



A Meta-Analysis of Folic Acid in Combination with Anti-Hypertension Drugs in Patients with Hypertension and Hyperhomocysteinemia

Wen-Wen Wang^{1†}, Xin-Shi Wang^{2†}, Zeng-Rui Zhang², Jin-Cai He^{2*} and Cheng-Long Xie^{2*}

¹ The Center of Traditional Chinese Medicine, The Second Affiliated Hospital and Yuying Children's Hospital of Wenzhou Medical University, Wenzhou, China, ² Department of Neurology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Wenzhou Medical University, Wenzhou, China

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Con Stough, Swinburne University of Technology, Australia

Reviewed by:

Ewa Krystyna Szczepanska-Sadowska, Medical University of Warsaw, Poland Fathi M. Sherif, University of Tripoli, Libya

*Correspondence:

Jin-Cai He hjc@wmu.edu.cn Cheng-Long Xie cl_xie1987@sohu.com

[†]These authors have contributed equally to this work.

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Neuropharmacology, a section of the journal Frontiers in Pharmacology

Received: 11 March 2017 Accepted: 14 August 2017 Published: 31 August 2017

Citation:

Wang W-W, Wang X-S, Zhang Z-R, He J-C and Xie C-L (2017) A Meta-Analysis of Folic Acid in Combination with Anti-Hypertension Drugs in Patients with Hypertension and Hyperhomocysteinemia. Front. Pharmacol. 8:585. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2017.00585 Folic acid is generally used to lower homocysteine concentrations and prevent stroke and cardiovascular disease (CVD) at present. However, the efficacy of therapies that lower homocysteine concentrations in reducing the risk of CVD and stroke remains controversial. Our objective was to do a meta-analysis of relevant randomized controlled trials (RCTs) to evaluate the efficacy of folic acid supplementation among patients with hypertension and Hyperhomocysteinemia (HT/HHcy). We included RCTs examining the effects of folic acid plus antihypertensive therapy compared to antihypertensive alone. Weighted Mean Difference (WMD) and Relative risk (RR) were used as a measure of the effect of folic acid on the outcome measures with a random effect model. Sixty-five studies including 7887 patients met all inclusion criteria. Among them, 49 trials reported significant effect of combination therapy for reducing SBP (systolic Blood Pressure) and DBP (Diastolic Blood Pressure) levels compared with antihypertensive alone (WMD = -7.85, WMD = -6.77, respectively). Meanwhile, folic acid supplementation apparently reduced the level of total homocysteine (WMD = 5.5). In addition, folic acid supplementation obviously reduced the risk of cardiovascular and cerebrovascular events (CVCE) by 12.9% compared with control groups. In terms of the stratified analyses, a bigger beneficial effect was seen in those RCTs with treatment duration of more than 12 weeks, a decrease in the concentration of total homocysteine of more than 25%, with folic acid fortification. Our findings indicated that folic acid supplementation was effective in the primary prevention of CVCE among HT/HHcy patients, as well as reducing the blood pressure and total homocysteine levels.

Keywords: folic acid, enalapril, hypertension, antihypertensive, hyperhomocysteinemia, meta-analysis

INTRODUCTION

Prospective previous researches had confirmed a solid, graded, and independent positive association between blood pressure and risk of stroke and cardiovascular disease (CVD) (Chobanian et al., 2003). The latest epidemiological data showed that hypertension is the biggest single contributor to the global burden of disease, leading to approximately nine million deaths each year (Lim et al., 2012), which was largely mediated through CVD and stroke (Poulter et al., 2015). Furthermore, the numbers of subjects suffered from hypertension and the morbidity of high

1

blood pressure worldwide were predicted to increase over the next decade (Kearney et al., 2005). What is more, hyperhomocysteinemia has also emerged as an independent risk factor for CVD and stroke. A recent meta-analysis showed that folic acid supplementation to lower total homocysteine (tHcy) concentrations could effectively reduce the risk of stroke in primary prevention (Wang et al., 2007). Meanwhile, it was interesting to note that several carefully conducted studies to date have showed hyperhomocysteinemia often accompany with hypertension in many experimental models, as well as in patients with primary hypertension, especially systolic blood pressure (SBP) (Lim and Cassano, 2002; Huo et al., 2015). In addition, some randomized, placebo-controlled trials (RCTs) of tHcy-lowering therapy had shown that such intervention was associated with a decrease in blood pressure (Mangoni et al., 2002). However, although Hyperhomocysteinemia associated hypertension patients (HT/HHcy) are common in clinic, the precise mechanism by which tHcy results in vascular dysfunction and contributes to hypertension are largely unknown (Sen et al., 2010). To date, several mechanisms have been proposed. Hyperhomocysteinemia related changes in vascular biology such as increased arterial stiffness, vascular smooth muscle cell proliferation and endothelial dysfunction could easily lead to an increase in blood pressure (Stehouwer and van Guldener, 2003).

The evidence from observational studies suggested that HT/HHcy levels were associated with increased danger of CVD and stroke compared with hypertension alone (Wang et al., 2007). Stanger and colleagues displayed that tHcy lowering may have intrinsic vasoprotective effects principally independent of folic acid supplementation (Stanger et al., 2002). Two metaanalyses reported that folic acid administration may be good for CVD prevention in patients with kidney disease, especially in patients without a history of grain fortification with folic acid, with lower percent baseline diabetes (Jardine et al., 2012; Qin et al., 2013). In addition, folic acid supplementation was effective in stroke prevention in populations with no or partial folic acid fortification (Huo et al., 2012). On the contrary, Zhou et al reported that folic acid did not impact on the incidence of CVD, stroke or all-cause mortality based on the 16 RCTs (Zhou et al., 2011). Taken together, multiple clinical trials had now been performed investigating folic acid administration for the prevention of CVD and stroke outcomes in HT/HHcy patients. However, there were still no meta-analysis concerns on tHcy-lower therapy in HT/HHcy. Our purpose was thus to do a meta-analysis focusing on efficacy of folic acid plus antihypertensive combination therapy among patients with HT/HHcy.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Search Strategy

We used a familiar search strategy as previously published study (Xie et al., 2014). We carried out a comprehensive and independent literature search of six databases of PubMed; Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL); Google scholar; Wanfang database and Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI) and VIP information database. The publication time is from January 1990 of each database up to December 2016 for all English and Chinese language publications. To identify any other relevant studies, we manually scanned the reference lists of identified trials and review articles. The search terms were "hypertension," "blood pressure," "hyperhomocysteine," and "homocysteine."

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Clinical trials were eligible for inclusion if satisfy the following criteria:

- (1) Study design: RCTs.
- (2) Subjects were demanded to have a clinical diagnosis of idiopathic hypertension and also a laboratory diagnosis of hyperhomocysteinemia without a history of stroke or myocardial infarction. A priori definition of hyperhomocysteinemia and hypertension should have been identified. In this study, most trials based on the Chinese guidelines for management of hypertension (GPMH) (Liu and Writing Group of Chinese Guidelines for the Management of Hypertension, 2011), using SBP \geq 140/DBP \geq 90 mmhg and tHcy >10 umol/L.
- (3) Conducted to evaluate the combination of folic acid and antihypertensive compared with antihypertensive alone.
- (4) Have adequate data such as blood pressure, tHcy levels or cardiovascular and cerebrovascular events (CVCE) as the outcome measures. Among them, definition of CVCE is including angina, carotid artery stenoses, myocardial infarction, stroke, transient ischemic attack.

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

The following data in the primary trials were extracted: first author's name, year of publication, diagnostic criteria of hypertension and hyperhomocysteinemia, basic data (age and sex), intervention, dosage of folic acid, treatment duration and outcome measures. In the event of outcomes were presented from the studies at different time points, we extracted data from the last time point. The validity of RCT was evaluated for risk of bias using the Cochrane Collaboration's tool (Higgins et al., 2011). The tool distinguished trials according to six domains; sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding, missing data, selective reporting and other biases.

Statistical Analysis

We utilized a random effects rather than a fixed effects model due to this takes into account heterogeneity between multi-trials, as well as many experts consider the random effects model to be a more natural choice than fixed effects in medical decision making contexts (Ades et al., 2005). For the assessment of heterogeneity, the I² statistic was used. For studies in which more than one folic acid supplementation regimen existed, we reported the high dosage folic acid both before and after the intervention. Publication bias was assessed by Begg's test. All the analyses were done with Revman software, version 5.0.

RESULTS

Results of the Search and Study Characteristics

Our final analysis included 65 RCTs (**Figure 1**) and all trials were reported between 2012 and 2016 (Full citation details of included studies are provided as Supplemental Material I). The basic characteristics of the included trial participants and risk bias of these RCTs were presented in **Table 1**. Sixty-five RCTs, with a total of 7,887 subjects, met the inclusion criteria and were included in the meta-analysis. Of whom, 3,972 were randomized to folic acid plus antihypertensive groups, and 3,915 were randomized to antihypertensive alone groups. The number of subjects included in this review ranged from 50 to 320 subjects. Moreover, the time of follow up was ranged from 8 weeks to 18

months. The interventions were primarily based on daily oral folic acid supplementation in doses of between 0.4 mg and 10 mg plus antihypertensive therapies. Among them, 40 studies used 0.8 mg of folic acid; 13 studies utilized a daily dose of 0.4 mg of folic acid; 5 studies adopted 5 mg of folic acid in the treatment groups; a daily oral dose of 10 mg of folic acid only in the 1 study; remaining 6 studies did not show the dose of folic acid, respectively. Co-interventions included Enalapril in 54 trials, amlodipine + benazepril in two studies, remaining 9 studies did not show the drug. Treatments duration of all studies is including 2 weeks (2 studies), 4 weeks (1 study), 5 weeks (1 study), 6 weeks (2 studies), 8 weeks (22 studies), 3 months (19 studies), 4 months (1 study), 6 months (8 studies), 10 months (1 study), 12 months (4 studies), and 18 months (1 study), respectively, and remaining 3 studies did not report the treatments duration. Therefore, a



TABLE 1 Basic c	characteristic of included studies.					
Study	Criteria (blood pressure/Hcy)*	Basic data: M/F(n); age	Pre-treatment: Hcy (umol/L); BP (SE	3P/DBPmmHg); Intervention	Outcome measures	Risk bias
1. Liu, 2012	180 > SBP ≥ 140;110 > DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 15 µmmo/L	162/158 (320), 52.33 ± 5.94	12.30 ± 4.32, NR Folate 0.4 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 160)	15.22 ± 4.55, NR Enalapril 10 mg/d for 6 mo (N = 160)	1.CVCE 2.Hcy	-
2. Liu, X. 2012	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 10 µ.mmo//L	26/20 (46) 23/17 (40) 67.6 ± 11.8 66.2 ± 9.9	15.2 ± 5.1, 138.3 ± 10.7/77 4 ± 7.8 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 46)	17.2 ± 5.8, 135.6 ± 12.1/86.5 ± 11.4 Enalapril 10 mg/d for 12 w (N = 40)	1.SBP, DBP 2.Hcy	0
3. Lu, 2012	SBP $\geq 140/DBP \geq 90 \text{ mmhg}$ Hcy $\geq 12 \text{ µmmo/L}$	56/51 (107) 50/47 (97) 76.2 ± 5.3 75.7 ± 5.1	13 ± 0.6,151.6 ± 5.5/93.4 ± 4.2 Folate 10 mg + anti-hypertension therapy (N = 107)	13.1 \pm 0.7, 150.5 \pm 5.2/92.6 \pm 4.5 Anti-hypertension therapy for 72 w (N = 97)	1.Hcy, CVCE 2.SBP, DBP	0
4. Meng, 2012	180 > SBP ≥ 140;110 > DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 15 μmmo/L	56/33 (89), 52.6 ± 7.2	16.3 ± 2.1, NR Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 45)	19.4 \pm 3.2, NR Enalapril 10 mg/d for 8 w (N = 44)	1.Hcy 2.SBP, DBP	n
5. Shen, 2012	SBP $\geq 140/DBP \geq 90 \text{ mmhg}$ Hcy $\geq 10 \text{ µmmo/L}$	$31/19$ (50), 62.4 \pm 5.2	20.32 ± 4.71, 151.58 ± 10.46/93.71 ± 8.53 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 25)	$21.11 \pm 5.02, 152.22 \pm 9.85/92.85 \pm 8.95$ 8.95 Enalapril 10 mg/d for 6 mo (N = 25)	1.Hcy 2.SBP, DBP, CVCE	2
6. Hu, 2013	SBP $\geq 140/DBP \geq 90 \text{ mmhg}$ Hcy $\geq 10 \text{ µmmo/L}$	77/63 (140), 58.2 ± 8.3	25.26 ± 5.62,157.25 ± 10.63/97.33 ± 7.82 Folate + Enalapril 10–20 mg/d (N = 70)	24.62 ± 5.76,154.83 ± 10.56/95.27 ± 7.82 Enalapril 10-20 mg/d for 2 mo (N = 70)	1.Hcy 2.SBP, DBP	с у
7. Li, 2013	NR, Hcy ≥ 12 µmmol/L	61/39 (100), 59.0 ± 9.4	21.48 ± 3.46, NR Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 50)	21.54 ± 3.45 , NR Enalapril 10 mg/d for 6 mo (N = 50)	1.Hcy, IMT 2. CVCE	CN
8. Mao, 2013	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	48/52 (100), 62.4 ± 5.3	13.8 ± 12.3, 154.2 ± 10.3/93.4 ± 8.2 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 50)	13.8 ± 12.1,152.4 ± 10.8/94.2 ± 8.6 Enalapril 10 mg/d For 8 w (N = 50)	1.Hcy, AE 2.SBP, DBP	N
9. Qin, 2013	SBP $\geq 140/DBP \geq 90 \text{ mmhg}$ Hcy $\geq 10 \text{ µmmo/L}$	46/22 (68), 52.0 ± 17.0	19.48 ± 3.42,152.28 ± 14.25/111.43 ± 5.48 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 34)	19.67 ± 3.82,153.52 ± 14.34/113.52 ± 5.62 Enalapril 10 mg/d for 8 w (N = 34)	1.Hcy, CVCE 2.SBP, DBP	0
10. Wan, 2013	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 10 μmmo/L	145/149 (294), 62.31 ± 4.16	14.0 ± 12.1,155.2 ± 9.8/93.5 ± 8.2 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 147)	$14.0 \pm 12.1,152.8 \pm 11.1/95.2 \pm 9.6$ Enalapril 10 mg/d for 8 w (N = 147)	1.Hcy 2.SBP, DBP	со
11. Wei, 2013	$180 > SBP \ge 140;110 > DBP \ge$ 90 mmhg Hcy $\ge 15 \mu$ mmol/L	48/21 (69), 35–73	29.3 ± 4.2, NR Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 35)	29.8 ± 3.9, NR Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 34)	1.Hcy 2.CVCE	CN
12. Wu, 2013	NR Hcy ≥ 10 µmmol/L	68/32 (100), 56.0 ± 6.0	17 ± 4 , NR Folate 0.8 mg + Ealapril 10 mg/d (N = 50)	18 ± 5 , NR Enalapril 10 mg/d for 12 w (N = 50)	1.Hcy 2.CVCE	-

(Continued)

