

Role of Xingnaojing Injection in treating acute cerebral hemorrhage

A systematic review and meta-analysis

Xiao Ma, MD, Tao Wang, MM, Jianxia Wen, MD, Jian Wang, MM^{*}, Nan Zeng, MD, Wenjun Zou, MD, Yuxue Yang, MM

Abstract

Background: Xingnaojing injection (XNJi) is widely used for acute cerebral hemorrhage. However, the efficacy of XNJi for acute cerebral hemorrhage has not been comprehensively proved by systematic analysis yet. Therefore, it is essential to evaluate the efficacy and safety of XNJi in an evidence-based method.

Methods: Six databases were searched with XNJi used for acute cerebral hemorrhage in randomized controlled trials (RCTs). Meta-analysis was performed by Review Manager 5.3. The efficacy rate, brain edema, cerebral hematoma, neurological deficit score, hs-crp, Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS), and activities of daily living (ADL) were systematically evaluated. The Cochrane risk of bias was used to evaluate the methodological quality of eligible studies.

Results: This study is registered with PROSPERO (CRD42018098737). Twenty-nine studies with a total of 2638 patients were included in this meta-analysis. Compared with conventional treatment, XNJi got higher efficacy rate (OR=3.37, 95% CI [2.65, 4.28], P < .00001). Moreover, XNJi showed significant enhancement of efficacy rate via subgroup analysis in course and dosage. In addition, XNJi demonstrated significant improvement in Chinese stroke scale (CSS) and National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NHISS) (mean difference [MD]=-4.74, 95% CI [-5.89, -3.60], P < .00001; MD=-4.45, 95% CI [-5.49, -3.41], P < .00001), GCS (MD=2.72, 95% CI [2.09, 3.35], P < .00001). It also remarkably decreased the level of hs-crp (MD=-6.50, 95% CI [-7.79, -5.21], P < .00001), enhanced ADL (MD=20.38, 95% CI [17.98, 22.79], P < .00001), and alleviated hematoma and edema (MD=-2.53, 95% CI [-4.75, -0.31] P < .05; MD=-1.74 95% CI [-2.42, -1.07] P < .00001) compared with conventional treatment.

Conclusion: XNJi is effective in treating acute cerebral hemorrhage with significant improvement of CSS, NHISS and impairment of hs-crp, hematoma, and edema compared with conventional treatment. Moreover, XNJi got remarkable efficacy at the dose of 20, 30, 60 mL and from 7 to 28 days. No serious adverse reactions occurred. These results were mainly based on small-sample and low-quality studies. Therefore, more rigorous, large-scale RCTs were further needed to confirm its efficacy, safety, and detailed characteristic of application.

Abbreviations: ACM = acute cerebral hemorrhage, ADL = activities of daily living, BBB = blood brain barrier, CI = confidence interval, CSS = Chinese stroke scale, DIC = disseminated intravascular coagulation, GCS = Glasgow Coma Scale, MOF = multiple organ failure, NIHSS = National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale, OR = odds ratio, TCM = traditional Chinese medicines, XNJi = Xingnaojing injection.

Keywords: acute cerebral hemorrhage, meta-analysis, randomized controlled trials, systematic review, xingnaojing injection

Editor: Daryle Wane.

Copyright © 2020 the Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc.

Received: 8 October 2019 / Received in final form: 17 February 2020 / Accepted: 24 February 2020

http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MD.000000000019648

XM, TW, and JXW have contributed equally to this manuscript.

This work was financially supported by grants from National Natural Science Foundation of China (81703725 and 81473371), China Postdoctoral Science Found Grant (2017M622987), and Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine: QNXZ2018025 and CXTD2018004.

Availability of data and materials: The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

The authors confirm that there are no known conflicts of interest associated with this publication and there has been no significant financial support for this work that could have influenced its outcome.

School of Pharmacy, Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Chengdu, China.

^{*} Correspondence: Jian Wang, School of Pharmacy, Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Chengdu, China (e-mail: jianwang08@163.com).

This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (CCBY), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

How to cite this article: Ma X, Wang T, Wen J, Wang J, Zeng N, Zou W, Yang Y. Role of xingnaojing injection in treating acute cerebral hemorrhage: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Medicine 2020;99:15(e19648).

1. Introduction

Stroke is the second most common cause of death and the leading cause of disability all over the world. There is an especially tremendous impact on middle-income countries in a few decades. As in China, stroke is already the leading cause of adult disability and death.^[1,2] Acute cerebral hemorrhage is one of the important causes of stroke.^[3] The number of patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage is also accordingly increasing with the risk factors such as hypertension and diabetes. At present, acute cerebral hemorrhage is believed to be the intractable problem in clinic. However, there is still no ideal therapy available.^[4] Nowadays, several conventional therapies were commonly used in acute cerebral hemorrhage treatment. In that, neuroprotective agents such as edaravone were the main kind of medicine for acute cerebral hemorrhage.^[5] However, several researches reported that edaravone treatment might got controversial result. Moreover, it might also cause renal dysfunction, disseminated intravascular coagulation (DIC), and even irreversible multiple organ failure (MOF).^[6] Therefore, finding new agents for acute cerebral hemorrhage is urgently needed.

