

Ultrasound features as predictive markers of *BRAFV600E* mutation in thyroid cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Rongwei Liu^{1,2}, Haiyuan Li¹, Xiumei Bai¹, Hong Yang¹, Yun He¹

¹Department of Medical Ultrasound, The First Affiliated Hospital of Guangxi Medical University, Nanning, China; ²Department of Medical Ultrasound, The First Affiliated Hospital of Gannan Medical University, Ganzhou, China

Contributions: (I) Conception and design: R Liu, Y He; (II) Administrative support: H Yang, Y He; (III) Provision of study materials or patients: R Liu, H Li; (IV) Collection and assembly of data: R Liu, H Li, X Bai; (V) Data analysis and interpretation: R Liu, H Li, X Bai, H Yang; (VI) Manuscript writing: All authors; (VII) Final approval of manuscript: All authors.

Correspondence to: Yun He, MM. Department of Medical Ultrasound, The First Affiliated Hospital of Guangxi Medical University, No. 6 Shuangyong Road, Qingxiu District, Nanning 530021, China. Email: heyun@stu.gxmu.edu.cn.

Background: Conflicting evidence exists on the predictive value of ultrasound characteristics for *BRAFV600E* gene expression in thyroid cancer. This study aimed to determine the predictive value of ultrasound features for *BRAFV600E* gene expression status in thyroid cancer.

Methods: A systematic review of studies published before December 31, 2023, was conducted in the PubMed, Web of Science, and Cochrane Library databases. Studies evaluating the ultrasonographic features for predicting *BRAFV600E* gene mutations in thyroid cancer were included. The relevant data were extracted, and the quality of eligible studies was independently assessed by two reviewers. Statistical analysis was performed using RevMan 5.4 and Stata 12.0 software.

Results: The meta-analysis included 13 studies involving a total of 2,250 thyroid cancer patients. Ultrasound features significantly associated with *BRAFV600E* gene expression status in thyroid cancer (P<0.05) comprised hypoechogenicity, absence of halo, irregular borders, and vertical orientation. Contrastingly, no significant differences were observed in solid composition, irregular shape, and microcalcifications (P>0.05). Among the seven ultrasound features, the ones with superior combined sensitivity for nodules were hypoechogenicity, solid composition, absence of halo, and irregular borders, with sensitivities of 0.93 [95% confidence interval (CI): 0.87–0.96], 0.93 (95% CI: 0.86–0.97), 0.83 (95% CI: 0.72–0.91), and 0.74 (95% CI: 0.64–0.83), respectively. Finally, the areas under the summary receiver operating characteristic (SROC) curve with the highest diagnostic performance were the absence of halo and hypoechogenicity, with area under the curve (AUC) of 0.84 (95% CI: 0.80–0.87) and 0.81 (95% CI: 0.77–0.84), respectively.

Conclusions: The expression status of the *BRAFV600E* gene in thyroid cancer correlates with nodules exhibiting hypoechogenicity, absence of halo, irregular borders, and taller-than-wide shape. Notably, the absence of a halo and hypoechogenicity were identified as the most predictive ultrasonic features. However, due to the limited sample size, there may be bias in the meta-analysis results, and more extensive research is necessary.

Keywords: Thyroid cancer; ultrasound features; BRAFV600E; meta-analysis

Submitted Apr 23, 2024. Accepted for publication Jul 07, 2024. Published online Jul 24, 2024. doi: 10.21037/gs-24-134 View this article at: https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gs-24-134

Introduction

The past few years have witnessed a considerable increase in thyroid carcinoma cases (1,2). Papillary thyroid carcinoma (PTC), the most prevalent histological variant, constitutes about 80–90% of all thyroid cancer instances, and its incidence continues to increase annually (3). While the majority of thyroid cancers are associated with a favorable prognosis and low mortality rates, a minority of highrisk patients face extrathyroidal invasion, recurrence, and metastasis, especially in advanced stages. Thus, accurate preoperative evaluation of the lesion's characteristics and its invasiveness is critical for surgical decision-making and planning.

Earlier research indicates that the *BRAFV600E* mutation can serve as a valuable biomarker and therapeutic target for the diagnosis, risk stratification, and prognosis prediction of PTC (4,5). Of note, the *BRAFV600E* mutation plays a crucial role in regulating cell proliferation, differentiation, and apoptosis (6). Moreover, it is frequently observed in thyroid carcinoma cases and is connected with PTC.

Hence, preoperative prediction of the *BRAFV600E* mutation holds significant clinical value for the diagnosis and treatment of PTC. Previous studies have actively explored preoperative prediction of the presence of

Highlight box

Key findings

• This meta-analysis about the predictive value of ultrasonographic features for the *BRAFV600E* gene mutation in thyroid cancer has shown encouraging results. Certain ultrasonographic features can predict the *BRAFV600E* gene expression status in thyroid cancer patients.

What is known and what is new?

- The value of ultrasonographic features in predicting the *BRAFV600E* gene mutation in thyroid cancer is controversial and has not yet reached a consensus.
- In response to the current focus of controversy, our metaanalysis included the latest literature to explore the value of ultrasonographic features in predicting the *BRAFV600E* gene mutation in thyroid cancer.

What is the implication, and what should change now?

- If ultrasonographic features could predict the *BRAFV600E* gene mutation in thyroid cancer, it would help to reduce the rate of unnecessary biopsies.
- Further research may focus on using radiomics techniques to explore the value of ultrasonographic features in predicting the *BRAFV600E* gene mutation in thyroid cancer.

BRAFV600E mutations in thyroid cancer based on conventional ultrasound imaging (7). Some studies reported that conventional ultrasound features could predict *BRAFV600E* mutations in PTC (8-14), whereas others have reached opposite conclusions (7,15,16), leading to significant discrepancies in the field. Currently, there are no published meta-analyses on the use of ultrasound features to predict *BRAFV600E* mutations preoperatively in thyroid cancer patients, which are significant prognostic factors and would assist in the diagnosis and differentiation of the disease.

Therefore, this study aimed to conduct a meta-analysis to determine the predictive value of ultrasound features for *BRAFV600E* gene expression status preoperatively, laying a theoretical reference to potentially mitigate unnecessary invasive procedures such as fine-needle biopsies. We present this article in accordance with the PRISMA reporting checklist (available at https://gs.amegroups.com/article/ view/10.21037/gs-24-134/rc).

Methods

Literature search

Literature searches were conducted in PubMed, Web of Science, and Cochrane Library using the terms "thyroid cancer" and "ultrasonography", or "sonography", or "ultrasonic", or "ultrasound", and "*BRAF*" until December 2023.

A total of 214 articles was yielded by our search algorithm: 138 from PubMed, 74 from Web of Science, and 2 from Cochrane Library. EndNote X8 was used for literature management, and duplicates were manually excluded.

The inclusion criteria for this study were: (I) research on the ultrasound characteristics of thyroid cancer; (II) histopathology or fine needle aspiration (FNA) cytology as the standard reference; (III) evaluation of ultrasound features for predicting *BRAFV600E* mutation status; and (IV) studies with retrospective or prospective designs.

Exclusion criteria were: (I) studies not focusing on thyroid cancer; (II) unavailable data in 2×2 diagnostic tables; and (III) studies containing duplicated data or instances where patients may have overlapped across studies.

Data extraction

Data extracted from the selected studies comprised (I)

study details such as first author, publication year, design, and inclusion period; and (II) patient demographics such as gender, age, and number of malignant nodules. Two reviewers independently screened the literature and extracted data into a standardized Microsoft Excel spreadsheet to ensure consistency.

Literature evaluation criteria

Study quality was assessed using the Quality Assessment Tool for Diagnostic Accuracy Studies-2 (QUADAS-2) tool. Each article was evaluated for quality and categorized as "yes", "no", or "unclear". Literature was rated "yes" if the criteria were met, "no" if the criteria were unmet or unspecified, and "unclear" if the provided information was incomplete.