Frontiers in Pharmacology | www.frontiersin.org

4

TABLE 1 Continu	led						
Study	Criteria (blood pressure/Hcy)*	Basic dat	a: M/F(n); age	Pre-treatment: Hcy (umol/L); BP (SB	BP/DBPmmHg); Intervention	Outcome measures	Risk bias
13. Xie, 2013	SBP ≥ 140 , DBP $\geq 90 \text{ mmHg}$ Hcy $\geq 10 \text{ µmmol/L}$	45/17 (62) 60.1 ± 7.5	48/16 (64) 59.8 ± 6.9	20.1 ± 3.9,152.6 ± 11.7/97.3 ± 8.9 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d //v - ev)	19.8 ± 4.1,152.3 ± 12.21/96.81 ± 9.1 Enclandi 10 mor/d for 6 mo (N – 6.0	1.Hcy 2.SBP, DBP, AE	σ
14. Xu, 2013	SBP ≥ 140;DBP ≥ 90 mmHg Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	21/17 (38) 65.84 ± 3.27	19/19 (38) 66.86 ± 3.52	(1	Triadoff 10 mg/d for 0 mg (v = 04) 17.92 ± 3.93,157.28 ± 13.51/100.32 ± 7.15 Enalopii 10 mg/d for 2 mg (V = 38)	1.Hcy, SBP, DBP 2. LVMI, leptin	N
15. Zhang, 2013	NR H6y ≥ 10 µmmo/L	28/22 (50) 27–81	27/23 (50) 29–80	(N = 50) 21.02 ± 4.73,152.59 ± 10.62/95.72 ± 8.52 Folder 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 50)	21.11 ± 5.01,153.22 ± 9.86/93.15 ± 8.96 Enalapril 10 mg/d for 2 mo (N = 50)	1.Hcy 2.SBP, DBP	F
16. Zhang. H, 2013	SBP ≥ 140 /DBP $\geq 90 \text{ mmhg}$ Hcy $\geq 10 \mu\text{mmol/L}$	41/23	(64), 35–74	NR - 50) NR, 156.8 ± 3.6/107.2 ± 4.3 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 32)	NR, 157.1 ± 4.1/105.5 ± 6.4 Enalapril 10 mg/d for 3mo (N = 32)	1.SBP, DBP 2.CVCE	N
17. Zhang. X, 2013	GPCH Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	15/10 (25) 52 ± 8.8	13/12 (25) 51 ± 9.3	N, NR, Folate 0.4 mg + amlodipine 5 mg/d + benazamil 5 mn/d for 12 w	NR, NR, Amlodipine 5 mg + benazepril 5 mon for 12 w	1.Hcy 2.SBP, DBP	Ю
18. Zhu, 2013	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	29/13 (42) 55.8 ± 3.8	33/8 (41) 54.9 ± 3.7	7.51 ± 5.61, 153.31 ± 12.85/92.59 ± 11.28 Folder 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d	18.15 ± 6.12,152.91 ± 13.12/94.16 ± 12.12 Enalapril 10 mg/d for 12 w (N = 41)	1.Hcy, CVCE 2.SBP, DBP	N
19. Feng, 2014	180 > SBP ≥ 140;110 > DBP ≥ 90 mmhg, NR	22/17 (39) 53.3 ± 8.9	23/17 (40) 54.1 土 9.1	(v = -4∠) 15.6 ± 11.4, NR Folde 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (v/ - 30)	14.9 \pm 12.4, NR Enalapril 10 mg/d for 5 w (N = 40)	1.Hcy 2.SBP, DBP	0
20. Gao, 2014	NR Hoy ≥ 15 µmmol/L	92/84 (17	6), 47.5 土 3.2	NR, NR Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d	NR, NR Enalapril 10 mg/d for 12 w ($N = 88$)	1.AE 2.SBP, DBP	Ю
21. Guo, 2014	$SBP \ge 140/DBP \ge 90 mmhg$ Hcy $\ge 10 \mu mmol/L$	18/14 (32) 39–75	17/15 (32) 39–74	(y = − 50) 13.5 ± 12.3,152.3 ± 9.4/94.6 ± 9.1 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril1#/d (N = 32)	13.6 \pm 11.6,153.6 \pm 9.8/92.1 \pm 7.9 Enalapril 1 #/d for 2 mo (N = 32)	1.Hcy, CVCE 2.SBP, DBP	N
22. Li, 2014	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 10 μmmo/L	23/16 (39) 64.1 ± 2.1	27/17(44) 62.9 ± 1.7	7.5 ± 4.9,163.1 ± 10.1/102.56 ± 6.2 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 39)	$18.5 \pm 4.4, 160.7 \pm 10.3/101.5 \pm 6.4$ Enalapril 10 mg/d for 8 w (V = 44)	1.SBP, DBP	σ
23. Li, J. 2014	180 > SBP ≥ 140;110 > DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 15 μmmol/L	47/13 (60) 64.2 ± 7.6	46/14 (60) 63.9 ± 7.9	20.2 ± 4.6,152.4 ± 20.4/92.9 ± 8.8 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril1#/d (// - 60)	19.9 ± 4.8,153.1 ± 19.6/94.1 ± 8.5 Enalapril 1#/d for 12 mo (N = 60)	1.Stroke, AE 2.Hcy, SBP, DBP	Ю
24. Li, F. 2014	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	30/26 (56	5), 53.2 ± 5.6	2003 ± 3.12,158.3 ± 12.1/98.6 ± 9.0 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d	19.72 ± 3.04,157.9 ± 12.1/98.4 ± 9.1 Enalapril 10 mg/d for 12 w (N = 28)	1.Stroke, IMT 2.Hcy, SBP, DBP	0
25. Li, X. 2014	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo//L	59/41 (100), 56.12 ± 8.34	(N = 50) Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 50)	14.97	1.Hcy, AE 2.SBP, DBP	0
						0	ontinued)

5

TABLE 1 Continu	led						
Study	Criteria (blood pressure/Hcy)*	Basic data	a: M/F(n); age	Pre-treatment: Hcy (umol/L); BP (SF	BP/DBPmmHg); Intervention	Outcome measures	Risk bias
26. Liu, 2014	SBP > 135;DBP > 85mmhg, Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	18/17 (35) 62.0 ± 3.5	NR (35) 55.0 ± 13.5	18.5 ± 4.5,162.8 ± 12.6/106.5 ± 7.5 Folate 0.8 mo + Ealand IV = 35)	18.9 ± 4.6,161 ± 12.5/106.8 ± 6.9 Enalapril for 8 w (N = 35)	1.Hcy, CVCE 2.SBP, DBP	0
27. Lu, 2014	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hoy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	19/13 (32) 58.6 ± 4.9	21/11 (32) 60.1 ± 5.2	20.26 ± 4.63,151.47 ± 10.39/93.69 ± 8.48 Folate 0.4 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 32)	21.22 ± 5.02,152.19 ± 9.73/91.97 ± 8.86 Enalapril 10 mg/d for 2 mo (N = 32)	1.Hcy, CVCE 2.SBP, DBP	-
28. Mu, 2014	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 10 μmmo/L	62/58 ((120), 57.5	21.15 ± 3.78, NR Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 60)	20.87 ± 3.81, NR Enalapril 10 mg/d for 12 mo (N = 60)	1.Hcy 2. CVCE	~
29. Wang, 2014	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	38/27	t (62), 58	13.7 ± 10.2,159.2 ± 10.9/94.2 ± 8.8 Fotate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 31)	$13.9 \pm 10.0,158.4 \pm 10.4/93.6 \pm 8.5$ Enalapril 10 mg/d for 3 mo ($N = 31$)	1.Hc, AE 2.SBP, DBP	
30. Xie, 2014	180 > SBP ≥ 140;110 > DBP ≥ 90 mmhg, Hcy ≥ 10 μmmol/L	28/17 (45) 52.7 ± 7.6	29/16 (45) 51.7 ± 7.3	20.39 ± 4.72,153.86 ± 10.47/93.72 ± 8.54 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril1#/d (N = 45)	21.13 ± 5.03, 152.24 ± 9.85/92.86 ± 8.93 Enalapril 1#/d for 8 w (N = 45)	1.Hcy, AE 2.SBP, DBP	0
31. Zhang, 2014	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	39/41 (80) 53.4 ± 9.1	38/42 (80) 51.2 ± 9.3	18.32 ± 8.22, 166.52 ± 9.78/82.96 ± 8.22 Folate 0.4 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 80)	18.13 \pm 7.12, NR Enalapril 10 mg/d for 2 mo (N = 80)	1.Hcy	-
32. Chen, 2015	SBP ≥ 140 /DBP $\geq 90 \text{ mmhg}$ Hcy $\geq 10 \mu \text{mmol/L}$	23/19 (42) 63.5 ± 7.3	19/22 (41) 64.2 ± 8.1	12.9 ± 11.8, NR Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 42)	13.2 \pm 10.6, NR Enalapril 10 mg/d for 8 w (V = 41)	1.Hcy	
33. Hu, 2015	180 > SBP ≥ 140;110 > DBP ≥ 90 mmhg, Hcy ≥ 10 μmmol/L	44/20 (64) 62.1 ± 7.1	43/21 (64) 62.6 ± 7.3	$16.1 \pm 4.5,156.5 \pm 19.7/91.8 \pm 8.7$ Folate + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 64)	15.9 ± 4.6,156.1 ± 19.4/92.2 ± 8.2 Enalapril 10 mg/d for 1 y (N = 64)	1.Hcy, CVCE 2.SBP, DBP	Ŋ
34. Huang, 2015	SBP ≥ 140;DBP ≥ 90 mmHg Hcy ≥ 15 μmmo//L	40/44 (84) 55.8 土 4.3	50/34 (84) 57.1 ± 5.2	NR,159.8 ± 17.3/88.2 ± 12.7 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 84)	NR,158.6 \pm 19.4/90.1 \pm 14.6 Enalgorii 10 mg/d for 8 w (V = 84)	1.Hcy, PWV 2.SBP, DBP, CF	0
35. Jiang, 2015	SBP ≥ 140 /DBP $\geq 90 \text{ mmhg}$ Hcy $\geq 10 \mu \text{mmol/L}$	45/7 (52) 58.2 ± 7.6	40/6 (46) 56.2 ± 8.3	19.3 ± 6.1,149 ± 7/95 ± 4 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 52)	20.0 ± 6.0,147 ± 5/94 ± 3 Indapamide 2.5 mg/d for 3 mo (N = 46)	1.P-selectin, TM,Vwf 2. Hcy	0
36. Li, 2015	SBP ≥ 140;DBP ≥ 90 mmHg Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	64/16 (80) 57.12 ± 7.13	60/20 (80) 58.24 ± 6.36	21.16 ± 2.54,169.66 ± 2.54/108.26 ± 2.34 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 80)	20.45 ± 2.26, 168.15 ± 1.94/98.45 ± 2.14 Enalapril 10 mg/d for 12 w (N = 80)	1.Hcy, SBP, DBP 2. MoCA, HAMD24	2
37. Luo, 2015	SBP \ge 140/DBP \ge 90 mmhg Hcy \ge 10 μ mmo//L	50/43 (93) 63.1 土 7.4	49/43 (92) 64.3 ± 8.3	19.7 ± 6.3,153.5 ± 9.6/94.4 ± 6.9 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 93)	18.8 \pm 6.9,152.3 \pm 9.1/95.2 \pm 7.4 Enalapril 10 mg/d for 24 w (N = 92)	1.SBP, DBP 2.BPV, Hcy	0
38. Qin, 2015	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	57/36 (93) 46 ± 10	53/32 (85) 50 ± 12	20.4 ± 8.5, NR Folate 0.8 mg + anti-hypertension therapy	21.6 ± 9.4, NR Anti-hypertension therapy for 8w	1.Hcy 2.BPV	ო
						0)	ontinued)

TABLE 1 Continu	led						
Study	Criteria (blood pressure/Hcy)*	Basic dat	:a: M/F(n); age	Pre-treatment: Hcy (umol/L); BP (SB	BP/DBPmmHg); Intervention	Outcome measures	Risk bias
39. Qiu, 2015	NR Hay ≥ 10 µmmo/L	95/85 (18	30), 59.3 土 5.6	20.43 ± 1.23, NR Folate 0.4 mg + Enalapril 5–10 mg/d (N = 90)	20.53 ± 1.94 , NR Enalapril5- 10 mg/d for 6 mo ($N = 90$)	1.Hcy, MAP 2.MMSE	N
40. Tu, 2015	SBP ≥ 140 /DBP $\ge 90 \text{ mmhg}$ Hcy $\ge 10 \mu \text{mmol/L}$	65/35 (100) 64.2 ± 7.8	61/39 (100) 63.3 ± 8.4	21.7 ± 3.8, NR Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 100)	20.6 \pm 3.6, NR Enalapril 10 mg/d for 3 mo (N = 100)	1.Hcy, MAP 2.CD41, CD62P, CRP	N
41. Wei, 2015	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	31/18 (49) 56.00 ± 13.13	26/23 (49) 53.50 ± 12.84	14.8 ± 9.4,147.6 ± 11.2/87.4 ± 6.8 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg.bid/d (N = 49)	13.9 \pm 9.2,145.7 \pm 10.8/84.9 \pm 6.5 Enalapril 10 mg.bid/d for 4 w (N = 49)	1.Hcy. 2.SBP, DBP	.
42. Xia, 2015	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	68/32 (100) 62.45 ± 3.28	67/33 (100) 62.08 ± 3.59	18.39 ± 5.01,168.27 ± 12.87/100.07 ± 11.30 Folate 0.4 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 100)	18.86 ± 5.24,164.24 ± 12.04/95.65 ± 11.83 Enalapril 10 mg/d for 14 d (N = 100)	1.Hcy. 2.SBP, DBP	0
43. Zhang, 2015	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	51/42 (93) 69.18 ± 7.25	53/40 (93) 68.23 ± 6.37	24.12 ± 4.69,155.58 ± 12.74/99.58 ± 8.69 Folate 5 mg + anti-hypertension therapy	24.56 ± 4.63,154.32 ± 11.23/100.74 ± 8.77 Anti-hypertension therapy for 3 mo	1.Hcy, PWV 2.SBP, DBP	0
44. Zhang, X. 2015	SBP <u>></u> 140;DBP <u>></u> 90 mmHg Hcy <u>></u> 10 μmmo/L	60/40 (100) 66.85 ± 5.25	61/39 (100) 67.56 ± 5.73	19.55 ± 3.24,165.75 ± 11.78/110.55 ± 9.28 Folate 5 mg + anti-hypertension therapy	19.75 ± 3.75,163.78 ± 11.75/110.09 ± 9.25 Anti-hypertension therapy for 3 mo	1.Hoy, CVCE	
45. Zhang, Y. 2015	SBP ≥ 140 /DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy $\geq 10 \mu$ mmo/L	32/28 (6	0), 59.7 ± 6.1	20.09 ± 4.13,152.44 ± 10.19/93.24 ± 8.15 Folate + Enalapril1#/d (N = 30)	21.98 ± 5.13,152.74 ± 9.37/92.65 ± 8.73 Enalapril 1 #/d for 8 w (N = 30)	1.Hcy. 2.SBP, DBP	-
46. Zhou, 2015	SBP ≥ 140;DBP ≥ 90 mmHg Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	39/41 (80) 56.89 ± 8.51	38/42 (80) 57.34 ± 7.24	27.86 ± 4.37,160.87 ± 7.91/98.02 ± 7.13 Folate 0.4 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 80)	28.31 ± 4.51,161.35 ± 8.27/97.28 ± 6.32 6.32 Enalapril 10 mg/d for 14 d (N = 80)	1.Hcy, CF 2.SBP, DBP	4
47. Bian, 2016	SBP ≥ 140 ;DBP $\geq 90 \text{ mmHg}$ Hcy $\geq 10 \mu\text{mmol/L}$	23/21(44) 56 土 8	21/22 (43) 56 ± 8	18 ± 4,153 ± 10/118 ± 8 Folate 0.4 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 44)	19 ± 3,152 ± 11/115 ± 7 Enalapril 1# bid/d for 12 w (N = 43)	1.Hcy,CVCE 2.SBP,DBP	
48. Chuan, 2016	SBP ≥ 140;DBP ≥ 90 mmHg Hcy ≥ 10 μmmo//L	80/56 (136) NR	76/54 (130) NR	42.5 ± 9.2,152.1 ± 10.5/92.5 ± 9.2 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 136)	41.9 ± 9.1,150.1 ± 11.2/91.3 ± 10.1 Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 120)	1.Hcy, IMT 2.SBP, DBP	0
49. Huang, 2016	SBP ≥ 140;DBP ≥ 90 mmHg Hcy ≥ 10 μmmo//L	28/12 (40) 72.5 ± 6.9	26/14 (40) 73.8 ± 6.2	24.1 ± 4.6, NR Folate 5 mg + anti-hypertension therapy	23.7 \pm 4.1, NR Anti-hypertension therapy for 3 mo	1.Hcy, PWV	
50. Li, 2016	SBP ≥ 140;DBP ≥ 90 mmHg Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	64/39 (10	3) ,51.0 ± 9.2	$17.83 \pm 4.24,158 \pm 10/100 \pm 7$ Folate 0.4 mg + Enalapril (V = 52)	17.92 \pm 5.04,158 \pm 9/101 \pm 5 Enalapril 1 #/d for 2 mo (N = 51)	1.Hcy, 2.SBP, DBP	0

Folic for HT/HHCY Patients

(Continued)

