

OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Li S, Xu M, Niu Q, Xu S, Ding Y, Yan Y, et al. (2015) Efficacy of Procyanidins against In Vivo Cellular Oxidative Damage: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. PLoS ONE 10(10): e0139455. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0139455

Editor: Giovanni Li Volti, University of Catania, ITALY

Received: June 25, 2015

Accepted: September 14, 2015

Published: October 1, 2015

Copyright: © 2015 Li et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the <u>Creative</u> <u>Commons Attribution License</u>, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Funding: This work was supported by Key Areas of Science and Technology Research Project of Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps (No. 2014BA039, No. 2015AG014); High-tech Intellectual Project of Shi Hezi University (No. RCZX201112); and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 81560517).

Competing Interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Efficacy of Procyanidins against In Vivo Cellular Oxidative Damage: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Shugang Li^{1©‡}, Mengchuan Xu^{1©‡}, Qiang Niu¹, Shangzhi Xu¹, Yusong Ding¹, Yizhong Yan¹, Shuxia Guo¹*, Feng Li²*

1 Department of Public Health and Key Laboratory of Xinjiang Endemic and Ethnic Diseases (Ministry of Education), Shihezi University School of Medicine, Xinjiang, China, **2** Department of Pathology and Key Laboratory of Xinjiang Endemic and Ethnic Diseases (Ministry of Education), Shihezi University School of Medicine, Shihezi, Xinjiang, 832002, China

• These authors contributed equally to this work.

‡ These authors are co-first authors on this work.

* pge888@sina.com (SXG); lifeng78551@126.com (FL)

Abstract

Aims

In this study, the efficacy of proanthocyanidins (PCs) against oxidative damage was systematically reviewed to facilitate their use in various applications.

Methods

A meta-analysis was performed by two researchers. Each investigator independently searched electronic databases, including Cochrane, PubMed, Springer, Web of Science, China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CKNI), China Science and Technology Journal Database (CSTJ), and WanFang Data, and analyzed published data from 29 studies on the effects of PCs against oxidative damage. Oxidative stress indexes included superoxide dismutase (SOD), malondialdehyde (MDA), catalase (CAT), glutathione (GSH), glutathione peroxidase (GPx), and total antioxidative capacity (T-AOC).

Results

Compared with the oxidative damage model group, PCs effectively improved the T-AOC, SOD, GSH, GPx, and CAT levels, and reduced the MDA levels; these differences were statistically significant (P < 0.05). In studies that used the gavage method, SOD (95% CI, 2.33–4.00) and GPx (95% CI, 2.10–4.05) were 3.16-fold and 3.08-fold higher in the PC group than in the control group, respectively. In studies that used the feeding method, SOD (95% CI, 0.32–1.74) and GPx (95% CI, -0.31 to 1.65) were 1.03-fold and 0.67-fold higher in the PC group than in the control group, respectively. Statistically significant differences in the effects of PCs (P < 0.00001) were observed between these two methods. MDA estimated from tissue samples (95% CI, -5.82 to -2.60) was 4.32-fold lower in the PC group than in the control group. In contrast, MDA estimated using serum samples (95% CI, -4.07 to -2.06)

was 3.06-fold lower in the PC group than in the control group. The effect of PCs on MDA was significantly greater in tissue samples than in serum samples (P = 0.02).

Conclusion

PCs effectively antagonize oxidative damage and enhance antioxidant capacity. The antagonistic effect may be related to intervention time, intervention method, and the source from which the indexes are estimated.

Introduction

Oxidative stress is caused by an imbalance between the production of reactive oxygen species (ROS) and the ability of a biological system to eliminate ROS or repair the resulting damage [1]. Thus, oxidative stress may result in an increased number of free radicals and cause lipid peroxidation, eventually leading to apoptosis and many diseases [2]. Increasing evidence has shown that oxidative stress plays a particularly important role in the development of cardiovascular diseases such as atherosclerosis, hypertension, atrial fibrillation, and cardiomyopathy [3]. Many reactive substances, such as arsenic [4] and hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2) [5], can result in organismal damage via ROS and oxidative stress. Therefore, it is important to repair damage using antioxidant agents.

The effects of antioxidant substances such as vitamin C [6], E [7], and luteins [8] have been extensively studied owing to their health benefits. Additionally, the relative antioxidant efficacy of these substances has been previously examined. In particular, proanthocyanidins (PCs) have gained recent attention. These polyphenols are abundant in grape, haw, and gingko [9]. PCs have high antioxidant capacities and are efficient free radical scavengers. They are highly water soluble, easy to extract, rich in various plants, and can be absorbed naturally [10]. The antioxidative effects of PCs have not been systematically reviewed; additionally, the reported antioxidant efficacy of these compounds differs among studies [11–13], and their antioxidative ability is still unclear. Therefore, we performed a systematic review and meta-analysis based on a literature search to comprehensively analyze relevant data regarding the efficacy of PCs against oxidative damage. This work provides a scientific basis for the development and utilization of PC-based resources. According to the PICOS framework, the subjects, intervention, controls, and outcomes considered in this analysis were mice, PCs, an oxidative damage model, and enzyme levels with respect to oxidative stress, respectively. Randomized controlled mouse experiments were considered.

Materials and Methods

Eligibility criteria

The eligibility criteria were as follows. Randomized controlled mouse experiments and studies published in either Chinese or English were included. All strains and mouse genders were included in the present study. Oxidative damage model groups induced by any substance were used as the controls. The experimental groups included interventions with PCs only. If various doses of PCs were used in a study, the highest dose was chosen for this analysis. Valid outcome measures included the levels of enzymes related to oxidative stress measured by a microplate reader. These indicators of oxidative stress included superoxide dismutase (SOD),

malondialdehyde (MDA), catalase (CAT), glutathione (GSH), glutathione peroxidase (GPx), and total antioxidative capacity (T-AOC).

Exclusion criteria

The exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) repeat publications, (2) incomplete information, (3) insufficient or insignificant statistical data, (4) unrelated to the study objectives, (5) lack of appropriate controls, and (6) reviews.

Search strategy

Searches were performed using the electronic databases Cochrane, PubMed, Springer, Web of Science, China Science and Technology Journal Database (CSTJ), WanFang Data, and China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CKNI) (last search updated on April 30, 2015) using PICOS. The key search string was (mice OR rat) AND (procyanidins OR proanthocyanidins) AND (antioxygenation OR antioxidant OR antioxidation) and the language was restricted to English and Chinese. We read both of the title and abstract first to make a decision whether the study is suitable for our study.