Furthermore, the included studies underwent risk of bias and applicability evaluation relative to the research question, with "low", "high", or "unclear" ratings denoting their applicability and bias risk levels. Disagreements were resolved via discussion.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were performed using RevMan 5.4 and Stata 12.0. The risk of bias in the included studies was assessed using bias risk graphs. The sensitivity and specificity of different ultrasound features in predicting the expression status of the BRAFV600E gene in thyroid cancer were analyzed, and the summary receiver operating characteristic (SROC) curves were plotted. The area under the curve (AUC) was calculated with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Heterogeneousness among studies was evaluated using the Q test and I^2 statistics. An I² inconsistency index was calculated to determine heterogeneity's level; high heterogeneousness was indicated by an $I^2 \ge 50\%$, and the random-effects model was adopted. In heterogeneity's absence, the fixed-effects model was applied. Funnel plots with different diagnostic indicators were used to detect potential publication bias, and sensitivity analyses were conducted. Forest plots generated by the software provided 95% CIs and P values for evaluating meta-analysis outcomes, with P<0.05 considered statistically significant.

Results

Literature search results and characteristics of included studies

The extensive search across the three databases yielded 214 relevant articles. Among them, 68 were found to be duplicates and thus excluded. A detailed review of the titles and abstracts led to the exclusion of 116 articles for their lack of relevance. Further scrutiny of the full texts resulted in the exclusion of 15 additional articles due to their insufficient relevance to the research topic. Moreover, two articles were excluded during the full-text assessment, given that it was not feasible to derive a 2×2 table from the data. Ultimately, 13 articles met the criteria and were incorporated into the systematic review and meta-analysis (8-20) (*Figure 1*).

This study consisted of 13 studies involving 2,250 patients with thyroid cancer, published between 2012 and 2022. Of these, eight were retrospective, three were prospective, and two were unspecified. The research was conducted across four countries: Poland, the United States, South Korea, and China. Sample sizes varied from 34 to 438 patients, with *BRAFV600E* mutation rates ranging from 47.7% to 86.5%. Notably, lower mutation rates were observed in European and American countries, while higher rates were found in East Asian countries (*Table 1*).

Quality assessment

Two reviewers independently conducted the quality assessment of the articles included in the study. In case of discrepancies between their evaluations, the decision was made following a thorough discussion. Based on the QUADAS-2 questionnaire outcomes, each study was characterized by a low risk of bias and qualified as high quality. This assessment is clearly reflected in both the literature risk of bias evaluation graph and the summary graph in *Figure 2*.

Evaluation of the diagnostic performance of ultrasound features

Notably, the combined sensitivity of the seven ultrasonographic features (as shown in Appendix 1) for



Figure 1 PRISMA flowchart of the study selection process. PRISMA, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses.

First author	Year	Country	Design	Sex (M/F)	Thyroid cancer (n)	No. of <i>BRAF</i> (+) (n)	Rate of <i>BRAF</i> (+) (%)	Period of enrollment
Li H (8)	2022	China	Retrospective	25/78	103	72	69.9	2020–2021
Skubisz K (9)	2021	Poland	NA	8/36	44	21	47.7	2015–2016
Shangguan R (10)	2019	China	Retrospective	101/296	397	323	81.4	2016
Zhang Q (11)	2017	China	Retrospective	100/338	438	379	86.5	2015–2016
Wang S (12)	2017	China	Retrospective	NA	64	44	68.8	2014–2015
Hahn SY (13)	2017	Korea	NA	26/124	150	115	76.7	1994–2004
Kakarmath S (14)	2016	USA	Prospective	NA	81	56	69.1	NA
Kwon MR (15)	2020	Korea	Retrospective	18/78	96	48	50.0	2012–2013
Li Q (16)	2017	China	Retrospective	6/28	34	18	52.9	2009–2010
Tang J (17)	2022	China	Retrospective	57/175	232	168	72.4	2019–2021
Lee DY (18)	2017	Korea	Prospective	60/272	332	192	57.8	2011–2014
Moon WJ (19)	2012	Korea	Prospective	35/129	164	141	86.0	2006–2008
Kabaker AS (20)	2012	USA	Retrospective	23/83	115	60	52.2	2007–2009

Table 1 The basic information of the included literatures

M, male; F, female; NA, not available.



Figure 2 Outcomes of QUADAS-2 for included studies. (A) Risk-of-bias summary. (B) Risk-of-bias graph. Symbols: (+), low risk of bias; (?), unclear risk of bias; (-), high risk of bias. QUADAS-2, Quality Assessment Tool for Diagnostic Accuracy Studies-2.

predicting *BRAFV600E* gene expression in thyroid cancer was satisfactory. The ultrasonographic features with high combined sensitivity included hypoechogenicity, solid composition, absence of halo, and ill-defined borders, with sensitivities of 0.93 (95% CI: 0.87–0.96), 0.93 (95% CI: 0.86–0.97), 0.83 (95% CI: 0.72–0.91), and 0.74 (95% CI: 0.64–0.83), respectively (*Figure 3* and *Table 2*). Additionally, the SROC curve displayed that features with high AUC were the absence of halo and hypoechogenicity, with AUC values of 0.84 (95% CI: 0.80–0.87) and 0.81 (95% CI: 0.77– 0.84), respectively (*Figure 4*).

Subgroup analysis and sensitivity analysis

High heterogeneousness was displayed by the forest plot in the pooled specificity and sensitivity of ultrasonographic features for predicting *BRAFV600E* gene expression in thyroid cancer. To address heterogeneousness and assess the results' robustness, the random-effects model was used to calculate combined outcomes, whilst subgroup analysis was conducted to explore heterogeneity's sources. The heterogeneity was addressed and homogenized following the exclusion of the study undertaken by Wang *et al.* using a leave-one-out approach (12), suggesting this study might

Liu et al. Meta-analysis: thyroid cancer BRAFV600E ultrasound features



Figure 3 Forest plot of sensitivity and specificity among studies. (A) Hypoechoic; (B) solid composition; (C) absent halo; (D) ill-defined margin. Each horizontal line represents an individual study with the result plotted as a box and the 95% CI displayed as the line. The diamond at the bottom of each plot shows the result of the individual studies combined and averaged. The horizontal lines of the diamond are the limits of the 95% CIs. CI, confidence interval.

Gland Surgery, Vol 13, No 7 July 2024

TT11 1 D 1	C	C 1	1.	C .
able 2 Predicting	performance	of each	sonographic	teatures
ruore - recurecting	Periormanee	or each	oonograpine	reaction

01	0 1						
Concernation for the second	SRO	C AUC	Sei	nsitivity	Specificity		
Sonographic leatures –	Value	95% CI	Value	95% CI	Value	95% CI	
Solid portion ≥50%	0.48	0.43-0.52	0.93	0.86–0.97	0.12	0.07-0.21	
Taller-than-wide	0.62	0.57-0.66	0.55	0.43-0.65	0.63	0.51-0.73	
III-defined margin	0.61	0.56-0.65	0.74	0.64–0.83	0.35	0.21-0.52	
Absent halo	0.84	0.80-0.87	0.83	0.72-0.91	0.58	0.34–0.79	
Hypoechoic	0.81	0.77–0.84	0.93	0.87-0.96	0.18	0.07–0.40	
Microcalcification	0.57	0.53-0.62	0.67	0.57-0.76	0.42	0.31–0.54	
Irregular shape	0.50	0.46-0.54	0.57	0.23–0.86	0.48	0.34–0.62	

SROC, summary receiver operator characteristic; AUC, area under the curve; CI, confidence interval



Figure 4 SROC curve with AUC of two sonographic features in predicting *BRAF* gene expression status in thyroid cancer. (A) Absent halo; (B) hypoechoic. SROC, summary receiver operator characteristic; SENS, sensitivity; SPEC, specificity; AUC, area under the curve.

have been a potential source of heterogeneity. Subgroup analysis of the seven ultrasonic features revealed that hypoechogenicity, absence of halo, ill-defined margins, and vertical orientation were statistically significant (P<0.05) predictors of *BRAFV600E* gene expression in thyroid cancer, with odds ratio (OR) values ranging from 1.02 to 36.91. However, solid nodule composition, irregular shape, and microcalcifications were not statistically significant (P>0.05) (*Figure 5*).

Publication bias

Additionally, the Deeks funnel plot analysis revealed no significant publication bias across the ultrasound characteristics (P>0.05) (*Figure 6*).

Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first metaanalysis summarizing the prognostic value of ultrasound features in preoperatively predicting *BRAFV600E* gene expression status in thyroid cancer. Prior research (21-23) documented that *BRAFV600E* gene expression is a critical prognostic factor in thyroid cancer, especially in advanced stages. Hence, this systematic review and meta-analysis were carried out to evaluate the predictive value of ultrasound characteristics. Based on the results of the included studies, the absence of halo and hypoechogenicity in thyroid nodules exhibited superior predictive efficacy for preoperative *BRAFV600E* gene expression status in thyroid carcinoma compared to the remaining ultrasonographic features.

