu XG, Feng YP (1995) Protective effect of DL-3-N-butylphalide on ischemic neurological damage and abnormal behavior in rats subjected to focal ischemia. Acta Pharm Sin B 30:896-903.
- Liu Z, Hu S, Zhong Q, Tian C, Ma H, Yu J (2017) N-methyl-D-aspartate receptor-driven calcium influx potentiates the adverse effects of myocardial ischemia-reperfusion injury ex vivo. J Cardiovasc Pharmacol 70:329-338.
- Lo EH, Matsumoto K, Pierce AR, Garrido L, Luttinger D (2016) Pharmacologic reversal of acute changes in diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging in focal cerebral ischemia. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab 14:597-603.
- Lyden PD, Lonzo L (1994) Combination therapy protects ischemic brain in rats. A glutamate antagonist plus a gamma-aminobutyric acid agonist. Stroke 25:189-196.
- Maas AIR, Menon DK, Adelson PD, Andelic N, Bell MJ, Belli A, Bragge P, Brazinova A, Büki A, Chesnut RM, Citerio G, Coburn M, Cooper DJ, Crowder AT, Czeiter E, Czosnyka M, Diaz-Arrastia R, Dreier JP, Duhaime A, Ercole A, et al. (2017) Traumatic brain injury: integrated approaches to improve prevention, clinical care, and research. Lancet Neurol 16:987-1048.
- Mackensen GB, Nellgård B, Sarraf-Yazdi S, Franklin D, Steffen RP, Grocott HP, Warner DS (2000) Post-ischemic RSR13 amplifies the effect of dizocilpine on outcome from transient focal cerebral ischemia in the rat. Brain Res 853:15-21.
- Margaill I, Parmentier S, Callebert J, Allix M, Boulu RG, Plotkine M (2016) Short therapeutic window for MK-801 in transient focal cerebral ischemia in normotensive rats. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab 16:107-113.
- Massari CM, Castro AA, Dal-Cim T, Lanznaster D, Tasca CI (2016) In vitro 6-hydroxydopamine-induced toxicity in striatal, cerebrocortical and hippocampal slices is attenuated by atorvastatin and MK-801. Toxicol In Vitro 37:162-168.
- Matute C (2007) Interaction between glutamate signalling and immune attack in damaging oligodendrocytes. Neuron Glia Biol 3:281-285.
- Memezawa H, Zhao Q, Smith ML, Siesjo BK (1995) Hyperthermia nullifies the ameliorating effect of dizocilpine maleate (MK-801) in focal cerebral ischemia. Brain Res 670:48-52.
- Milton M, Smith PD (2018) It's all about timing: the involvement of Kir4.1 channel regulation in acute ischemic stroke pathology. Front Cell Neurosci 12:36.

- Morkuniene R, Cizas P, Jankeviciute S, Petrolis R, Arandarcikaite O, Krisciukaitis A, Borutaite V (2015) Small Aβ1-42 oligomer-induced membrane depolarization of neuronal and microglial cells: role of N-methyl-D-aspartate receptors. J Neurosci Res 93:475-486.
- Moyanova S, Kortenska L, Mitreva R (2009) Endothelin-1-induced cerebral ischemia: effects of ketanserin and MK-801 on limb placing in rats. Int J Neurosci 117:1361-1381.
- Moyanova SG, Kortenska LV, Mitreva RG, Pashova VD, Ngomba RT, Nicoletti F (2007) Multimodal assessment of neuroprotection applied to the use of MK-801 in the endothelin-1 model of transient focal brain ischemia. Brain Res 1153:58-67.
- Nagalakshmi B, Sagarkar S, Sakharkar AJ (2018) Epigenetic mechanisms of traumatic brain injuries. Prog Mol Biol Transl Sci 157:263-298.
- Nategh M, Shaveisi K, Shabanzadeh AP, Sadr SS, Parviz M, Ghabaei M (2010) Systemic hyperthermia masks the neuroprotective effects of mk-801, but not rosiglitazone in brain ischaemia. Basic Clin Pharmacol Toxicol 107:724-729.
- Oh SM, Betz AL (1991) Interaction between free radicals and excitatory amino acids in the formation of ischemic brain edema in rats. Stroke 22:915-921.
- Olmos G, Lladó J (2014) Tumor necrosis factor alpha: a link between neuroinflammation and excitotoxicity. Mediators Inflamm 2014:861231.
- Onal MZ, Li F, Tatlisumak T, Locke KW, Sandage BJ, Fisher M (1997) Synergistic effects of citicoline and MK-801 in temporary experimental focal ischemia in rats. Stroke 28:1060-1065.
- Pan DQ, Li CY (2003) Effects of neuroprotectant cocktails on focal cerebral ischemia in rats. Zhongguo Linchuang Kangfu 5:842-844.
- Park CK, Nehls DG, Graham DI, Teasdale GM, McCulloch J (1988) The glutamate antagonist MK-801 reduces focal ischemic brain damage in the rat. Ann Neurol 24:543-551.
- Pascotini MET, Flores DAE, Kegler MA, Konzen MV, Fornari MAL, Arend MJ, Gabbi MP, Gobo MLA, Bochi DGV, Prado DALC, de Carvalho DLM, Duarte DMMM, Da Cruz DIBM, Moresco DRN, Dos Santos DARS, Royes DLFF, Fighera DMR (2018) Brain-derived neurotrophic factor levels are lower in chronic stroke patients: a relation with manganese-dependent superoxide dismutase ALA16VAL single nucleotide polymorphism through tumor necrosis factor-α and caspases pathways. J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis 27:3020-3029.
- Pschorn U, Korperich H, Heymans L, Subramanian S, Kuhn W (1993) MRI and MRS studies on the time course of rat brain lesions and the effect of drug treatment: volume quantification and characterization of tissue heterogeneity by parameter selection. Magn Reson Med 30:174-182.
- Qian Y, Tang X, Guan T, Li Y, Sun H (2016) Neuroprotection by combined administration with maslinic acid, a natural product from olea europaea, and mk-801 in the cerebral ischemia model. Molecules 21:1093.
- Regan HK, Detwiler TJ, Huang JC, Lynch JJ, Regan CP (2007) An improved automated method to quantitate Lesion volume in triphenyltetrazolium stained rat brain sections. J Pharmacol Toxicol Methods 56:339-343.
- Relton JK, Martin D, Thompson RC, Russell DA (1996) Peripheral administration of interleukin-1 receptor antagonist inhibits brain damage after focal cerebral ischemia in the rat. Exp Neurol 138:206-213.
- Roussel S, Pinard E, Seylaz J (1992) Effect of MK-801 on focal brain infarction in normotensive and hypertensive rats. Hypertension 19:40-46.
- Sanchez AB, Medders KE, Maung R, Sánchez-Pavón P, Ojeda-Juárez D, Kaul M (2016) CXCL12-induced neurotoxicity critically depends on NMDA receptor-gated and l-type Ca<sup>2+</sup> channels upstream of p38 MAPK. J Neuroinflammation 13:252.
- Sarraf-Yazdi S, Sheng H, Grocott HP, Bart RD, Pearlstein RD, Steffen RP, Warner DS (1999) Effects of RSR13, a synthetic allosteric modifier of hemoglobin, alone and in combination with dizocilpine, on outcome from transient focal cerebral ischemia in the rat. Brain Res 826:172-180.
- Sarraf-Yazdi S, Sheng H, Miura Y, McFarlane C, Dexter F, Pearlstein R, Warner DS (1998) Relative neuroprotective effects of dizocilpine and isoflurane during focal cerebral ischemia in the rat. Anesth Analg 87:72-78.
- Shapira Y, Setton D, Artru AA, Shohami E (1993) Blood-brain barrier permeability, cerebral edema, and neurologic function after closed head injury in rats. Anesth Analg 77:141-148.
- Shen SY, Fu XD, Fei ZY (2003) The effects of MK-801 on hippocampal N-methyl-D-aspartic acid receptor of focal cerebral ischemia in rats. Zhongguo Xingwei Yixue Kexue 12:489-490, 577.
- Shirasaki Y, Edo N, Sato T (2004) Serum S-100b protein as a biomarker for the assessment of neuroprotectants. Brain Res 1021:159-166.

- Sommer JB, Bach A, Malá H, Strømgaard K, Mogensen J, Pickering DS (2017) In vitro and in vivo effects of a novel dimeric inhibitor of PSD-95 on excitotoxicity and functional recovery after experimental traumatic brain injury. Eur J Neurosc 45:238-248.
- Song X, Jensen MØ, Jogini V, Stein RA, Lee C, Mchaourab HS, Shaw DE, Gouaux E (2018) Mechanism of NMDA receptor channel block by MK-801 and memantine. Nature 556:515-519.
- Sönmez A, Sayın O, Gürgen SG, Çalişir M (2015) Neuroprotective effects of MK-801 against traumatic brain injury in immature rats. Neurosci Lett 597:137-142.
- Sriram K, Benkovic SA, Hebert MA, Miller DB, O'Callaghan JP (2004) Induction of gp130-related cytokines and activation of JAK2/STAT3 pathway in astrocytes precedes up-regulation of glial fibrillary acidic protein in the 1-methyl-4-phenyl-1,2,3,6-tetrahydropyridine model of neurodegeneration. J Biol Chem 279:19936-19947.
- Streit WJ, Morioka T, Kalehua AN (1992) MK-801 prevents microglial reaction in rat hippocampus after forebrain ischemia. Neuroreport 3:146-148.
- Sutton G, Chandler LJ (2002) Activity-dependent NMDA receptor-mediated activation of protein kinase B/Akt in cortical neuronal cultures. J Neurochem 82:1097-1105.
- Takamatsu H, Kondo K, Ikeda Y, Umemura K (1998) Neuroprotective effects depend on the model of focal ischemia following middle cerebral artery occlusion. Eur J Pharmacol 362:137-142.
- Tran H, Chung YH, Shin E, Tran T, Jeong JH, Jang C, Nah S, Yamada K, Nabeshima T, Kim H (2017) MK-801, but not naloxone, attenuates highdose dextromethorphan-induced convulsive behavior: possible involvement of the GluN2B receptor. Toxicol Appl Pharmacol 334:158-166.
- Uchida K, Nakakimura K, Kuroda Y, Haranishi Y, Matsumoto M, Sakabe T (2001) Dizocilpine but not ketamine reduces the volume of ischaemic damage after acute subdural haematoma in the rat. Eur J Anaesthesiol 18:295-302.
- Wang J, Qiao Y, Yang R, Zhang C, Wu H, Lin J, Zhang T, Chen T, Li Y, Dong Y, Li J (2017) The synergistic effect of treatment with triptolide and MK-801 in the rat neuropathic pain model. Mol Pain doi: 10.1177/1744806917746564.
- Wang W, Jiang B, Sun H, Ru X, Sun D, Wang L, Wang L, Jiang Y, Li Y, Wang Y, Chen Z, Wu S, Zhang Y, Wang D, Wang Y, Feigin VL (2017) Prevalence, incidence, and mortality of stroke in chinaclinical perspective. Circulation 135:759-771.
- Wang W, Mei X, Wei Y, Zhang M, Zhang T, Wang W, Xu L, Wu S, Li Y (2011) Neuronal NR2B-containing NMDA receptor mediates spinal astrocytic c-Jun N-terminal kinase activation in a rat model of neuropathic pain. Brain Behav Immun 25:1355-1366.
- Wenbin A, Chuanyi H, Yuhong C (2000) Effect of MK-801 on brain edema following traumatic brain injury in rats. Shiyong Yixue Jinxiu Zazhi 2:93-95.
- Wexler EJ, Peters EE, Gonzales A, Gonzales ML, Slee AM, Kerr JS (2002) An objective procedure for ischemic area evaluation of the stroke intraluminal thread model in the mouse and rat. J Neurosci Methods 113:51-58.
- Xue D, Huang Z, Barnes K, Lesiuk HJ, Smith KE, Buchan AM (2016) Delayed treatment with AMPA, but not NMDA, antagonists reduces neocortical Lesionion. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab 14:251-261.
- Ye L, Huang Y, Zhao L, Li Y, Sun L, Zhou Y, Qian G, Zheng JC (2013) IL-1 $\beta$  and TNF- $\alpha$  induce neurotoxicity through glutamate production: a potential role for neuronal glutaminase. J Neurochem 125:897-908.
- You M, Pan Y, Liu Y, Chen Y, Wu Y, Si J, Wang K, Hu F (2019) Royal jelly alleviates cognitive deficits and  $\beta$ -amyloid accumulation in APP/PS1 mouse model via activation of the CAMP/PKA/CREB/BDNF pathway and inhibition of neuronal apoptosis. Front Aging Neurosci 10:428.
- Zhao H, Alam A, San C, Eguchi S, Chen Q, Lian Q, Ma D (2017) Molecular mechanisms of brain-derived neurotrophic factor in neuro-protection: recent developments. Brain Res 1665:1-21.
- Zhu X, Dong J, Shen K, Bai Y, Zhang Y, Lv X, Chao J, Yao H (2015) NMDA receptor NR2B subunits contribute to PTZ-kindling-induced hippocampal astrocytosis and oxidative stress. Brain Res Bull 114:70-78.
- Zieminska E, Lenart J, Diamandakis D, Lazarewicz JW (2017) The role of Ca<sup>2+</sup> imbalance in the induction of acute oxidative stress and cytotoxicity in cultured rat cerebellar granule cells challenged with tetrabromobisphenol A. Neurochem Res 42:777-787.