Data extraction

Two reviewers (SGL and MCX) independently screened full-length articles. The following information was extracted from the complete manuscripts of each qualified study: publication characteristics (title of the study, first author, publication date, and journal/magazine), basal data (n, mean \pm SD) for the experimental and control groups, PC intervention modes, period of PC treatment, outcome indicators, and the source of indicator estimates (i.e., serum or tissue samples) (S1 File). If the two reviewers hold different opinions, then we invited the Prof. GSX, who is teaching meta-analysis subject in university, to make a final decision of the results.

Data analysis

The mean values for each outcome indicator differed between the experimental and control groups. Significant heterogeneity was detected (P < 0.05, $I^2 > 75\%$); therefore, a random-effects model was applied for the meta-analysis. A multivariate meta-regression analysis was performed to determine the source of heterogeneity. Continuous variables were estimated as standardized mean differences (SMDs) with 95% confidence intervals (CI) between the PC-treated animals and control animals. All reported *P*-values are two-sided and a significance level of 0.05 was used. For additional insight, subgroup analyses were performed based on intervention mode (feed or gavage), length of PC treatment (<30 d or \geq 30 d), and sample source (serum or tissue samples) to determine the factors associated with differences among study results in the outcome indicators. Publication bias was explored using funnel plots. All analyses were implemented in Review Manager Version 5.2 (The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2012) and Stata 12.0.

Results

Study characteristics

Using the search strategy, 462 articles were identified (Fig 1), of which 29 were valid for the meta-analysis according to the eligibility and exclusion criterias. [14–42] (Table 1). Mice were used as animal models in these studies, and each study investigated the effect of PCs on oxidative damage. The oxidative damage models were primarily mice induced by various substances (e.g., arsenite, H_2O_2 , and fluorine), and the antioxidative damage models were provided





various PCs as interventions. PCs were administered by feeding (n = 3) or gavage (n = 26). The PC intervention time varied among studies, and was categorized as $<30 \text{ d} (n = 17) \text{ or } \ge 30 \text{ d} (n = 12)$. Oxidative stress indexes (i.e., MDA, SOD, GPx, T-AOC, GSH, and CAT) were examined using serum (n = 19) and tissue samples (n = 10).

Meta-analyses

Effect of PC on SOD. A total of 28 studies estimated SOD levels. A pooled analysis showed that the SOD level was 2.91-fold higher in the experimental group than in the control group (95% CI, 2.16–3.67; Z = 7.53; P < 0.00001) with significant heterogeneity (P < 0.0001; $I^2 = 88\%$; Fig.2).

Effect of PC on T-AOC. A total of 4 studies estimated T-AOC levels. A pooled analysis showed that the T-AOC level was 3.79-fold higher in the experimental group than in the control group (95% CI, 0.69–6.88; Z = 2.40; P = 0.02) with significant heterogeneity (P < 0.0001; $I^2 = 94\%$; Fig 3).

Effect of PC on GSH. A total of 9 studies estimated GSH levels. A pooled analysis showed that the GSH level was 4.53-fold higher in the experimental group than in the control group (95% CI, 2.30–6.76; Z = 3.97; P < 0.0001) with significant heterogeneity (P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 93\%$; Fig.4).

Effect of PC on GPx. Fourteen studies described GPx levels. A pooled analysis showed that the GPx level was 2.68-fold higher in the experimental group than in the control group (95% CI, 1.80–3.56; Z = 5.96; P < 0.00001) with significant heterogeneity (P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 85\%$; Fig.5).

Effect of PC on CAT. Nine studies estimated CAT levels. A pooled analysis showed that the CAT level was 4.95-fold higher in the experimental group than in the control group (95% CI, 2.99–6.90; Z = 4.96; P < 0.00001) with significant heterogeneity (P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 92\%$; Fig.6).

Effect of PC on MDA. Twenty-five studies described MDA levels. A pooled analysis showed that the MDA level was 3.06-fold lower in the experimental group than in the control

Table 1.	Characteristics of	the animal studies	s included in the meta	-analysis.
----------	--------------------	--------------------	------------------------	------------

First author (year)	Language	n	Mode of intervention	Period of PC(day)	Source of indicators	Outcome indicators
Su-Jin2009 [<u>14]</u>	English	10	Feed	<30d	Tissue	2.3.6
Mi-Ok Shin2010 [<u>15]</u>	English	6	Feed	<30d	Tissue	1
Xiayuan2010 [<u>16]</u>	Chinese	8	Gavage	<30d	Serum	1.2
Adem Guler2011 [17]	English	8	Gavage	<30d	Tissue	1.2.3.4
HUANG Qi-liang2011 [18]	English	10	Gavage	\geq 30d	Serum	1.2
Lijianling2011 [<u>19]</u>	Chinese	10	Gavage	<30d	Tissue	1.2
Osama M.Ashour2011 [20]	English	12	Gavage	<30d	Tissue	1.2.5.6
Xielimei2011 [21]	Chinese	10	Gavage	≥30d	Tissue	1.2
Soo-Kyong Choi2012 [22]	English	8	Feed	<30d	Tissue	2.3.5
Vijayakumar2012 [<u>23]</u>	English	6	Gavage	<30d	Tissue	2.3.5.6
Wangweifen2012 [24]	Chinese	10	Gavage	<30d	Tissue	1.2
Xiao GENG2012 [<u>25]</u>	English	8	Gavage	<30d	Tissue	1.2
Yu Deng2012 [26]	English	8	Gavage	<30d	Tissue	1.2.3.5
zhangxuan2012 [<u>27</u>]	English	16	Gavage	<30d	Tissue	1.2.3.6
zhaopeng2012 [<u>28]</u>	Chinese	12	Gavage	\geq 30d	Serum	1.2.3
Bailijun2013 [<u>29]</u>	Chinese	5	Gavage	<30d	Serum	1.2.3.6
Dingyusong2013 [<u>30]</u>	Chinese	10	Gavage	\geq 30d	Tissue	1.2
Hanaa A2013 [<u>31]</u>	English	6	Gavage	\geq 30d	Tissue	1.2.3.4
Jiangyanfei2013 [<u>32]</u>	Chinese	12	Gavage	\geq 30d	Serum	1.2
Miaozhiru2013 [<u>33]</u>	Chinese	10	Gavage	\geq 30d	Serum	1.2.3.5
E Bakar2014 [<u>34]</u>	English	7	Gavage	<30d	Tissue	1.2.4.5
Gaolu2014 [<u>35]</u>	Chinese	10	Gavage	\geq 30d	Serum	1.2.3.6
Hua Zhang2014 [<u>36</u>]	English	10	Gavage	\geq 30d	Tissue	1.2.5.6
Juan Xiao2014 [<u>37]</u>	English	10	Gavage	<30d	Serum	1.2.3
Noorah2014 [<u>38]</u>	English	10	Gavage	<30d	Tissue	2.6
Tingting Ren2014 [39]	English	8	Gavage	\geq 30d	Serum	2.5
Wangcheng2014 [40]	Chinese	10	Gavage	\geq 30d	Tissue	1.2.4.5
Ying GAO2014 [<u>41]</u>	English	10	Gavage	\geq 30d	Tissue	1.2.3
Esrafil Mansouri2015 [42]	English	10	Gavage	<30d	Serum	1.2.3.6