In this meta-analysis, we included 13 studies involving

3.1.1 Composition Soli Hahn SY 2017 Kabaker AS 2012 Kakarmath S 2016 Kwon MR 2020 Moon W. 2012	Events d portion		- 001111			Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio	
Hahn SY 2017 Kabaker AS 2012 Kakarmath S 2016 Kwon MR 2020		Total ≥50%	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	ABCDEF
Kabaker AS 2012 Kakarmath S 2016 Kwon MR 2020 Moon W.I 2012	102	133	13	17	1.5%	1.01 [0.31, 3.33]		
Kakarmath S 2016 Kwon MR 2020 Moon W J 2012	23	50	37	65	2.0%	0.64 [0.31, 1.35]		
Won MH 2020	53	76	3	5	1.0%	1.54 [0.24, 9.82]		
	40	452	11	11	1.2%	3.93 [0.77, 19.98]		
Shangguan R 2019	219	385	9	12	1.4%	0.44 [0.12, 1.65]		
Skubisz K 2021	20	42	1	2	0.6%	0.91 [0.05, 15.52]		
Fang J 2022	160	216	8	16	1.7%	2.86 [1.02, 7.97]		
Vang S 2017	43	56	1	8	0.8%	23.15 [2.60, 205.89]		
Chang Q 2017 Subtotal (05%, CI)	363	416	16	22	1.7%	2.57 [0.96, 6.85]	_	
Total events	1159	1014	101	107	12.070	1.51 [0.70, 2.55]	-	
teterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.	56: Chi ² =	20.14.0	tf = 9 (P	= 0.02)	: l² = 55%			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 1.21 (P	= 0.23)		0.02,				
0.1.2 Taller than wide								
lahn SY 2017	59	68	56	82	1.9%	3.04 [1.31, 7.06]		
Won MR 2020	26	32	32	03 57	1.0%	3 18 [1 36 7 47]		
ee DY 2017	144	224	48	108	2.2%	2.25 [1.41, 3.59]		
i H 2022	50	71	22	32	1.8%	1.08 [0.44, 2.67]	_ _	
Noon WJ 2012	51	62	90	102	1.8%	0.62 [0.25, 1.50]	-+	
Shangguan R 2019	102	120	221	277	2.1%	1.44 [0.80, 2.57]	<u>+-</u>	
Skubisz K 2021	14	23	7	21	1.5%	3.11 [0.91, 10.69]		
ang J 2022	128	166	40	66	2.1%	2.19 [1.19, 4.04]		
Vang 5 2017 Thang O 2017	31	122	274	20	1.0%	0.87 (0.48, 1.59)	<u> </u>	
Subtotal (95% CI)	105	967	214	1168	20.7%	2.01 [1.35, 3.00]	•	
intal events	738	507	825		20.1 /0	2.01 [1.00, 0.00]	1	
leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.	28; Chi ² =	29.55, 0	df = 10 (F	P = 0.00	01); l² = 66	3%		
est for overall effect: Z	= 3.42 (P	= 0.0006	6)					
. 1.5 Margin III-defined	65	00	50	64	1.00	0 60 10 27 4 227		
anni 31 2017 abaker AS 2012	25	69 30	90 25	01 85	1.9%	0.00 [0.27, 1.33] 7 14 [2 40, 20 47]		
akarmath S 2012	25	42	23	39	1.7%	2.55 [0.96 6.76]	<u> </u>	
won MR 2020	39	76	9	20	1.7%	1.29 [0.48, 3.46]	- .	
ee DY 2017	142	236	50	96	2.2%	1.39 [0.86, 2.24]	+-	
i H 2022	65	95	7	8	0.8%	0.31 [0.04, 2.63]		
i Q 2017	11	23	7	11	1.3%	0.52 [0.12, 2.29]		
100n WJ 2012	128	148	13	16	1.4%	1.48 [0.39, 5.65]		
hangguan R 2019	259	308	64	89	2.1%	2.06 [1.19, 3.59]		
kubisz K 2021	20	38	1	6	0.8%	5.56 [0.59, 52.16]		
bang S 2017	30 164	47	215	246	2.2%	0.84 [0.49, 1.46]	-	
ubtotal (95% CI)	104	1324	215	694	19.4%	1.61 [1.02, 2.56]	◆	
otal events	989		480					
leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.	38; Chi ² =	32.47, 0	df = 11 (F	P = 0.00	006); l² = 6	6%		
est for overall effect: Z	= 2.02 (P	= 0.04)						
.1.4 Echogenicity Hyp	oechoic		40		4.00/	0 70 /4 05 0 701		
lahn SY 2017	96	116	19	34	1.9%	3.79 [1.65, 8.70]		
abaker A5 2012 akarmath S 2016	50	70	10	45	1.8%	8.75 [3.05, 20.96] 14.67 [4.66, 47.32]		
won MR 2020	43	77	5	19	1.6%	3.54 [1.16, 10.81]		
ee DY 2017	156	170	36	62	2.0%	8.05 [3.82, 16.93]		
i H 2022	70	101	2	2	0.5%	0.45 [0.02, 9.60]		
loon WJ 2012	139	161	2	3	0.7%	3.16 [0.27, 36.32]		
Shangguan R 2019	317	390	6	7	0.9%	0.72 [0.09, 6.10]		
Skubisz K 2021	21	39	0	5	0.5%	12.78 [0.66, 246.95]	′	
vang S 2017 Ibang O 2017	42	54	2 22	10	1.1%	14.00 [2.62, 74.90]	<u> </u>	
Subtotal (95% CI)	337	1637	22	247	14.4%	4.90 [2.87, 8.34]	•	
otal events	1335		116					
leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.	33; Chi² =	18.95, 0	df = 10 (F	P = 0.04	1); l ² = 47 ⁴	%		
est for overall effect: Z	= 5.84 (P	< 0.0000	01)					
1.5 Calcification Micr	ocalcifica	ition						
lahn SY 2017	85	107	30	43	1.9%	1.67 (0.75, 3.73)	+	
ahakar AS 2012	52	65	30	40 50	1.8%	21 00 [7 96 55 40]		
akarmath S 2016	35	56	25	32	1.7%	0.47 [0.17, 1.27]		
won MR 2020	19	41	29	55	1.9%	0.77 [0.34, 1.74]	-+	
ee DY 2017	102	170	90	162	2.2%	1.20 [0.78, 1.86]	+-	
H 2022	41	50	31	53	1.8%	3.23 [1.31, 7.99]		
i Q 2017	14	27	4	7	1.1%	0.81 [0.15, 4.32]		
	96	124	8	9	0.9%	0.43 [0.05, 3.57]		
Noon WJ 2012	200	∠06	114	141	∠.2% 1.5%	1.05 [0.62, 1.78]		
foon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021	209	21	10		1 23/202	1 43 [] 44 4 607		
loon WJ 2012 ihangguan R 2019 ikubisz K 2021 iano J 2022	209 11 92	21 128	10 76	104	2.1%	1.43 [0.44, 4.69] 0.94 [0.53 1.68]		
foon WJ 2012 ihangguan R 2019 ikubisz K 2021 iang J 2022 Vang S 2017	209 11 92 37	21 128 47	10 76 7	23 104 17	2.1% 1.5%	1.43 [0.44, 4.69] 0.94 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41]	+	
loon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 /ang S 2017 hang Q 2017	209 11 92 37 210	21 128 47 252	10 76 7 169	23 104 17 186	2.1% 1.5% 2.1%	1.43 [0.44, 4.69] 0.94 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.28, 0.92]		
loon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 /ang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (95% CI)	209 11 92 37 210	21 128 47 252 1344	10 76 7 169	23 104 17 186 882	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8%	1.43 [0.44, 4.69] 0.94 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.28, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32]		
toon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 /ang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (95% CI) otal events	209 11 92 37 210	21 128 47 252 1344	10 76 7 169 601	23 104 17 186 882	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8%	1.43 [0.44, 4.69] 0.94 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.28, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32]		
toon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 /ang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (95% CI) otal events leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² =	21 128 47 252 1344	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (F	23 104 17 186 882 P < 0.00	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8%	1.43 [0.44, 4.69] 0.94 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.28, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32]		
loon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 ikubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 iubtotal (95% CI) otal events leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. est for overall effect: Z	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = = 1.32 (P	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, o = 0.19)	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (F	23 104 17 186 882 P < 0.00	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 0001); I ² =	1.43 [0.44, 4.69] 0.94 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.28, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80%		
Itoon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 lubtotal (95% Cl) otal events leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. jest for overall effect: Z 1.6 Shape Irregular	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = = 1.32 (P	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, 0 = 0.19)	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (F	23 104 17 186 882 P < 0.00	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8%	1.43 [0.44, 4.69] 0.94 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17, 41] 0.50 [0.28, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80%	+	
toon WJ 2012 ihangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 hang Q 2017 ibang Q 2017 Colla events leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. est for overall effect: Z .1.6 Shape Irregular ahn SY 2017	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = = 1.32 (P 36	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, o = 0.19)	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (F 79	23 104 17 186 882 P < 0.00	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9%	1.43 [0.44, 4.69] 0.94 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.28, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80%		
Aoon WJ 2012 Shangguan R 2019 Skubisz K 2021 'ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 'hang Q 2017 'bubtotal (95% CI) 'otal events feterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. 'est for overall effect: Z .1.6 Shape Irregular Iahn SY 2017 'won MR 2020	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = = 1.32 (P 36 12	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, c = 0.19) 49 32	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (F 79 36	23 104 17 186 882 P < 0.00 101 64	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.9%	1.43 [0.44, 4.69] 0.94 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.28, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80%		