P-Reviewer: Caltana LR; C-Editor: Zhao M; S-Editors: Wang J, Li CH; L-Editors: Patel B, Hindle A, Qiu Y, Song LP; T-Editor: Jia Y

1 2.26	otal Mean 8 34.59			Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
	8 34.59	2.01	0	the comments		
0 005		3.01	8	9.2%	-17.48 [-20.09, -14.87]	
8 3.05	8 33.28	5.19	8	8.4%	-17.10 [-21.27, -12.93]	
4 1.31	8 32.25	2.1	8	9.6%	-15.21 [-16.93, -13.49]	
5 1	13 27.7	3.7	24	9.6%	-14.20 [-15.78, -12.62]	-
9 2.46	14 31	2	6	9.5%	-11.71 [-13.76, -9.66]	
3 3.12	16 26.78	1.86	11	9.5%	-10.25 [-12.13, -8.37]	
1 2.2	6 21	7.6	6	7.1%	-10.00 [-16.33, -3.67]	
3 2.82	11 18.15	3.56	11	9.2%	-7.92 [-10.60, -5.24]	
3 0.96	10 25.88	1.16	10	9.8%	-7.85 [-8.78, -6.92]	*
7 4.19	8 57.94	4.19	8	8.5%	-1.57 [-5.68, 2.54]	
5 1.2	12 30	2	11	9.7%	-1.50 [-2.86, -0.14]	-
	114		111	100.0%	-10.44 [-13.60, -7.28]	•
	.5       1         29       2.46         33       3.12         1       2.2         23       2.82         03       0.96         87       4.19         .5       1.2	.5         1         13         27.7           29         2.46         14         31           33         3.12         16         26.78           1         2.2         6         21           23         2.82         11         18.15           30         0.96         10         25.88           37         4.19         8         57.94	55         1         13         27.7         3.7           19         2.46         14         31         2           33         3.12         16         26.78         1.86           1         2.2         6         21         7.6           23         3.62         11         18.15         3.56           33         0.96         10         25.88         1.16           37         4.19         8         57.94         4.19           5         1.2         30         2	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	55         1         13         27.7         3.7         24         9.6%           99         2.46         14         31         2         6         9.5%           53         3.12         16         26.78         1.86         11         9.5%           1         2.2         6         21         7.6         6         7.1%           13         2.82         11         18.15         3.56         11         9.2%           13         0.96         10         25.88         1.16         10         9.8%           77         4.19         8         57.94         4.19         8         8.5%           .5         1.2         12         30         2         11         9.7%	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

Additional Figure 1 Lesion volume (%) meta-analysis of rats after brain injury.

Most literatures have proved that MK-801 can decrease Lesion volume (%) after acute brain injury in rats.

		K-801	10000		ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
9.1.1 i.p.									
Buchan AM 1992	41	19	9	150	43	9		-109.00 [-139.71, -78.29]	
Hanon E 2001	107	22.3	9	211	23.8	12	2.8%	-104.00 [-123.84, -84.16]	
Foster KA 2009	112.82	20.5	41	200.71	23.88	41	3.2%	-87.89 [-97.52, -78.26]	-
Moyanova SG 2007	85.5	5.2	13	170.5	22.7	24	3.2%	-85.00 [-94.51, -75.49]	-
Sarraf-Yazdi S 1998	100	65	18	182	63	18	1.7%	-82.00 [-123.82, -40.18]	
Regan HK 2007	130	24	20	211	28	17	2.9%	-81.00 [-97.96, -64.04]	
Shen SY 2003	60.8	7.76	18	140.6	14.81	18	3.3%	-79.80 [-87.52, -72.08]	-
Katsuta K 1995	69.53	31.63	7	145.99	36.46	9	2.1%	-76.46 [-109.87, -43.05]	
Katsuta K 1995	73.39	39.68		145.99	36.46	9	1.9%	-72.60 [-110.43, -34.77]	
Gorgulu A 2000	90.55	8.49	10	162.29	16.31	10	3.2%	-71.74 [-83.14, -60.34]	-
Dirnagl U 1990	165	63	15	231	22	13	2.1%	-66.00 [-100.05, -31.95]	
Relton JK 1996	26.87	6.37	8	78.88	13.06	8	3.2%	-52.01 [-62.08, -41.94]	-
Pan DQ 2003	94.29	8.94	5	144.65	7.37	5	3.2%	-50.36 [-60.52, -40.20]	+
lijima T 1992	58	11.5	6	108	38.5	6	2.2%	-50.00 [-82.15, -17.85]	
Cam E 2008	23.12	21.1	5	73.12	23.2	5	2.4%	-50.00 [-77.49, -22.51]	
Buchan AM 1992	145.29	11.03	31	186.23	7.86	31	3.3%	-40.94 [-45.71, -36.17]	-
Gill R 1992	121.32	19.82	16	159.8	20.7	16	3.1%	-38.48 [-52.52, -24.44]	
Roussel S 1992	73.81	26.47	21	110.71	22.62	19	3.0%	-36.90 [-52.12, -21.68]	
Bielenberg GW 1991	66.36	28.13	14	99.1	26.9	9	2.6%	-32.74 [-55.67, -9.81]	
Katsuta K 1995	114.46	41.29	10	145.99	36.46	9	2.0%	-31.53 [-66.49, 3.43]	
Kawai N 2000	66.4	13.7	5	86.6	20.7	5	2.7%	-20.20 [-41.96, 1.56]	
Bertorelli R 1998	24.6	4	4	44.5	3	4	3.3%	-19.90 [-24.80, -15.00]	-
Dirnagl U 1990	186	33	12	197	51	11	2.0%	-11.00 [-46.45, 24.45]	
Xue D 1994	170	33	11	181	32	15	2.5%	-11.00 [-36.35, 14.35]	
Onal MZ 1997	179.1	78.5	7	175.2	89.3	8	0.7%	3.90 [-81.02, 88.82]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			322			331	65.0%	-55.81 [-67.19, -44.43]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	687.48; CI	ni² = 434	4.84, df	= 24 (P	< 0.0000	)1); I <sup>2</sup> =	94%		
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 9.61 (P	< 0.000	001)						
9.1.2 i.v.									
Memezawa H 1995	27.01	46.49	8	157.76		7		-130.75 [-200.68, -60.82]	
Herz RC 1998	54.23	17.46	7	154.41	20.22	7	2.8%	-100.18 [-119.97, -80.39]	
Mackensen GB 2000	35	35	16	125	72	16	1.8%	-90.00 [-129.23, -50.77]	
Sarraf-Yazdi S 1999	81	60	18	163	36	12	2.1%	-82.00 [-116.40, -47.60]	
Takamatsu H 1998	126.1	20.3	8	202.4	8.5	9	3.0%	-76.30 [-91.42, -61.18]	
Margaill I 1996	169	30	9	239	30	9	2.4%	-70.00 [-97.72, -42.28]	
Lo EH 1994	49	27	6	118	44	6	1.8%	-69.00 [-110.31, -27.69]	<u> </u>
Uchida K 2001	61	38	9	119	38	9	2.0%	-58.00 [-93.11, -22.89]	
Gill R 1991	92.47	16.15	24	141.97	4.68	24	3.3%	-49.50 [-56.23, -42.77]	-
Park CK 1988	79.71	8.49	14	127	7	6	3.3%	-47.29 [-54.44, -40.14]	-
Herz RC 1998	45.96	3.68	6	92.83	3.68	6	3.3%	-46.87 [-51.03, -42.71]	-
Lyden PD 1994	88.54	26.09	23	118.19	39.13	27	2.9%	-29.65 [-47.86, -11.44]	
Margaill   1996	200	40	8	209	14	8	2.3%	-9.00 [-38.37, 20.37]	-+-
Dawson DA 1994	50.71	15.71	9	59.06	11.43	10	3.1%	-8.35 [-20.82, 4.12]	1
Subtotal (95% CI)			165			156	35.0%	-55.15 [-66.07, -44.22]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1	285.92; CI	ni² = 107	7.42, df	= 13 (P <	< 0.0000	)1); I <sup>2</sup> =	88%		
Test for overall effect: 2									
Total (95% CI)			487			487	100.0%	-56.15 [-64.06, -48.24]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	482.02; CI	ni² = 543	2.93, df	= 38 (P	< 0.0000	)1); I <sup>2</sup> =	93%		-200 -100 0 100 20
Test for overall effect: 2									
Test for subaroup diffe	erences: C	hi² = 0.0	01. df=	1 (P = 0.	93),  ²=	0%			Favours MK-801 Favours control

## Additional Figure 2 Lesion volume subgroup analysis concerning administration routes after brain injury.

Under different administration routes, most literatures have proved that MK-801 can also decrease Lesion volume after acute brain injury in rats.