TABLE 1 Continue	pe						
Study	Criteria (blood pressure/Hcy)*	Basic dat	a: M/F(n); age	Pre-treatment: Hcy (umol/L); BP (SB	3P/DBPmmHg); Intervention	Outcome measures	Risk bias
51. Liang, 2016	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hoy ≥ 10 µ.mmo//L	68/80 (148) 55.8 ± 15.3	70/78 (148) 54.2 ± 14.7	20.7 ± 4.3,153.2 ± 12.5/100.2 ± 5.2 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 148)	$21.1 \pm 4.1,152.1 \pm 10.6/99.1 \pm 6.7$ Enalapril 10 mg/d for 3 mo (N = 148)	1.Hcy, DBP 2.SBP, DBP	N
52. Liu, 2016	SBP ≥ 140;DBP ≥ 90 mmHg Hoy ≥ 10 μmmo/L	34/36 (70) 68.0 ± 8.3	35/35 (70) 69.0 ± 8.1	0.11 ± 4.78,158.32 ± 7.92/78.73 ± 6.54 6.54 Folate 0.8 mg + anti-hypertension therapy	19.83 ± 4.32, 158.69 ± 8.33/79.15 ± 7.32 Anti-hypertension therapy for 12 w	1.Hcy, IMT 2.SBP, DBP	N
53. Song, 2016	$180 > SBP \ge 140;110 > DBP \ge$ 90 mmhg, Hcy $\ge 10 \mu mmol/L$	29/16 (45) 63.13 ± 5.29	31/14(45) 63.59 ± 5.67	15.52 ± 3.24,153.71 ± 6.88/93.72 ± 4.75 Folate + Enalapril1# bid/d (N = 45)	16.11 ± 3.54, 153.64 ± 5.79/93.19 ± 3.58 Enalapril 1# bid/d for 1y (N = 45)	1.Hcy, CVCE 2.SBP, DBP	N
54. Sun, 2016	SBP $\ge 140/\text{DBP} \ge 90 \text{ mmhg}$ Hcy $\ge 10 \mu \text{mmol/L}$	20/19 (39) 62.4 ± 6.8	21/18 (39) 62.8 ± 7.0	18.11 ± 5.82,151.11 ± 12.65/97.71 ± 11.34 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril (N = 39)	18.13 ± 5.94,152.10 ± 12.81/97.52 ± 11.87 Enalapril 10 mg/d for 12 mo (V = 39)	1.Hcy, CVCE 2.SBP, DBP	N
55. Tang, 2016	SBP ≥ 140;DBP ≥ 90 mmHg Hcy ≥ 10 µ.mmol/L	39/21 (60) 75.8 ± 8.9	39/21 (60) 73.3 ± 9.2	20 ± 11,157 ± 12/79 ± 8 Folate 0.8 mg + anti-hypertension therapy	$19 \pm 10,158 \pm 12/78 \pm 7$ Anti-hypertension therapy for 12 w	1.Hcy, CVCE 2.SBP, DBP	ო
56. Tian, 2016	SBP $\ge 140/DBP \ge 90 \text{ mmhg}$ Hcy $\ge 10 \mu \text{mmol/L}$	48/22 (70) 63.0 ± 6.5	46/24 (70) 65.3 ± 8.3	19.20 ± 4.11, NR, Folate 5 mg tid/d + anti-hypertension therapy	19.25 \pm 3.75, NR Anti-hypertension therapy for 6 mo	1.Hcy, CVCE	-
57. Tian, T, 2016	GPCH Hoy ≥ 10 µmmol/L	17/21(38) 58.7 ± 6.3	19/19 (38) 59.2 ± 10.3	18.12 ± 4.78,143.4 ± 12.9/102.4 ± 9.5 Folate + Enalapril 10 mg bid/d (N = 38)	17.96 ± 4.67,144.2 ± 13.1/103.6 ± 9.7 Enalapril 10 mg bid/d for 8 w (N = 38)	1.Hcy, 2.SBP, DBP	0
58. Wang, 2016	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hoy ≥ 10 μmmo//L	22/20 (42) 59.8 ± 2.7	20/22 (42) 58.6 ± 2.5	7.21 ± 6.21,157.21 ± 10.21/100.81 ± 7.31 Fotate 0.4 mg + Enatapril 5 mg bid/d (N = 42)	18.47 ± 7.20,158.47 ± 11.20/101.10 ± 6.41 Enalapril 5 mg bid/d for 6 w (N = 42)	1.Hcy, 2.SBP, DBP	N
59. Wei, 2016	SBP ≥ 140;DBP ≥ 90 mmHg Hcy ≥ 10 µmmo/L	20/20 (40) 69.86 \pm 7.03	22/18 (40) 67.86 ± 5.95	24.7 ± 8.7, NR Folate 0.8 mg + anti-hypertension therapy	23.5 ± 10.6, NR Anti-hypertension therapy for 16 w	1.Hcy, 2.IL-6, MMP-9	N
60. Wu, 2016	SBP ≥ 140 /DBP $\ge 90 \text{ mmhg}$ Hcy $\ge 10 \mu \text{mmo/L}$	19/17 (36) 53.00 \pm 5.57	20/16 (36) 55.00 ± 5.13	22.33 ± 4.56,153.77 ± 15.26/112.32 ± 5.55 Folate + Enalapril 5 ma bid/d (N = 36)	20.12 ± 4.67,153.42 ± 15.97/114.02 ± 5.77 Enalapril 5 mo/d for 8 w (N = 36)	1.Hcy, CVCE 2.SBP, DBP	N
61. Wu. G, 2016	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hoy ≥ 10 μmmol/L	NR (99) 62.3 ± 15.8	NR (97) 62.5 ± 15.1	16.89 ± 5.62,159.51 ± 8.55/98.11 ± 7.44 Folate 0.8 mg + Enalapril10 mg/dl (N = 99)	17.11 ± 6.33, 160.10 ± 9.12/97.88 ± 7.62 Enalapril 10 mg/d for 10 mo (N = 97)	1.Hcy, IMT 2.SBP, DBP	N
62. Yang, 2016	SBP ≥ 140/DBP ≥ 90 mmhg Hcy ≥ 10 μmmo//L	46/34 (8	0) 66.3 ± 3.4	23.2 ± 9.6,146.4 ± 12.7/85.7 ± 9.4 Folate 0.4 mg + Amlodipine + Benazepril (N = 40)	23.0 ± 9.7,147.6 ± 10.8/85.8 ± 9.9 Amlodipine + Benazepril (V = 40)	1.Hcy, 2.SBP, DBP	N

(Continued)

Study	Criteria (blood pressure/Hcy)*	Basic dat	a: M/F(n); age	Pre-treatment: Hcy (umol/L); BP (SE	BP/DBPmmHg); Intervention	Outcome measures	Risk bias
63. Zhang, 2016	180 > SBP ≥ 140;110 > DBP ≥ 90 mmhg, Hcy ≥ 15 µmmo//L	29/17 (46) 63.1 ± 2.6	31/15 (46) 65.8 ± 3.5	21.01 ± 3.12, NR Folate 5 mg + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 46)	20.96 ± 3.05, NR Enalapril 10 mg/d for 8 w (V = 46)	1.Hcy, CRP 2.NO, ET-1	ю
64. Zhao, 2016	SBP \geq 140/DBP \geq 90 mmhg Hcy \geq 10 μ mmol/L	22/20 (42) 59.8 ± 2.7	20/22 (42) 58.6 ± 2.5	17.21 ± 6.21,157.21 ± 10.21/100.80 ± 7.31 Folate 0.4 mg + Enalapril 5 mg bid/d (N = 42)	18.47 ± 7.20,158.47 ± 11.20/101.10 ± 6.47 Enalapril 5 mg bid/d for 6 w (N = 42)	1.Hcy, CVCE 2.SBP, DBP	0
65. Zhou, 2016	SBP \geq 140/DBP \geq 90 mmhg Hcy \geq 10 μ mmol/L	26/22 (48) 62.7 土 4.8	27/2′ (48) 62.3 ± 4.7	29.34 ± 2.69,162.34 ± 6.96/103.65 ± 3.82 Folate + Enalapril 10 mg/d (N = 48)	29.37 ± 2.65,163.28 ± 7.23/102.43 ± 2.96 Enalapril 10 mg/d for 2 mo (<i>N</i> = 48)	1.Hcy. 2.SBP, DBP	0

SBP, Systolic blood pressure; DBP, Diastolic blood pressure; NR, No report; Hcy, Homocysteine; M/F (n), male/female (numbers); W, weeks; mo, Months; d, Days; IMT, Intima media thickness; CVCE, Cardiovascular and cerebrovascular events; LVMI, Left ventricular mass index; PWV, Pulse wave velocity; CF, Cardiac function; MAP, Mean arterial blood pressure Folic for HT/HHCY Patients

median treatment duration is 3.8 months. In terms of outcome measure, SBP and DBP as the outcome measure were observed in 49 studies; The Hcy levels were observed in 60 studies; CVCE was reported in 22 studies. The risk of bias of these trials ranged from 1 to 4. Of whom, 15 studies got 1 point; 40 studies got 2; 9 studies got 3; 1 study got 4, an average risk of bias score is 1.9. Fourteen studies described the method of randomization, only five studies showed the blinding of participants. Therefore, all of these included trials were supposed to have a high risk of bias.

Meta-Analysis of Homocysteine Lowering Therapy on Outcomes

SBP data were available from 49 trials with 5,707 participants in this analysis of folic acid plus antihypertensive combination therapy compared with antihypertensive alone. We then pooled the whole data to process and found obvious difference between two groups (p < 0.00001, WMD = -7.85, 95% CI: -9.43 to -6.27; Heterogeneity test: Tau² = 28.41, Chi² = 894.74, p < 0.00001, $I^2 = 95\%$, Figure 2). Meanwhile, 49 trials displayed significant effect of combination therapy for reducing DBP compared with antihypertensive alone (p < 0.00001, WMD = -6.77, 95% CI: -8.55 to -5.00; Heterogeneity test: Tau² = 37.91, $\text{Chi}^2 = 1820.55$, p < 0.00001, $\text{I}^2 = 97\%$, Figure 3). Data on the tHcy levels were available from 60 studies with 7,340 participants included. Compared to antihypertensive alone, the result showed significant effects of folic acid plus antihypertensive therapy for reducing the tHcy levels (p < 0.00001, WMD = 5.5, 95% CI: 6.44 to 4.57; Heterogeneity test: $Tau^2 = 12.87$, $Chi^2 = 1908.88, p < 0.00001, I^2 = 97\%$, Figure 4). Due to the high heterogeneity of all analyses, consequently, we should interpret the results prudently ($I^2 = 95\%$, $I^2 = 97\%$, $I^2 = 97\%$, respectively). When pooling the 22 randomized trials with 2,057 subjects, folic acid therapy reduced the danger of CVCE by 12.9% compared with control groups (p < 0.00001, RR = 0.30, 95% CI: 0.21 to 0.43; Heterogeneity test: $Tau^2 = 0.28$, $Chi^2 =$ 36.66, p = 0.02, $I^2 = 43\%$, Figure 5). The Begg's tests roughly suggest low likelihood of publication bias for the effect of folic acid on SBP (p > 0.05, Figure 6A) and tHcy levels (p > 0.05, **Figure 6B**) rather than DBP (p < 0.05, **Figure 6C**) or CVCE (p < 0.050.05, Figure 6D), respectively. Meanwhile, the funnel plot of the outcome measures by visual inspection were also consistent with the Begg's tests (The Funnel Plots are provided as Supplementary Figure I).

Stratified Analysis

In the stratified analysis by tHcy reduction rate, folic acid fortification and duration of intervention, a greater beneficial effect was observed among those trials of longer intervention duration. The merged RR for the trials with shorter duration was 0.36 (\leq 12 weeks; 95% CI 0.26 to 0.50, *p* < 0.00001); by contrast the merged RR for the trials with longer duration was 0.31 (> 12)weeks; 95% CI 0.22 to 0.43, *p* < 0.00001, **Table 2**). In addition, when we stratified the included studies by the degree of tHcy lowering, the pooled RR for the studies with a reduction in tHcy concentration of less than 25% was 0.30 (95% CI 0.19 to 0.47 p <0.00001); by contrast, the pooled RR for the trials with a reduction

ot t	Folic a	icid grou	ips	Contr	ol grou	ps		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Bian2016	107	8	44	139	12	43	2.0%	-32.00 [-36.30, -27.70]	-
Chuan 2016	121.3	10.1	136	120.1	8.9	130	2.2%	1.20 [-1.09, 3.49]	T
Feng 2014	134.7	10	39	143.8	10.9	40	1.9%	-9.10 [-13.71, -4.49]	and the second se
Gao 2014	144.2	11.4	88	145.7	12.6	88	2.1%	-1.50 [-5.05, 2.05]	-
Guo 2014	134.5	7.8	32	139.4	5.2	32	2.1%	-4.90 [-8.15, -1.65]	and the second s
Hu 2013	134.27	8.52	70	146.26	10.63	70	2.1%	-11.99 [-15.18, -8.80]	
Hu2015	127.6	12.5	64	137.5	13.1	64	1.9%	-9.90 [-14.34, -5.46]	14 The second
Huang2015	129.8	12.2	84	139.3	18.5	84	1.9%	-9.50 [-14.24, -4.76]	a state
Li 2014	139	10.5	39	138.5	11.7	44	1.9%	0.50 [-4.28, 5.28]	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Li 2016	130	5	52	140	7	51	2.2%	-10.00 [-12.35, -7.65]	
Li FJ 2014	127.6	9.2	28	128	10.1	28	1.9%	-0.40 [-5.46, 4.66]	
Li JH 2014	128.4	11.4	60	138.4	14.4	60	1.9%	-10.00 [-14.65, -5.35]	
Li XJ 2014	132.2	6.5	50	137.3	5.7	50	2.2%	-5.10 [-7.50, -2.70]	
Li2015	121.25	2.61	80	133.46	2.34	80	2.3%	-12.21 [-12.98, -11.44]	-
Liang 2016	128.4	9.8	148	137.5	9.1	148	2.2%	-9.10 [-11.25, -6.95]	
Liu 2014	130.2	9.8	35	147.6	9.5	35	1.9%	-17.40 [-21.92, -12.88]	
Liu 2016	133.58	9.17	70	134.56	8.15	70	2.1%	-0.98 [-3.85, 1.89]	-+
Liu XY 2012	138.3	10.7	46	135.6	12.1	40	1.9%	2.70 [-2.16, 7.56]	+
Lu 2012	142.6	6.1	107	141.5	6.5	97	2.2%	1.10 [-0.63, 2.83]	+
Lu 2014	130.14	9.79	32	143.23	10.06	32	1.9%	-13.09 [-17.95, -8.23]	
Luo2015	131.4	5.5	93	136.9	6.2	92	2.2%	-5.50 [-7.19, -3.81]	
Mao 2013	134.5	7.8	50	139.3	5.7	50	2.1%	-4.80 [-7.48, -2.12]	
Mena 2012	133.7	10.3	45	145.3	11.2	44	1.9%	-11.60 [-16.07, -7.13]	
Qin 2013	129.46	8.69	34	141.82	8.93	34	2.0%	-12.36 [-16.55, -8.17]	
Shen 2012	130.26	9.87	25	142.74	10.03	25	1.8%	-12.48 [-18.00, -6.96]	
Sona 2016	127.96	3.57	45	137.44	3.29	45	2.2%	-9.48 [-10.90, -8.06]	-
Sun 2016	127.36	8.14	39	128.16	8.23	39	2.0%	-0.80 [-4.43, 2.83]	
Tang 2016	131	13	60	139	13	60	1.9%	-8.00 [-12.65 -3.35]	
Tian T 2016	122.4	8.6	38	131.7	9.2	38	2.0%	-9.30 [-13.30, -5.30]	
Wan 2013	135.55	7.89	147	138.19	5.9	147	2.2%	-2.64 [-4.23, -1.05]	-
Wang 2014	131	6.2	31	137	7.1	31	2.1%	-6.00 [-9.32, -2.68]	
Wang 2016	130.21	5.47	42	137.26	6.24	42	2.2%	-7.05 [-9.56, -4.54]	
Wei2015	125.2	8.3	49	133.6	9.7	49	2.0%	-8.40 [-11.974.83]	
Wu 2016	128.55	8.33	36	143.76	9.33	36	2.0%	-15.21 [-19.30, -11.12]	
Wu G 2016	138.68	7.82	99	139.47	7.99	97	2.2%	-0.79[-3.00, 1.42]	-+
Xia2015	130.54	11.45	100	146.07	12.67	100	2.1%	-15.53 [-18.8812.18]	
Xie 2013	130.9	9.5	62	139.5	10.7	64	2.1%	-8.60 [-12.135.07]	
Xie 2014	130.28	9.86	45	142.75	10.06	45	2.0%	-12.47 [-16.59, -8.35]	
Xu 2013	132 45	9.72	38	138.34	10.65	38	1.9%	-5 89 [-10 47 -1 31]	
Yang 2016	125.6	7.5	40	132.4	9.6	40	2.0%	-6 80 [-10 58 -3 02]	
Zhang 2013	132.25	9.88	50	136.74	10.01	50	2.0%	-4.49 [-8.39 -0.59]	
Zhang H 2013	129.6	4	32	141 2	73	32	21%	-11 60 [-14 48 -8 72]	
Zhang X 2013	130	15	25	140	10	25	1.6%	-10.00 [-17 07 -2 93]	
Zhang2015	11614	6.14	93	125.36	6 21	93	2.2%	-9.22 [-10 99 -7 45]	
ZhangY2015	133 31	9.36	30	142.36	10.77	30	1.8%	-9 05 [-14 16 -3 94]	
7han 2016	130.21	5.47	42	137 26	6 74	42	2 2 96	-7 05 [-9 56 -4 54]	
7hou 2016	110.25	2.60	48	126 35	312	48	2.2.10	-16 10 [-17 27 -14 92]	-
Zhou2015	120.63	4 78	80	127.85	4 37	80	2.3%	-7 22 [-8 56 -5 88]	-
Zhu 2013	138.13	10.23	42	135.12	12.13	41	1.9%	3.01 [-1.82, 7.84]	
Total (95% CI)			2864			2843	100.0%	-7.85 [-9.43, -6.27]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	28.41; CI	hi ² = 894	.74, df	= 48 (P <	0.0000	1); ² =	95%		
Test for overall effect	Z= 9.74 ((P < 0.00	0001)						-20 -10 0 10 20 Folic acid favor Control favor

in tHcy concentration of 25% or more was 0.35 (95% CI 0.26 to 0.46, p < 0.00001, **Table 2**). Meanwhile, a bigger beneficial effect was found among those trials of patients with folic acid fortication (RR: 0.27 to 0.18, **Table 2**). We should explain this result prudently due to only one trial by fortification status, while remaining trials without folic acid fortification.