Note: n = number of experimental animals; 1 = malondialdehyde, 2 = superoxide dismutase, 3 = glutathione peroxidase, 4 = total antioxidative capacity, 5 = glutathione, and 6 = catalase.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0139455.t001

group (95% CI, 4.07–2.06; Z = 5.99; P < 0.00001) with significant heterogeneity (P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 92\%$; Fig 7).

Subgroup analyses. We conducted a subgroup analysis considering the mode of intervention (gavage vs. feed), intervention period (<30 d vs. \geq 30 d), and source of samples (tissue vs. serum). The SMD between PCs and control groups for SOD and GPx of tissue samples, gavage, and \geq 30-d interventions were higher than those for serum samples, feeding, and <30-d interventions (P < 0.05, see Fig 8A1, 8A2, 8B1, 8B2 and 8B3). Furthermore, the SMD of MDA between the PC and control groups was significantly higher for tissue samples than for serum samples (P < 0.05, see Fig 8C1). The SMD of CAT between the PC and control groups was also higher for interventions of \geq 30 d than for those of <30 d (P < 0.05, see Fig 8D3). We did not detect statistically significant differences in GSH or T-AOC (see Fig 8C3, 8D1 and 8D2).

Sensitivity analysis. A sensitivity analysis was performed to evaluate the robustness of the study results. Specifically, we conducted a sensitivity analysis for SOD because it was estimated in 28 studies. Fig 9 shows the stability results for all studies; these results indicated that no

	Expe	rimental		Co	ntrol		1	Std. Mean Difference		Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Bu-Jin2009	0.21	0.04	10	0.17	0.01	10	4.4%	1.31 [0.33, 2.30]	2009	
(iayuan2010	172.52	2.99	8	163.36	4.4	8	4.1%	2.30 [0.96, 3.65]	2010	
Adem Guler 2011	95.95	6.32	8	58.14	4.17	8	2.8%	6.68 [3.84, 9.52]	2011	
_ijianling2011	311.8	71	10	241	62.7	10	4.4%	1.01 [0.07, 1.96]	2011	
(ielimei2011	292.88	43.59	10	243.48	48.85	10	4.4%	1.02 [0.08, 1.97]	2011	
Osama M. Ashour2011	30.1	1.14	12	17.7	1.2	12	2.5%	10.23 [6.96, 13.49]	2011	
HUANG Qi-liang 2011	116.421	11.501	10	100.788	8.436	10	4.3%	1.48 [0.47, 2.50]	2011	
thaopeng2012	115.9	10.5	12	108.8	7.1	12	4.5%	0.76 [-0.07, 1.60]	2012	
Gao GENG 2012	69.95	6.91	8	63.66	7.07	8	4.3%	0.85 [-0.19, 1.89]	2012	+
thangxuan 2012	9.08	1.09	16	3.27	0.31	16	3.6%	7.07 [5.09, 9.04]	2012	
Nangweifen 2012	465.43	8.12	10	387.22	7.47	10	2.4%	9.60 [6.17, 13.04]	2012	
/u Dena2012	89.67	11.82	8	57.5	11.09	8	4.0%	2.65 [1.21, 4.10]	2012	
/ijayakumar2012	116.72	1.75	6	65.23	1.78	6	0.3%	26.93 [13.73, 40.12]	2012	
Boo-Kyong Choi2012	0.147	0.015	8	0.137	0.011	8	4.3%	0.72 [-0.30, 1.74]	2012	+
Hanaa A 2013	140	1.15	6	103.1	1.32	6	0.3%	27.52 [14.04, 40.99]	2013	
Dingyusong2013	93.3	38.8	10	98.1	23.5	10	4.4%	-0.14 [-1.02, 0.73]	2013	-
Bailijun2013	158.55	10.03	5	140.15	4.14	5	3.8%	2.17 [0.43, 3.90]	2013	
Jiangyanfei2013	101.03	12.53	12	79.97	6.82	12	4.4%	2.02 [1.00, 3.03]	2013	
diaozhiru2013	254.45	22.84	10	226.82	21.05	10	4.4%	1.20 [0.23, 2.18]	2013	
Esrafil Mansouri2014	2,059.23	90.34	10	1,612.49	68.28	10	3.5%	5.34 [3.30, 7.39]	2014	
E Bakar2014	184.77	12.98	7	170.25	8.94	7	4.2%	1.22 [0.04, 2.40]	2014	
-lua Zhang2014	87.24	1.19	10	60.92	1.24	10	0.9%	20.74 [13.52, 27.97]	2014	
ring GAO 2014	52.9	13.8	10	32.6	0.9	10	4.3%	1.99 [0.87, 3.10]	2014	
3aolu2014	739.81	119.08	10	170.63	22.92	10	3.2%	6.36 [3.99, 8.72]	2014	
Fingting Ren2014	23.34	3.58	8	13.25	4.36	8	4.1%	2.39 [1.02, 3.76]	2014	
Nangcheng2014	28.56	20.36	10	25.8	4.65	10	4.4%	0.18 [-0.70, 1.06]	2014	+-
Noorah2014	10.33	1.137	10	4.74	0.423	10	3.3%	6.24 [3.91, 8.57]	2014	
Juan Xiao2014	195.42	11.3	10	170.85	20.13	10	4.4%	1.44 [0.43, 2.45]	2014	
fotal (95% CI)			264			264	100.0%	2.91 [2.16, 3.67]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.1	18; Chi# = 23	32.58, df =	= 27 (P	< 0.00001)	; I ² = 88	1%				
Food for everall offerst 7-	7 60 /0 - 0	000043								-4 -2 U 2 4

Fig 2. Effect of PC on superoxide dismutase (SOD). Forest plot showing the impact of PC treatment on SOD compared with controls. Abbreviations: SMD = standardized mean difference, IV = independent variable, 95% CI = 95% confidence interval.

individual study influenced the combined results. The method of intervention and the source of the outcome indicators (i.e., serum or tissue samples) significantly influenced the outcome indicators. A trend toward greater improvements was observed (Fig 8) when PC treatments were applied using the gavage method and when parameter estimates were based on tissue samples. The funnel plot for the studies that include estimates of SOD suggests that values were approximately evenly distributed around the overall mean estimate (Fig 10). Based on a multivariate meta-regression analysis, the source of outcome indicators (P = 0.040) and intervention method (P = 0.038) were significantly associated with differences in SOD.