		K-801	Tatel		ontrol	Tatal	Maint	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
10.1.1 pretreatment						-			
Memezawa H 1995		46.49		157.76		7	1.1%	-130.75 [-200.68, -60.82]	
Hanon E 2001	107	22.3	9	211	23.8	12	3.1%	-104.00 [-123.84, -84.16]	
Foster KA 2009	112.82	20.5	41	200.71	23.88	41	3.5%	-87.89 [-97.52, -78.26]	
Sarraf-Yazdi S 1998	100	65	18	182	63	18	2.0%	-82.00 [-123.82, -40.18]	
Sarraf-Yazdi S 1999	81	60	18	163	36	12	2.4%	-82.00 [-116.40, -47.60]	
Regan HK 2007	130	24	20	211	28	17	3.2%	-81.00 [-97.96, -64.04]	
Shen SY 2003	60.8	7.76	18	140.6	14.81	18	3.5%	-79.80 [-87.52, -72.08]	
Park CK 1988	86	6	6	127	7	6	3.5%	-41.00 [-48.38, -33.62]	-
Roussel S 1992	73.81	26.47		110.71	22.62	19	3.3%	-36.90 [-52.12, -21.68]	1
Bielenberg GW 1991	66.36	28.13	14	99.1	26.9	9	2.9%	-32.74 [-55.67, -9.81]	
Kawai N 2000	66.4	13.7	5	86.6	20.7	5	3.0%	-20.20 [-41.96, 1.56]	
Dirnagl U 1990	186	33	12	197	51	11	2.3%	-11.00 [-46.45, 24.45]	-+-
Margaill I 1996	200	40	8	209	14	8	2.6%	-9.00 [-38.37, 20.37]	
Dawson DA 1994	50.71	15.71	9	59.06	11.43	10	3.4%	-8.35 [-20.82, 4.12]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			207			193	39.8%	-55.00 [-72.49, -37.50]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1	942.63; CI	hi² = 224	4.95, df	= 13 (P <	< 0.0000	));  ² =	94%		
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 6.16 (P	< 0.000	001)						
10.1.2 posttreatment	[0,15min]								
Mackensen GB 2000	35	35	16	125	72	16	2.1%	-90.00 [-129.23, -50.77]	
Takamatsu H 1998	126.1	20.3	8	202.4	8.5	9	3.3%	-76.30 [-91.42, -61.18]	
Gorgulu A 2000	90.55	8.49		162.29	16.31	10	3.4%	-71.74 [-83.14, -60.34]	-
Katsuta K 1995		42.54		145.99	36.46	9	2.6%	-56.61 [-85.89, -27.33]	
Cam E 2008	23.12	21.1	5	73.12	23.2	5	2.7%	-50.00 [-77.49, -22.51]	
lijima T 1992	23.12	11.5	6	108	38.5	6	2.5%	-50.00 [-82.15, -17.85]	
Gill R 1991		16.15		141.97	4.68	24	3.5%		-
				118.19		24	3.1%	-49.50 [-56.23, -42.77]	
Lyden PD 1994 Bertorelli R 1998	88.54					4	3.6%	-29.65 [-47.86, -11.44]	-
	24.6	4	4	44.5	3			-19.90 [-24.80, -15.00] -53 36 [-70 77 -35 94]	•
Subtotal (95% CI)			120			110	26.9%	-19.90 [-24.80, -15.00] -53.36 [-70.77, -35.94]	•
Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau² = :	588.06; CI	hi² = 132	120 2.32, df			110	26.9%		•
Subtotal (95% CI)	588.06; CI	hi² = 132	120 2.32, df			110	26.9%		•
Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau² = :	588.06; Cł Z = 6.01 (P	hi² = 132 ' < 0.000	120 2.32, df			110	26.9%		•
Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau² = Test for overall effect: 2	588.06; CI Z = 6.01 (P (15,30min	hi² = 132 ' < 0.000	120 2.32, df 001)			110	26.9%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94]	•
Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: 2 10.1.3 posttreatment	588.06; Cl Z = 6.01 (P (15,30min 75.97	hi² = 132 ' < 0.000	120 2.32, df 001)	= 8 (P <	0.00001 41.6	110 ); I² = 9	26.9% 14%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94]	•
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: 2 10.1.3 posttreatment Pschorn U 1993	588.06; Cl Z = 6.01 (P (15,30min 75.97	hi² = 132 ' < 0.000 I 10.85	120 2.32, df 001) 5	= 8 (P < 250.52	0.00001 41.6	110 ); I² = 9 5	26.9% 14% 2.2%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87]	• 
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: 2 10.1.3 posttreatment Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998	588.06; Cl Z = 6.01 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23	hi <sup>2</sup> = 132 < 0.000 ] 10.85 17.46	120 2.32, df 001) 5 7	<sup>2</sup> = 8 (P < 250.52 154.41	0.00001 41.6 20.22	110 ); I <sup>2</sup> = 9 5 7	26.9% 14% 2.2% 3.1%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49]	• 
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: 2 10.1.3 posttreatment Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996	588.06; Cl Z = 6.01 (P ( <b>15,30min</b> 75.97 54.23 85.5	hi <sup>2</sup> = 132 < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30	120 2.32, df 001) 5 7 13	250.52 154.41 170.5	41.6 20.22 22.7 30	110 ); I <sup>2</sup> = 9 5 7 24	26.9% 14% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 2.7%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28]	• 
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: 2 10.1.3 posttreatment Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill 1996 Uchida K 2001	588.06; CI Z = 6.01 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 61	hi <sup>z</sup> = 132 < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2	120 2.32, df 001) 5 7 13 9	250.52 154.41 170.5 239	0.00001 41.6 20.22 22.7	110 );  ² = 9 5 7 24 9	26.9% 14% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 2.7% 2.3%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -58.00 [-93.11, -22.89]	• 
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: <i>2</i> <b>10.1.3 postreatment</b> Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996 Uchida K 2001 Park CK 1988	588.06; CI Z = 6.01 (P ( <b>15,30min</b> 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 61 75	hi <sup>2</sup> = 132 < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 38 7	120 2.32, df 001) 5 7 13 9 9 8	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 119 127	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 38 7	110 );  ² = 9 5 7 24 9 9 6	26.9% 14% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 2.7% 2.3% 3.5%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -58.00 [-93.11, -22.89] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59]	• 
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.3 posttreatment</b> Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996 Uchida K 2001 Park CK 1988 Pan DQ 2003	588.06; CI Z = 6.01 (P ( <b>15,30min</b> 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 61 75 94.29	hi <sup>2</sup> = 132 < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 38 7 8.94	120 2.32, df 001) 5 7 13 9 9 8 5	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 119 127 144.65	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 38 7 7.37	110 );   <sup>2</sup> = 9 5 7 24 9 9 6 5	26.9% 14% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 2.7% 2.3% 3.5% 3.5%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -58.00 [-93.11, -22.89] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20]	• 
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: 2 10.1.3 posttreatment Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996 Uchida K 2001 Park CK 1988 Pan DQ 2003 Herz RC 1998	588.06; CI Z = 6.01 (P ( <b>15,30min</b> 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 61 75 94.29 45.96	hi <sup>2</sup> = 132 < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 38 7 8.94 3.68	120 2.32, df 001) 5 7 13 9 9 8 5 5 6	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 119 127 144.65 92.83	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 38 7 7.37 3.68	110 );   <sup>2</sup> = 9 5 7 24 9 9 6 5 6	26.9% 14% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 2.7% 2.3% 3.5% 3.5% 3.6%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -58.00 [-93.11, -22.89] -50.36 [-50.52, -40.20] -60.36 [-50.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71]	• 
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: 2 10.1.3 postreatment Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996 Uchida K 2001 Park CK 1988 Pan DQ 2003 Herz RC 1998 Gill R 1992	588.06; Cl Z = 6.01 (P 75.97 54.23 85.5 61 75 94.29 45.96 121.32	hi <sup>2</sup> = 132 < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 38 7 8.94 3.68 19.82	120 2.32, df 001) 5 7 13 9 9 8 5 6 16	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 119 127 144.65 92.83 159.8	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 38 7 7.37 3.68 20.7	110 ); I <sup>2</sup> = 9 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 5 6 16	26.9% 14% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 2.7% 2.3% 3.5% 3.5% 3.5% 3.6% 3.3%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.61, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44]	• 
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.3 postfreatment</b> Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996 Uchida K 2001 Park CK 1988 Pan DQ 2003 Herz RC 1998 Gill R 1992 Xue D 1994	588.06; CI Z = 6.01 (P ( <b>15,30min</b> 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 61 75 94.29 45.96	hi <sup>2</sup> = 132 < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 38 7 8.94 3.68	120 2.32, df 001) 5 7 13 9 9 8 5 6 16 16	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 119 127 144.65 92.83	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 38 7 7.37 3.68	110 );   <sup>2</sup> = 9 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 5 6 16 15	26.9% 14% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 2.7% 2.3% 3.5% 3.5% 3.6% 3.8% 3.3% 2.8%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -58.00 [-93.11, -22.89] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35]	• 
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: 2 10.1.3 posttreatment Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996 Uchida K 2001 Park CK 1988 Pan DQ 2003 Herz RC 1998 Gill R 1992 Xue D 1994 Subtotal (95% CI)	588.06; Ci Z = 6.01 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 61 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170	hi <sup>2</sup> = 132 < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 38 7 8.94 3.68 19.82 33	120 2.32, df 001) 5 7 13 9 9 8 5 6 16 16 11 89	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 119 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 38 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32	110 );   <sup>2</sup> = 9 5 7 24 9 9 6 5 6 16 15 102	26.9% 14% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 2.7% 2.3% 3.5% 3.5% 3.5% 3.6% 3.3% 2.8% 30.5%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.61, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44]	• 
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.3 posttreatment</b> Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996 Uchida K 2001 Park CK 1988 Pan DQ 2003 Herz RC 1998 Gill R 1992 Xue D 1994 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	588.06; Ci Z = 6.01 (P ( <b>15,30min</b> 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 61 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170 433.79; Ci	hi <sup>2</sup> = 132 < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 38 7 8.94 3.68 19.82 33 hi <sup>2</sup> = 130	120 2.32, df 001) 5 7 13 9 9 8 5 6 16 11 89 0.02, df	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 119 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 38 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32	110 );   <sup>2</sup> = 9 5 7 24 9 9 6 5 6 16 15 102	26.9% 14% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 2.7% 2.3% 3.5% 3.5% 3.5% 3.6% 3.3% 2.8% 30.5%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -58.00 [-93.11, -22.89] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35]	• 
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.3 postfreatment</b> Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996 Uchida K 2001 Park CK 1988 Pan DQ 2003 Herz RC 1998 Gill R 1992 Xue D 1994 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: <i>J</i>	588.06; Ci Z = 6.01 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 61 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170 433.79; Ci Z = 8.85 (P	hi <sup>2</sup> = 132 < < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 38 7 8.94 3.68 19.82 33 hi <sup>2</sup> = 130 < 0.000	120 2.32, df 001) 5 7 13 9 9 8 5 6 16 11 89 0.02, df	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 119 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 38 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32	110 );   <sup>2</sup> = 9 5 7 24 9 9 6 5 6 16 15 102	26.9% 14% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 2.7% 2.3% 3.5% 3.5% 3.5% 3.6% 3.3% 2.8% 30.5%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -58.00 [-93.11, -22.89] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35]	• 