DISCUSSION

Summary of Evidence

In our current meta-analysis, we provided coherent evidence and found apparent benefit of folic acid paratherapy antihypertensive treatments on the risk of cardiovascular and stroke events

	Folic a	cid gro	ups	Cont	rol grou	ips .	144 1 1 1	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Bian2016	74	3	44	99	3	43	2.1%	-25.00 [-26.26, -23.74]	
Chuan 2016	75.3	7.5	136	77.3	8.1	130	2.1%	-2.00 [-3.88, -0.12]	
-eng 2014	80.4	9.4	39	88.6	8.9	40	1.9%	-8.20 [-12.24, -4.16]	
Gao 2014	82.5	10.1	88	91.3	10.5	88	2.0%	-8.80 [-11.84, -5.76]	and a second sec
Guo 2014	80.7	5.2	32	83.5	4.2	32	2.1%	-2.80 [-5.12, -0.48]	
Hu 2013	75.72	6.83	70	88.32	7.36	70	2.1%	-12.60 [-14.95, -10.25]	
Hu2015	82.9	6.9	64	88	7.2	64	2.1%	-5.10 [-7.54, -2.66]	
Huang2015	67.9	9.4	84	76.3	11.3	84	2.0%	-8.40 [-11.54, -5.26]	
Li 2014	97.6	10.3	39	98.2	11.5	44	1.9%	-0.60 [-5.29, 4.09]	
Li 2016	82	4	52	90	9	51	2.1%	-8.00 [-10.70, -5.30]	
Li FJ 2014	83.5	7.2	28	87.8	7.9	28	1.9%	-4.30 [-8.26, -0.34]	
Li JH 2014	83.8	7.2	60	90.2	7.9	60	2.1%	-6.40 [-9.10, -3.70]	
Li XJ 2014	80.3	5.2	50	83.1	4.7	50	2.1%	-2.80 [-4.74, -0.86]	
Li2015	79.25	2.64	80	80.36	2.44	80	2.1%	-1.11 [-1.90, -0.32]	-
Liang 2016	75.1	7.1	148	86.4	7.5	148	2.1%	-11.30 [-12.96, -9.64]	-
Liu 2014	78.5	7.8	35	89.7	7.9	35	2.0%	-11.20 [-14.88, -7.52]	Contraction of Association
Liu 2016	71.49	6.26	70	72.93	6.48	70	2.1%	-1.44 [-3.55, 0.67]	
Liu XY 2012	77.4	7.8	46	86.5	11.4	40	1.9%	-9.10 [-13.29, -4.91]	and the second s
Lu 2012	89.1	4.1	107	88.7	4	97	2.1%	0.40 [-0.71, 1.51]	+
Lu 2014	76.23	7.56	32	87.39	7.87	32	2.0%	-11.16 [-14.94, -7.38]	
Luo2015	80.8	4.7	93	87.8	4.4	92	2.1%	-7.00 [-8.31, -5.69]	-
Mao 2013	80.3	5.2	50	84.3	4.8	50	2.1%	-4.00 [-5.96, -2.04]	
Meng 2012	87.3	9.4	45	96.3	8.9	44	2.0%	-9.00 [-12.80, -5.20]	
Qin 2013	86.52	4.82	34	98.71	4.73	34	2.1%	-12.19 [-14.46, -9.92]	
Shen 2012	76.63	7.64	25	87.73	7.92	25	1.9%	-11.10 [-15.41, -6.79]	
Song 2016	82.29	2.63	45	88.13	2.8	45	2.1%	-5.84 [-6.96, -4.72]	-
Sun 2016	80.12	5.07	39	81.13	5.28	39	2.1%	-1.01 [-3.31, 1.29]	-+
Tang 2016	72	8	60	72	8	60	2.0%	0.00 [-2.86, 2.86]	<u> </u>
Tian T 2016	82.3	7.6	38	88.7	8.3	38	2.0%	-6.40 [-9.98, -2.82]	
Wan 2013	80.69	5.38	147	84.18	4.98	147	2.1%	-3.49 [-4.68, -2.30]	-
Wang 2014	79.3	5.2	31	81.7	5.6	31	2.1%	-2 40 [-5 09 0 29]	
Wang 2016	82.17	4.51	42	84.27	5.1	42	2.1%	-2.10 [-4.160.04]	-
Wei2015	75.6	59	49	80.1	6.2	49	21%	-4 50 [-6 90 -2 10]	
AU 2016	85 38	5	36	9913	512	36	21%	-13 75 [-16 09 -11 41]	
AU G 2016	82.98	5 22	aa	83.12	5.57	97	2.1%	-0 14 [-1 65 1 37]	+
(ia2015	75 44	8 97	100	80.22	9.47	100	2.1%	-4 78 [-7 33 -7 73]	
Xie 2013	84.4	7.5	62	85.9	51	64	2.1%	-1 50 63 75 0 75	
Xie 2013	76 68	7.65	45	87 75	7 93	45	2.1%	-11 07 [-14 29 -7 85]	
Vu 2019	00.00	6.04	20	07.75	6.64	20	2.0%	-2 27 L6 20 -0 24	
Vana 2016	72.2	5.0	40	76.5	6.0	40	2.0%	-3.27 [-0.30, -0.24]	
7hong 2010	75.62	7 60	40	07 72	7.01	40	2.0%	-4.20 [-0.97, -1.43]	
Zhang 2013 Zhang U 2012	75.05	7.00	20	07.72	7.91	20	2.0%	-12.09[-15.15, -9.05]	
Zhang M 2013	70.0	1.2	32	00.3	1.0	32	1 60	10.00[17.07, 2.02]	
2013 7hong2016	70 54	0 1 4	20	00 00	774	20	1.0%	-10.00[-17.07,-2.93]	
znangz015 ZhangV2045	72.51	8.14	93	82.39	1.14	93	2.1%	-9.88 [-12.16, -7.60]	
2nang12015 7boo 2016	10.41	1.59	30	87.93	1.1	30	2.0%	-11.52 [-15.24, -7.80]	
2na0 2016 Zhao 2016	82.17	4.51	42	84.27	5.1	42	2.1%	-2.10 [-4.16, -0.04]	
2nou 2016 Zhaw2016	15.87	3.69	48	91.63	2.89	48	2.1%	-15./6[-1/.09, -14.43]	
2nou2015	81.45	3.27	80	86.57	3.41	80	2.1%	-5.12 [-6.16, -4.08]	
Znu 2013	77.65	8.77	42	86.56	11.14	41	1.9%	-8.91 [-13.23, -4.59]	
Fotal (95% CI)	-	and some	2864	-		2843	100.0%	-6.77 [-8.55, -5.00]	_ , ♦ , , ,
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	: 37.91; C	hi ² = 18	20.55,	df = 48 i	(P < 0.0	0001);	l*= 97%		-20 -10 0 10 20
Fact for overall effect:	Z = 7.49	(P < 0.0	00001)						Ealia acid favor Control favor

in primary prevention compared with antihypertensive alone in HT/HHcy. Meanwhile, 65 trials with the total of 7,887 subjects that met the inclusion criteria to process the analysis and the results suggested that folic acid plus antihypertensive combination therapy could evidently reduce the SBP and DBP levels compared to antihypertensive alone. There was also a