Discussion

Our results showed that PC intervention increases the levels of the antioxidative indicators SOD, CAT, GSH, GPx, and T-AOC, and decreases the concentration of MDA in oxidative damage mouse models. The reported effects of PCs were also influenced by other factors, such as the mode of intervention, treatment period, and sample source. Based on this meta-analysis of published papers, PCs have an obvious antioxidative effect.

PCs, a type of polyphenol, were first extracted from haw in Germany [43]. These compounds contain various amounts of catechin and epicatechin [44]. Depending on the degree of polymerization, dipolymer–tetramers are usually called oligomeric procyanidins, and others are usually called procyanidolic polymers [45]. The widely distributed dipolymers are the focus of research and are among the most important PCs [46].

	Experimental Control							Std. Mean Difference		Std. Mean Difference			
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl			
Dingyusong2013	0.65	0.28	10	0.68	0.18	10	27.0%	-0.12 [-1.00, 0.76]	2013	+			
Gaolu2014	39.9	1.21	10	16.28	3.98	10	22.5%	7.69 [4.89, 10.49]	2014				
Juan Xiao2014	5.41	0.23	10	4.65	0.35	10	26.4%	2.46 [1.24, 3.68]	2014				
Wangcheng2014	11.54	1.86	10	2.52	0.85	10	24.1%	5.97 [3.73, 8.22]	2014				
Total (95% CI)			40			40	100.0%	3.79 [0.69, 6.88]					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 9.02; Cl	hi² = 4!		-10 -5 0 5 10									
l est for overall effect: Z = 2.40 (P = 0.02)										Favours [experimental] Favours [control]			

Fig 3. Effect of PC on total antioxidative capacity (T-AOC). Forest plot showing the impact of PC treatment on T-AOC, compared with controls. Abbreviations: SMD = standardized mean difference, IV = independent variable, 95% CI = 95% confidence interval.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0139455.g003

	Expe	rimenta	al	C	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference		Std. Mear	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl			
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Rand	om, 95% Cl			
Osama M. Ashour2011	4.88	0.17	12	1.8	0.13	12	6.7%	19.65 [13.52, 25.78]	2011		•			
Vijayakumar2012	176.93	4.24	6	151.74	3.03	6	10.5%	6.31 [3.03, 9.59]	2012					
Yu Deng2012	31.76	4.83	8	43.48	3.14	8	12.8%	-2.72 [-4.18, -1.26]	2012					
Soo-Kyong Choi2012	23.5	2.2	8	19.8	2.6	8	13.1%	1.45 [0.31, 2.59]	2012					
Dingyusong2013	30.13	3.11	10	24.54	4.15	10	13.2%	1.46 [0.45, 2.47]	2013					
Hanaa A 2013	0.29	0.009	6	0.2	0.006	6	7.5%	10.86 [5.44, 16.28]	2013					
Miaozhiru2013	21.4	4.16	10	15.12	3.98	10	13.2%	1.48 [0.46, 2.49]	2013					
Wangcheng2014	272.06	35.85	10	48.65	14.69	10	11.1%	7.81 [4.97, 10.65]	2014					
Tingting Ren2014	22.328	1.092	8	13.223	1.993	8	11.8%	5.36 [3.01, 7.71]	2014					
Total (95% CI)			78			78	100.0%	4.53 [2.30, 6.76]			-			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 9.1	58; Chi ² = '	114.20,	df = 8 (P < 0.00	001); I ² :	93%								
Test for overall effect Z =	: 3.97 (P <	0.0001))							-10 -5	U 5 1U			

Fig 4. Effect of PC on glutathione (GSH). Forest plot showing the impact of PC treatment on GSH, compared with controls. Abbreviations: SMD = standardized mean difference, IV = independent variable, 95% CI = 95% confidence interval.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0139455.g004

	Expe	rimental		C	ontrol		Std. Mean Difference Std. Mean Difference			
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI
Su-Jin2009	15.5	1.2	10	14.9	3.5	10	8.4%	0.22 [-0.66, 1.10]	2009	+
Adem Guler 2011	21.87	2.49	8	16.11	1.11	8	7.3%	2.83 [1.33, 4.32]	2011	
Vijayakumar2012	17.82	0.52	6	13.07	0.38	6	2.4%	9.63 [4.79, 14.46]	2012	
Yu Deng2012	829.56	224.48	8	506.61	132.84	8	7.9%	1.66 [0.47, 2.84]	2012	-
Soo-Kyong Choi2012	40	7.6	8	31.9	4.5	8	8.1%	1.23 [0.13, 2.32]	2012	
zhangxuan 2012	5.28	0.51	16	2.12	0.07	16	5.6%	8.46 [6.14, 10.78]	2012	
zhaopeng2012	432	68.2	12	356.5	84.4	12	8.5%	0.95 [0.10, 1.80]	2012	+
Jiangyanfei2013	441.95	50.75	12	360.98	34.39	12	8.3%	1.80 [0.83, 2.78]	2013	-
Miaozhiru2013	1,194.25	167.66	10	920.25	119.52	10	8.1%	1.80 [0.73, 2.88]	2013	
E Bakar2014	17.684	3.381	7	11.728	2.373	7	7.6%	1.91 [0.57, 3.25]	2014	
Ying GAO 2014	1.14	0.12	10	0.86	0.07	10	7.7%	2.73 [1.44, 4.02]	2014	-
Gaolu2014	1,914.4	76.1	10	1,173.33	110.29	10	4.9%	7.49 [4.76, 10.23]	2014	
Juan Xiao2014	599.62	29.08	10	529.51	33.92	10	8.0%	2.13 [0.98, 3.27]	2014	-
Esrafil Mansouri2014	157.07	18.39	10	93.24	17.15	10	7.3%	3.44 [1.96, 4.92]	2014	-
Total (95% CI)			137			137	100.0%	2.68 [1.80, 3.56]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2	21: Chi ² = 1	34.42. df	= 13 (P	< 0.00001): I ² = 859	6		,		
Test for overall effect Z	= 5.96 (P <	0.00001								-10 -5 0 5 10
									-	avours [experimental] Favours [control]



doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0139455.g005

	Exp	erimenta	al l	C	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference		Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Su-Jin2009	311.6	39.3	10	283.5	20.4	10	14.4%	0.86 [-0.07, 1.79]	2009	+
Adem Guler 2011	5.41	0.39	8	4.61	0.39	8	14.0%	1.94 [0.69, 3.19]	2011	-
Osama M. Ashour2011	3.86	0.28	12	3.4	0.16	12	14.3%	1.95 [0.95, 2.95]	2011	-
zhangxuan 2012	6.56	0.17	16	3.7	0.18	16	8.8%	15.92 [11.70, 20.15]	2012	
Vijayakumar2012	32.28	0.87	6	19.45	0.53	6	4.2%	16.44 [8.34, 24.55]	2012	
Hanaa A 2013	7.4	0.28	6	3.4	0.25	6	5.2%	13.91 [7.03, 20.80]	2013	
Esrafil Mansouri2014	487.16	48.16	10	308.83	45.51	10	13.6%	3.65 [2.11, 5.18]	2014	-
E Bakar2014	3,440	195.72	7	3,109.28	582.15	7	14.2%	0.71 [-0.38, 1.81]	2014	-
Noorah2014	5.47	0.208	10	3.78	0.22	10	11.5%	7.56 [4.80, 10.32]	2014	
Total (95% CI)			85			85	100.0%	4.95 [2.99, 6.90]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 6.7	2; Chi ² =	96.63, df	= 8 (P ·	< 0.00001);	I ² = 92%					
Test for overall effect: Z =	4.96 (P <	0.00001)							-10 -5 d 5 10



doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0139455.g006

PCs are excellent antioxidants and free-radical scavengers; their antioxidative ability exceeds that of vitamins C and E [47]. The results of this meta-analysis also indicated that PCs, which can effectively improve the activity of antioxidative enzymes and reduce lipid peroxidation products, have an obvious antioxidant effect. The influence of PCs on SOD, GPx, and CAT can be maximized by applying the gavage mode instead of the normal feeding mode. This may be attributed to the precise control of PC intake by the investigator when using the gavage method. PCs can more effectively enhance antioxidant enzyme activity in tissues than in serum. We speculated that the indicators in serum samples reflect the whole-body oxidation-antioxidation levels, rather than that of a specific organ or tissue. In addition, the effect of PCs on the T-AOC index was not significant, probably owing to the small sample size (i.e., 4 studies). The results of the subgroup analysis will facilitate the selection of detection indexes in future studies regarding the antioxidative effect of PCs.

The antioxidative role of PCs is complex (Fig 11). Some harmful substances (such as H_20_2 , ethanol, galactose, and so on) induce oxidative stress and ROS production, and ultimately cause lipid peroxidation. The antioxidant defense system is activated and antioxidants (such as

	Exp	erimenta	1	C	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Mi-Ok Shin2010	0.2	0.02	6	0.29	0.05	6	4.6%	-2.18 [-3.74, -0.63]	2010	-
Xiayuan2010	5.48	0.52	8	3.62	1.18	8	4.8%	1.93 [0.68, 3.17]	2010	-
HUANG Qi-liang 2011	18.814	7.325	10	26.755	5.594	10	4.9%	-1.17 [-2.13, -0.20]	2011	+
Xielimei2011	2.84	0.71	10	3.88	0.87	10	4.9%	-1.25 [-2.23, -0.28]	2011	-
Osama M. Ashour2011	79.2	3.3	12	130.3	6.1	12	3.4%	-10.06 [-13.27, -6.85]	2011	
Adem Guler 2011	7.8	1.47	8	9.04	1.63	8	4.9%	-0.76 [-1.78, 0.27]	2011	-
Lijianling2011	14.9	2.7	10	21.5	7.4	10	4.9%	-1.13 [-2.10, -0.17]	2011	-
zhangxuan 2012	18.74	1.64	10	35.78	1.68	10	3.2%	-9.83 [-13.34, -6.32]	2012	
Yu Deng2012	345.92	110.17	8	763.52	96.47	8	4.4%	-3.81 [-5.62, -2.00]	2012	
Xiao GENG 2012	15.04	0.55	8	15.2	0.24	8	4.9%	-0.36 [-1.35, 0.63]	2012	+
Wangweifen2012	1.79	0.09	10	2.67	0.1	10	3.4%	-8.86 [-12.05, -5.67]	2012	
zhaopeng2012	3.75	0.74	12	3.89	0.87	12	5.0%	-0.17 [-0.97, 0.63]	2012	+
Jiangyanfei2013	9.46	1.11	12	9.1	1.14	12	5.0%	0.31 [-0.50, 1.11]	2013	t
Miaozhiru2013	9.68	0.54	10	11.01	1.09	10	4.9%	-1.48 [-2.50, -0.47]	2013	-
Hanaa A 2013	53.9	0.62	6	72.7	0.63	6	0.5%	-27.77 [-41.37, -14.16]	2013	·
Bailijun2013	3.52	0.49	5	9.36	0.4	5	1.5%	-11.79 [-18.55, -5.04]	2013	
Dingyusong2013	5.13	0.62	10	3.43	0.39	10	4.7%	3.14 [1.75, 4.54]	2013	-
Juan Xiao2014	23.03	5.6	10	33.87	9.12	10	4.9%	-1.37 [-2.37, -0.38]	2014	-
Ying GAO 2014	4	0.7	10	6.1	2.1	10	4.9%	-1.28 [-2.27, -0.30]	2014	+
Wangcheng2014	33.99	19.81	10	171.17	21.5	10	4.0%	-6.36 [-8.72, -3.99]	2014	
Hua Zhang2014	18.74	1.64	10	35.78	1.68	10	3.2%	-9.83 [-13.34, -6.32]	2014	
Gaolu2014	16.68	3.65	10	33.99	4.42	10	4.5%	-4.09 [-5.75, -2.43]	2014	+
Tingting Ren2014	0.546	0.348	8	1.435	0.412	8	4.8%	-2.20 [-3.52, -0.89]	2014	+
Esrafil Mansouri2014	8.01	0.55	10	14.41	0.6	10	3.0%	-10.65 [-14.44, -6.86]	2014	
E Bakar2014	1.289	0.12	7	14.41	0.6	7	0.6%	-28.39 [-40.84, -15.94]	2014	←
Total (95% CI)			230			230	100.0%	-3.06 [-4.07, -2.06]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 5.05	5; Chi# = :	290.71, d	f= 24 (P < 0.001	301); I ^z =	= 92%				
Test for overall effect: Z = !	5.99 (P <	0.00001) '							-20 -10 J 10 20

Fig 7. Effect of PC on malondialdehyde (MDA). Forest plot showing the impact of PC treatment on MDA, compared with controls. Abbreviations: SMD = standardized mean difference, IV = independent variable, 95% CI = 95% confidence interval.