teon WJ 2012 thangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 thang 0 2017 viabtotal (6% CI) otal events telerogeneily: Tau ² = 0. est for overall effect: Z .1.6 Shape Irregular lain SY 2017 won MR 2020 Vang S 2017	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = = 1.32 (P 36 12 42	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, c = 0.19) 49 32 53	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (F 79 36 2	23 104 17 186 882 P < 0.00 101 64 11	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.9% 1.1%	1.43 [0.44, 4.69] 0.94 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.28, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.20, 1.11] 17.18 [3.24, 91.25]		
teon WJ 2012 thangguan R 2019 kubiaz K 2021 ang J 2022 yang S 2017 tubtotal (5% CI) otal events teterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. est for overall effect: Z 1.6 Shape Irregular tain SY 2017 won MR 2020 Yang S 2017 hang Q 2017	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = = 1.32 (P 36 12 42 225	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, c = 0.19) 49 32 53 265	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (F 79 36 2 154	23 104 17 186 882 P < 0.00 101 64 111 173	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.9% 1.1% 2.1%	1.43 [0.44, 4.69] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17, 41] 0.50 [0.26, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.20, 1.11] 17, 18 [3.24, 91 [25] 0.69 [0.39, 1.24]		
teon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Yang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (95% CI) otal events leterogeneity: Tau* = 0. est for overall effect: Z 1.6 Shape Irregular ahn SY 2017 won MR 2020 Yang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (95% CI)	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = = 1.32 (P 36 12 42 225	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, c = 0.19) 49 32 53 265 399	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (F 79 36 2 154	23 104 17 186 882 P < 0.00 101 64 11 173 349	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.9% 1.1% 2.1% 7.0%	1.43 [0.44, 4.68] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17, 41] 0.50 [0.26, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.20, 1.11] 17, 18 [3.24, 91.25] 0.68 [0.39, 1.24] 1.10 [0.42, 2.93]	+	
toon WJ 2012 thangpuan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 ang Q 2017 ubical (95% CI) dal overls detrogeneity: Tau'= 0. est for overall effect Z .1.6 Shape Irregular ains SY 2017 wom IM 2020 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubical (95% CI) otal events laterrogeneity: Tau'= 0.	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = = 1.32 (P 36 12 42 225 315 75; Chi ² =	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, c = 0.19) 49 32 53 265 399	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (F 79 36 2 154 271	23 104 17 186 882 P < 0.00 101 64 11 173 349	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.9% 1.1% 2.1% 7.0%	1.43 [0.44, 4.68] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17, 41] 0.50 [0.26, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.26, 1.17] 1.71 8[324, 91 25] 0.68 [0.39, 1.24] 1.10 [0.42, 2.93] %		
loon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubics K 2021 ang J 2022 ang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (95% C) cet for overall effect Z cet for overall effect Z cet for overall effect Z cet S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (95% C) cotal events efforgenetity: Tau ² = 0. efforgenetity: Tau ² = 0.	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = = 1.32 (P 36 12 42 225 315 75; Chi ² = 0.20 (P	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, o = 0.19) 49 32 53 265 399 14.80, o = 0.84)	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (F 79 36 2 154 271 df = 3 (P	23 104 17 186 882 9 < 0.00 101 64 11 173 349 = 0.002	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.9% 1.1% 2.1% 7.0%	1.43 [0.44, 4.69] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.26, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.20, 1.11] 17.18 [3.24, 91.25] 0.69 [0.39, 1.24] 1.10 [0.42, 2.93]		
loon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubics K 2021 ang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubitotal (95% C) dal events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. 1.1 S hange Irregular ahm SY 2017 hang Q 2017 ubitotal (95% C) dal events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. est for overail effect: Z	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = = 1.32 (P 36 12 42 225 315 75; Chi ² = = 0.20 (P	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, c = 0.19) 49 32 53 265 399 14.80, c = 0.84)	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (F 79 36 2 154 271 df = 3 (P	23 104 17 186 882 P < 0.00 101 64 11 173 349 = 0.002	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.1% 2.1% 7.0% 2); I ² = 80 ⁴	1.43 [0.44, 4.66] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.26, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.20, 1.11] 17.48 [3.24, 91.25] 0.69 [0.39, 1.24] 1.10 [0.42, 2.93]		
toon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (95% C) ost levents deterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. est for overall effect Z 1.6 Shape tregular tahn S Y 2017 won MR 2020 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (95% C) otal events sc for overall effect Z 1.7 Halo absent	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = 1.32 (P 36 12 42 225 315 75; Chi ² = = 0.20 (P	21 128 47 252 1344 (59.51, c = 0.19) 49 32 53 265 399 (14.80, c = 0.84)	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (f 79 36 2 154 271 df = 3 (P	23 104 17 186 882 P < 0.00 101 64 11 173 349 = 0.002	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.9% 1.1% 2.1% 7.0% 2); I ² = 80°	1.43 [0.44, 4.69] 0.94 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.20, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.20, 1.11] 17.18 [3.24, 91.25] 0.69 [0.39, 1.24] 1.10 [0.42, 2.93]		
teon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (95% C) otal events eterogeneity: Tau' = 0, atin S Y 2017 won MB 2020 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (95% C)) otal events leterogeneity: Tau' = 0, est for overall effect: Z 1.7 Halo absent abaker A 2012	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = = 1.32 (P 36 12 42 225 315 75; Chi ² = = 0.20 (P 51	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, c = 0.19) 49 32 53 265 399 14.80, c = 0.84) 66	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (f 79 36 2 154 271 df = 3 (P 9	23 104 17 186 882 9 < 0.00 101 64 11 173 349 = 0.002	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.9% 1.1% 2.1% 7.0% 2); I ² = 80°	1.43 [0.44, 4.66] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 6.29 [1.60, 17, 41] 0.50 [0.26, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.20, 1.11] 1.71 [8] 23, 49 [1.25] 0.69 [0.39, 1.24] 1.10 [0.42, 2.93] %		
toon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (8% C) otal events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. die levents eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. von MF 2020 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (8% C) otal events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. die levents eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. die levents eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = 1.32 (P 36 12 42 225 315 75; Chi ² = 0.20 (P 51 17	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, c = 0.19) 49 32 53 265 399 14.80, c = 0.84) 66 31	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (F 79 36 2 154 271 df = 3 (P 9 4	23 104 17 186 882 9 < 0.00 101 64 11 173 349 = 0.002 49 13	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.9% 1.1% 2.1% 7.0% 2); I ² = 80°	1.43 [0.44, 4.66] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.20, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.20, 1.11] 17.18 [3.24, 91.25] 0.69 [0.30, 12.41] 1.10 [0.42, 2.93] %		