Bian2016 11 Chen 2015 10.3 9 Chuan 2016 13.1 6 Feng 2014 11.1 11 Guo 2014 10.1 3 Hu 2013 15.27 5.2 Hu2015 7.1 2 Huang2016 18.2 3 Jiang2015 8.4 1 Li 2013 12.36 1.6 Li 2016 13.22 2.7 Li FJ 2014 9.67 2.0 Li JU 2015 11.25 2.5 Liang 2016 16.1 3 Liv X 2014 10.37 3.3 Liu 2015 11.25 3.6 Liu 2014 15.8 4.0 Lu 2012 10.8 1 Lu 2014 15.88 4.0 Lu 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2015 11.23 1.6 Gin 2015 9.7 1.0 Gin 2015 1.1.3<	3 44 .8 42 .9 136 .5 39 .4 32 .22 70 .6 64 .6 64 .6 64 .6 64 .6 64 .6 64 .6 64 .6 64 .6 64 .6 64 .6 64 .6 64 .6 64 .6 64 .8 50 .1 52 .2 148 .2 160 .2 70 .1 46 .2 93 .4 50 .2 34 .3 60 .2 33 .3 60 .2 33 .3 90 .4	17 11.7 35.3 14.8 10.2 20.63 15.6 23.1 19.9 20.13 16.65 18.62 21.2 14.86 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.64 19.24 15.47 17.64	4 10.6 7.3 10.9 4.6 5.5 3.5 3.12 3.25 3.12 3.25 3.12 3.25 3.12 4.9 3.64 2.34 3.5 4.55 4.8 4.86 5.8 0.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 3.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 3.13	43 41 130 40 322 70 64 40 40 46 50 51 28 80 50 51 28 80 50 50 80 80 80 80 80 97 32 92 50 44 460 345 80 90 25 52 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	1.7% 1.3% 1.3% 1.7% 1.2% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7	-6.00 [-7.49, -4.51] -1.40 [-5.79, 2.99] -22.20 [-23.91, -20.49] -3.70 [-8.64, 1.24] -0.10 [-2.08, 1.88] -5.36 [-7.00, -3.72] -8.50 [-9.57, -7.43] -4.90 [-6.78, -3.02] -11.50 [-13.00, -10.00] -7.77 [-8.83, -6.71] -3.43 [-4.59, -2.27] -8.95 [-10.34, -7.56] -14.00 [-15.35, -12.66] -4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Chen 2015 10.3 9 Chuan 2016 13.1 6 Feng 2014 11.1 11 Guo 2014 10.1 3 Hu 2013 15.27 5.2 Hu2015 7.1 2 Huang2016 18.2 3 Jiang2015 8.4 1 Li 2013 12.36 1.6 Li 2016 13.22 2.7 Li FJ 2014 9.67 2.0 Li JU 2015 11.25 2.5 Li 2016 13.22 2.7 Li XJ 2014 10.37 3.3 Li2015 11.25 2.5 Liang 2016 16.1 3 Liu 2012 12.3 4.3 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2013 16.8 4.0 Luo2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2014	.8 42 .9 136 .5 39 .4 32 .22 70 .6 64 .6 40 .1 52 .8 50 .1 52 .1 60 .2 148 .2 160 .5 80 .2 148 .2 160 .5 35 .2 70. .3 50 .4 50 .5 35 .2 70 .5 35 .2 70 .4 50 .5 30 .4 50 .2 34 .3 60 .2 33 .3 90 .4 25 .4 25 .4 2 .4	11.7 35.3 14.8 10.2 20.63 15.6 23.1 19.9 20.13 16.65 18.62 21.2 14.86 20.46 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 19.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.64 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	$\begin{array}{c} 10.6\\ 7.3\\ 10.9\\ 4.6\\ 4.65\\ 3.5\\ 4.9\\ 5.1\\ 3.42\\ 3.25\\ 3.12\\ 4.9\\ 3.64\\ 2.34\\ 3.5\\ 4.55\\ 4.8\\ 4.66\\ 5.8\\ 0.8\\ 4.82\\ 6.7\\ 5.7\\ 3.2\\ 4.26\\ 2.03\\ 7.4\\ 2.34\\ 3.13\\ \end{array}$	41 130 40 32 70 64 40 46 50 51 28 80 50 50 40 45 50 35 70 32 92 50 44 40 34 40 34 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	1.3% 1.7% 1.2% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.6% 1.6% 1.6% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7%	-1.40 [-5.79, 2.99] -22.20 [-23.91, -20.49] -3.70 [-8.64, 1.24] -0.10 [-2.08, 1.88] -5.36 [-7.00, -3.72] -8.50 [-9.57, -7.43] -4.90 [-6.78, -3.02] -11.50 [-13.00, -10.00] -7.77 [-8.83, -6.71] -3.43 [-4.59, -2.27] -8.95 [-10.34, -7.56] -14.00 [-15.35, -12.65] -4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Chuan 2016 13.1 6 Feng 2014 11.1 11 Guo 2014 10.1 3 Hu 2013 15.27 5.2 Huang2016 18.2 3 Jiang2015 8.4 1 Li 2013 12.36 1.6 Li 2016 13.22 2.7 Li FJ 2014 9.67 2.0 Li JH 2014 7.2 2 Li XJ 2014 10.37 3.3 Liang 2016 16.1 3 Liu 2012 12.3 4.3 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2015 11.25 3.6 Liu 2014 15.88 4.0 Luo 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2014 15.63 4.5 Gin 2015 1.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.3 2.5 Gin 2015 11.23 1.6 Shen	9 136 .5 39 .4 32 .2 70 .6 64 .6 40 .1 52 .88 50 .15 50 .16 60 .17 52 .18 50 .15 80 .2 148 .2 148 .2 148 .2 160 .55 35 .2 148 .2 168 .2 148 .2 160 .2 148 .2 700 .1 46 .33 60 .32 34 .33 90 .4 2 .32 34 .4 2 .32 .4 .33 .4 .34 .4	35.3 14.8 10.2 20.63 15.6 23.1 19.9 20.13 16.65 18.62 21.2 14.86 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 12.9 19.3 19.4 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.63 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	$\begin{array}{c} 7.3\\ 10.9\\ 4.6\\ 4.65\\ 3.5\\ 4.9\\ 5.1\\ 3.42\\ 3.25\\ 3.12\\ 4.9\\ 3.64\\ 2.34\\ 2.34\\ 2.5\\ 4.55\\ 4.8\\ 4.66\\ 5.8\\ 0.8\\ 4.66\\ 5.8\\ 0.8\\ 2.67\\ 5.7\\ 3.2\\ 4.26\\ 2.03\\ 7.4\\ 2.33\\ 3.13\\ \end{array}$	130 40 32 70 64 40 50 51 28 80 50 50 35 70 40 40 97 72 92 50 44 40 34 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 25 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	1.7% 1.2% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.8% 1.6% 1.6% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7	-22.20 [-23.91, -20.49] -3.70 [-8.64, 1.24] -0.10 [-2.08, 1.88] -5.36 [-7.00, -3.72] -8.50 [-9.57, -7.43] -4.90 [-6.78, -3.02] -11.50 [-13.00, -10.00] -7.77 [-8.83, -6.71] -3.43 [-4.59, -2.27] -8.95 [-10.34, -7.56] -14.00 [-15.35, -12.65] -4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.34, 1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Feng 2014 11.1 11 Guo 2014 10.1 3 Hu 2013 15.27 5.2 Hu2015 7.1 2 Huang2016 18.2 3 Jiang2015 8.4 1 Li 2013 12.36 1.6 Li 2016 13.22 2.7 Li FJ 2014 9.67 2.0 Li JH 2014 7.2 2 Li XJ 2014 10.37 3.3 Liang 2016 16.1 3 Liu 2012 12.3 4.3 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2012 15.2 5 Lu 2014 16.8 4.0 Luo 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2014 15.63 4.5 Gin 2015 17.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.8 Sun 2016 10.33 3.9 Tu2015 14.1 3	.5 39 .4 32 .2 70 .6 64 .6 40 .1 52 .8 50 .11 52 .88 50 .11 60 .16 50 .16 50 .1 60 .2 148 .2 148 .2 160 .5 35 .2 168 .1 46 .8 107 .1 46 .2 93 .4 50 .1 45 .33 60 .32 93 .4 2 .33 60 .4 2 .35 90 .4 2 .4 2 .4 2 .35 90 .4	14.8 10.2 20.63 15.6 23.1 16.65 18.62 21.2 14.86 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 19.2 18.74 17.9 19.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.63 19.4 19.07 18.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	$\begin{array}{c} 10.9\\ 4.6\\ 4.65\\ 3.5\\ 4.9\\ 5.1\\ 3.42\\ 3.25\\ 3.12\\ 4.9\\ 3.64\\ 2.36\\ 4.9\\ 3.64\\ 2.36\\ 4.55\\ 4.8\\ 4.66\\ 5.8\\ 0.8\\ 4.66\\ 5.8\\ 0.8\\ 4.66\\ 5.8\\ 0.8\\ 4.66\\ 5.8\\ 0.8\\ 4.26\\ 2.03\\ 7.4\\ 4.83\\ 3.13\\ \end{array}$	40 32 70 64 40 46 50 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 97 32 92 50 44 46 80 97 32 92 50 80 97 25 92 50 80 80 97 92 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80	1.2% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.8% 1.8% 1.6% 1.6% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7	-3.70 [-8.64, 1.24] -0.10 [-2.08, 1.88] -5.36 [-7.00, -3.72] -8.50 [-9.57, -7.43] -4.90 [-6.78, -3.02] -11.50 [-13.00, -10.00] -7.77 [-8.83, -6.71] -3.43 [-4.59, -2.27] -8.95 [-10.34, -7.56] -14.00 [-15.35, -12.65] -4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Guo 2014 10.1 3 Hu 2013 15.27 5.2 Hu2015 7.1 2 Huang2016 18.2 3 Jiang2015 8.4 1 Li 2013 12.36 1.6 Li 2016 13.22 2.7 Li FJ 2014 9.67 2.0 Li JH 2014 7.2 2 Li XJ 2014 10.37 3.3 Li 2015 11.25 2.5 Liang 2016 16.1 3.8 Liu 2012 12.3 4.3 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2014 16.8 4.0 Luo 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2.5 Gin 2013 16.12 2.5 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.8 Sun 2016 10.33 3.9 Tua	4 32 22 70 .6 64 .6 40 .6 64 .6 50 .1 52 .8 50 .1 62 .1 60 .2 148 .2 148 .2 148 .2 148 .2 148 .2 148 .2 148 .2 148 .2 148 .2 148 .32 700 .4 50 .5 35 .6 32 .3 60 .2 93 .3 5 .4 2 .3 .4 .3 .4 .3 .4 .4 .2 .3 .4 .3 .4 .3	10.2 20.63 15.6 23.1 19.9 20.13 16.65 18.62 21.2 14.86 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.2 19.2 19.31 17.9 19.2 19.2 19.31 17.9 19.2 19.2 19.2 19.31 17.9 19.2 19.2 19.2 19.2 19.2 19.2 19.3 19.5 19.2 19.2 19.2 19.2 19.2 19.2 19.3 19.5 19.2 19.2 19.2 19.3 19.5 19.2 19.2 19.2 19.2 19.3 19.5 19.5 19.5 19.5 19.5 19.5 19.5 19.5	4.6 4.65 3.5 4.9 5.1 3.42 3.25 3.12 4.9 3.64 2.34 3.64 2.34 4.55 4.55 4.8 4.66 5.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 3.74 3.42 3.75 4.83 3.13	32 70 64 40 50 51 28 80 50 50 80 50 80 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 97 32 92 50 44 460 34 85 90 25	1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7	-0.10 [-2.08, 1.88] -5.36 [-7.00, -3.72] -8.50 [-9.57, -7.43] -4.90 [-6.78, -3.02] -11.50 [-13.00, -10.00] -7.77 [-8.83, -6.71] -3.43 [-4.59, -2.27] -8.95 [-10.34, -7.56] -14.00 [-15.35, -12.65] -4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Hu 2013 15.27 5.2 Hu2015 7.1 2 Huang2016 18.2 3 Jiang2015 8.4 1 Li 2013 12.36 1.6 Li 2016 13.22 2.7 Li JU 2014 9.67 2.0 Li JJ 2014 9.67 2.0 Li JJ 2014 10.37 3.3 Li2015 11.25 2.5 Liag 2016 16.1 3 Liu 2012 12.3 4.3 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2015 8.4 4 Lu 2014 15.88 4.0 Lu 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2014 15.63 4.5 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.8 Sun 2016 10.33 3.9 Tu2015 14.1 3 Wang 2016 13.1 5	12 70 1.6 64 1.6 64 1.6 50 1.7 52 1.8 50 1.1 52 1.8 28 1.1 60 1.6 50 1.7 52 1.8 28 1.1 60 1.2 160 1.5 35 1.1 45 1.2 700 1.1 45 1.3 60 1.1 45 1.1 45 1.1 45 1.2 33 1.3 45 1.4 45 1.1 45 1.2 34 2 93 3.5 90 4 25 1.4 45 1.4 45 1.4 45 1.4 45 <tr< td=""><td>20.63 15.6 23.1 19.9 20.13 16.65 18.62 21.2 14.86 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 19.3 19.3 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64</td><td>4.65 3.5 4.9 5.1 3.42 3.25 3.12 4.9 3.64 2.34 3.5 4.55 4.55 4.8 4.66 5.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13</td><td>70 64 40 50 51 28 60 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80</td><td>1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7%</td><td>-5.36 [-7.00, -3.72] -8.50 [-9.57, -7.43] -4.90 [-6.78, -3.02] -11.50 [-13.00, -10.00] -7.77 [-8.83, -6.71] -3.43 [-4.59, -2.27] -8.95 [-10.34, -7.56] -14.00 [-15.35, -12.65] -4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]</td><td></td></tr<>	20.63 15.6 23.1 19.9 20.13 16.65 18.62 21.2 14.86 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 19.3 19.3 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	4.65 3.5 4.9 5.1 3.42 3.25 3.12 4.9 3.64 2.34 3.5 4.55 4.55 4.8 4.66 5.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	70 64 40 50 51 28 60 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80	1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7%	-5.36 [-7.00, -3.72] -8.50 [-9.57, -7.43] -4.90 [-6.78, -3.02] -11.50 [-13.00, -10.00] -7.77 [-8.83, -6.71] -3.43 [-4.59, -2.27] -8.95 [-10.34, -7.56] -14.00 [-15.35, -12.65] -4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Hu2015 7.1 2 Huang2016 18.2 3 Jiang2015 8.4 1 Li 2013 12.36 1.6 Li 2016 13.22 2.7 Li FJ 2014 9.67 2.0 Li JH 2014 7.2 2 Li XJ 2014 10.37 3.3 Li2015 11.25 2.5 Liang 2016 16.1 3 Liu 2012 12.3 4.3 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2015 11.25 3.6 Liu 2014 15.8 4.0 Lu 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2015 11.23 1.6 Qin 2013 16.12 2.5 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.8 Sun 2016 10.33 3.9 Taan 2016 10.33 3.2 W	6 64 .6 64 .6 40 .1 52 .8 50 .1 52 .88 50 .1 60 .2 148 .2 160 .5 35 .2 70 .1 46 .2 70 .1 46 .2 70 .1 46 .2 93 .3 60 .2 93 .5 90 .4 25 .2 93 .5 90 .4 25 .9 39 .4 25 .4 25 .4 25 .4 25	15.6 23.1 19.9 20.13 16.65 18.62 21.2 21.2 14.86 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 19.3 19.31 17.9 19.34 19.44 19.52 19.54 19.54 19.55 19.54 19.55 19.5	3.5 4.9 5.1 3.42 3.25 3.12 4.9 3.64 2.34 3.5 4.55 4.8 4.66 5.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	64 40 46 50 51 28 60 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 97 97 92 92 50 44 60 34 85 90 25	1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7%	-8.50 [-9.57, -7.43] -4.90 [-6.78, -3.02] -11.50 [-13.00, -10.00] -7.77 [-8.83, -6.71] -3.43 [-4.59, -2.27] -8.95 [-10.34, -7.56] -14.00 [-15.35, -12.65] -4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Huang2016 1.1 2.3 Jiang2015 8.4 1 Li 2013 12.36 1.6 Li 2016 13.22 2.7 Li FJ 2014 9.67 2.0 Li JH 2014 7.2 2 Li JH 2014 7.2 2 Li JJ 2014 10.37 3.3 Liu JD 2015 11.25 2.6 Liang 2016 16.1 3 Liu 2012 12.3 4.3 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2014 16.8 4.0 Lu 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2015 11.23 1.6 Gin 2015 9.7 9 Qiu2015 11.23 1.6 Sung 2016 7.33 2.6 Sung 2016 7.33 2.6 Sung 2016 13.31 3.2 Wan	1 52 1 52 1 52 1 52 1 52 1 60 1 60 1 60 1 60 1 60 1 60 1 60 1 60 1 46 1 46 1 46 1 46 1 46 3 2 1 46 3 2 3 60 3 2 3 60 2 33 3 60 2 33 3 60 3 90 4 2 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3 9 3<	23.1 19.9 20.13 16.65 18.62 21.2 14.86 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 12.9 19.31 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.63 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	4.9 5.1 3.42 3.25 3.12 4.9 3.64 2.34 3.5 4.55 4.8 4.66 5.8 0.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	40 46 50 51 28 60 50 50 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 97 32 92 92 50 44 60 34 80 90 25 25	1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.7% 1.8% 1.6% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7	-4.90 [-6.78, -3.02] -11.50 [-13.00, -10.00] -7.77 [-8.83, -6.71] -3.43 [-4.59, -2.27] -8.95 [-10.34, -7.56] -14.00 [-15.35, -12.65] -4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Namp2015 10.2 10.2 Jiang2015 8.4 1 Li 2013 12.36 1.6 Li 2016 13.22 2.7 Li FJ 2014 9.67 2.0 Li JH 2014 7.2 2 Li JJ 2014 10.37 3.3 Li Z015 11.25 2.5 Liang 2016 16.1 3 Liu 2012 12.3 4.3 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2012 10.8 1 Lu 2014 15.88 4.0 Luo 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2015 11.23 1.6 Sun 2016 7.33 2.6 Sun 2016 10.33 3.9 Tang 2016 13.31 3.2 Sun 2016 13.31 3.2 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang	1 52 1 52 1 52 1 52 1 52 1 52 1 52 1 52 18 28 16 50 17 52 18 28 10 50 12 160 12 160 12 70 1 46 10 50 11 45 13 60 13 60 14 29 13 60 14 25 15 90 14 25 14 25 14 25 14 25 14 25 14 25 14 25 14 25 15 90 14 14	19.9 20.13 16.65 18.62 21.2 14.86 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 19.3 19.4 17.9 19.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.63 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	5.1 3.42 3.25 3.12 4.9 3.64 2.34 2.34 4.55 4.8 4.66 5.8 0.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.42 4.83 3.13	466 500 511 288 600 500 500 500 800 800 800 800 800 800 977 92 922 922 922 922 922 920 444 600 344 855 900 225	1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.8% 1.8% 1.6% 1.6% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.6%	-11.50 [13.00, -10.00] -7.77 [-8.83, -6.71] -3.43 [-4.59, -2.27] -8.95 [-10.34, -7.56] -14.00 [-15.35, -12.65] -4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.30 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Starting	1 52 108 500 11 52 18 28 18 500 16 50 16 50 17 160 18 160 192 160 102 700 11 46 12 700 11 45 12 34 105 32 11 45 12 34 13 600 14 25 15 90 14 25 15 90 14 25 14 25 14 25 15 90 14 25 14 25 14 25 14 25 14 25 14 25 15 90 14 <td>20.13 16.65 18.62 21.2 14.86 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 12.9 19.3 19.4 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.64 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64</td> <td>3.42 3.25 3.12 4.9 3.64 2.34 4.55 4.8 4.66 5.8 0.8 4.66 5.8 0.8 4.66 5.8 0.8 4.66 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 2 4.83 3.13</td> <td> 50 51 28 60 50 80 8</td> <td>1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.8% 1.8% 1.6% 1.6% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.6%</td> <td>-7.77 [-8.83, -6.71] -3.43 [-4.59, -2.27] -8.95 [-10.34, -7.56] -14.00 [-15.35, -12.65] -4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]</td> <td></td>	20.13 16.65 18.62 21.2 14.86 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 12.9 19.3 19.4 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.64 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	3.42 3.25 3.12 4.9 3.64 2.34 4.55 4.8 4.66 5.8 0.8 4.66 5.8 0.8 4.66 5.8 0.8 4.66 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 2 4.83 3.13	 50 51 28 60 50 80 8	1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.8% 1.8% 1.6% 1.6% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.6%	-7.77 [-8.83, -6.71] -3.43 [-4.59, -2.27] -8.95 [-10.34, -7.56] -14.00 [-15.35, -12.65] -4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Li 2016 13.22 27. Li FJ 2014 9.67 2.0 Li FJ 2014 9.67 2.0 Li JH 2014 7.2 2 Li JJ 2014 10.37 3.3 Li 2015 11.25 2.5 Liang 2016 16.1 3 Liu 2012 12.3 4.3 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2014 15.8 4.0 Luo 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2013 16.12 2.5 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.8 Sun 2015 11.23 1.6 Sun 2015 11.23 1.6 Sun 2015 11.33 3.9 Tang 2016 10.33 3.9 Tu 2015 14.1 3 <	32 32 11 52 18 28 16 50 16 50 15 80 12 148 142 160 155 35 152 700 1 46 10 32 18 107 16 32 13 60 14 45 15 36 102 34 12 93 14 25 15 90 14 25 15 90 14 25 15 90 14 25 14 25 14 25 15 90 14 25 14 25 15 9 16 39 16 39 17	16.65 18.62 21.2 14.86 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	3.25 3.12 4.9 3.64 2.34 3.5 4.55 4.86 5.8 0.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	51 28 60 50 80 148 160 35 70 40 97 32 92 50 44 60 34 85 90 25	1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.8% 1.8% 1.6% 1.7% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.6%	-3.43 [-4.59, -2.27] -8.95 [-10.34, -7.56] -14.00 [-15.35, -12.65] -4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Li FJ 2014 9.67 2.0 Li FJ 2014 9.67 2.0 Li JH 2014 7.2 2 Li XJ 2014 10.37 3.3 Li 2015 11.25 2.5 Li ag 2016 16.1 3 Liu 2012 12.3 4.3 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2014 15.2 5 Lu 2012 10.8 1 Lu 2014 15.88 4.0 Luo 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2014 15.63 4.5 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 Sun 2016 7.03 2.8 Sun 2016 10.33 3.9 Tu 2015 14.1 3 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 201	1 60 18 28 1 60 16 50 15 80 160 50 15 80 160 52 160 52 11 46 12 700 13 45 14 50 15 35 160 32 17 46 18 107 106 32 11 45 12 33 160 32 161 32 17 45 163 60 12 34 12 33 14 25 14 25 14 25 14 25 14 25 14 25 15 9 16 39 17	18.62 21.2 14.86 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 12.9 19.31 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.56 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	3.12 4.9 3.64 2.34 3.5 4.55 4.8 4.66 5.8 0.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	288 60 50 80 148 160 35 70 40 97 32 92 50 44 60 34 85 90 25	1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.8% 1.8% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7	-8.95 [-10.34, -7.56] -14.00 [-15.35, -12.65] -4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Li JH 2014 7.2 2 Li JH 2014 10.37 3.3 Li Z015 11.25 2.5 Liang 2016 16.1 3 Liu 2012 12.3 4.3 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2014 16.8 4 Liu 2014 15.88 4.0 Lu 2012 10.8 1 Lu 2014 15.88 4.0 Luo2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.8 Sun 2016 10.33 3.9 Tian 2016 10.33 3.9 Tian 2016 10.33 3.9 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2015 10.7 5 Wei 2015 10.7 5 Wu 2016	1 60 36 50 35 80 36 50 35 80 36 50 35 80 32 148 32 70 32 70 32 70 32 70 36 932 37 60 32 34 50 90 4 25 39 4 4 25 9 39 4 80	21.2 14.86 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 12.9 19.31 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	4.9 3.64 2.34 3.5 4.55 4.8 4.66 5.8 0.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	60 50 80 148 160 35 70 40 97 32 92 50 44 60 34 85 90 25	1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.8% 1.8% 1.6% 1.6% 1.6% 1.6% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8%	-14.00 [+15.35, -12.65] -4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Lix Join Jiz Jiz <thjiz< td="" th<=""><td>1.1 50 166 50 155 80 12 160 15.5 35 12 160 15.5 35 12 700 1.1 46 1.3 8 1.4 45 1.5 33 1.60 322 1.4 45 1.3 46 1.4 45 1.5 90 1.4 45 1.5 93 1.4 45 1.5 90 1.4 45 1.5 90 1.4 45 1.4 45 1.5 90 1.4 45 1.4 45 1.4 45 1.4 45 1.4 45 1.5 90 1.4 45 1.5 90</td><td>14.86 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 12.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64</td><td>3.64 2.34 3.5 4.55 4.8 4.66 5.8 0.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.22 4.203 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13</td><td>50 80 148 160 35 70 40 97 32 92 50 44 60 34 85 90 25</td><td>1.7% 1.8% 1.8% 1.6% 1.6% 1.6% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.6%</td><td>-4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]</td><td></td></thjiz<>	1.1 50 166 50 155 80 12 160 15.5 35 12 160 15.5 35 12 700 1.1 46 1.3 8 1.4 45 1.5 33 1.60 322 1.4 45 1.3 46 1.4 45 1.5 90 1.4 45 1.5 93 1.4 45 1.5 90 1.4 45 1.5 90 1.4 45 1.4 45 1.5 90 1.4 45 1.4 45 1.4 45 1.4 45 1.4 45 1.5 90 1.4 45 1.5 90	14.86 20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 12.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.31 17.9 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	3.64 2.34 3.5 4.55 4.8 4.66 5.8 0.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.22 4.203 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	50 80 148 160 35 70 40 97 32 92 50 44 60 34 85 90 25	1.7% 1.8% 1.8% 1.6% 1.6% 1.6% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.6%	-4.49 [-5.86, -3.12] -9.21 [-9.97, -8.45] -3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Lin 2014 11.25 2.5 Liang 2016 16.1 3 Liu 2012 12.3 4.3 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2016 11.25 3.6 Liu 2016 11.25 3.6 Liu 2016 15.2 5 Liu 2012 15.2 5 Lu 2014 15.88 4.0 Luo 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2014 15.63 4.5 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 Sung 2016 7.33 2.6 Sung 2016 10.33 3.9 Tua 2016 10.33 3.9 Tua 2016 10.33 3.9 Tua 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei	30 30 30 30 31 46 32 70 33 70 34 50 35 31 46 32 38 107 36 93 34 50 32 34 2 93 35 90 4 25 32 45 9 39 4 25 39 4	20.46 19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 12.9 19.31 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.65 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	2.34 3.5 4.55 4.8 4.66 5.8 0.