GSH, SOD, CAT, and GPx) remove excess free radicals and peroxides. If the degree of oxidation is beyond the capacity of antioxidant molecules, the levels of GSH, SOD, CAT, GPx, etc., will be reduced. PCs contain many phenolic hydroxyl groups and release H⁺ when they are



Fig 8. Subgroup analyses to determine the effect of PC on oxidative damage. Based on a subgroup analysis, the effect of PC using the gavage mode was stronger than that observed using the feeding mode (P < 0.00001; A2, B2). The effect of PC on MDA measured in tissue samples was significantly stronger than that measured in serum samples (P = 0.02; C1). Abbreviations: SMD = standardized mean difference.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0139455.g008





oxidized, which can bind active oxygen radicals competitively to block the reaction chains of free radicals [48]. This reduces the consumption of antioxidants, increases the activity of antioxidative enzymes, improves antioxidative ability, and increases the T-AOC levels. In addition, it may be connected with increased expression of B-cell lymphoma-2 (Bcl-2), which can enhance antioxidation in cells. Liming [49], Yujie [50], and others have found that PC significantly increases the expression of Bcl-2, which increases the activity of antioxidant enzymes based on in vivo and vitro experiments.





doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0139455.g010



promotion Fig 11. Antioxidant mechanism of PCs. PCs contain many phenolic hydroxyl groups and release H⁺ when they are oxidized, which can bind active oxygen radicals and competitively block the reaction chains of free radicals, reducing the consumption of antioxidants and increasing the activity of antioxidant enzymes. Abbreviations: LP represents lipid peroxidation, GSSG represents oxidized glutathione.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0139455.g011

This meta-analysis included 29 published papers. The quality of these studies was sufficient to analyze the combined effects of PCs. The sensitivity analysis demonstrated the robustness of the overall results. Similarly, the symmetric distribution of the studies in a funnel plot demonstrated the lack of a publication bias. Although there was heterogeneity among studies, the randomized effect model was used to integrate the results and a subgroup analysis and meta-regression were

inhibition

used to evaluate the heterogeneity. All of the above analyses support the validity of using the combined results of the 29 studies to determine the effect of PCs.

In summary, the results of the present study support the strong antioxidative effect of PCs as evidenced by the levels of oxidative stress indicators in a systematic review of relevant published papers. PCs are able to block the free radical chain reaction by eliminating radicals. They may also regulate the signaling pathway related to oxidative stress, thereby improving antioxidative activity. These results provide a scientific basis for the development and utilization of PC-based resources.

Outlook

PCs have important antioxidative and antitumor effects and have protective effects with respect to the cardiovascular system and other biological activities [51]. They are widely used in medicine, health care products, and cosmetics [52]. Despite their wide use and increasing data related to their effects, the mechanisms that mediate the antioxidative effect of PCs are unclear. To improve product development and the utilization of PCs, it is necessary to determine the enzymes, receptor genes, and signaling pathways involved in the antioxidation process [53]. Additional examinations of the molecular mechanisms of PCs are needed to maximize their benefits with respect to human health.

Limitations

A limitation of the present study was the obvious heterogeneity in the data. Heterogeneity was observed with respect to subgroup factors, animal strains, reagents, PC dosages, and many other factors. Using a funnel plot analysis, we detected some evidence for a publication bias. We only considered manuscripts published in English and Chinese in this study and were not able to retrieve negative results.

Supporting Information

S1 File. Raw Data of 29 studies. All data in the present study were extracted from 29 papers (references 14–42) and we display the data in the table as a supporting information to show the data availability.

(XLS)

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the Department of Public Health, Shihezi University School of Medicine for assistance with this work, as well as funding from the Key Areas of Science and Technology Research Project of Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps (No. 2014BA039, No. 2015AG014), the High-tech Intellectual Project of Shi Hezi University (No. RCZX201112), and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 81560517).

Author Contributions

Conceived and designed the experiments: SGL MCX. Performed the experiments: SGL MCX QN SZX YSD YZY SXG FL. Analyzed the data: SGL MCX SXG. Contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools: QN SZX YSD YZY SXG FL. Wrote the paper: SGL MCX FL.

References

1. Shugang L, Yusong D, Qiang N, Shangzhi X, Lijuan P, Rulin M, et al. Lutein Has a Protective Effect on Hepatotoxicity Induced by Arsenic via Nrf2 Signaling. BioMed Research International, 2015: 1–10.