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.3 posttreatment</b> Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996 Uchida K 2001 Park CK 1988 Pan DQ 2003 Herz RC 1998 Gill R 1992 Xue D 1994 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.4 posttreatment</b>	588.06; Ci Z = 6.01 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 61 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170 433.79; Ci Z = 8.85 (P (30,60min	$hi^{2} = 132$ < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 38 7 8.94 3.68 19.82 33 $hi^{2} = 130$ < 0.000	120 2.32, df 001) 5 7 13 9 9 8 5 6 16 11 89 0.02, df 001)	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 119 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181 2= 9 (P <	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 38 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32 0.00001	110 );   <sup>2</sup> = 9 5 7 24 9 9 6 5 6 16 15 102 );   <sup>2</sup> = 9	26.9% 14% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 2.7% 2.3% 3.5% 3.5% 3.5% 3.5% 3.6% 3.3%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -68.00 [-93.11, -22.89] -52.00 [-99.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35] -64.88 [-79.24, -50.51]	• 
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.3 posttreatment</b> Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996 Uchida K 2001 Park CK 1988 Pan DQ 2003 Herz RC 1998 Gill R 1992 Xue D 1994 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.4 posttreatment</b> Lo EH 1994	588.06; Ci Z = 6.01 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 61 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170 433.79; Ci Z = 8.85 (P (30,60min 49	$hi^2 = 132$ 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 38 7 8.94 3.68 19.82 33 $hi^2 = 130$ < 0.000 1 27	120 2.32, df 001) 5 7 13 9 8 8 5 6 16 11 89 0.02, df 001) 6	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 119 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181 2= 9 (P <	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 38 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32 0.00001	110 );   <sup>2</sup> = § 5 7 24 9 9 6 5 6 16 15 102 );   <sup>2</sup> = § ()	26.9% 14% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 3.5% 3.5% 3.5% 3.6% 3.3% 2.8% 30.5% 13%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-93.11, -22.89] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35] -64.88 [-79.24, -50.51] -69.00 [-110.31, -27.89]	• 
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.3 postfreatment</b> Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996 Uchida K 2001 Park CK 1988 Pan DQ 2003 Herz RC 1998 Gill R 1992 Xue D 1994 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.4 postfreatment</b> Lo EH 1994 Onal MZ 1997	588.06; Ci Z = 6.01 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 61 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170 433.79; Ci Z = 8.85 (P (30,60min	$hi^{2} = 132$ < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 38 7 8.94 3.68 19.82 33 $hi^{2} = 130$ < 0.000	120 2.32, df 001) 5 7 7 13 9 9 9 8 8 5 6 6 16 11 89 0.02, df 001) 6 7 7	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 119 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181 2= 9 (P <	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 38 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32 0.00001	110 );   <sup>2</sup> = § 5 7 24 9 9 6 5 5 6 16 15 102 );   <sup>2</sup> = § 6 8	26.9% 14% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 2.7% 2.3% 3.5% 3.5% 3.5% 3.6% 3.3% 2.8% 30.5% 30.5% 30.5%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -58.00 [-93.11, -22.89] -50.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35] -64.88 [-79.24, -50.51] -69.00 [-110.31, -27.89] 3.90 [-81.02, 88.82]	• 
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: J 10.1.3 posttreatment Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996 Uchida K 2001 Park CK 1988 Pan DQ 2003 Herz RC 1998 Gill R 1992 Xue D 1994 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: J 10.1.4 posttreatment Lo EH 1994 Onal MZ 1997 Subtotal (95% CI)	588.06; Ci Z = 6.01 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 61 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170 433.79; Ci Z = 8.85 (P (30,60min 49 179.1	hi <sup>≠</sup> = 132 < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 38 7 8.94 3.68 19.82 33 hi <sup>≠</sup> = 130 < 0.000 1 27 78.5	120 2.32, dt 001) 5 7 7 13 9 9 9 8 8 5 6 16 11 89 9 0.02, dt 001) 6 7 7 13	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 119 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181 2 9 (P < 118 175.2	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 38 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32 0.00001	110 );   <sup>2</sup> = § 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 6 5 6 6 15 102 102 102 102 8 8 8 14	26.9% 14% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 3.5% 3.5% 3.5% 3.6% 3.3% 2.8% 30.5% 13%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-93.11, -22.89] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35] -64.88 [-79.24, -50.51] -69.00 [-110.31, -27.89]	• 
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.3 postfreatment</b> Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996 Uchida K 2001 Park CK 1988 Pan DQ 2003 Herz RC 1998 Gill R 1992 Xue D 1994 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.4 postfreatment</b> Lo EH 1994 Onal MZ 1997	588.06; Ci Z = 6.01 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 61 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170 433.79; Ci Z = 8.85 (P (30,60min 49 179.1	hi <sup>#</sup> = 13: < 0.00( 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 38 7 8.94 3.68 19.82 33 19.82 33 hi <sup>#</sup> = 13: < 0.00( 19.27 78.5 Chi <sup>#</sup> = 2.	120 2.32, dt 001) 5 7 7 13 9 9 9 8 8 5 6 16 16 11 11 89 9 0.02, dt 001) 6 7 7 13 29, dt=	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 119 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181 2 9 (P < 118 175.2	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 38 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32 0.00001	110 );   <sup>2</sup> = § 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 6 5 6 6 15 102 102 102 102 8 8 8 14	26.9% 14% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 2.7% 2.3% 3.5% 3.5% 3.5% 3.6% 3.3% 2.8% 30.5% 30.5% 30.5%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -58.00 [-93.11, -22.89] -50.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35] -64.88 [-79.24, -50.51] -69.00 [-110.31, -27.89] 3.90 [-81.02, 88.82]	• 
Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.3 postreatment</b> Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996 Uchida K 2001 Park CK 1988 Pan DQ 2003 Herz RC 1998 Gill R 1992 Xue D 1994 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.4 postreatment</b> Lo EH 1994 Onal MZ 1997 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: <i>J</i>	588.06; Ci Z = 6.01 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 61 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170 433.79; Ci Z = 8.85 (P (30,60min 49 179.1	hi <sup>#</sup> = 13: < 0.00( 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 38 7 8.94 3.68 19.82 33 19.82 33 hi <sup>#</sup> = 13: < 0.00( 19.27 78.5 Chi <sup>#</sup> = 2.	120 2.32, df 001) 5 7 7 3 3 9 9 8 8 5 5 6 16 11 89 9 0.02, df 001) 6 7 13 29, df= )	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 119 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181 2 9 (P < 118 175.2	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 38 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32 0.00001	110 );   <sup>2</sup> = § 5 7 24 9 9 6 5 6 6 15 102 102 ;   <sup>2</sup> = § 6 8 14 5 56%	26.9% 44% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 2.7% 2.3% 3.5% 3.6% 3.5% 3.6% 3.6% 3.6% 3.8% 3.0,5% 13% 2.0% 2.0% 2.9%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -58.00 [-93.11, -22.89] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -36.848 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35] -64.88 [-79.24, -50.51] -69.00 [-110.31, -27.69] 3.90 [-81.02, 88.82] -42.38 [-111.17, 26.42]	• 
Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.3 posttreatment</b> Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996 Uchida K 2001 Park CK 1988 Par DQ 2003 Herz RC 1998 Gill R 1992 Xue D 1994 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.4 posttreatment</b> Lo EH 1994 Onal MZ 1997 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> Total (95% Cl)	588.06; Ci Z = 6.01 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 61 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170 433.79; Ci Z = 8.85 (P (30,60min 49 179.1 1496.56; ( Z = 1.21 (P	hi <sup>#</sup> = 132 < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 38 7 8.94 3.68 7 8.94 3.68 7 8.94 3.68 7 8.94 3.68 7 8.94 3.68 7 7 7 8.94 3.68 7 7 7 8.94 3.68 7 7 8.94 3.68 7 7 7 8.94 3.68 7 7 7 8.94 3.68 8.94 3.77 8.94 3.89 8.94 3.77 8.94 3.77 8.94 3.77 8.94 3.77 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 8.94 3.78 9.78 3.78 9.78 5.78 7.78 5.78 7.78 5.78 7.79 7.78 5.78 7.79 7.79 7.79 7.79 7.79 7.79 7.79 7	120 2.32, dtf 001) 5 7 7 13 9 9 9 9 8 8 5 6 6 16 11 11 89 90.02, dtf 001) 6 7 13 29, dt= ) 429	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 119 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181 = 9 (P < 118 175.2 = 1 (P = 0	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 38 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32 0.00001 44 49.3 13); ₱=	110 );   <sup>2</sup> = \$ 5 7 24 9 9 6 5 5 6 16 15 102 102 102 \$ 102 56% 8 14 556%	26.9% 44% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 2.3% 3.5% 3.6% 3.5% 3.6% 3.3% 2.8% 30.5% 30.5% 2.9% 100.0%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -58.00 [-93.11, -22.89] -50.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35] -64.88 [-79.24, -50.51] -69.00 [-110.31, -27.89] 3.90 [-81.02, 88.82]	• 
Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.3 postreatment</b> Pschorn U 1993 Herz RC 1998 Moyanova SG 2007 Margaill I 1996 Uchida K 2001 Park CK 1988 Pan DQ 2003 Herz RC 1998 Gill R 1992 Xue D 1994 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: <i>J</i> <b>10.1.4 postreatment</b> Lo EH 1994 Onal MZ 1997 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = : Test for overall effect: <i>J</i>	588.06; Ci Z = 6.01 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 61 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170 433.79; Ci Z = 8.85 (P (30,60min 49 179.1 1496.56; C Z = 1.21 (P	hi <sup>#</sup> = 132 < < 0.00( 10.85 5.2 30 38 7 8.94 3.68 7 8.94 19.82 33 3.68 19.82 3.68 19.82 3.68 19.82 3.68 19.82 3.68 19.82 3.68 19.82 3.68 19.85 5.2 3.68 19.85 5.2 3.68 19.85 5.2 3.68 19.85 5.2 3.68 19.85 5.2 3.68 19.85 5.2 3.68 19.85 5.2 3.68 19.82 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.	120 2.32, dtf 2.32, dtf 001) 5 5 7 7 13 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 8 8 5 6 16 16 11 89 90.02, dtf 001) 6 7 7 13 3 29, dtf 9 9 8 8 8 5 6 6 16 17 18 9 9 9 8 8 8 5 6 6 16 17 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 119 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181 = 9 (P < 118 175.2 = 1 (P = 0	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 38 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32 0.00001 44 49.3 13); ₱=	110 );   <sup>2</sup> = \$ 5 7 24 9 9 6 5 5 6 16 15 102 102 102 \$ 102 56% 8 14 556%	26.9% 44% 2.2% 3.1% 3.5% 2.3% 3.5% 3.6% 3.5% 3.6% 3.3% 2.8% 30.5% 30.5% 2.9% 100.0%	-53.36 [-70.77, -35.94] -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -58.00 [-93.11, -22.89] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -36.848 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35] -64.88 [-79.24, -50.51] -69.00 [-110.31, -27.69] 3.90 [-81.02, 88.82] -42.38 [-111.17, 26.42]	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