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	80 148 160 35 70 40 97 32 92 50 44 60 34 85 90 25	1.8% 1.8% 1.7% 1.6% 1.7% 1.6% 1.8% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8%	-9.21 [-9.37, -8.45] -9.21 [-9.37, -8.45] -2.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Liang 2016 16.1 3 Liu 2012 12.3 4.3 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2016 11.25 3.8 Liu 2016 11.25 3.8 Liu 2012 10.8 1 Lu 2012 10.8 1 Lu 2014 15.88 4.0 Luo 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2014 15.63 4.5 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.6 Sun 2016 10.48 3.1 Tang 2016 10.33 3.9 Tu2015 14.1 3 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2015 10.7 5 Wu 2013 14 4 Wu 2013 14 4 Wu 2016	148 160 12 148 160 .5 12 700 .1 46 .8 93 .4 50 .3 60 .1 45 .3 60 .3 93 .4 50 .1 45 .3 60 .2 93 .3 60 .4 50 .1 45 .3 60 .2 93 .35 90 .4 25 .32 .4 .4 .4 .3 .4 .4 .4 .5 .90 .39 .4 .4 .5 .32 .4 .4 .5 .5 .9 .39 .4	19.7 15.22 19.2 18.74 17.2 12.9 19.31 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	3.5 4.55 4.8 4.66 5.8 0.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	148 160 35 70 40 97 32 92 50 44 60 34 85 90 25	1.8% 1.7% 1.6% 1.6% 1.6% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8%	-3.60 [-4.36, -2.84] -2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Ling 2013 10.1 10.1 Liu 2012 12.3 4.3 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2016 11.25 3.8 Liu 2012 15.2 5 Lu 2012 15.8 4.0 Lu 2014 15.88 4.0 Lu 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2014 15.63 4.5 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.8 Sun 2016 10.33 3.9 Tu2015 14.1 3 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 3.0 Xia	140 140 122 160 16 35 11 46 18 107 16 32 16 32 13 60 13 60 12 344 12 93 13 60 14 22 13 60 14 2 15 90 14 25 15 90 14 25 15 90 14 25 15 90 16 32 17 45 18 93 19 39 14 45	15.22 19.22 18.74 17.2 12.9 19.31 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	4.55 4.8 4.66 5.8 0.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	160 35 70 40 97 32 92 50 44 60 34 85 90 25	1.7% 1.7% 1.6% 1.7% 1.6% 1.8% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8%	-2.92 [-3.89, -1.95] -2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2014 16.6 4 Liu 2016 11.25 3.8 Liu XY 2012 15.2 5 Lu 2014 15.88 4.0 Lu 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2014 15.63 4.5 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.8 Sun 2016 10.48 3.1 Tang 2016 10.33 3.9 Tu2015 14.1 3 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 X	1 1	19.2 18.74 17.2 12.9 19.31 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	4.83 4.66 5.8 0.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	35 70 40 97 32 92 50 44 60 34 85 90 25	1.6% 1.7% 1.6% 1.8% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7%	-2.60 [-4.78, -0.42] -7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Liu 2016 11.25 3.8 Liu 2016 11.25 3.8 Liu 2012 10.8 1 Lu 2012 10.8 1 Lu 2014 15.88 4.0 Lu 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2014 15.63 4.5 Qin 2015 9.7 9 Qiu2015 11.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.8 Sun 2016 10.33 3.9 Tian 2016 10.33 3.9 Tian 2015 14.1 3 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2015 10.7 5 Wei 2013 14 4 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Yang 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia 2013	33 33 32 700 1.1 466 .8 107 16 32 .8 93 .4 50 .1 45 .33 60 .12 34 .2 93 .35 90 .4 25 .9 39 .4 25 .9 39 .4 25	18.74 17.2 12.9 19.31 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	4.66 5.8 0.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	70 40 97 32 92 50 44 60 34 85 90 25	1.7% 1.6% 1.8% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.8%	-7.49 [-8.90, -6.08] -2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Lu 2010 11.23 5.2 Liu XY 2012 15.2 5 Lu 2012 10.8 1 Lu 2014 15.88 4.0 Lu 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2014 15.63 4.5 Qin 2015 9.7 2 Qin2015 11.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.8 Sun 2016 10.48 3.1 Tang 2016 10.3 3.9 Tu2015 14.1 3 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2015 10.7 5 Wei 2013 14.5 3 Wu 2013 14 4 Wu 2013 14 4 Wu 2013 16.2 1.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.1 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2016 <	1 46 8 107 86 32 8 93 8 93 8 93 4 50 1 45 53 60 52 34 2 93 35 90 4 25 32 45 9 39 4 60	17.2 12.9 19.31 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	5.8 0.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	40 97 32 92 50 44 60 34 85 90 25	1.7% 1.6% 1.8% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.8%	-2.00 [-4.32, 0.32] -2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Lu 2012 10.8 1 Lu 2014 15.88 4.0 Lu 2014 15.88 4.0 Lu 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2014 15.63 4.5 Qin 2013 16.12 2.5 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.8 Sun 2016 10.48 3.1 Tang 2016 10.33 3.9 Tian 2016 10.33 3.9 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 <	400 .8 107 .8 107 .8 93 .4 50 .1 45 .3 60 .2 93 .6 90 .4 20 .2 93 .5 90 .4 25 .9 39 .9 39 .9 39	17.2 12.9 19.31 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	0.8 4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	40 97 32 92 50 44 60 34 85 90 25	1.8% 1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.8%	-2.10 [-2.48, -1.72] -3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Lu 2014 15.88 4.0 Lu 2014 15.88 4.0 Lu 2015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2014 15.63 4.5 Qin 2013 16.12 2.6 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.6 Sun 2016 10.48 3.1 Tang 2016 13.3 3.9 Tu2015 14.1 3 Wan 2013 10.89 3.4 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2015 10.7 5 Wu 2013 14 4 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2013 14 4 Wu 2013 1.4 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2016	106 32 106 32 108 93 11 45 12 34 12 93 135 90 14 25 15 30 16 30 17 30 18 30 19 30 10	19.31 17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	4.82 6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	32 92 50 44 60 34 85 90 25	1.6% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.8%	-3.43 [-5.61, -1.25] -9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Lu 2014 15.00 4.4 Lu 02015 8.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2014 15.63 4.5 Qin 2015 9.7 16.3 2 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 1.2 2.5 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 1.2 3.5 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 30 3.9 Tang 2016 7.33 2.6 3.9 3.9 Tu 2015 14.1 3 3.9 3.9 Tu 2015 14.1 3 3.9 3.9 Wang 2014 10.1 4 4 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 3.9 3.9 3.9 Wei 2013 16.5 3 3 4 3.1 Wu 2016 10.37 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.1 3.1 3.0	32 32 .8 93 .4 50 .1 45 .53 60 .52 34 .2 93 .55 90 .4 25 .32 45 .9 39 .9 39	17.9 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	6.7 5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	92 50 44 60 34 85 90 25	1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.8%	-9.50 [-11.18, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Lucords 0.4 4 Mao 2013 10.8 3 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2014 15.63 4.5 Qin 2013 16.12 2.5 Qin 2015 11.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.8 Sun 2016 10.48 3.1 Tang 2016 10.33 3.9 Tu2015 14.1 3 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2016 13.1 5 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2013 1.6.37 4.1 Xu 2013 1.6.37 4.2 Xia 2015 10.37 4.2 Xia 2015 10.37 4.2 Yang 2016 10.3 3.2 Yang	.4 50 .1 45 .3 60 .2 34 .2 93 .5 90 .4 25 .32 45 .9 39 .4 80	17.5 11.3 19.4 19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	5.7 3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	50 44 60 34 85 90 25	1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.6%	-3.50 [-1.16, -7.82] -0.50 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Mag 2012 16.3 2 Meng 2012 16.3 2 Mu 2014 15.63 4.5 Qin 2013 16.12 2.5 Qin 2015 9.7 9.7 Qiu2015 11.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.6 Sun 2016 10.48 3.1 Tang 2016 10.33 3.9 Tu2015 14.1 3 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2013 10.89 3.4 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2015 10.7 5 Wei 2015 10.7 5 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2013 14 Wu 2013 14 Wu 2013 14 2.1 Yang 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.1 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Xu 2013 15.34 3.2	1 45 3 60 5 3 60 5 90 4 25 3 45 9 39 4 80	19.4 19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	3.2 4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	44 60 34 85 90 25	1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.6%	-0.30 [-2.34, 1.34] -3.10 [-4.23, -1.97] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Minerg 2012 10.3 16.3 4.5 Mu 2014 15.63 4.5 16.12 2.5 Qin 2013 16.12 2.5 11.23 1.6 Shen 2015 9.7 11.23 1.6 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 3 2.6 Sun 2016 7.33 2.6 3 3 Tang 2016 10.3 3.9 3 3 Tian 2015 14.1 3 3 3 Wang 2014 10.1 4 4 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 3 4 4 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 3 3 3 Wei 2015 10.7 5 3 4 4 Wu 2016 16 2.1 3 3 3 3 Wu 2016 10.37 3.0 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	1 45 53 60 52 34 2 93 55 90 4 25 32 45 9 39 4 50	19.07 18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	4.26 2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	60 34 85 90 25	1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.6%	-3.10 [4.23, -1.37] -3.44 [-5.01, -1.87] -2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Minu 2014 10.03 4.1 Qin 2013 16.12 2.5 Qin2015 9.7 11.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.8 Sun 2016 10.48 3.1 Tang 2016 10.33 3.9 Tian 2015 14.1 3 Wan 2013 10.89 3.4 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wu 2013 14 4 Wu 2013 14 4 Wu 2013 14 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2016 10.3 2.1 Yang 2016 10.3 2.1 Yang 2016 10.3 2.1	33 60 52 34 2 93 55 90 4 25 32 45 9 39 4 50	18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	2.03 7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	34 85 90 25	1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.6%	-2.41 [-3.50, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Gin 2013 10.12 2 Qin2015 9.7 Qin2015 11.23 1.6 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.8 Sun 2016 10.48 3.1 Tang 2016 10.33 3.9 Tuan 2015 14.1 3 Wan 2013 10.89 3.4 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2013 16 2.1 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2013 14 Wu 2013 14 Wu 2013 1.4 3.0 2 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 3.1 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 3.1 Yang 2016 10.3 2 3.4 Yang 2016 10.3 2 3.1 Yang 2013 16.38 4.1 3.4	2 93 5 90 4 25 92 45 9 39 4 60	18.53 18.6 19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	7.4 3.42 4.83 3.13	85 90 25	1.7% 1.7% 1.8% 1.6%	-2.41 [-3.30, -1.32] -8.90 [-10.52, -7.28] -8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	<u> </u>
Gill 2015 9.7 Qiu2015 11.23 1.6. Qiu2015 11.23 1.6. Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.6 Sun 2016 10.48 3.1 Tang 2016 10.33 3.9 Tu2015 14.1 3 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2016 13.1 5 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2013 16.38 4.1 Xu 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2016 10.3 2.1 Zhang 2016 10.3 2.1 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016<	2 93 5 90 4 25 82 45 9 39 4 60	19.54 19.24 15.47 17.64	3.42 4.83 3.13	90 25	1.8%	-8.31 [-9.09, -7.53] -2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	-
Glu2015 11.23 1.6.36 Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.8 Sun 2016 10.48 3.1 Tang 2016 13 1 Tian 2015 14.1 3 Wang 2015 10.48 3.4 Wang 2015 10.33 3.9 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2015 10.7 5 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2014 16.37 4.1 Xu 2013 16.38 4.1 <t< td=""><td>4 25 32 45 9 39 4 60</td><td>19.24 15.47 17.64</td><td>4.83 3.13</td><td>25</td><td>1.6%</td><td>-2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]</td><td></td></t<>	4 25 32 45 9 39 4 60	19.24 15.47 17.64	4.83 3.13	25	1.6%	-2.88 [-5.37, -0.39]	
Shen 2012 16.36 4.1 Song 2016 7.33 2.8 Sun 2016 10.48 3.1 Tiang 2016 10.33 3.9 Tu2015 14.1 3 Wan 2013 10.89 3.4 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2016 13.1 5 Wei 2015 10.7 5 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2013 14 Wu 2016 10.37 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2015 10.3 2 Zhang 2016 10.3 2 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2016 10.3 3.5 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3<	4 25 32 45 9 39 4 60	19.24 15.47 17.64	4.83	25	1.070	-2.00 [-0.37, -0.39]	
Soing 2016 7.33 2.6 Sun 2016 10.48 3.1 Tang 2016 13 Tian 2016 10.33 3.9 Tu2015 14.1 3 Wan 2013 10.89 3.4 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2015 10.7 5 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2013 9.7 2 Xia 2014 16.37 4.1 Xu 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2016 10.3 2 Yang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.5 Zhang 2015	9 39 4 60	17.64	3.13	45	1 70	0 1 4 1 0 37 6 041	
Suri 2016 10.48 3.1 Tang 2016 13 13 Tian 2016 10.33 3.9 Tu2015 14.1 3 Wan 2013 10.89 3.4 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2016 13.1 5 Wu 2015 10.7 5 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2014 16.37 4.1 Xu 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2016 10.3 Zhang 2013 16.38 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 10.3 2 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3	4 60	17.04	5 27	45	1.7%	-8.14 [-9.37, -0.91]	
Tang 2016 T3 Tian 2016 10.33 3.9 Tian 2015 14.1 3 Wan 2013 10.89 3.4 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2015 10.7 5 Wu 2013 14 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2013 14 Wu 2013 14 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Xia 2015 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2016 10.3 2 Yang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2015 9.73 3.1		211	0.27	39	1.7%	-7.10[-9.09, -0.23]	
Train 2016 10.33 3.5 Tu2015 14.1 3 Tu2015 14.1 3 Wan 2013 10.89 3.4 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2016 13.1 5 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2013 9.7 2 Xia 2014 16.37 4.1 Xu 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2016 10.3 Zhang 2016 10.3 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2016 10.3 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 1.3 Zhang 2016 18.13 3.5 Zhang 2015 9.73 3.1 Zhang 2015	4 00	17.00	10	50	1.5%	-0.00[-8.73,-3.27]	
112,015 14,1 3 Wan 2013 10,89 3,4 Wang 2014 10,1 4 Wang 2016 13,31 3,2 Wei 2013 16,5 3 Wei 2016 13,1 5 Wei 2015 10,7 5 Wu 2015 10,7 5 Wu 2016 16 2,1 Wu 2016 10,37 3,0 Xia 2015 10,37 4,7 Xia 2015 10,37 4,7 Xia 2013 15,34 3,2 Yang 2016 10,3 Zhang 2013 16,38 Zhang 2013 16,38 4,1 Zhang 2014 10,22 7,0 Zhang 2016 8,95 1,3 Zhang 2016 8,95 1,3 Zhang 2016 8,95 1,3 Zhang 2015 14,4 4 Zhang 2015 9,73 3,5 Zhang 2015 16,13 4,6	4 70	17.90	4.00	100	1.7 70	-7.03 [-9.10, -0.10]	
Wang 2013 10.89 3.4 Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2016 13.1 5 Wei 2015 10.7 5 Wu 2013 14 4 Wu 2013 16 2.1 Wu 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2015 10.37 4.1 Xu 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2016 10.3 10.3 Zhang 2016 10.3 2.1 Zhang 2016 10.3 2.1 Zhang 2016 10.3 2.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.5 Zhang 2015 9.73 3.1 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.5	.1 100	20.2	4.4	100	1.7%	-0.10[-7.10,-0.00]	_
Wang 2014 10.1 4 Wang 2016 13.31 3.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3 Wei 2016 13.1 5 Wei 2015 10.7 5 Wu 2013 14 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2013 9.7 2. Xie 2014 16.37 4.1 Xu 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2016 10.3 2 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2015 1.3 3.5 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.5 Zhang 2015 9.73 3.1 Zhang 2015 9.73 3.5 Zhang 2015 18.13 4.5	0 147	11.30	0.79	147	1.7 70	-0.49 [-1.36, 0.60]	
Waing 2016 13.31 5.2 Wei 2013 16.5 3. Wei 2016 13.1 5 Wei 2015 10.7 5 Wu 2013 14 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 6 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xia 2013 9.7 2 Xia 2014 16.37 4.1 Xu 2013 15.34 3.2 Zhang 2016 10.3 2 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.5 Zhang 2015 9.73 3.1 Zhang 2015 9.73 3.1 Zhang 2015 18.13 4.5	.2 31	15.07	4.0	31	1.0%	-2.00 [-4.17, 0.17]	
Wei 2013 10.5 3 Wei 2016 13.1 5 Wu 2015 10.7 5 Wu 2013 14 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 6 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xie 2013 9.7 2 Xie 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2016 10.3 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 2.7.0 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 10.3 Zhang 2015 1.3 1.3 Zhang 2016 1.3 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 1.3 Zhang 2016 3.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.6 3.5 3.5 3.5 Zhang 2015 9.73 3.1 4.6 3.4 3.6	42	10.27	4.24	42	1.7 %	-1.90 [-3.07, -0.30]	
Wei 2015 10.7 5 Wei 2015 10.7 5 Wu 2013 14 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 6 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xie 2013 9.7 2 Xie 2013 16.37 4.1 Xu 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2016 10.3 Zhang 2013 16.38 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 18.13 3.6 Zhang 2015 9.73 3.1 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.6 Zhang 2015 9.73 3.4	0 40	21.0	0.2	34	1.7 %	-0.10[-0.08,-0.01]	
Wiel2013 10.7 3 Wu 2013 14 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 6 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia2015 10.37 4.7 Xie 2013 9.7 2 Xie 2014 16.37 4.1 Xu 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2016 10.3 Zhang 2013 16.38 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 18.13 3.5 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.5 Zhang2015 9.73 3.1	.9 40	11 7	9.5	40	1.470	1 00 [2 60 1 60]	
Wu 2013 14 Wu 2016 16 2.1 Wu 6 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia2015 10.37 4.7 Xie 2013 9.7 2 Xie 2013 16.37 4.1 Xu 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2016 10.3 Zhang 2016 10.3 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 18.13 3.6 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.5 Zhang2015 9.73 3.1	.0 49	16	1.4	49	1.0%	-1.00 [-3.00, 1.00]	_
Wu G 2016 16 2.1 Wu G 2016 10.37 3.1 Xia2015 10.37 4.7 Xie 2013 9.7 2 Xie 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2014 16.37 4.1 Xu 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2016 10.3 2 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.5 Zhang2015 9.73 3.1 Zhang22015 9.73 3.5 Zhang22015 16.13 4.6	4 00 6 06	10 00	211	26	1.7 70	-2.00 [-3.77, -0.23]	-
Wid 6 2016 10.37 3.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.0 Xia 2015 10.37 4.0 Xie 2013 9.7 2 Xie 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2016 10.3 2 Yang 2016 10.3 2 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.5 Zhang 2015 9.73 3.1 Zhang 2015 9.73 3.5 Zhang 2015 16.13 4.6	0 30	10.90	2.11	07	1.7 70	-2.90 [-3.97, -1.99]	
Xia 2015 10.37 4.7 Xie 2013 9.7 2.7 Xie 2014 16.37 4.1 Xiu 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2016 10.3 2 Yang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.5 Zhang2015 9.73 3.1 Zhang2015 18.13 4.5	10 99	10.00	0.40	100	1.770	-0.01 [-7.93, -0.09]	
Xie 2013 9.7 2.1 Xie 2014 16.37 4.1 Xu 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2016 10.3 2 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.5 Zhang2015 9.73 3.1 Zhang22015 16.13 4.6	3 100	10.32	4.04	100	1.7%	-4.95 [-0.25, -3.05]	
XIE 2014 16.37 4.1 Xu 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2016 10.3 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 18.13 3.6 Zhang2015 18.13 3.6 Zhang2015 18.13 3.6 Zhang2015 9.73 3.1	.0 02	18.5	3.8	64	1.7%	-8.80 [-9.93, -7.67]	
XU 2013 15.34 3.2 Yang 2016 10.3 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang 2016 14 4 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.5 ZhangX2015 9.73 3.1	5 45	18.25	4.83	45	1.7%	-1.88 [-3.74, -0.02]	_
Yang 2016 10.3 Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang X 2013 14 4 Zhang X 2013 14 4 Zhang X 2015 18.13 3.5 Zhang X 2015 9.73 3.1 Zhang X 2015 16.12 4.6	8 38	10.45	3.47	38	1.7%	-1.11 [-2.63, 0.41]	
Zhang 2013 16.38 4.1 Zhang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang X 2013 14 4 Zhang X 2013 14 4 Zhang X 2015 18.13 3.5 Zhang X 2015 9.73 3.1	5 40	22.1	9.8	40	1.4%	-12.40 [-15.81, -8.99]	
Zriang 2014 10.22 7.0 Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang X 2013 14 4 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.5 Zhang X2015 9.73 3.1 Zhang X2015 16.13 4.6	5 50	19.25	0.81	50	1.0%	-2.87 [-5.08, -0.66]	
Zhang 2016 8.95 1.3 Zhang X 2013 14 4 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.5 Zhang X 2015 9.73 3.1 Zhang X 2015 16.13 4.6	08 80	17.32	5.54	80	1.6%	-7.10[-9.07, -5.13]	
Znang X 2013 14 4 Zhang 2015 18.13 3.5 Zhang X 2015 9.73 3.1 Zhang X 2015 16.13 4.6	2 46	10.03	1.67	46	1.8%	-7.08 [-7.70, -6.46]	
Znang2015 18.13 3.5 ZhangX2015 9.73 3.1 ZhangX2015 16.13 4.6	.3 25	18	5.5	25	1.5%	-4.00 [-6.74, -1.26]	
ZhangX2015 9.73 3.1 ZhangY2015 16.13 4.6	5 93	21.3	4.85	93	1.7%	-3.17 [-4.39, -1.95]	-
/handy///15 1612 / 6	5 100	18.79	5.46	100	1.7%	-9.06 [-10.30, -7.82]	
Zhang12013 10.13 4.0		19.54	4.85	30	1.6%	-3.41 [-5.82, -1.00]	
Znao 2016 13.31 3.2	ib 30	15.27	4.24	42	1.7%	-1.96 [-3.57, -0.35]	
Znou 2016 16.72 3.1	30 30 21 42	22.18	2.57	48	1.7%	-5.46 [-6.61, -4.31]	
Znou2015 13.25 3.4	06 30 21 42 7 48	25.78	4.01	80	1.7%	-12.53 [-13.69, -11.37]	
∠nu 2013 13.53 3.1	06 30 21 42 7 48 46 80		4.32	41	1.7%	-1.72 [-3.34, -0.10]	7
Total (95% CI)	56 30 21 42 7 48 16 80 2 42	15.25		3649	100.0%	-5.50 [-6.44, -4.57]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 12.87; Chi ² =	30 30 21 42 7 48 16 80 2 42 3691	15.25		0001):	² = 97%		
Test for overall effect: Z = 11.50 (P <	30 30 31 42 7 48 46 80 2 42 3691 1908.88	15.25 df = 59 ((P < 0.0				-20 -10 0 10 20