- Qingli G, Xue L, Yan L. Update of Mitochondrial Mechanism Under the Diseases Related to Oxidative Stress. Chinese Journal of Cell Biology, 2013, 35(10): 1540–1545.
- Khoubnasab Jafari M, Ansarin K, Jouyban A. Comments on "Use of Malondialdehyde as a Biomarker for Assesing Oxidative Stress in Different Disease Pathologies: A Review". Iran J Public Health, 2015, 44(5): 714–715. PMID: <u>26284218</u>
- ShuGang L, ShangZhi X, Qiang N, YuSong D, LiJuan P, RuLin M, et al. Lutein alleviates arsenicinduced reproductive toxicity in male mice via Nrf2 signaling. Human and Experimental Toxicology, 2015, 1(10): 1–10.
- Tao J, Chen BD, Ma YT, Yang YN, Li XM, Ma X, et al. FrzA gene protects cardiomyocytes from H2O2induced oxidative stress through restraining the Wnt/Frizzled pathway. Lipids Health Dis, 2015, 14(1): 90. doi: <u>10.1186/s12944-015-0088-0</u> PMID: <u>26282432</u>
- Valacchi G, Sticozzi C, Belmonte G, Cervellati F, Demaude J, Chen N, et al. Vitamin C Compound Mixtures Prevent Ozone-Induced Oxidative Damage in Human Keratinocytes as Initial Assessment of Pollution Protection. PLoS One, 2015, 10(8): e0131097. doi: <u>10.1371/journal.pone.0131097</u> PMID: <u>26270818</u>
- Saita E, Kondo K, Momiyama Y. Anti-Inflammatory Diet for Atherosclerosis and Coronary Artery Disease: Antioxidant Foods. Clin Med Insights Cardiol, 2015, 8(Suppl 3): 61–65. doi: <u>10.4137/CMC.</u> S17071 PMID: 26279633
- Cheng F, Zhang Q, Yan FF, Wan JF, Lin CS. Lutein protects against ischemia/reperfusion injury in rat skeletal muscle by modulating oxidative stress and inflammation. Immunopharmacol Immunotoxicol, 2015, 37(4): 329–334. PMID: <u>26250522</u>
- Bingzheng Z, Shugang L, Qiang N, Yusong D, Shuxia G, Shangzhi X, et al. Intervention of grape seed procyanidin extract on reproductive toxicity induced by arsenic in male mice. Journal of Toxicology, 2014, 05: 397–400.
- Aruoma OI, Sun B, Fujii H, Neergheen VS, Bahorun T, Kang KS, et al. Low molecular proanthocyanidin dietary biofactor Oligonol: Its modulation of oxidative stress, bioefficacy, neuroprotection, food application and chemoprevention potentials. Biofactors, 2006, 27(1–4): 245–265. PMID: 17012779
- Shu Gang L, Yu Song D, Qiang N, Shang Zhi X, Li Juan P, Ru Lin M, et al. Grape Seed Proanthocyanidin Extract Alleviates Arsenic-Induced Oxidative Reproductive Toxicity in Male Mice. Biomendical and Environmental Sciences, 2015, 28(4): 272–280.
- Mansouri E, Khorsandi L, Abdollahzade Fard A. Protective role of grape seed proanthocyanidin antioxidant properties on heart of streptozotocin-induced diabetic rats. Vet Res Forum, 2015, 6(2): 119–124. PMID: 26261706
- Gao M, Zhao Z, Lv P, Li Y, Gao J, Zhang M, et al. Quantitative combination of natural anti-oxidants prevents metabolic syndrome by reducing oxidative stress. Redox Biol, 2015, 6: 206–217. doi: <u>10.1016/j.</u> redox.2015.06.013 PMID: 26262997
- Su-Jin L, Soo-Kyong C, Jung-Sook S. Grape skin improves antioxidant capacity in rats fed a high fat diet. Nutrition Research and Practice, 2009, 3(4): 279–285. doi: <u>10.4162/nrp.2009.3.4.279</u> PMID: <u>20098580</u>
- Mi-Ok S, Jeon-Ok M. Effect of dietary supplementation of grape skin and seeds on liver fibrosis inducedby dimethylnitrosamine in rats. Nutrition Research and Practice(Nutr Res Pract), 2010, 4(5):369– 374.
- Yuan X, Zhifang Z, Min L, Boling L. Procyanidins' Impact on SOD Activity, MDA Content in Rats Exposed to Cadmium in Serum and Liver. Modern Chinese Doctor, 2010, 48(23): 8–10.
- Adem G, Mehmet Ali S, Orhan Y, Mehmet Y, Mehmet G, Ertugrul O, et al. Proanthocyanidin prevents myocardial ischemic injury in adult rats. Med Sci Monit, 2011, 17(11): BR326–331. PMID: <u>22037735</u>
- Qiliang H, Shan J, Xuejun W, Lishan X. Effects of Proanthocyanidin from Pine Needles onSOD Activity, MDA Content in Serum and Visceralndex of Mice. Medicinal Plant, 2011, 2(6): 43–44, 46.
- Jianling L, Bin H, Linlin L. Protective effects of procyanidins on rats brain after cerebral ischemia-reperfusion. Chinese Journal of Biochemical Pharmaceutics, 2011, 32(6):463–466.
- Osama MA, Ahmed AE, Abdulrahman MA, Ameen MM, Ayman AN, Ashraf BA, et al. Protective effect of bilberry(Vaccinium myrtillus)against doxorubicin-induced oxidative cardiotoxicity in rats. Med Sci Monit, 2011, 17(4): BR110–115. PMID: 21455099
- Limei X, Shue W, Hongmei J, Dianjuan F, Xiaosi R. Grape seed extract's impact on oxidative damage in mice induced by radiation. Journal of Environment and Health, 2011, 28(8):725–726.
- Soo-Kyong C, Xian-Hua Z, Jung-Sook S. Suppression of oxidative stress by grape seed supplementation in rats. Nutrition Research and Practice (Nutr Res Pract), 2012, 6(1):3–8.
- 23. Vijayakumar S, Subramaniam R, Koikaramparambil Robert N, Kaliyamoorthy P. Investigation of in vivo antioxidant property of Abelmoschus esculentus (L) moench. fruit seed and peel powders in

streptozotocin-induced diabetic rats. J Ayurveda Integr Med, 2012, 3(4): 188–193. doi: <u>10.4103/0975-9476.104432</u> PMID: <u>23326089</u>