teon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubitotal (95% C) dal events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. dan SY 2017 vang MF 2020 vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubitotal (95% C)) otal events leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. est for overall effect: Z .1.7 Halo absent abaker A 2012 kubisz K 2021 ubitotal (95% C))	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = = 1.32 (P 36 12 42 225 315 75; Chi ² = = 0.20 (P 51 17	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, c = 0.19) 49 32 53 265 399 14.80, c = 0.84) 66 31 97	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (F 79 36 2 154 271 df = 3 (P 9 4	23 104 17 186 882 9 < 0.00 101 64 11 173 349 = 0.002 49 13 62	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.9% 1.1% 2.1% 7.0% 2); I ² = 80' 1.8% 1.4% 3.2%	1.43 [0.44, 4.66] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 0.50 [0.26, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.26, 1.17] 1.74 [3.24, 91.25] 0.66 [0.39, 1.24] 1.10 [0.42, 2.93] %		
teor WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (8% C) ola events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. et for overal effect Z .1.6 Shape Irregular ahn S Y 2017 worn MR 2020 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (8% C) otal events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. dial events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. dial events abaker A 2012 kubisz K 2021 ubtotal (9% C) ubtotal (9% C) ubtotal (9% C)	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = = 1.32 (P 36 12 42 225 315 75; Chi ² = = 0.20 (P 51 17 8 68 51 17 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, c = 0.19) 49 32 53 265 399 14.80, c = 0.84) 66 31 97	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (F 79 36 2 154 271 df = 3 (P 9 4 13	23 104 17 186 882 9 < 0.00 101 64 111 173 349 = 0.002 49 13 62	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.9% 1.1% 2.1% 7.0% 2); I ² = 80° 1.8% 1.4% 3.2%	1.43 [0.44, 4.66] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17, 41] 0.50 [0.20, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.20, 1.11] 17.18 [3.24, 91,25] 0.66 [0.20, 1.24] 1.10 [0.42, 2.93] %		
teon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 van tal (5% C) otal events eterogeneity: Tau' = 0. and S 2017 van MF 2020 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 vato MF 2020 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 vato MF 2020 van MF 20	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = 1.32 (P 36 12 42 225 315 75; Chi ² = 0.20 (P 51 17 68 11; Chi ² = 2.29 (Chi ² =	$\begin{array}{c} 21\\ 128\\ 47\\ 252\\ 1344\\ 59.51, (, = 0.19)\\ 49\\ 32\\ 53\\ 265\\ 399\\ 14.80, (, = 0.84)\\ 66\\ 31\\ 97\\ 4.10, dt\\ -0.02\\ \end{array}$	10 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (f 79 36 2 154 271 df = 3 (P 9 4 13 f = 1 (P =	233 104 17 186 882 9 < 0.00 101 64 11 173 349 = 0.002 49 13 62 5 0.04);	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 0001); ² = 1.9% 1.9% 1.9% 7.0% 2.1% 7.0% 2.1% 7.0% 2.1% 7.0%	1.43 [0.44, 4.66] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 0.50 [0.26, 0.52] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.26, 1.17] 1.74 [132, 491, 25] 0.66 [0.39, 1.24] 1.10 [0.42, 2.93] %		
teon WJ 2012 thangquan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (95% CI) odal events set for overall effect. Z 1.5 Shape Irregular tahn S Y 2017 vom MR 2020 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 Vang S 2	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = 1.32 (P 36 12 42 42 225 315 75; Chi ² = 0.20 (P 51 17 68 11; Chi ² = 2.28 (P	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, c = 0.19) 49 32 25 399 14.80, c = 0.84) 66 31 97, d f = 0.02)	10 76 601 3f = 12 (f 79 36 2 271 154 271 154 271 154 3 (P 9 4 13 15 9 4	233 104 17 186 882 2 < 0.00 101 64 11 173 349 = 0.000 49 13 62 0 < 0.00 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	2.1% 1.5% 22.8% 22.8% 22.8% 22.8% 1.9% 1.9% 1.1% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 1.4% 3.2% 1.4% 3.2%	1.43 [0.44, 4.66] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17, 41] 0.50 [0.26, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.20, 1.11] 17.18 [0.24, 91, 25] 0.66 [0.36, 1.24] 1.10 [0.42, 2.93] % 15.11 [6.00, 38.06] 2.73 [0.89, 10.79] 6.95 [1.31, 36.91]		
theor WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (8% C) cest for overall effect: Z cla events teterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. est for overall effect: Z 1.5 Shape Irregular lam S 2017 vang S 201	209 11 92 37 2100 62; Chi ² = = 1.32 (P 36 12 42 225 315 75; Chi ² = = 0.20 (P 51 17 68 81; Chi ² = = 2.28 (P	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, (59.51, (9 22 5399 14.80, (66 31 97 4.10, df = 0.02) 7382	10 76 7 169 601 119 79 36 2 2 154 271 154 271 154 271 154 9 4 13 3 (P	233 104 17 186 882 2 < 0.00 101 64 11 173 349 = 0.002 49 13 62 5 = 0.04); 3569	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.9% 1.1% 2.1% 7.0% 2); I ² = 80 ⁴ 1.8% 1.4% 3.2% I ² = 76% 100.0%	1.43 [0.44, 4.66] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17, 41] 0.50 [0.26, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.26, 1.11] 17, 18 [32, 49, 125] 0.68 [0.39, 1.24] 11, 10 [0.42, 2.93] % 15, 11 [6, 00, 38, 08] 2.73 [0.69, 10, 79] 6.95 [1.52, 2.49]		
teon WJ 2012 thangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (9%) C() del events teterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0. 4.6 Shape Irregular teterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0. won MR 2020 Vang S 2017 van MR 2020 Vang S 2017 van MR 2020 Vang S 2017 van G 2017 Vang S 2017 van MR 2020 Vang S 2017 van MR 2020 Vang S 2017 van MR 2020 Vang S 2017 van MR 2020 Van MR 2020 Van MR 2021 van Van MR 2021 van	$\begin{array}{c} 209\\ 11\\ 92\\ 92\\ 77\\ 210\\ 62\\ Chi^2 = 1.32 \ (P\\ 36\\ 225\\ 315\\ 75\\ Chi^2 = 0.20 \ (P\\ 51\\ 17\\ 68\\ 811\\ Chi^2 = 2.28 \ (P\\ 5607\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 21\\ 128\\ 47\\ 252\\ 1344\\ 59.51, c\\ 53\\ 265\\ 399\\ 14.80, c\\ = 0.84\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 10\\ 76\\ 7\\ 7\\ 169\\ 601\\ 1f = 12 \ (f\\ 79\\ 36\\ 2\\ 154\\ 271\\ 154\\ 271\\ 154\\ 154\\ 1 \\ 3 \ (P\\ 9\\ 4\\ 13\\ 16\\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 9\\ 2407\\ \end{array}$	233 104 17 186 882 2 < 0.00 101 64 11 173 349 = 0.002 49 13 62 0.004); 3569	2.1% 1.5% 2.1% 22.8% 20001); I ² = 1.9% 1.9% 1.1% 2.1% 7.0% 2); I ² = 80' 1.8% 1.4% 3.2% I ² = 76% 100.0%	1.43 [0.44, 4.66] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17, 41] 0.50 [0.26, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1,70] 0.47 [0.20, 1.11] 17, 18 [3.24, 91, 25] 0.59 [0.39, 124] 1.10 [0.42, 2.33] % 15, 11 [6,00, 38,08] 2.73 [0.68, 10,79] 6.95 [1.31, 36,91] 1.95 [1.52, 2.49]		
	$\begin{array}{c} 209\\ 11\\ 92\\ 92\\ 77\\ 210\\ 1003\\ 62\\ Chi^2 = 1.32 \ (P\\ 42\\ 225\\ 315\\ 75 \ Chi^2 = 0.20 \ (P\\ 51\\ 17\\ 68\\ 11\ Chi^2 = 2.28 \ (P\\ 5607\\ 55\ Chi^2 = 0.20 \ (P\\ 5607\\ 5607\ (P\\ 5607\\ 5607\ (P\\ 5607\ (P\ 5607\ (P$	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, (1) 49 32 53 265 53 265 339 14.80, (1) 97 4.10, df = 0.02) 7382 263.32.2	$\begin{array}{c} 10\\ 76\\ 7\\ 7\\ 169\\ 601\\ 1f=12 \ (f\\ 79\\ 36\\ 2\\ 154\\ 271\\ 1f=3 \ (P\\ 9\\ 4\\ 13\\ 1f=1 \ (P=2\\ 2407\\ df=62\\ \end{array}$	233 104 17 186 882 9 < 0.00 101 64 111 173 349 = 0.002 49 13 62 50.04); 3569 (P < 0.0	2.1% 1.5% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.9% 2.1% 7.0% 2.1% 7.0% 1.8% 1.4% 3.2% I ² = 80' 1.8% 1.4% 3.2%	1.43 [0.44, 4.66] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17, 41] 0.50 [0.26, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.26, 1.11] 1.71 [8] (3.4, 91.25] 0.68 [0.39, 1.24] 15, 11 [6, 00, 38, 08] 2.73 [0.69, 10, 79] 6.95 [1.51, 36, 91] 1.95 [1.52, 2.49] = 76%		
teon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (9%) C) del events teterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0. 6. Shape Irregular ahn SY 2017 worn MR 2020 Vang Q 2017 Ang Q 2017 Ang Q 2017 Vang Q 2017	$\begin{array}{c} 209\\ 11\\ 92\\ 92\\ 37\\ 1003\\ 62. \ Chi^{\mu}=\\ 1.32\ (P\\ 36\\ 12\\ 42\\ 225\\ 315\\ 75; \ Chi^{\mu}=\\ 0.20\ (P\\ 51\\ 17\\ 68\\ 11. \ Chi^{\mu}=\\ 2.28\ (P\\ 56. \ Chi^{\mu}=\\ 5.067\\ 68\\ 5. \ Chi^{\mu}=\\ 5.33\ (P\\ 5.33\ (P\ 5.33\ (P$	21 128 47 252 1344 59.51, c 53 265 399 14.80, c 84) 66 31 97 4.10, df = 0.02) 7382 263.32, < 0.0000	10 76 7 601 ff = 12 (f 79 36 2 2 154 271 ff = 3 (P 9 9 4 13 15 ff = 1 (P = 2407 (df = 62 2)	233 104 17 186 882 9 < 0.00 101 64 11 173 349 = 0.000 49 13 62 (P < 0.0	2.1% 1.5% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.19% 1.19% 2.1% 1.19% 2.1% 1.9% 1.19% 2.1% 1.9% 1.19% 1.9% 1.9% 1.9% 1.9% 1.9%	1.43 [0.44, 4.69] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.26, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.23, 1.17] 17.18 [3.24, 91.25] 0.69 [0.30, 1.24] 1.10 [0.42, 2.93] % 15.11 [6.00, 38,08] 2.73 [0.69, 10.79] 6.95 [1.31, 36.91] 1.95 [1.52, 2.49] = 76%		