FIGURE 4 | Forest Plot of effect sizes for tHcy level.

Study or Subgroup Events Total Events Bian2016 2 42 Guo 2014 3 29 Hu2015 2 62 Li 2013 4 46 Liu 2012 16 144 Liu 2014 1 34 Lu 2012 10 97 Lu 2014 1 31 Mu 2014 5 55 Qin 2013 1 33 Shen 2012 1 24 Song 2016 1 44 Sun 2016 2 37 Tang 2016 14 46 Tian 2016 0 60 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2013 5 45 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40	vents Total 9 34 9 23 6 58 11 39 38 122 5 30 13 84 6 26 15 45 3 31	Weight 1 4.1% 5.4% 3.8% 6.0% 9.8% 2.4% 8.0% 2.5%	<u>M-H, Random, 95% Cl</u> 0.18 [0.04, 0.78] 0.26 [0.08, 0.87] 0.31 [0.07, 1.48] 0.31 [0.11, 0.89] 0.36 [0.21, 0.61] 0.18 [0.02, 1.43] 0.67 [0.31, 1.44]	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Bian2016 2 42 Guo 2014 3 29 Hu2015 2 62 Li 2013 4 46 Liu 2012 16 144 Liu 2012 10 97 Lu 2012 10 97 Lu 2014 1 31 Mu 2014 5 55 Qin 2013 1 33 Shen 2012 1 24 Song 2016 1 44 Sun 2016 2 37 Tang 2016 14 46 Tian 2016 0 60 Wei 2013 1 34 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40	9 34 9 23 6 58 11 39 38 122 5 30 13 84 6 26 15 45 3 31	4.1% 5.4% 3.8% 6.0% 9.8% 2.4% 8.0% 2.5%	0.18 [0.04, 0.78] 0.26 [0.08, 0.87] 0.31 [0.07, 1.48] 0.31 [0.11, 0.89] 0.36 [0.21, 0.61] 0.18 [0.02, 1.43] 0.67 [0.31, 1.44]	
Guo 2014 3 29 Hu2015 2 62 Li 2013 4 46 Liu 2012 16 144 Liu 2012 10 97 Lu 2012 10 97 Lu 2014 1 31 Mu 2014 5 55 Qin 2013 1 33 Shen 2012 1 24 Song 2016 1 44 Sun 2016 2 37 Tang 2016 14 46 Tian 2016 0 60 Wei 2013 1 34 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhau 2013 2 40	9 23 6 58 11 39 38 122 5 30 13 84 6 26 15 45 3 31	5.4% 3.8% 6.0% 9.8% 2.4% 8.0% 2.5%	0.26 [0.08, 0.87] 0.31 [0.07, 1.48] 0.31 [0.11, 0.89] 0.36 [0.21, 0.61] 0.18 [0.02, 1.43] 0.67 [0.31, 1.44]	
Hu2015 2 62 Li 2013 4 46 Liu 2012 16 144 Liu 2014 1 34 Lu 2012 10 97 Lu 2012 10 97 Lu 2014 1 31 Mu 2014 5 55 Qin 2013 1 33 Shen 2012 1 24 Song 2016 1 44 Sun 2016 2 37 Tang 2016 14 46 Tian 2016 0 60 Wei 2013 1 34 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40	6 58 11 39 38 122 5 30 13 84 6 26 15 45 3 31	3.8% 6.0% 9.8% 2.4% 8.0% 2.5%	0.31 [0.07, 1.48] 0.31 [0.11, 0.89] 0.36 [0.21, 0.61] 0.18 [0.02, 1.43] 0.67 [0.31, 1.44]	
Li 2013 4 46 Liu 2012 16 144 Liu 2014 1 34 Lu 2012 10 97 Lu 2012 10 97 Lu 2014 1 31 Mu 2014 5 55 Qin 2013 1 33 Shen 2012 1 24 Song 2016 1 44 Sun 2016 2 37 Tang 2016 14 46 Tian 2016 0 60 Wei 2013 1 34 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40	11 39 38 122 5 30 13 84 6 26 15 45 3 31	6.0% 9.8% 2.4% 8.0% 2.5%	0.31 [0.11, 0.89] 0.36 [0.21, 0.61] 0.18 [0.02, 1.43] 0.67 [0.31, 1.44]	
Liu 2012 16 144 Liu 2014 1 34 Lu 2012 10 97 Lu 2012 10 97 Lu 2014 1 31 Mu 2014 5 55 Qin 2013 1 33 Shen 2012 1 24 Song 2016 1 44 Sun 2016 2 37 Tang 2016 14 46 Tian 2016 0 60 Wei 2013 1 34 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhau 2013 2 40	38 122 5 30 13 84 6 26 15 45 3 31	9.8% 2.4% 8.0% 2.5%	0.36 [0.21, 0.61] 0.18 [0.02, 1.43] 0.67 [0.31, 1.44]	
Liu 2014 1 34 Lu 2012 10 97 Lu 2014 1 31 Mu 2014 5 55 Qin 2013 1 33 Shen 2012 1 24 Song 2016 1 44 Sun 2016 2 37 Tang 2016 14 46 Tian 2016 0 60 Wei 2013 1 34 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhau 2013 2 40	5 30 13 84 6 26 15 45 3 31	2.4% 8.0% 2.5%	0.18 [0.02, 1.43] 0.67 [0.31, 1.44]	
Lu 2012 10 97 Lu 2014 1 31 Mu 2014 5 55 Qin 2013 1 33 Shen 2012 1 24 Song 2016 1 44 Sun 2016 2 37 Tang 2016 14 46 Tian 2016 0 60 Wei 2013 1 34 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhao 2013 2 40	13 84 6 26 15 45 3 31	8.0% 2.5%	0.67 [0.31, 1.44]	
Lu 2014 1 31 Mu 2014 5 55 Qin 2013 1 33 Shen 2012 1 24 Song 2016 1 44 Sun 2016 2 37 Tang 2016 14 46 Tian 2016 0 60 Wei 2013 1 34 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40	6 26 15 45 3 31	2.5%		
Mu 2014 5 55 Qin 2013 1 33 Shen 2012 1 24 Song 2016 1 44 Sun 2016 2 37 Tang 2016 14 46 Tian 2016 0 60 Wei 2013 1 34 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40	15 45 3 31		0.14 [0.02, 1.09]	
Qin 2013 1 33 Shen 2012 1 24 Song 2016 1 44 Sun 2016 2 37 Tang 2016 14 46 Tian 2016 0 60 Wei 2013 1 34 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40	3 31	6.8%	0.27 [0.11, 0.69]	
Shen 2012 1 24 Song 2016 1 44 Sun 2016 2 37 Tang 2016 14 46 Tian 2016 0 60 Wei 2013 1 34 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40		2.2%	0.31 [0.03, 2.85]	
Song 2016 1 44 Sun 2016 2 37 Tang 2016 14 46 Tian 2016 0 60 Wei 2013 1 34 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40	7 18	2.6%	0.11 [0.01, 0.80]	
Sun 2016 2 37 Tang 2016 14 46 Tian 2016 0 60 Wei 2013 1 34 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40	6 39	2.5%	0.15 [0.02, 1.17]	
Tang 2016 14 46 Tian 2016 0 60 Wei 2013 1 34 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40	9 30	4.2%	0.18 [0.04, 0.77]	
Tian 2016 0 60 Wei 2013 1 34 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 ZhangX2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40	5 55	6.8%	3.35 [1.30, 8.60]	
Wei 2013 1 34 Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40	8 52	1.5%	0.05 [0.00, 0.86]	
Wu 2013 5 45 Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40	6 28	2.5%	0.14 [0.02, 1.07]	
Wu 2016 2 36 Zhang H 2013 1 31 Zhang X2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40	14 36	6.9%	0.29 [0.11, 0.72]	
Zhang H 2013 1 31 ZhangX2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40	11 25	4.3%	0.13 [0.03, 0.52]	
ZhangX2015 6 94 Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40	6 26	2.5%	0.14 [0.02, 1.09]	
Zhao 2016 2 40 Zhu 2013 2 40	15 85	7.0%	0.36 [0.15, 0.89]	
Zhu 2013 2 40	9 33	4.1%	0.18 [0.04, 0.79]	
	7 34	4.0%	0.24 [0.05, 1.09]	
Total (95% CI) 1104	953	100.0%	0.30 [0.21, 0.43]	•
Total events 82	218			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.28; Chi ² = 36.66, df = 2 ⁴	1 (P = 0.02); I ² =	43%	Ę	
Test for overall effect: Z = 6.50 (P < 0.00001)	74 90		ı	Control favor. Folio acid favor

significance difference in tHcy levels reduction by folic acid supplementation. In addition, in terms of stratified analysis, folic acid fortification and increasing intervention duration showed greater beneficial effects on the risk of CVCE. To our best knowledge from this meta-analysis, we reinforced the efficacy of folic acid plus antihypertensive therapy in HT/HHcy patients.