# Additional Figure 3 Lesion volume subgroup analysis concerning administration time after brain injury.

Under different administration time, most literatures have proved that MK-801 can also decrease Lesion volume after acute brain injury in rats.

Nuture Outers		K-801	· · · · ·		ontrol	T	104-1-1-1-1	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
11.1.1 MCAO						-			
Pschorn U 1993		10.85		250.52	41.6	5		-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87]	
Memezawa H 1995		46.49		157.76		7	1.0%	-130.75 [-200.68, -60.82]	
Buchan AM 1992	41	19	9	150	43	9	2.3%	-109.00 [-139.71, -78.29]	
Hanon E 2001	107	22.3	9	211	23.8	12	2.8%	-104.00 [-123.84, -84.16]	
Herz RC 1998	54.23	17.46	7	154.41	20.22	7	2.8%	-100.18 [-119.97, -80.39]	
Mackensen GB 2000	35	35	16	125	72	16	1.9%	-90.00 [-129.23, -50.77]	
Foster KA 2009	112.82	20.5	41	200.71	23.88	41	3.2%	-87.89 [-97.52, -78.26]	1
Moyanova SG 2007	85.5	5.2	13	170.5	22.7	24	3.2%	-85.00 [-94.51, -75.49]	-
Sarraf-Yazdi S 1998	100	65	18	182	63	18	1.8%	-82.00 [-123.82, -40.18]	
Sarraf-Yazdi S 1999	81	60	18	163	36	12	2.1%	-82.00 [-116.40, -47.60]	
Regan HK 2007	130	24	20	211	28	17	3.0%	-81.00 [-97.96, -64.04]	
Shen SY 2003	60.8	7.76	18	140.6	14.81	18	3.3%	-79.80 [-87.52, -72.08]	+
Takamatsu H 1998	126.1	20.3	8	202.4	8.5	9	3.0%	-76.30 [-91.42, -61.18]	
Gorgulu A 2000	90.55	8.49	10	162.29	16.31	10	3.2%	-71.74 [-83.14, -60.34]	-
Margaill I 1996	169	30	9	239	30	9	2.5%	-70.00 [-97.72, -42.28]	
Lo EH 1994	49	27	6	118	44	6	1.8%	-69.00 [-110.31, -27.69]	
Dirnagl U 1990	165	63	15	231	22	13	2.1%	-66.00 [-100.05, -31.95]	
Katsuta K 1995		42.54	24	145.99	36.46	9	2.4%	-56.61 [-85.89, -27.33]	
Relton JK 1996	26.87	6.37	8	78.88	13.06	8	3.2%	-52.01 [-62.08, -41.94]	+
Pan DQ 2003	94.29	8.94		144.65	7.37	5	3.2%	-50.36 [-60.52, -40.20]	
Cam E 2008	23.12	21.1	5	73.12	23.2	5	2.5%	-50.00 [-77.49, -22.51]	
lijima T 1992	58	11.5	6	108	38.5	6	2.2%	-50.00 [-82.15, -17.85]	
Gill R 1991		16.15	24	141.97	4.68	24	3.3%	-49.50 [-56.23, -42.77]	-
Park CK 1988	79.71	8.49	14	127	7	6	3.3%	-47.29 [-54.44, -40.14]	+
Herz RC 1998	45.96	3.68	6	92.83	3.68	6	3.4%	-46.87 [-51.03, -42.71]	-
Buchan AM 1992	145.29		31	186.23	7.86	31	3.4%	-40.94 [-45.71, -36.17]	+
Gill R 1992	121.32		16	159.8	20.7	16	3.1%	-38.48 [-52.52, -24.44]	
Roussel S 1992		26.47	21	110.71	22.62	19	3.0%	-36.90 [-52.12, -21.68]	
Bielenberg GW 1991		28.13	14	99.1	26.9	9	2.7%	-32.74 [-55.67, -9.81]	
Bertorelli R 1998	24.6	20.13	4	44.5	20.9	9 4	3.4%		+
								-19.90 [-24.80, -15.00]	
Dirnagl U 1990	186	33	12	197	51	11	2.1%	-11.00 [-46.45, 24.45]	
Xue D 1994	170	33	11	181	32	15	2.6%	-11.00 [-36.35, 14.35]	
Margaill   1996	200	40	8	209	14	8	2.4%	-9.00 [-38.37, 20.37]	
Dawson DA 1994		15.71	9		11.43	10	3.2%	-8.35 [-20.82, 4.12]	
Onal MZ 1997	179.1	78.5	7	175.2	89.3	8	0.7%	3.90 [-81.02, 88.82]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			455			433	92.2%	-60.37 [-68.98, -51.76]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 5				= 34 (P <	< 0.0000	11); l*=	94%		
Test for overall effect: Z	.= 13.75 (	P < 0.00	JUU1)						
444011									
11.1.2 Hemorrhage			621			2			
Uchida K 2001	61	38	9	119	38	9	2.1%	-58.00 [-93.11, -22.89]	
Lyden PD 1994		26.09		118.19		27	2.9%	-29.65 [-47.86, -11.44]	
Kawai N 2000	66.4	13.7	5	86.6	20.7	5	2.7%	-20.20 [-41.96, 1.56]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			37			41	7.8%	-31.58 [-48.90, -14.26]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 8				(P = 0.20	l); l² = 3	3%			
Test for overall effect: Z	. = 3.57 (P	= 0.000	04)						
Total (95% CI)			492			474	100.0%	-58.31 [-66.55, -50.07]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 5	520.31: CI	ni² = 580		= 37 (P <	< 0.0000				- <u>t-t-</u> ++
Fest for overall effect: Z				0. 0	5.0000		- / //		-200 -100 Ó 100 20
Fest for subaroup diffe				1 /P - 0	004) 12-	- 00 20			Favours MK-801 Favours control

## Additional Figure 4 Lesion volume subgroup analysis concerning injury model after brain

injury.

Under different injury model, most literatures have proved that MK-801 can also decrease Lesion volume after acute brain injury in rats.

Study or Subgroup 13.1.1 i.p. 3echorn U 1993 Buchan AM 1992 Hanon E 2001 Foster KA 2009 Moyanova SG 2007 Sarraf-Yazdi S 1998 Regan HK 2007 Shen SY 2003 Sorgulu A 2000 Dimagl U 1990 Katsuta K 1995	Mean 75.97 41 107 112.82 85.5 100 130 60.8 90.55 165		<u>Total</u> 9 9 41 13 18	Mean 250.52 150 211 200.71 170.5	41.6 43 23.8 23.88	101a1 5 9 12 41	Weight 2.2% 2.5% 3.1%	N, Random, 95% Cl -174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -109.00 [-139.71, -78.29]	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Pschom U 1993 Juchan AM 1992 Hanon E 2001 "oster KA 2009 Moyanova SG 2007 Sarraf-Yazdi S 1998 Regan HK 2007 Shen SY 2003 Sorgulu A 2000 Dirmagl U 1990 Katsuta K 1995	41 107 112.82 85.5 100 130 60.8 90.55	19 22.3 20.5 5.2 65 24	9 9 41 13 18	150 211 200.71 170.5	43 23.8 23.88	9 12	2.5%		
Buchan AM 1992 Hanon E 2001 Foster KA 2009 Moyanova SG 2007 Barraf-Yazdi S 1998 Regan HK 2007 Shen SY 2003 Borgulu A 2000 Dimagl U 1990 Katsuta K 1995	41 107 112.82 85.5 100 130 60.8 90.55	19 22.3 20.5 5.2 65 24	9 9 41 13 18	150 211 200.71 170.5	43 23.8 23.88	9 12	2.5%		
Hanon E 2001 Foster KA 2009 Moyanova SG 2007 Sarraf-Yazdi S 1998 Regan HK 2007 Shen SY 2003 Sorgulu A 2000 Dimagl U 1990 Katsuta K 1995	107 112.82 85.5 100 130 60.8 90.55	22.3 20.5 5.2 65 24	9 41 13 18	211 200.71 170.5	23.8 23.88	12		-109.001-139.7178.790	
Foster KA 2009 Moyanova SG 2007 Sarraf-Yazdi S 1998 Regan HK 2007 Shen SY 2003 Sorgulu A 2000 Dirnagl U 1990 Katsuta K 1995	112.82 85.5 100 130 60.8 90.55	20.5 5.2 65 24	41 13 18	200.71 170.5	23.88				
Moyanova SG 2007 Sarraf-Yazdi S 1998 Regan HK 2007 Shen SY 2003 Sorgulu A 2000 Dirnagi U 1990 Katsuta K 1995	85.5 100 130 60.8 90.55	5.2 65 24	13 18	170.5				-104.00 [-123.84, -84.16]	-
Sarraf-Yazdi S 1998 Regan HK 2007 Shen SY 2003 Gorgulu A 2000 Dirnagl U 1990 Katsuta K 1995	100 130 60.8 90.55	65 24	18				3.5%	-87.89 [-97.52, -78.26]	1
Regan HK 2007 Shen SY 2003 Sorgulu A 2000 Dirnagl U 1990 Katsuta K 1995	130 60.8 90.55	24			22.7	24	3.5%	-85.00 [-94.51, -75.49]	
Bhen SY 2003 Gorgulu A 2000 Dirnagl U 1990 Katsuta K 1995	60.8 90.55			182	63	18	2.0%	-82.00 [-123.82, -40.18]	
∋orgulu A 2000 Dirnagl U 1990 <atsuta 1995<="" k="" td=""><td>90.55</td><td>( /h</td><td>20</td><td>211</td><td>28</td><td>17</td><td>3.2%</td><td>-81.00 [-97.96, -64.04]</td><td></td></atsuta>	90.55	( /h	20	211	28	17	3.2%	-81.00 [-97.96, -64.04]	
Dirnagl U 1990 Katsuta K 1995			18		14.81	18	3.6%	-79.80 [-87.52, -72.08]	
≺atsuta K 1995	165	8.49	10	162.29	16.31	10	3.5%	-71.74 [-83.14, -60.34]	
		63	15	231	22	13	2.3%	-66.00 [-100.05, -31.95]	
	89.38			145.99	36.46	9	2.6%	-56.61 [-85.89, -27.33]	
Relton JK 1996	26.87	6.37	8	78.88	13.06	8	3.5%	-52.01 [-62.08, -41.94]	+
Pan DQ 2003	94.29	8.94		144.65	7.37	5	3.5%	-50.36 [-60.52, -40.20]	
ijima T 1992	58	11.5	6	108	38.5	6	2.4%	-50.00 [-82.15, -17.85]	
Cam E 2008	23.12	21.1	5	73.12	23.2	5	2.7%	-50.00 [-77.49, -22.51]	
Buchan AM 1992	145.29			186.23	7.86	31	3.6%	-40.94 [-45.71, -36.17]	-
Roussel S 1992	73.81		21	110.71	22.62	19	3.3%	-36.90 [-52.12, -21.68]	
Bielenberg GW 1991	66.36		14	99.1	26.9	9	2.9%	-32.74 [-55.67, -9.81]	
Bertorelli R 1998	24.6	4	4	44.5	3	4	3.6%	-19.90 [-24.80, -15.00]	-
(ue D 1994	170	33	11	181	32	15	2.8%	-11.00 [-36.35, 14.35]	
Dirnagl U 1990	186	33	12	197	51	11	2.3%	-11.00 [-46.45, 24.45]	
Onal MZ 1997	179.1	78.5	7	175.2	89.3	8	0.8%	3.90 [-81.02, 88.82]	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			306			297	63.3%	-62.25 [-75.06, -49.44]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 7: Fest for overall effect: Z 13.1.2 i.v.				- 21 (i		-17,1 -	33 %		
vlemezawa H 1995	27.01	46.49	8	157.76	83.78	7	1.1%	-130.75 [-200.68, -60.82]	
Herz RC 1998	54.23			154.41	20.22	7	3.1%	-100.18 [-119.97, -80.39]	
dackensen GB 2000	35	35	16	125	72	16	2.1%	-90.00 [-129.23, -50.77]	
Sarraf-Yazdi S 1999	81	60	18	163	36	12	2.3%	-82.00 [-116.40, -47.60]	
Fakamatsu H 1998	126.1	20.3	8	202.4	8.5	9	3.3%	-76.30 [-91.42, -61.18]	
dargaill   1996	169	30	9	239	30	9	2.7%	-70.00 [-97.72, -42.28]	
_0 EH 1994	49	27	6	118	44	6	2.0%	-69.00 [-110.31, -27.69]	
Gill R 1991	92.47			141.97	4.68	24	3.6%	-49.50 [-56.23, -42.77]	-
Park CK 1988	79.71	8.49	14	127	7	6	3.6%	-47.29 [-54.44, -40.14]	-
Herz RC 1998	45.96	3.68	6	92.83	3.68	6	3.6%	-46.87 [-51.03, -42.71]	-
Sill R 1992	121.32		16	159.8	20.7	16	3.3%	-38.48 [-52.52, -24.44]	
vlargaill   1996	200	40	8	209	14	8	2.6%	-9.00 [-38.37, 20.37]	
Dawson DA 1994	50.71		9		11.43	10	3.4%	-8.35 [-20.82, 4.12]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	00.11		149	00.00	. 1.45	136	36.7%	-55.52 [-66.55, -44.50]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 2	76 79.04	ni <sup>2</sup> = 104		= 12 (P -	. 0 0000			19102 [ 00100, 14100]	
Fest for overall effect: Z				12 (1	5.0000	.,, -	0010		
fotal (95% CI)			455			433	100.0%	-60.37 [-68.98, -51.76]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 5				= 34 (P •	0.0000				-200 -100 0 100 200
Fest for overall effect: Z : Fest for subaroup differ									Favours MK-801 Favours control

Additional Figure 5 Middle cerebral artery occlusion (MCAO) sub-subgroup analysis concerning administration routes after brain injury.