toon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (95% C) otal events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. et for overall effect Z et for overall effect Z soft overts eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. dial events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 1. dial events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62: Chi ² = 1.32 (P 36 12 225 315 75: Chi ² = 0.20 (P 51 17 75: Chi ² = 2.25 51 17 75 68 611: Chi ² = 2.28 (P 5607 65; Chi ² = 5.33 (P 5.5 Chi ² = 2.53 (P) 5.5 Chi ² = 5.5 Chi ² = 5.53 (P) 5.5 Chi ² = 5.53 (P) 5.55 (P	$\begin{array}{c} 21\\ 21\\ 128\\ 47\\ 252\\ 1344\\ 59.51, (, -)\\ 522\\ 53\\ 265\\ 399\\ 14.80, (-)\\ 83\\ 97\\ 14.80, (-)\\ 10\\ 97\\ 4.10, (di\\ -)\\ 10\\ 263, 22\\ (-)\\ 0.000\\ 7382\\ 263, 32\\ (-)\\ 0.000\\ -1, 788\\ 263, 32\\ (-)\\ 0.000\\ -1, 788\\ 263, 32\\ (-)\\ 0.000\\ -1, 788\\ 263, 32\\ (-)\\ 0.000\\ -1, 788\\ 263, 32\\ (-)\\ 0.000\\ -1, 788\\ 263, 32\\ (-)\\ 0.000\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1, 788\\ -1$	10 76 7 169 601 119 169 601 179 36 2 2 154 271 154 271 154 271 154 175 79 9 4 4 13 8 5 17 9 4 5 5 79 9 4 5 79 70 79 36 2 2 154 70 79 79 36 2 2 154 70 79 36 2 2 154 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70	233 104 17 186 882 9 < 0.00 101 64 11 173 349 = 0.000 49 13 62 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0	2.1% 2.1% 1.5% 2.2.8% 0001); I ² = 1 1.9% 1.9% 1.9% 1.9% 2.1% 7.0% 2.1% 7.0% 2.1% 7.0% 2.1% 7.0% 1.5% 1.4% 3.2% 1.4% 3.2% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5%	1.43 [0.44, 4.66] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 6.29 [1.60, 17, 41] 0.50 [0.26, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.20, 1.11] 1.718 [3.24, 91.25] 0.68 [0.39, 1.24] 8, 273 [0.69, 10, 79] 6.95 [1.51, 2.49] = 76%	d1 0.1 1 0 100 urs [experimental] Favours [control]	
teon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisz K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (95% C) otal events teterogeneity: Tau ^a = 0. 1.6 Shape Irregular ahn SY 2017 von MR 2020 Yang Q 2017 Ang Ang Q 2017 Ang Ang Q 2017 Ang Q 2017	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = 1.32 (P 36 12 225 315 75; Chi ² = 0.20 (P 51 17 68 68 62; Chi ² = 0.20 (P 51 17 11; Chi ² = 0.22 (P 5607 56; Chi ² = 55; Chi ² = 56; C	$\begin{array}{c} 21\\ 21\\ 128\\ 128\\ 47\\ 252\\ 1344\\ 59.51, c\\ 59.51, c\\ 5339\\ 14.80, c\\ = 0.84\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 10\\ 7\\ 169\\ 601\\ 1f=12\ (f\\ 7\\ 9\\ 36\\ 2\\ 154\\ 271\\ 154\\ 271\\ 1f=3\ (P\\ 9\\ 4\\ 13\\ f=1\ (P=2\\ 2407\\ df=62\\ 21\\ 1)\\ 3, df=6\\ \end{array}$	104 104 17 186 882 0 < 0.00 101 64 11 173 349 = 0.002 49 13 62 0.04); 3569 (P < 0.0 (P = 0.0)	2.1% 1.5% 2.2.8% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.9% 7.0% 7.0% 7.0% 7.0% 7.0% 7.0% 7.0% 7.0	1.43 [0.44, 4.66] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.26, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.20, 1.11] 17.18 [3.24, 91.25] 0.66 [0.30, 12.4] 1.10 [0.42, 2.93] % 15.11 [6.00, 38.06] 2.73 [0.69, 10.79] 6.95 [1.31, 36.91] 1.95 [1.52, 2.49] = 76%	01 0.1 Favours [control]	
theon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubisc K 2021 ang J 2022 Vang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (8% C) otal events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. Shape Uraguan and S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (8% C) otal events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. kubisc K 2021 ubtotal (8% C) dal events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 1. dal events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 1. dal events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0. dal events eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.	209 11 92 37 210 1003 52: Chi ² = 1.32 (P 36 12 225 315 75: Chi ² = 0.20 (P 51 17 68 811: Chi ² = 2.28 (P 56: Chi ² = 2.28 (P	21 218 128 128 128 129 129 1344 59.51, (59.51, (59.51, (1345 59.51, (59.51, (1345 59.51, (1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 1345 13	100 76 7 169 601 154 221 154 271 154 271 154 271 154 3 154 7 9 4 3 15 7 9 4 3 16 9 7 9 3 6 17 9 3 6 17 9 3 6 17 9 3 6 9 3 6 9 3 6 9 3 6 9 2 10 9 3 6 9 3 6 9 2 10 9 3 6 9 10 9 3 6 9 10 9 3 6 9 10 9 3 6 9 10 9 3 6 10 9 3 10 9 10 9 3 10 9 3 10 9 3 10 9 3 10 9 3 10 9 3 10 9 3 10 9 3 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	104 104 17 186 882 0 < 0.00 101 64 111 173 349 = 0.000 49 13 62 (0 < 0.0) (2 < 0.04); 3569 (P < 0.0) (P = 0.0)	2.1% 2.1% 1.5% 22.8% 22.8% 0001); I ² = 1.9% 1.9% 7.0% 7.0% 1.1% 7.0% 1.1% 7.0% 1.1% 7.0% 1.1% 7.0% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5% 1.5%	1.43 [0.44, 4.69] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.20, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.20, 1.11] 17.18 [3.24, 91.25] 0.69 [0.30, 1.24] 1.10 [0.42, 2.93] % 15.11 [6.00, 38.08] 2.73 [0.69, 10.79] 6.95 [1.31, 36.91] 1.95 [1.52, 2.49] = 76% ↓ 0.000	d1 0.1 1 0 100 Favours [control]	
loon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 kubics K 2021 ang S 2017 hang Q 2017 ubtotal (95% C) dul events eterogeneity: Tau' = 0. dul events eterogeneity: Tau' = 0. dul events eterogeneity: Tau' = 0. dubtotal (95% C) dul events eterogeneity: Tau' = 0. dest for overall effect: Z dubtotal (95% C)) dul events eterogeneity: Tau' = 0. dul events eterogeneity: Tau' = 0. dul events eterogeneity: Tau' = 0. dul events eterogeneity: Tau' = 0. dul events eterogeneity: Tau' = 1. dul events e	$\begin{array}{c} 209\\ 11\\ 92\\ 37\\ 10\\ 1003\\ 62, Ch^{\mu}=\\ 1, 12\\ 210\\ 1003\\ 62, Ch^{\mu}=\\ 1, 12\\ 212\\ 42\\ 225\\ 51\\ 12\\ 42\\ 225\\ 55\\ Ch^{\mu}=\\ 0, 20\\ (P\\ 55\\ Ch^{\mu}=\\ 0, 20\\ 17\\ 65\\ 55\\ Ch^{\mu}=\\ 0, 20\\ 17\\ 56\\ 05\\ Ch^{\mu}=\\ 0, 20\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 1$	21 128 47 252 59.51, d 59.51, d 50.51,	100 76 901 df = 12 (f 79 36 2 2 154 271 154 271 154 154 13 df = 3 (P 9 4 13 13 = 1 (P = 2407 07 df = 62 3, df = 6 (n) bias)	233 104 17 1866 882 2 < 0.0(101 64 11 173 339 = 0.002 49 13 62 \$ 0.04); 3569 (P < 0.((P = 0.0)	2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 2.2.1% 2.2.1% 2.2.8% 2.2.8% 2.1% 7.0% 2.1% 7.0% 2.1% 7.0% 2.1% 7.0% 2.1% 7.0% 2.1% 7.0% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 2.1	1.43 [0.44, 4.66] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.26, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.20, 1.11] 17.18 [32, 49 1.25] 0.69 [0.39, 1.24] 1.10 [0.42, 2.93] % 1.5.11 [6.00, 38.06] 2.73 [0.69, 10.79] 6.95 [1.31, 36.91] 1.95 [1.52, 2.49] = 76% ↓ 0.0 6.4%	01 0.1 1 0 100 Urus [experimenta] Favours [control]	
loon WJ 2012 hangguan R 2019 hubics K 2021 ang S 2017 hubics K 2021 ang S 2017 hubics (195% C) Jubics (195% C) Jubics (195% C) hubics (195% C)	209 11 92 37 210 1003 62; Chi ² = 1.32 (P 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 5 5 75; Chi ² = 0.20 (P 51 17 66; Chi ² = 2.28 (P 55; Chi ² = 0.20 (P 55; Chi ² = 0.20 (P 55; Chi ² = 0.20 (P 55; Chi ² = 0.20 (P) 75; Chi ² =	21 128 47 252 255 59.51, (59.51, (59.51, (59.51, (53 265 53 339 14.80, (265 53 339 14.80, (8, (265 339 14.80, (97 4.10, df 4.10, df 97 7382 263.32, < 263.32, < 263.32, < 263.32, < 263.32, < 263.32, < 263.32, < 263.32,	100 76 7 169 601 df = 12 (f 79 6 2 154 271 df = 3 (P 9 4 13 3 f = 1 (P = 2407 7 9 3, df = 62 201) 3, df = 62 201	233 104 104 104 104 107 882 882 9 < 0.00 101 64 117 173 349 = 0.000 49 13 62 (P < 0.04); 3569 (P < 0.04); (P = 0.02) (P = 0.02)	2.1% 2.1% 2.1% 2.2.8% 2.2.8% 1.9% 1.9% 2.1% 7.0% 7.0% 7.0% 7.0% 7.0% 7.0% 7.0% 7.0	1.43 [0.44, 4.66] 0.49 [0.53, 1.68] 5.29 [1.60, 17.41] 0.50 [0.26, 0.92] 1.40 [0.85, 2.32] 80% 0.77 [0.35, 1.70] 0.47 [0.20, 1.11] 17.18 [3.24, 91.25] 0.66 [0.30, 1.24] 1.10 [0.42, 2.93] % 1.511 [6.00, 38.08] 2.73 [0.69, 10.79] 6.95 [1.51, 36, 91] 1.95 [1.52, 2.49] = 76% ↓ 0.01 0.47 [0.22, 1.41] 1.95 [1.52, 2.49] = 76% ↓ 0.01 0.47 [0.42, 2.93]	01 0.1 1 Favours [control]	