Our results were consistent with some previous meta-analyses in different subjects (Jardine et al., 2012; Qin et al., 2013). Qin et al. showed that folic acid administration was helpful to reduce CVD risk in patients with kidney disease (Huo et al., 2012). However, Zhou et al concluded that folic acid does not impact on the incidence of major cardiovascular events, myocardial infarction, stroke or all-cause mortality (Zhou et al., 2011). Consequently, we carried out this meta-analysis to explain the possible effect of folic acid on CVCE, SBP and DBP among patients with HT/HHcy.

Interpretation of the Results

Results of previous epidemiologic studies indicated that elevated plasma tHcy levels were popular in the general population and were related to an increased risk for hypertension, CVD and stroke (Eikelboom et al., 1999; Liu and Writing Group of Chinese Guidelines for the Management of Hypertension, 2011). Although the physiological character of hyperhomocysteinemia in multi-organ damage has been suggested, the accurate

mechanisms by which it mediates these harmful effects are still unclear but maybe concern on impaired smooth muscle cell function and vascular endothelial (Ganguly and Alam, 2015). Furthermore, hyperhomocysteinemia may be a pivotal pathogenic element in the target organ damages, such as glomerular damage, associated with hypertension, as well as CVD events (Catena et al., 2015). Consequently, management of hyperhomocysteinemia may be helpful to reduce the blood pressure level and the risk of CVCE. However, the clinical meaning of interventions on the tHcy metabolism in the course of the high blood pressure was not fully explored yet. Recently, it had been showed that tHcy levels were associated with SBP and DBP values (Golbahar and Mostafavi, 2012). To our knowledge, insufficient dietary intake of vitamins B, are supposed as a main cause of hyperhomocysteinemia. Hence, attempts to normalize homocystine level by the supplementation of these vitamins, such as folic acid become the main measure (Barnabé et al., 2015). However, Mao et al reported in their study that folic acid in doses 0.4 mg/d and 0.8 mg/d did not lower SBP or DBP, the differences in SBP/DBP change compared to the control group being 0.6/0.0 mmHg (Mao et al., 2008). Moreover, according to the recent report of the China Stroke Primary Prevention Trial (CSPPT) folic acid substitution decreased the risks of stroke without any effect on blood pressure (Huo et al., 2015). All of these results were inconsistent with our findings, We speculated that they were



conducted among patient with preexisting cardiovascular disease and none had CVCE as the primary outcome.

Stratified Analyses

Based on the different factors vary the the risk of CVCE. We found that longer duration of intervention seems to more efficacious than shorter duration regarding CVCE in HT/HHcy patients, and the discrepancy between two groups likely to widen with increasing intervention duration. This phenomenon might explain by the pathogenesis of CVCE results from a long and accumulative process, one would anticipant that averting the illness process would also need quite a bit of time (Wang et al., 2007). Our current meta-analysis showed that a decrease of more than 25% in the concentration of homocysteine affected the RR of CVCE slightly more than did a concentration of 25% or less (RR 0.32 vs. 0.31), nevertheless, indicating no significant statistical difference in terms of tHcy lowering level. Which was inconsistent with previous studies showed that an inverse relation between stroke and CVD events and the concentration of tHcy in the blood (Spence et al., 2005). Therefore, the dose-response relation tHcy lowering and CVCE should further validate by much more trials in future. Subgroup analyses of folic acid fortification or not showed the results of fortification had little effect on the risk of CVCE than those without fortification (RR 0.18 vs. 0.27). There were a couple of possibilities which might account for the results. First, in this analysis, only one trial by fortification status, while remaining trials without folic acid fortification, which might also result in certain bias (Xie et al., 2015). Second, folic acid obviously reduced the risk of stroke in countries where grain was not fortified. As any essential nutrient, one would expect that in subjects with ample intake of folic acid, further reduction in the prevalent of stroke would be limited (Wang et al., 2007).

Limitations

Firstly, a great part of the trials included in this review were of folic acid plus enalapril vs. enalapril, only one trial aim to investigate the difference effect between folic acid plus amlodipine and antihypertensive which did not give the drug, respectively. Secondly, the risk of bias of the included trials was highly variable and not optimal. Nearly all of the included

TABLE 2 | Pooled relative risk for CVCE and stratified analysis.

	CVCE events/t	otal subjects	Relative risk (95%CI)	P-value
	Folic acid groups	Control groups		
DURATION OF INTERVENTION				
>12 weeks	41/569	113/487	0.31 (0.22, 0.43)	P < 0.00001
≤12 weeks	40/501	99/438	0.36 (0.26, 0.50)	P < 0.00001
HOMOCYSTEINE LOWERING				
>25%	58/729	148/635	0.35 (0.26, 0.46)	P < 0.00001
≤25%	23/344	64/292	0.30 (0.19, 0.47)	P < 0.00001
FOLIC ACID FORTICATION				
Yes	3/96	11/88	0.25 (0.07, 0.86)	P = 0.03
No	89/905	192/777	0.18 (0.14, 0.40)	P < 0.00001

CVCE, Cardiovascular and cerebrovascular events; CI, Confidence interval.

trials had an overall assessment as "high risk of bias" (score 1-3), so we unable to exclude that our results may be biased. Meanwhile, meta-analyses have been often criticized for the potential of publication bias and for the inclusion of poorquality trials (Rosenthal and DiMatteo, 2001). Thirdly, all the included 65 trials were carried out in China, indicating that there are insufficient data on the US, Africa and Europe. In such a worldwide disease as HT/HHcy, it would inevitable be valuable to know whether the folic acid supplementation is discrepancy in different regions. Interesting, why the addition of folic acid to antihypertensive therapy apparently has only been studied in China. There is striking feature in Chinese that approximate 75% of Chinese hypertension patients are coupled with hyperhomocysteinemia. Therefore, the concept of H-type hypertension was proposed in china (Spence et al., 2005). Then, a large population based studies in China were conducted to test the relation between H-type hypertension and stroke or cardiovascular disease. We have searched the PubMed, Google scholar and CENTRAL et al and found no relevant studies were identified. Fourthly, this meta-analysis also highlights the lack of data on the long term balance of benefits and risks of folic acid supplementation based on the duration of intervention was ranged from 2 to 18 months, as well as the lack of data from multiple large trials that have yet to report results. Finally, CVCE was reported in 22 studies as the outcome measure in this metaanalysis without classifying the detail of subtype. Therefore, we were unable to evaluate the effect of folic acid supplementation on different stroke subtypes (e.g., ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke, fatal or non-fatal stroke) and different cardiovascular disease (e.g., myocardial infarction or stenocardia), because of lack of such data in the published trials (Hu and Xu, 2008). An additional limitation of meta-analyses is that they vary in regard to the characteristics of participants, duration and intensity of treatment, the type of cardiovascular and cerebrovascular event identified, and other design features (Lee et al., 2010). In spite of such limitations, our meta-analysis also had possessed some advantages. Most subjects in this study were not suffered from other disease, such as kidney diseases, diabetes mellitus, thyroid and adrenal glands malfunction, which were exclusion criteria. Furthermore, the body weight, age of patients and the duration of treatments were comparable between two groups. Subjects included in this study without a history of coexisting diseases. Therefore, a large proportion of patients were not treated with other therapies. Regrettably, we did not know the patients whether they were smokers or using any other type of stimulants.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this meta-analysis suggested that folic acid supplementation was effective in the primary prevention of CVCE among HT/HHcy patients without a history of vascular diseases, as well as reducing the blood pressure and tHcy levels.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

WW and XW conceived and participated in its design, searched databases, ZZ extracted and assessed studies and helped to draft the manuscript. JH helped in guiding and revising the manuscript. CX participated in the conceptualization and design of the review and revised the review. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

FUNDING

The study was supported by the Projects of National Science Foundation of China (No. 81600977), National Key Technology Research and Development Program of the Ministry of Science and Technology of China (grant number: 2015BAI13B01) and Wenzhou Municipal Sci-Tech Bureau Program (Y20160002).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fphar. 2017.00585/full#supplementary-material

REFERENCES

- Ades, A. E., Lu, G., and Higgins, J. P. (2005). The interpretation of randomeffects meta-analysis in decision models. *Med. Decis. Making* 25, 646–654. doi: 10.1177/0272989X05282643
- Barnabé, A., Aléssio, A. C., Bittar, L. F., de Moraes Mazetto B., Bicudo, A. M., de Paula, E. V., et al. (2015). Folate, vitamin B12 and Homocysteine status in the post-folic acid fortification era in different subgroups of the Brazilian population attended to at a public health care center. *Nutr. J.* 14:19. doi: 10.1186/s12937-015-0006-3
- Catena, C., Colussi, G., Nait, F., Capobianco, F., and Sechi, L. A. (2015). Elevated homocysteine levels are associated with the metabolic syndrome and cardiovascular events in hypertensive patients. *Am. J. Hypertens.* 28, 943–950. doi: 10.1093/ajh/hpu248
- Chobanian, A. V., Bakris, G. L., Black, H. R., Cushman, W. C., Green, L. A., Izzo, J. L. Jr., et al. (2003). Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure. National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; National High Blood Pressure Education Program Coordinating Committee. Seventh report of the Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure. Hypertension 42, 1206–1252. doi: 10.1161/01.HYP.0000107251.49515.c2
- Eikelboom, J. W., Lonn, E., Genest, J. Jr., Hankey, G., and Yusuf, S. (1999). Homocyst(e)ine and cardiovascular disease: a critical review of the epidemiologic evidence. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 131, 363–375. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-131-5-199909070-00008
- Ganguly, P., and Alam, S. F. (2015). Role of homocysteine in the development of cardiovascular disease. *Nutr. J.* 14:6. doi: 10.1186/1475-2891-14-6
- Golbahar, J., and Mostafavi, E. (2012). Association between low red blood cell 5-methyltetrahydrofolate and hyperhomocysteinaemia with hypertension: a cross-sectional study. *High Blood Press Cardiovasc. Prev.* 19, 229–235. doi: 10.1007/BF03297635
- Higgins, J. P., Altman, D. G., Gøtzsche, P. C., Jüni, P., Moher, D., Oxman, A. D., et al. (2011). The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 343:d5928. doi: 10.1136/bmj.d5928
- Hu, D., and Xu, X. (2008). Prevention of stroke relies on valid control H-type hypertension. *Chin. J. Intern. Med.* 47, 976–977. doi: 10.3321/j.issn:0578-1426.2008.12.005
- Huo, Y., Li, J., Qin, X., Huang, Y., Wang, X., Gottesman, R. F., et al. (2015). Efficacy of folic acid therapy in primary prevention of stroke among adults with hypertension in China: the CSPPT randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 313, 1325–1335. doi: 10.1001/jama.2015.2274
- Huo, Y., Qin, X., Wang, J., Sun, N., Zeng, Q., Xu, X., et al. (2012). Efficacy of folic acid supplementation in stroke prevention: new insight from a meta-analysis. *Int. J. Clin. Pract.* 66, 544–551. doi: 10.1111/j.1742-1241.2012.02929.x
- Jardine, M. J., Kang, A., Zoungas, S., Navaneethan, S. D., Ninomiya, T., Nigwekar, S. U., et al. (2012). The effect of folic acid based homocysteine lowering on cardiovascular events in people with kidney disease: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 344:e3533. doi: 10.1136/bmj.e3533
- Kearney, P. M., Whelton, M., Reynolds, K., Muntner, P., Whelton, P. K., and He, J. (2005). Global burden of hypertension: analysis of worldwide data. *Lancet* 365, 217–123. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(05)70151-3
- Lee, M., Hong, K. S., Chang, S. C., and Saver, J. L. (2010). Efficacy of homocysteinelowering therapy with folic Acid in stroke prevention: a meta-analysis. *Stroke* 41, 1205–1212. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.109.573410
- Lim, S. S., Vos, T., Flaxman, A. D., Danaei, G., Shibuya, K., Adair-Rohani, H., et al. (2012). A comparative risk assessment of burden of disease and injury attributable to 67 risk factors and risk factor clusters in 21 regions, 1990-2010: a systematicanalysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *Lancet* 380, 2224–22460. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61766-8
- Lim, U., and Cassano, P. A. (2002). Homocysteine and blood pressure in the Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 1988-1994. Am. J. Epidemiol. 156, 1105–1113. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwf157

- Liu, L. S., and Writing Group of Chinese Guidelines for the Management of Hypertension (2011). Chinese guidelines for management of hypertension 2010. *Chin. J. Cardiol.* 39, 579–616. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1674-7372.2011. 03.016
- Mangoni, A. A., Sherwood, R. A., Swift, C. G., and Jackson, S. H. (2002). Folic acid enhances endothelial function and reduces blood pressure in smokers: a randomized controlled trial. *J. Int. Med.* 252, 497–503. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2796.2002.01059.x
- Mao, G., Hong, X., Xing, H., Liu, P., Liu, H., Yu, Y., et al. (2008). Efficacy of folic acid and enalapril combined therapy on reduction of blood pressure and plasma glucose: a multicenter, randomized, double-blind, parallelcontrolled, clinical trial. *Nutrition* 24, 1088–1096. doi: 10.1016/j.nut.2008. 05.009
- Poulter, N. R., Prabhakaran, D., and Caulfield, M. (2015). Hypertension. *Lancet* 6736, 61468–61469. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(14) 61468-9
- Qin, X., Huo, Y., Xie, D., Hou, F., Xu, X., and Wang, X. (2013). Homocysteinelowering therapy with folic acid is effective in cardiovascular disease prevention in patients with kidney disease: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Clin Nutr.* 32, 722–727. doi: 10.1016/j.clnu.2012.12.009
- Rosenthal, R., and DiMatteo, M. R. (2001). Meta-analysis: recent developments in quantitative methods for literature reviews. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 52, 59–82. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.59
- Sen, U., Mishra, P. K., Tyagi, N., and Tyagi, S. C. (2010). Homocysteine to hydrogen sulfide or hypertension. *Cell Biochem. Biophys.* 57, 49–58. doi: 10.1007/s12013-010-9079-y
- Spence, J. D., Bang, H., Chambless, L. E., and Stampfer, M. J. (2005). Vitamin Intervention For Stroke Prevention trial: an efficacy analysis. *Stroke* 36, 2404–2409. doi: 10.1161/01.STR.0000185929.38534.f3
- Stanger, O., Semmelrock, H. J., Wonisch, W., Bös, U., Pabst, E., and Wascher, T. C. (2002). Effects of folate treatment and homocysteine lowering on resistance vessel reactivity in atherosclerotic subjects. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 303, 158–162. doi: 10.1124/jpet.102.036715
- Stehouwer, C. D., and van Guldener, C. (2003). Does homocysteine cause hypertension? *Clin. Chem. Lab. Med.* 41, 1408–1411. doi:10.1515/CCLM.2003.216
- Wang, X., Qin, X., Demirtas, H., Li, J., Mao, G., Huo, Y., et al. (2007). Efficacy of folic acid supplementation in stroke prevention: a meta-analysis. *Lancet* 369, 1876–1882. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(07)60854-X
- Xie, C. L., Wang, W. W., Zhang, S. F., Gan, J., and Liu, Z. G. (2014). Continuous dopaminergic stimulation (CDS)-based treatment in Parkinson's disease patients with motor complications: a systematic review and metaanalysis. *Sci. Rep.* 4:6027. doi: 10.1038/srep06027
- Xie, C. L., Wang, X. D., Chen, J., Lin, H. Z., Chen, Y. H., Pan, J. L., et al. (2015). A systematic review and meta-analysis of cognitive behavioral and psychodynamic therapy for depression in Parkinson's disease patients. *Neurol. Sci.* 36, 833–843. doi: 10.1007/s10072-015-2118-0
- Zhou, Y. H., Tang, J. Y., Wu, M. J., Lu, J., Wei, X., Qin, Y. Y., et al. (2011). Effect of folic acid supplementation on cardiovascular outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE* 6:e25142. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone. 0025142

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2017 Wang, Wang, Zhang, He and Xie. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) or licensor are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.