Under different administration routes, most literatures have proved that MK-801 can also decrease Lesion volume after acute brain injury in rat MCAO model.

	K-801 SD	Total		ontrol SD	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
mean	30	Total	mean	30	Total	weight	10, Random, 35% CI	N, Kandolii, 55% Ci
27.01	46.49	0	157 76	02 70	7	1 2%	-120 75 (-200 69 -60 92)	
								-
	1.2.2			5.73	2.075			
								-
50.71	15.71		59.06	11.43				▲ <sup>-1</sup>
							-57.16 [-73.32, -41.00]	•
			'=13 (P ∘	¢ 0.0000	)1); l²=	94%		
0,15min]								
35	35	16	125	72	16	2.2%	-90.00 [-129.23, -50.77]	
126.1	20.3	8	202.4	8.5	9	3.5%	-76.30 [-91.42, -61.18]	
90.55	8.49	10	162.29	16.31	10	3.6%	-71.74 [-83.14, -60.34]	+
89.38	42.54	24	145.99	36.46	9	2.7%	-56.61 [-85.89, -27.33]	
23.12	21.1	5	73.12	23.2	5	2.8%		
	11.5	6	108	38.5	6			
	16.15	24	141.97	4.68	24			-
24.6	4	4	44.5	3	4	3.8%	-19.90 [-24.80, -15.00]	<b>•</b> •
		97			83	25 0%	56 50 [ 75 72 37 AA1	•
							-50.56 [-75.72, -57.44]	
634.60; Ch		1.52, df	= 7 (P <	0.00001			-50.56 [-75.72, -57.44]	
634.60; Ch (= 5.79 (P		1.52, df	= 7 (P <	0.00001			-50.56 [-75.72, -57.44]	
. = 5.79 (P	< 0.000	1.52, df	= 7 (P <	0.00001			-30.36 [-13.12, -31.44]	
(= 5.79 (P (15,30min	' < 0.000 ]	1.52, df D01)	, da		); l² = 9	5%		
(= 5.79 (P (15,30min (75.97	' < 0.000  ]   10.85	1.52, df D01) 5	250.52	41.6	); I² = 9 5	2.3%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87]	
(= 5.79 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23	' < 0.000 ] 10.85 17.46	1.52, df D01) 5 7	250.52 154.41	41.6 20.22	); I² = 9 5 7	2.3% 3.2%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39]	
(= 5.79 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5	' < 0.00( ] 10.85 17.46 5.2	1.52, df D01) 5 7 13	250.52 154.41 170.5	41.6 20.22 22.7	); I² = 9 5 7 24	2.3% 3.2% 3.7%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49]	
(= 5.79 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169	<ol> <li>&lt; 0.000</li> <li>10.85</li> <li>17.46</li> <li>5.2</li> <li>30</li> </ol>	1.52, df D01) 5 7 13 9	250.52 154.41 170.5 239	41.6 20.22 22.7 30	); l² = 9 5 7 24 9	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28]	
(= 5.79 (P (15,30min (75.97 (54.23 (85.5) (169 (75)	2 < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 7	1.52, df D01) 5 7 13 9 8	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7	); I² = 9 5 7 24 9 6	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59]	
2 = 5.79 (P 15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 75 94.29	9 < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 7 8.94	1.52, df D01) 5 7 13 9 8 5	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127 144.65	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7 7.37	);  ² = 9 5 7 24 9 6 5	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7% 3.7%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -86.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20]	
2 = 5.79 (P 15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 75 94.29 45.96	<pre>9 &lt; 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 7 8.94 3.68</pre>	1.52, df D01) 5 7 13 9 8 5 6	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127 144.65 92.83	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7 7.37 3.68	);  ² = 9 5 7 24 9 6 5 6	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7% 3.7% 3.7% 3.8%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-50.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71]	
2 = 5.79 (P 15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 75 94.29 45.96 121.32	<ul> <li>&lt; 0.000</li> <li>10.85</li> <li>17.46</li> <li>5.2</li> <li>30</li> <li>7</li> <li>8.94</li> <li>3.68</li> <li>19.82</li> </ul>	1.52, df D01) 5 7 13 9 8 5 6 16	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127 144.65 92.83 159.8	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7 7.37 3.68 20.7	);  ² = 9 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 16	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7% 3.7% 3.8% 3.5%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -86.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20]	
2 = 5.79 (P 15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 75 94.29 45.96	<pre>9 &lt; 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 7 8.94 3.68</pre>	1.52, df D01) 5 7 13 9 8 5 6 16 11	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127 144.65 92.83	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7 7.37 3.68	);   <sup>2</sup> = 9 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 16 15	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7% 3.7% 3.8% 3.5% 2.9%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-50.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71]	
2 = 5.79 (P 15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 75 94.29 45.96 121.32	<ul> <li>&lt; 0.000</li> <li>10.85</li> <li>17.46</li> <li>5.2</li> <li>30</li> <li>7</li> <li>8.94</li> <li>3.68</li> <li>19.82</li> </ul>	1.52, df D01) 5 7 13 9 8 5 6 16	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127 144.65 92.83 159.8	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7 7.37 3.68 20.7	);  ² = 9 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 16	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7% 3.7% 3.8% 3.5%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -60.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44]	
z = 5.79 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170 143.72; Cł	r < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 7 8.94 3.68 19.82 33 hi <sup>2</sup> = 125	1.52, df D01) 5 7 13 9 8 5 6 16 11 80 9.96, df	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32	);  ² = 9 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 16 15 93	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7% 3.7% 3.8% 3.8% 3.8% 3.5% 2.9% 29.7%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35]	
2 = 5.79 (P 15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170	r < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 7 8.94 3.68 19.82 33 hi <sup>2</sup> = 125	1.52, df D01) 5 7 13 9 8 5 6 16 11 80 9.96, df	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32	);  ² = 9 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 16 15 93	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7% 3.7% 3.8% 3.8% 3.8% 3.5% 2.9% 29.7%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35]	
z = 5.79 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170 143.72; Cł	<pre>       &lt; 0.000       10.85       17.46       5.2       30       7       8.94       3.68       19.82       33       hi<sup>2</sup> = 129       &lt; 0.000 </pre>	1.52, df D01) 5 7 13 9 8 5 6 16 11 80 9.96, df	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32	);  ² = 9 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 16 15 93	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7% 3.7% 3.8% 3.8% 3.8% 3.5% 2.9% 29.7%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35]	
2 = 5.79 (P 15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170 143.72; CH 2 = 8.52 (P 30,60min	<pre>     &lt; 0.000     10.85     17.46     5.2     30     7     8.94     3.68     19.82     33 hi<sup>2</sup> = 129     &lt; 0.000 ] </pre>	1.52, df 001) 5 7 13 9 8 5 6 16 11 80 9.96, df 001)	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181 = 8 (P < 1	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32 0.00001	);   <sup>2</sup> = 9 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 16 16 19 3 93 );   <sup>2</sup> = 9	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7% 3.7% 3.8% 3.5% 2.9% 29.7%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, +00.20] -60.36 [-50.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35] -65.46 [-80.52, -50.41]	
<ul> <li>5.79 (P</li> <li>(15,30min</li> <li>75.97</li> <li>54.23</li> <li>85.5</li> <li>169</li> <li>75</li> <li>94.29</li> <li>45.96</li> <li>121.32</li> <li>170</li> <li>143.72; Cf</li> <li>= 8.52 (P</li> <li>(30,60min</li> <li>49</li> </ul>	<pre>v &lt; 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 300 7 8.94 3.68 19.82 33 hi² = 129 v &lt; 0.000 ] 27</pre>	1.52, df D01) 5 7 13 9 8 5 6 16 11 80 9.96, df 001) 6	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181 = 8 (P <	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7,37 3.68 20.7 32 0.00001	);   <sup>2</sup> = 9 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 16 16 93 93 93 ();   <sup>2</sup> = 9	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7% 3.7% 3.5% 2.9% 29.7% 4%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -60.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35] -65.46 [-80.52, -50.41] -69.00 [-110.31, -27.69]	
2 = 5.79 (P 15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170 143.72; CH 2 = 8.52 (P 30,60min	<pre>     &lt; 0.000     10.85     17.46     5.2     30     7     8.94     3.68     19.82     33 hi<sup>2</sup> = 129     &lt; 0.000 ] </pre>	1.52, df D01) 5 7 13 9 8 5 6 16 11 80 9.96, df D01) 6 7	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181 = 8 (P < 1	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32 0.00001	);  * = 9 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 16 15 93 );  * = 9 6 8	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7% 3.8% 3.5% 2.9% 29.7% 4%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35] -65.46 [-80.52, -50.41] -69.00 [-110.31, -27.69] 3.90 [-81.02, 88.82]	
<ul> <li>5.79 (P</li> <li>(15,30min 75.97 54.23 86.5 94.29 45.96 121.32 170</li> <li>(143.72; CF</li> <li< td=""><td><pre>         &lt; 0.000         10.85         17.46         5.2         30         7         8.94         3.68         19.82         33         hi<sup>2</sup> = 129         &lt; 0.000         27         78.5         </pre></td><td>1.52, df D01) 5 7 13 9 8 5 6 16 11 80 9.96, df D01) 6 7 13</td><td>250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181 = 8 (P &lt; 118 175.2</td><td>41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32 0.00001 0.00001</td><td>);  <sup>2</sup> = § 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 16 15 93 93 93 );  <sup>2</sup> = § 6 8 14</td><td>2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7% 3.7% 3.5% 2.9% 29.7% 4%</td><td>-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -60.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35] -65.46 [-80.52, -50.41] -69.00 [-110.31, -27.69]</td><td></td></li<></ul>	<pre>         &lt; 0.000         10.85         17.46         5.2         30         7         8.94         3.68         19.82         33         hi<sup>2</sup> = 129         &lt; 0.000         27         78.5         </pre>	1.52, df D01) 5 7 13 9 8 5 6 16 11 80 9.96, df D01) 6 7 13	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181 = 8 (P < 118 175.2	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32 0.00001 0.00001	);   <sup>2</sup> = § 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 16 15 93 93 93 );   <sup>2</sup> = § 6 8 14	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7% 3.7% 3.5% 2.9% 29.7% 4%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -60.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35] -65.46 [-80.52, -50.41] -69.00 [-110.31, -27.69]	
2 = 5.79 (P (15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 169 75 94.29 45.96 121.32 170 443.72; Cf = 8.52 (P (30,60min 49	r < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 7 8.94 3.68 19.82 33 hi <sup>2</sup> = 129 r < 0.000 r = 27 78.5	1.52, df D01) 5 7 7 13 9 8 5 6 16 16 16 16 16 18 00 9.96, df 001) 6 7 7 13 29, df=	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181 = 8 (P < 118 175.2	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32 0.00001 0.00001	);   <sup>2</sup> = § 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 16 15 93 93 93 );   <sup>2</sup> = § 6 8 14	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7% 3.8% 3.5% 2.9% 29.7% 4%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35] -65.46 [-80.52, -50.41] -69.00 [-110.31, -27.69] 3.90 [-81.02, 88.82]	
<ul> <li>5.79 (P</li> <li>(15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 94.29 45.96 121.32 170</li> <li>(143.72; CF</li> <li>(130,60min 49 179.1</li> <li>(1496.56; C</li> </ul>	r < 0.000 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 7 8.94 3.68 19.82 33 hi <sup>2</sup> = 129 r < 0.000 r = 27 78.5	1.52, df D01) 5 7 7 13 9 8 5 6 16 16 16 16 16 18 00 9.96, df 001) 6 7 7 13 29, df=	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181 = 8 (P < 118 175.2	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7 7.37 3.68 20.7 32 0.00001 0.00001	);   <sup>2</sup> = § 5 7 24 9 6 5 5 6 16 15 93 3 93 93 93 93 93 93 93 93 16 8 14 5 56%	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7% 3.7% 3.7% 3.5% 2.9% 2.9.7% 4% 2.1% 0.9% 3.0%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -50.36 [-50.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35] -65.46 [-80.52, -50.41] -89.00 [-110.31, -27.89] 3.90 [-81.02, 88.82] -42.38 [-111.17, 26.42]	
<ul> <li>5.79 (P</li> <li>(15,30min 75.97 54.23 85.5 94.29 45.96 121.32 170</li> <li>(143.72; CF</li> <li>(130,60min 49 179.1</li> <li>(1496.56; C</li> </ul>	< 0.00( ] 10.85 17.46 5.2 30 7 8.94 3.68 19.82 33 19.82 33 19.82 33 19.82 33 19.82 33 19.82 33 19.82 33 19.82 27 78.5 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 2.2 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 2.2	1.52, df 001) 5 7 13 9 8 5 6 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 10 9.96, df 7 13 29, df= 7 400	250.52 154.41 170.5 239 127 144.65 92.83 159.8 181 = 8 (P < 1 118 175.2 : 1 (P = 0.	41.6 20.22 22.7 30 7.37 3.68 20.7 32 0.00001 44 89.3 13); F=	);  *= \$ 5 7 24 9 6 5 6 16 15 3 9 3 8 4 4 5 5 6% 3 86	2.3% 3.2% 3.7% 2.8% 3.7% 3.8% 3.5% 2.9% 29.7% 4% 2.1% 0.9% 3.0%	-174.55 [-212.23, -136.87] -100.18 [-119.97, -80.39] -85.00 [-94.51, -75.49] -70.00 [-97.72, -42.28] -52.00 [-59.41, -44.59] -50.36 [-60.52, -40.20] -46.87 [-51.03, -42.71] -38.48 [-52.52, -24.44] -11.00 [-36.35, 14.35] -65.46 [-80.52, -50.41] -69.00 [-110.31, -27.69] 3.90 [-81.02, 88.82]	
	107 112.82 81 100 130 60.8 26.87 86 73.81 66.36 186 200 50.71 92.51; Cl = 6.93 (P 0,15min] 35 126.1 90.55 89.38 23.12 58 92.47	$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 27.01 & 46.49 \\ 107 & 22.3 \\ 112.82 & 20.5 \\ 81 & 60 \\ 100 & 65 \\ 130 & 24 \\ 60.8 & 7.76 \\ 26.87 & 6.37 \\ 86 & 6 \\ 73.81 & 26.47 \\ 66.36 & 28.13 \\ 186 & 33 \\ 200 & 40 \\ 50.71 & 15.71 \\ 92.51; Chi^2 = 21 \\ = 6.93 (P < 0.001 \\ 0.15min] \\ 35 & 35 \\ 126.1 & 20.3 \\ 90.55 & 8.49 \\ 89.38 & 42.54 \\ 23.12 & 21.1 \\ 58 & 11.5 \\ 92.47 & 16.15 \\ \end{array}$	27.01 46.49 8 107 22.3 9 112.82 20.5 41 81 60 18 100 65 18 130 24 20 60.8 7.76 18 26.87 6.37 8 86 6 6 73.81 26.47 21 66.36 28.13 14 186 33 12 200 40 8 50.71 15.71 9 210 92.51; Chi² = 214.72, df = 6.93 (P < 0.00001) 0.15min] 35 35 16 126.1 20.3 8 90.55 8.49 10 89.38 42.54 24 23.12 21.1 5 5 88 11.5 6 92.47 16.15 24 24.6 4 4	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