Figure 5 Odds ratio and its 95% confidence intervals of ultrasound features in predicting *BRAF* gene expression status in thyroid cancer. M-H, Mantel-Haenszel; CI, confidence interval.



Figure 6 Deeks funnel plot to assess the publication of bias. ESS, effective sample size; sqrt, square root.

2,250 patients with thyroid carcinoma to examine the value of ultrasonographic features in predicting the BRAFV600E gene expression status in thyroid carcinoma. Herein, a SROC curve was constructed for each ultrasound feature, and the AUC value was used as an indicator of the diagnostic efficacy. A larger AUC corresponds to a greater diagnostic accuracy. The findings revealed that the AUC for the absence of a halo and hypoechogenicity was notably high, at 0.84 (95% CI: 0.80-0.87) and 0.81 (95% CI: 0.77-0.84), respectively. The findings implied that the absence of halo and hypoechogenicity were strongly predictive of BRAFV600E gene expression status in thyroid cancer. Likewise, ultrasonographic features such as hypoechogenicity, absence of halo, blurred margins, and vertical orientation were all significantly associated (P<0.05) with BRAFV600E gene expression in thyroid carcinoma, consistent with international studies' findings (9,14,24). This may be ascribed to the invasiveness of thyroid cancer, enhanced heterogeneity of cancer cells, and alterations in the tumor microenvironment associated with the BRAFV600E gene mutation (25,26). Increased invasiveness results in tumor cells penetrating the surrounding thyroid tissue and capsule, while increased heterogeneity reflects a complex cellular composition within the tumor, contributing to indistinct margins and heterogeneous internal echoes on ultrasonography. The presence of hypoechogenicity in nodules is commonly attributed to interstitial edema, which is the buildup of fluid between follicles and within the lobules, resulting in mild to moderate hypoechogenicity. Malignant nodules are often characterized by hypoechogenic or markedly hypoechogenic appearances. A nodule with a

taller-than-wide shape is usually associated with malignancy and serves as an independent risk factor. The halo observed around thyroid nodules typically stems from blood vessels encircling the periphery. Some research suggests that this halo may also result from additional pathological changes, including compressive atrophy of the thyroid tissue outside the capsule, inflammatory exudate from adjacent tissues, and interstitial edema. A thin halo may indicate benign tumors, while malignant nodules often lack a halo or present with a thick halo. However, our meta-analysis noted that the differences in solid composition, irregular shape, and microcalcifications of nodules were not statistically significant (P>0.05), discrepant from the observations of previous studies wherein microcalcifications were significantly associated with BRAFV600E mutations in thyroid cancer and considered an independent predictive factor (8,11,12,20). These discrepancies may be attributed to differences in the studied populations, with reports documenting a significant association of microcalcifications being predominantly observed in East Asian populations. Variability in interpreting ultrasound imaging features among different physicians can significantly influence these findings.

The analysis of different ultrasonographic features across the 13 included studies exposed that while the combined sensitivity of the included features was satisfactory, their specificity was relatively poor. Although this collectively enhances screening capability, it may simultaneously lead to an increase in the rate of misdiagnosis. The high sensitivity but low specificity of these predictive outcomes can be attributed to the non-specific nature of the ultrasound features and their indirect correlation with BRAFV600E mutation. Ultrasound characteristics such as internal echoes, microcalcifications, blurred margins, and the absence of a halo are notably more prevalent in nodules with BRAFV600E mutations. Nevertheless, these features might also manifest in nodules without BRAFV600E mutations, leading to reduced specificity. The BRAFV600E mutation is also associated with certain characteristics of PTC and a more aggressive tumor phenotype. Nonetheless, this association is likely indirect. Moreover, heterogeneity among the included studies was relatively high; hence, the random-effects model was adopted, and subgroup sensitivity analyses were performed using the leave-one-out approach. The significant decrease in heterogeneity observed after excluding one particular study signals that it might have been the primary contributor to the heterogeneity (12). After conducting an exhaustive review, it was determined that the current study, which exclusively focused on patients

with PTC undergoing total thyroidectomy and central lymph node dissection, applied more stringent inclusion criteria compared to the remaining 12 studies, thereby accounting for the observed heterogeneity.