- Weifen W, Youliang W, Beibei Z, Lejiu Z, Jieying H, Peiyi L, et al. Effect of procyanidins on liver toxicity induced by semicarbazide in male mice. Studies of Trace Elements and Health, 2012, 29(4): 1–3.
- Xiao G, Zhu M, Quan-sheng S. Effects of Procyanidins on Free Radical Metabolism and Apoptosis of Myocardial Tissue in Rat after Exercise. Proceedings of the Xi'an 2012 International Conference of Sport Science and Physical Education, 2012: pp394-399.
- Yu D, Zhaofa X, Wei L, Haibo Y, Bin X, Yangang W. Effects of Lycopene and Proanthocyanidins on HepatotoxicityInduced by Mercuric Chloride in Rats. Biol Trace Elem Res, 2012, 146:213–22. doi: <u>10.</u> <u>1007/s12011-011-9242-3</u> PMID: <u>22048885</u>
- Xuan Z, Yizhen H. Inhibitory Effects of Grape Seed Proanthocyanidin Extract on Selenite-induced Cataract Formation and Possible Mechanism. J Huazhong Univ Sci Technol, 2012, 32(4):613–619.
- 28. Peng Z, Weizhong F, Bin L, Jiehong Z, Liang P, Huiyan T, et al. The antioxidant effect of grape seed powder in aging rats. Journal of Toxicology, 2012, 26(6): 434–436.
- Lijun B, Ying L, Huazhi Z, Ruiping J. Effect of Proanthocyanidin on retina ischemia-reperfusion of ra. Journal of New Chinese Medicine, 2013, 45(6): 169–171.
- Yusong D, Shugang L, Qiang N, Rulin M, Shuxia G, et al. The study of the antagonism of proanthocyanidin on arsenic trioxide-induced the oxidative damage of the testis tissue in male mice. Journal of Toxicology, 2013, 27 (6): 423–426.
- Hanaa A, Hassan Ahmed M, Isa Wafaa M, El-Kholy Samar E, Nour. Testicular disorders induced by plant growth regulators: cellular protection with proanthocyanidins grape seedsextract. Cytotechnology, 2013, 65: 851–862. doi: <u>10.1007/s10616-012-9525-3</u> PMID: <u>23292365</u>
- Yanfei J, Zhaofeng Z, Lei B, Lulu J, Ye D, Xiaoqian D, et al. Effect of Long-Term Intervention with Proanthocyanidin on Oxidative Stress in Type II Diabetes. Food Science, 2013, 34(7): 262–265.
- Zhiru M, Xia Y, Lina L, Zhonghai H, Guojun J. Experimental study on anti-oxidative effect of proanthocyanidins phospholipid complex in grape seed. Journal of Pharmaceutical Practice, 2013, 31(5): 362– 365.
- Bakar E, Ulucam E, Cerkezkayabekir A. Protective effects of proanthocyanidin and vitamin E against toxic effects of formaldehyde in kidney tissue. Biotechnic & Histochemistry, 2015, 90(1): 69–78. doi: 10.3109/10520295.2014.954620 PMID: 25225844
- Lu G, Ying W, Shengqi R, Zhenquan Y, Agen H, Boran H. Antioxidant Activity of Grape Seed Proanthocyanidin Extract in Aging Mouse Model. Food Science, 2014, 35(23): 253–256.
- Hua Z, XiaoQin S, Jian-Min C, HaiTao Z, Xian G, Yi W. Protective effect of epimedium combined with oligomeric proanthocyanidins on exercise-induced renal ischemia-reperfusion injury of rats. Int J Clin Exp Med, 2014, 7(12): 5730–5736. PMID: 25664099
- Juan X, Shuyi L, Yong S, Qian W, Xiaopeng L, Bijun X, et al. Lactobacillus casei-01 Facilitates the AmeliorativeEffects of Proanthocyanidins Extracted from LotusSeedpod on Learning and Memory Impairment in Scopolamine-Induced Amnesia Mice. PLOS ONE, 2014, 9 (11): e112773. doi: <u>10.1371/journal.pone.0112773</u> PMID: <u>25396737</u>
- Noorah Saleh A, Nadia H. M. The Protective Effect of Grape Seed Extract on Cardiotoxicity Induced by Doxorubicin Drug in Male Rats. Advances in Bioscience and Biotechnology, 2014, 5: 1078–1089.
- Tingting R, Chao H, Mingliang C. Dietary Blueberry and Bifidobacteria Attenuate Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease in Rats by Affecting SIRT1-Mediated Signaling Pathway. Oxidative Medicine and Cellular Longevity, 2014: 1–12.
- Cheng W, Shugang L, Yusong D, Qiang N, Shangzhi X, Rulin M, et al. Intervention of Grape Seed Procyanidin Extract (GSPE) onLiver Toxicity of Mice Induced by Arsenic. Journal of Environmental Hygiene, 2014, 4(5): 430–433.
- Ying G, Hongwei H, Xinyu L, Min L, Weilin W. The Antioxidation of Proanthocyanidins from in Rhodiola rosea L. Medicinal Plant, 2014, 5(8): 8–11.
- Esrafil M, Layasadat K, Maasoumeh Zare M. Grape Seed Proanthocyanidin Extract Improved some of Biochemical Parameters and Antioxidant Disturbances of Red Blood Cells in Diabetic Rats. IJPR, 2015, 14 (1): 329–334. PMID: <u>25561939</u>
- Yan Z, Xiuxiang W. Research progress on procyanidins. Pharmacology and Clinics of Chinese Materia Medica, 2011, 27(6): 112–116.
- Jinjing W, Yan S, Chunfeng L, Qi L. Study on the anti-oxidative capability of proanthocyanidins from hops. Science and Technology of Food Industry, 2013, 34(8): 118–122, 126.

- 45. Wiesneth S, Petereit F, Jürgenliemk G. Salix daphnoides: A Screening for Oligomeric and Polymeric Proanthocyanidins. Molecules, 2015, 20(8): 13764–79. doi: <u>10.3390/molecules200813764</u> PMID: <u>26230683</u>
- 46. Bagchil D, Garg A, Kmhn R L. Oxygen freeradicalscavenging abilities of vitamin C and vitamin E, and a grape seed proanthocyanidins extract in vitro. Res Commun Mol Pathol Pharmacol, 1997, 95(2): 179–189. PMID: <u>9090754</u>
- **47.** Feng G, Kun Z, Xintian S, Xiaogang W, Jingying Z. Study on Anti-Oxidation Function of Extraction from Grape Seed to Human. Chinese Journal of Public Health Engineering, 2010, 9(2): 99–100.
- Bagchi D, Bagchi M, Stohs SJ, Das DK, Ray SD, Kuszynski CA, et al. Free radicals and grape seed proanthocyanidin extract: importance in human health and disease prevention. Toxicology, 2000, 148 (2–3): 187–197. PMID: <u>10962138</u>
- 49. Liming D, Xiaomin H, Wei Z, Rufeng L. Inhibition of Procyanidins on the Apoptosis of Human Umbilical Vein Endothelial Cell through the Regulating Caspase-3 and Bcl-xl and Bax. Chinese Archives of Traditional Chinese Medicine, 2013, 31(3): 582–584.
- Yujie J, Lianqiu M, Zhansheng J, Chang L. Influence of procyanidin on Bcl-2 and Bax after cerebral ischemia. Chinese Journal of Clinical Rehabilitation, 2006, 10(23): 65–66.
- Schroeter H, Heiss C, Spencer JP, Keen CL, Lupton JR, Schmitz HH. Recommending flavanols and procyanidins for cardiovascular health: current knowledge and future needs. Molecular Aspects Of Medicine, 2010, 31(6): 546–557. doi: 10.1016/j.mam.2010.09.008 PMID: 20854838
- Anunciato TP, Rocha Filho PA. Carotenoids and polyphenols in nutricosmetics, nutraceuticals, and cosmeceuticals. Journal Of Cosmetic Dermatology, 2012, 11(1): 51–54. doi: <u>10.1111/j.1473-2165.</u> <u>2011.00600.x</u> PMID: <u>22360335</u>
- Neus Martinez M, Noemi Gonzalez A, Anna A, Montserrat P, Maria Teresa B. Procyanidins and inflammation: Molecular targets and health implications. Official Publication Of The Federation Of American Societies For Experimental Biology, 2005, 19(3): 479–481.