## Additional Figure 6 Middle cerebral artery occlusion (MCAO) sub-subgroup analysis concerning administration time after brain injury.

Under different administration time, most literatures have proved that MK-801 can also decrease Lesion volume after acute brain injury in rat MCAO model.

Study	Animals	Injury model	Animal number	Source of MK- 801	Experimental groups	Control group	Main outcomes
Sommer et al. (2017)	45 male Wistar rats (321–387 g)	TBI with a pneumatic impactor device	12/11/11/11	Tocris Bioscience (Bristol, UK)	1. ABI+ MK- 801 (1 mg/kg intravenously, 5 minutes pre- injury)	2.Sham+vehicle/ saline 3. ABI+ UCCB01- 147 4. ABI+vehicle	Behavior: water maze test Histopathology: Cresyl violet staining, lesion volume
Qian et al. (2016)	32 male SD rats (240–260 g)	MCAO	8/8/8/8	Sigma	1. ABI+MK-801 (0.5 mg/kg	2. ABI+vehicle 3. ABI+MA 4. ABI+(MA +MK- 801)	Histopathology: TTC staining, HE staining immunohistochemistry, western blot assay, lesion volume
Hu et al. (2015)	40 male SD rats (250–320 g)	MCAO	10/10/10/10	N/A	1. ABI+MK-801 (1.0 mg/kg intraperitoneally, immediately post-injury)	2. Sham 3. ABI+notreatment 4. ABI+GBE	Behavior: Longa scoring system, Movement capture analysis system test Histopathology: TTC staining, lesion volume
Nategh et al. (2010)	48 male Wistar rats (250–300 g)		Hyperthermic: 8/8/8 Normothermic: 8/8/8		1. ABI+MK-801 (0.1 mg/kg intravenously, immediately post-injury)	2. ABI+saline 3. ABI+Rosiglitazone	Behavior: Neurological deficit, seizure activity Histopathology: TTC staining, lesion volume
Han et al. (2009)	40 male SD rats (200±30 g)	TBI (weight- drop head injury, 600 g)	8/8/8/8	N/A	1. ABI+MK-801 (0.5 mg/kg) 2. ABI+MK-801 (2 mg/kg intraperitoneally) 3. ABI+MK-801 (10 mg/kg intraperitoneally, immediately post-injury)	4. Sham+saline 5. ABI+saline	Behavior: water maze test Histopathology: TTC staining, morphology, immunohistochemistry
Foster et al. (2009)	121 male rats (270–310 g)	MCAO	Pretreatment: 19/20/19 Posttreatment: 22/21/20	N/A	1. ABI+MK-801 (3 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, pre-injury)	<ol> <li>Sham+vehicle</li> <li>ABI+Compound-1</li> </ol>	Histopathology: TTC staining, lesion volume
Ashioti et al. (2009)	28 male spontaneously hypertensive rats (200–250 g) 38 male SD rats (280–360 g)	MCAO	6/5 9/8	Sigma Aldrich, UK	1. ABI+MK-801 (1.5 mg/kg, intraperitoneally)	2. ABI+saline	Behavior: neurological scoring Histopathology: MRI
Cam et al. (2008)	10 male Wistar rats (330–370 g)	MCAO	5/5	N/A	1. ABI+MK-801 (3 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, post-injury)	2. ABI+saline	Histopathology: toluidine blue staining, lesion volume
Regan et al. (2007)	37 male rats (270–310 g)	MCAO	20/17	Sigma Aldrich	1. ABI+MK801 (3 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 15 min pre- injury)	2. ABI+saline	Histopathology: TTC staining, lesion volume
Moyanova et al. (2007)	39 male Wistar rats	MCAO	13/24/2	Tocris Cookson Ltd.	1. ABI+MK-801 (3 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 20 min post- injury)	2. ABI+ddwater 3. Sham	Behavior: behavioral and neurological examinations Histopathology: TTC staining, lesion volume
Moyanova et al. (2009)	30 male SD rats (280–350 g)	MCAO	11/19	N/A	1. ABI+MK801 (3 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, pre-injury)	2. ABI+saline	Behavior: neurological scores
Allahtavakoli et al. (2007)	32 male Wistar rats (250–320 g)		8/8/8/8	Alexis Biochemicals	1. ABI+MK-801 (0.1 mg/kg, intravenously, post-injury)	2. Sham+DMSO 3. ABI+Rosiglitazone 4. ABI+MK-801 and rosiglitazone	Behavior: neurological function score Histopathology: TTC staining, lesion volume