This study found that the prevalence of *BRAFV600E* mutations is lower in Western countries and higher in East Asian countries. This could be tied to genetic predispositions within the population, as well as variations in lifestyle and dietary choices. In addition, it is plausible that certain genetic traits in East Asian populations may increase their susceptibility to *BRAFV600E* mutations. Furthermore, disparities in iodine consumption could be linked to the frequency and variation of mutations observed in patients with thyroid cancer.

There are limitations to this study that cannot be overlooked. To begin, the patient demographic largely consisted of Asians in the included studies, with limited representation from Western populations, thereby limiting the generalizability of the findings across different ethnicities. In addition, not all studies reported data on the seven ultrasound features, and there was a lack of uniformity in their criteria across the studies. Furthermore, the exclusion of non-English language articles could have introduced inherent biases, as potentially relevant studies in other languages were not considered.

Conclusions

This meta-analysis evaluated ultrasonographic features for predicting the expression status of the *BRAFV600E* gene in thyroid cancer to determine their predictive value for *BRAF* expression status, which could mitigate the reliance on invasive diagnostic methods such as FNA biopsies and ultimately reduce the financial burden for patients. Our results collectively indicated the expression of the *BRAFV600E* gene in thyroid cancer was associated with hypoechoic nodules, the absence of halos, unclear margins, and a taller-than-wide shape. Notably, the absence of a halo and hypoechogenicity were identified as superior predictors of *BRAFV600E* gene status.

Acknowledgments

Funding: None.

Footnote

Reporting Checklist: The authors have completed the

PRISMA reporting checklist. Available at https://gs.amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/gs-24-134/rc

Peer Review File: Available at https://gs.amegroups.com/ article/view/10.21037/gs-24-134/prf

Conflicts of Interest: All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form (available at https://gs.amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/gs-24-134/coif). The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Ethical Statement: The authors are accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Open Access Statement: This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits the non-commercial replication and distribution of the article with the strict proviso that no changes or edits are made and the original work is properly cited (including links to both the formal publication through the relevant DOI and the license). See: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.

References

- 1. Russell MD, Shonka DC Jr, Noel J, et al. Preoperative Evaluation of Thyroid Cancer: A Review of Current Best Practices. Endocr Pract 2023;29:811-21.
- Miller KD, Nogueira L, Devasia T, et al. Cancer treatment and survivorship statistics, 2022. CA Cancer J Clin 2022;72:409-36.
- Haugen BR, Alexander EK, Bible KC, et al. 2015 American Thyroid Association Management Guidelines for Adult Patients with Thyroid Nodules and Differentiated Thyroid Cancer: The American Thyroid Association Guidelines Task Force on Thyroid Nodules and Differentiated Thyroid Cancer. Thyroid 2016;26:1-133.
- 4. Subash A, Sinha P, Singh A. BRAF mutation and age in differentiated thyroid cancer risk stratification: Two sides of the same coin. Oral Oncol 2020;106:104732.
- Yan C, Huang M, Li X, et al. Relationship between BRAF V600E and clinical features in papillary thyroid carcinoma. Endocr Connect 2019;8:988-96.
- 6. Kure S, Ishino K, Kudo M, et al. Incidence of BRAF V600E mutation in patients with papillary thyroid

Gland Surgery, Vol 13, No 7 July 2024

carcinoma: a single-institution experience. J Int Med Res 2019;47:5560-72.

- Xu JM, Chen YJ, Dang YY, et al. Association Between Preoperative US, Elastography Features and Prognostic Factors of Papillary Thyroid Cancer With BRAF(V600E) Mutation. Front Endocrinol (Lausanne) 2019;10:902.
- Li H, Ma J, Xi X, et al. The analysis and validation of the prediction value of conventional and contrast-enhanced ultrasonography for BRAF mutant papillary thyroid microcarcinoma. Gland Surg 2022;11:1683-96.
- Skubisz K, Januszkiewicz-Caulier J, Cybula P, et al. Higher EU-TIRADS-Score Correlated with BRAF V600E Positivity in the Early Stage of Papillary Thyroid Carcinoma. J Clin Med 2021;10:2304.
- Shangguan R, Hu YP, Huang J, et al. Association Between BRAF(V600E) Mutation and the American College of Radiology Thyroid Imaging, Reporting and Data System in Solitary Papillary Thyroid Carcinoma. Acad Radiol 2019;26:154-60.
- Zhang Q, Liu BJ, Ren WW, et al. Association between BRAF V600E Mutation and Ultrasound Features in Papillary Thyroid Carcinoma Patients with and without Hashimoto's Thyroiditis. Sci Rep 2017;7:4899.
- Wang S, Liu Z, Sun S, et al. Ultrasound features suspicious for malignancy predict the risk of BRAF mutation in papillary thyroid carcinoma. Int J Clin Exp Med 2017;10:9470-5.
- Hahn SY, Kim TH, Ki CS, et al. Ultrasound and clinicopathological features of papillary thyroid carcinomas with BRAF and TERT promoter mutations. Oncotarget 2017;8:108946-57.
- Kakarmath S, Heller HT, Alexander CA, et al. Clinical, Sonographic, and Pathological Characteristics of RAS-Positive Versus BRAF-Positive Thyroid Carcinoma. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2016;101:4938-44.
- Kwon MR, Shin JH, Park H, et al. Radiomics Study of Thyroid Ultrasound for Predicting BRAF Mutation in Papillary Thyroid Carcinoma: Preliminary Results. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 2020;41:700-5.
- 16. Li Q, Yuan J, Wang Y, et al. Association between the BRAF V600E mutation and ultrasound features of the

Cite this article as: Liu R, Li H, Bai X, Yang H, He Y. Ultrasound features as predictive markers of *BRAFV600E* mutation in thyroid cancer: a systematic review and metaanalysis. Gland Surg 2024;13(7):1243-1253. doi: 10.21037/gs-24-134 thyroid in thyroid papillary carcinoma. Oncol Lett 2017;14:1439-44.

- Tang J, Jiang S, Ma J, et al. Nomogram based on radiomics analysis of ultrasound images can improve preoperative BRAF mutation diagnosis for papillary thyroid microcarcinoma. Front Endocrinol (Lausanne) 2022;13:915135.
- Lee DY, Hwang SM, An JH, et al. Predicting Extrathyroidal Extension in Patients With Papillary Thyroid Microcarcinoma According to a BRAF Mutation. Clin Exp Otorhinolaryngol 2017;10:174-80.
- Moon WJ, Choi N, Choi JW, et al. BRAF mutation analysis and sonography as adjuncts to fine-needle aspiration cytology of papillary thyroid carcinoma: their relationships and roles. AJR Am J Roentgenol 2012;198:668-74.
- 20. Kabaker AS, Tublin ME, Nikiforov YE, et al. Suspicious ultrasound characteristics predict BRAF V600E-positive papillary thyroid carcinoma. Thyroid 2012;22:585-9.
- Rashid FA, Munkhdelger J, Fukuoka J, et al. Prevalence of BRAF(V600E) mutation in Asian series of papillary thyroid carcinoma-a contemporary systematic review. Gland Surg 2020;9:1878-900.
- 22. Bandoh N, Goto T, Kato Y, et al. BRAF V600E mutation co-existing with oncogenic mutations is associated with aggressive clinicopathologic features and poor prognosis in papillary thyroid carcinoma. Asian J Surg 2024;47:413-9.
- 23. Wei X, Wang X, Xiong J, et al. Risk and Prognostic Factors for BRAF(V600E) Mutations in Papillary Thyroid Carcinoma. Biomed Res Int 2022;2022:9959649.
- Wen J, Liu H, Lin Y, et al. Correlation analysis between BRAF(V600E) mutation and ultrasonic and clinical features of papillary thyroid cancer. Heliyon 2024;10:e29955.
- de Visser KE, Joyce JA. The evolving tumor microenvironment: From cancer initiation to metastatic outgrowth. Cancer Cell 2023;41:374-403.
- 26. Li DD, Zhang YF, Xu HX, et al. The role of BRAF in the pathogenesis of thyroid carcinoma. Front Biosci (Landmark Ed) 2015;20:1068-78.