#### Additonal Table 1 Continued

Study	Animals	Injury model	Animal number	Source of MK-801	Experimental groups	Control group	Main outcomes
Shirasaki et al. (2004)	16 male Wistar rats (220–270 g)	Embolic model (Microspheres injection)	10/6	Sigma	1. ABI+ MK-801 (5 mg/kg, intravenously, 30 min pre-injury)	2. Sham operation+20% dextran solution without micro spheres	Histopathology: brain water content
Shen et al. (2003)	36 male Wistar rats (220±20 g)	MCAO	18/18	Sigma	1.ABI+MK-801 (3 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 30 min pre-injury)	2. ABI+saline	Behavior: neurological function score Histopathology: TTC staining, lesion volume
Pan and Li (2003)	50 male Wistar rats (280–320 g)	MCAO	Occlusion 6 h: 5/5/5/5/5 Occlusion 24 h: 5/5/5/5/5	Sigma	1.ABI+MK-801 (1 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 30 min post-injury)	2. ABI+saline 3. ABI+FDP 4. ABI +NAC 5. ABI + cocktail (FDP+NAC+MK-801)	Histopathology: TTC staining, lesion volume
Wexler et al. (2002)	28 male SD rats (250–300 g)	MCAO	11/6/11	Sigma	1. MK-801 (3 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 15 min pre-injury)	2. Sham 3. ABI+saline	Histopathology: TTC staining, lesion volume
Uchida et al. (2001)	36 male Wistar rats (350–450 g)	Subdural hematoma (150 µL venous blood)	9/9/9/9	N/A	1. ABI+mk-801 (1 mg/kg, intravenously, 30 min post-injury)	2. ABI+saline 3. ABI+ketamine 4. ABI+silicone	Histopathology: HE staining, lesion volume
Hanon and Klitgaard (2001)	21 male Wistar rats (300–350 g)	MCAO	9/12	N/A	1. ABI+MK-801 (0.4 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 30 min pre-injury)	2. ABI+saline	Histopathology: TTC staining, lesion volume
Ai et al. (2000)	45 male SD rats (320–350 g)	TBI (height 1 m, weight 350 g)	15/15/15	Sigma	1. ABI+mk-801 (1 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 20 min post-injury)	<ol> <li>Vehicle+saline</li> <li>ABI+saline</li> </ol>	Histopathology: brain water content
Mackensen et al. (2000)	49 male Wistar rats (age 8–10 weeks)	MCAO	16/16/17	Natick MA	1. ABI+mk-801 (0.25 mg/kg, intravenously, post-injury)		Behavior: Neurological scores Histopathology: HE staining, lesion volume
Kawai et al. (2000)	10 male SD rats (280–370 g)	Acute subdural hematoma (0.4 mL non- heparinized autologous blood)	5/5	N/A	1. ABI+MK-801 (2 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, pre- injury)	2. ABI+saline	Histopathology: HE staining, brain water content, lesion volume
Gorgulu et al. (2000)	30 male SD rats (270–300 g)	MCAO	10/10/10	Merck Sharp Dohme Laboratories USA	1. ABI+MK-801 (1 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 15 minutes post-injury)	2. ABI+saline 3. ABI+Memantine	Behavior: Neurological deficit examination Histopathology: Evans Blue staining, TTC staining, brain edema, lesion volume
Sarraf-Yazdi et al. (1999)	30 male Wistar rats (age 8–10 weeks)	MCAO	12/18		1. ABI+MK-801 (0.25 mg/kg, intravenously, 15 min pre-injury)	2. ABI+saline	Behavior: Neurological scores Histopathology: HE staining, lesion volume
Takamatsu et al. (1998)	17 male SD rats (280–300 g)	MCAO	8/9	RBI, USA	1. ABI+MK-801 (0.1 mg/kg, intravenously, immediately post- injury)	2. ABI+saline	Histopathology: HE staining, lesion volume
Sarraf-Yazdi et al. (1998)	58 male Wistar rats (age 8–10 weeks)	MCAO	18/18/22		1.ABI+MK-801	2. ABI+saline 3. ABI+isoflurane	Behavior: Neurological scores Histopathology: HE staining, lesion volume
Herz et al. (1998)	26 male Wistar rats (350–400 g)	MCAO	7/6/7/6	N/A	1. Intravasal ABI+mk-801 (500 µg/kg) 2. Extravasal ABI+mk-801 (500 µg/kg, intravenously, 30 min post-injury)	3. Intravasal ABI+saline 4. Extravasal ABI+saline	Histopathology: HE staining, lesion volume

#### Additonal Table 1 Continued

Study	Animals	Injury model	Animal number	Source of MK-801	Experimental groups	Control group	Main outcomes
Chen et al. (1998)	33 male SD rats	MCAO	11/11/11	N/A	1. ABI+MK-801 (1 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, post-injury)	2. ABI+saline 3. ABI+Memantine	Behavior: water maze test
Bertorelli et al. (1998)	12 male SD rats (230–300 g)	MCAO	4/4/4	RBI, Natick, MA, USA	1. ABI+MK-801 (3 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 10 min post-injury)	<ol> <li>ABI+saline</li> <li>ABI+dexamethasone</li> </ol>	Histopathology: cresyl violet staining, lesion volume
Onal et al. (1997)	31 male SD rats (290–350 g)	MCAO	7/8/7/9	N/A	1. ABI+MK-801 (0.5 mg/kg, intraperitoneally,	2. ABI+saline 3. ABI+citicoline 4. ABI+MK-801 and citicoline	Behavior: Neurologica scores Histopathology: TTC
Relton et al. (1996)	24 male SD rats (200–300 g)	MCAO	8/8/8	RBI, Natick, MA, USA	post-injury) 1. ABI+MK-801 (5 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, post-injury)	2. ABI+saline 3. Sham	staining, lesion volume Histopathology: TTC staining, lesion volume
Margaill et al. (1996)	34 male SD rats (300–350 g)	MCAO	Pretreatment: 9/9 Posttreatment: 8/8	N/A	1. Pretreatment: ABI+MK-801 (1 mg/kg, intravenously) 2. Posttreatment: ABI+MK-801 (1 mg/kg, intravenously 30 min post-injury)	3. ABI+saline	Histopathology: cresyl violet staining, brain edema, lesion volume
Liu and Feng (1995)	23 male Wistar rats (250–350 g)	MCAO	8/8/7	Sigma	1. ABI+MK-801 (0.5 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 15 min post-injury)	2. ABI+ oil 3. ABI+ Nimodipine	Behavior: Neurological scores Histopathology: TTC staining
Memezawa et al. (1995)	15 male Wistar rats (290–350 g)	MCAO	8/7	N/A	1. ABI+MK-801 (1 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 15 min pre-injury)	2. ABI+saline	Histopathology: TTC staining, lesion volume
Katsuta et al. (1995)	33 male SD rats (300–400 g)	MCAO	10/7/7/9	N/A	1. ABI+MK-801 (0.1 mg/kg) 2. ABI+MK-801 (1 mg/kg) 3. ABI+MK-801 (10 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, post-injury)	4. ABI+saline	Behavior: Neurological scores Histopathology: HE, cresyl violet and luxol fast blue staining, lesion volume
Green et al. (1995)	32 male Wistar rats	MCAO	6/6/8/6/6	N/A	1. ABI (37°C)+ MK-801 (4 mg/kg, intraperitoneally) 2. ABI (30°C)+ MK-801 (4 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, post-injury)	3. Sham 4. ABI (37°C) 5. ABI (30°C)	Behavior: water maze test
Xue et al. (1994)	47 male rats (225–250 g)	MCAO	11/15/15/6	N/A	1. ABI+MK-801 (1 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, post-injury)	2. ABI+saline 3. ABI+NBQX 4. ABI+MK-801 and NBQX	Histopathology: TTC staining
Lyden and Lonzo (1994)	118 male SD rats (250–300 g)	Embolic model (microspheres injection)	23/26/27/17/25	Merck	1. ABI+MK-801 (1 mg/kg, intravenously, 5 min pos-injury)	1. Sham 2. ABI+saline 3. ABI+Muscimol 4. ABI+MK801 and Muscimol	Behavior: water maze test Histopathology: Cresyl violet and Luxol Fast Blue staining, lesion volume
Lo et al. (1994)	12 male SD rats (300±20 g)	MCAO	6/6	N/A	1. ABI+MK-801 (0.5 mg/kg, intravenously, 80 min post-injury)	2. ABI+saline	Histopathology: MRI, TTC staining, lesion volume

#### Additonal Table 1 Continued

Study	Animals	Injury model	Animal number	Source of MK-801	Experimental groups	Control group	Main outcomes
Frazzini et al. (1994)	27 male Wistar rats (260–400 g)	MCAO	7/9/11	Merck	1. ABI + MK-801 (1 mg/kg) 2. ABI+MK-801 (2.5 mg/kg MK-801 intraperitoneally, 30 min pre-injury)	3. ABI+saline	Histopathology: TTC staining, lesion volume
Dawson et al. (1994)	19 male SD rats	MCAO	9/10		1. ABI+MK-801 (0.12 mg/kg, intravenously, pre-injury)	2. ABI+saline	Histopathology: HE staining, physiological variables, blood pressure, lesion volume
Shapira et al. (1993)	10 male Sabra rats (340±4 g)		5/5	Merck, Sharp & Dohme Research Laboratories	1. ABI+MK-801 (3 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 1 h post- injury)	2. ABI+saline	Histopathology: brain water content
Pschorn et al. (1993)	10 male Wistar rats (275–320 g)	MCAO	5/5	N/A	1. ABI+MK801 (1 mg/kg, i.h. post-injury)	2. ABI+untreatment	Histopathology: neuronal cells number, lesion volume MRI
Hamm et al. (1993)	76 male SD rats (300–350 g)	TBI (fluid percussion device)	Pretreatment: 8/8/8/14 Posttreatment: 8/8/8/14	N/A	1. ABI+MK-801 (0.3 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 15 min pre-injury) 2. ABI+MK-801 (0.3 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 15 min post-injury)	3. Sham 4. ABI+scopolamine	Behavior: water maze test
Roussel et al. (1992)	40 male Fischer-344 rats (290–330 g)	MCAO	9/12/10/9	N/A	1. ABI+MK801 (5 mg/kg) 2. ABI+MK801 (0.5 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 30 min pre-injury)	3. ABI+saline 4. ABI+saline	Histopathology: TTC staining, lesion volume
Iijima et al. (1992)	18 male CDF 344 strain rats (200–280 g)	MCAO	6/6/6	N/A	1. ABI+MK801 (3 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 3 min post-injury)	2. Sham 3. ABI+saline	Histopathology: Cresyl violet and HE staining, lesion volume
Gill et al. (1992)	32 male SD rats (330–370 g)	MCAO	16/16	N/A	1. ABI+MK801 (3 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 30 minutes post-injury)	2. ABI+saline	Histopathology: HE staining, lesion volume
Buchan et al. (1992)	18 male Wistar rats (180–230 g) and 62 SHR (230–260 g)	MCAO	Wistar: 9/9 SHR: 31/31	N/A	Wistar: ABI+MK801 (2.5 mg/kg) SHR: ABI+MK801 (5 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 30 min pre-injury and 2.5 mg/kg at 6 and 14 h)	Wistar: ABI+saline SHR: ABI+saline	Histopathology: HE staining, lesion volume
Oh and Betz (1991)	23 male SD rats (350–450 g)	MCAO	8/7/8	Merck & Co. Inc.	1. ABI+MK801 (0.5 mg/kg) 2. ABI+MK801 (2.0 mg/kg, intravenously, 30 min pre- injury)	3. ABI+saline	Histopathology: brain edema
Gill et al. (1991)	36 male SD rats (300–350 g)	MCAO	12/12/12	N/A	1. ABI+MK801 (0.04 mg/kg) 2. ABI+MK801 (0.4 mg/kg, intravenously, post-injury)	3. ABI+saline	Histopathology: HE staining, lesion volume
Bielenberg and Beck (1991)	23 Fischer 344 rats	MCAO	8/6/9		1. ABI+MK801 (1 mg/kg) 2. ABI+MK801 (10 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 30 min pre-injury)	3. ABI+saline	Histopathology: Cresyl violet staining, lesion volume
Dirnagl et al. (1990)	51 adult male spontaneously hypertensive rats (250–300 g)		12/15/11/13	N/A	1. ABI+MK801 (5 mg/kg) 2. ABI+MK801 (5 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, 30 min pre-injury and 2.5 mg/kg, 8 h and 16 h after injury)	3. ABI+saline 4. ABI+saline	Histopathology: HE staining, lesion volume
Park et al. (1988)	20 male SD rats (368–463 g)	MCAO	6/8/6	N/A	1. ABI+MK801 (0.5 mg/kg, intravenously, 30 min pre- injury) 2. ABI+MK801 (0.5 mg/kg, intravenously, 30 min post- injury)	3. ABI+saline	Histopathology: Cresyl violet and Luxol fast blue staining, lesion volume

ABI: Acute brain injury; TBI: traumatic brain injury; MCAO: middle cerebral artery occlusion; SD: Sprague-Dawley; TTC: staining, 2,3,5-triphenyltetrazolium chloride staining; MA: maslinic acid; HE: hematoxylin-eosin; GBE: Ginkgo biloba extract; MRI: magnetic resonance imaging; SHR: spontaneously hypertensive rats; DMSO: dimethyl sulfoxide; FDP: fructose 1,6-diphosphate; NAC: N-acetylcysteine; N/A: not available; min: minutes; h: hours.