Traditional Chinese medicine (TCM) has been used as complementary therapy for acute cerebral hemorrhage for decades. Among these, Xingnaojing injection (XNJi) is one of the most common used traditional Chinese patent medicines for acute cerebral hemorrhage treatment. In recent years, XNJi accompany with decreasing blood pressure, maintaining water and electrolyte balance, and neuroprotective agent therapy is thought as effective at acute stage of acute cerebral hemorrhage in China. It can significantly enhance the efficacy and decrease the complications according to the majority reports of literatures. XNJi is comprised of multiple Chinese materia medica such as Musk, Synthetic Borneol, Curcuma aromatica Salisb, and Gardenia jasminoides Ellis. It got various effects such as resuscitation, antipyretic action, activating blood circulation, cooling blood, and eliminating toxins.^[7] Recent research reported that XNJi could penetrate blood brain barrier (BBB) and directly act on the central nervous system.^[8] In addition, the effect of XNJi on alleviating hydrocephalus, scavenging free radicals, promoting patient recovery, shortening coma time, and reducing complications were believed to improve the function of BBB permeability and benefit in acute cerebral hemorrhage.^[9,10]

There were abundant reports regarding XNJi as an available treatment measure for acute cerebral hemorrhage. However, systemic evaluation on its therapeutic effects is lacking. Nowadays, more and more TCM is gradually re-confirmed via systemic review method as trends in China. Thus, in order to assess the application value of XNJi on acute cerebral hemorrhage, a systemic analysis was carried to concern its efficacy and safety.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Search strategy

This systematic review had been registered in PROSPERO and the registration number is CRD42018098737. The databases included China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), VIP medicine information system (VMIS), Wanfang, Embase, PubMed, and Cochrane Library. The dates ranged from the establishment to August 2017. In our study, "P" should be "acute cerebral hemorrhage." "I" should be "Conventional treatment (including lowing blood pressure, maintaining water and electrolyte balance, and neuroprotective agent)." "C" should be "Xingnaojing injection with or without conventional treatment." "O" should be "efficacy rate." However, the range of conventional treatment is so wide. In addition, the name of Xingnaojing injection is the specific name. Therefore, the following initial search items were used: "Xingnaojing injection" [Title/Abstract] and "acute cerebral hemorrhage" [Title/Abstract] or "hemorrhagic stroke" [Title/Abstract] in both Chinese and English. The searched results were downloaded for the further screening.

2.2. Inclusion criteria

The inclusion criteria were as follows: all randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of XNJi were included. Treatment group was the conventional treatment combined with XNJi, whereas control group was conventional treatment alone. Acute cerebral hemorrhage was diagnosed according to definite diagnostic criteria and CT/MRI. The age and sex of patients were not restrictive.

2.3. Exclusion criteria

The exclusion criteria were as follows: repeated published literature. Studies with incomplete or incorrect data. Patients with cerebral infarction and severe organ dysfunction. Treatment group or control group combined with other TCM during treatment. Animal experiments and review literatures.

2.4. Data extraction

The general information, including diagnostic criteria, interventions, outcome measures, and adverse reaction were extracted by 2 researchers (TW and YXY) independently. The extracted data were showed as following: general information, including first author, published year, the number of participants in treatment and control group respectively. Intervention, including the dosage, treatment course, and the combining drugs of XNJi were also extracted. Outcome measures, including efficacy rate, brain edema, cerebral hematoma, neurological deficit score, hscrp, Glasgow coma scale (GCS), and activities of daily living (ADL) were recorded for further analysis. This research was based on synthesizing clinical trials' data and it would not leak out patients' information. Therefore, ethical approval for this research is unnecessary to be conducted.

2.5. Quality assessment

The quality of literature was evaluated according to the following items: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome date, selective reporting, and other bias. Each item was assessed using the 3 levels of "low," "high," and "unclear." The retrieval process and quality evaluation in accordance with the above items were carried out by 2 reviewers independently, and cross checked (TW and JXW). Discussion would be carried out if any differences generated.

2.6. Statistical analysis

RevMan5.3 software (Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, UK). provided by Cochrane Collaboration was utilized for metaanalysis. Odds ratio (OR) was adopted in dichotomous variable, such as efficacy rate. Meanwhile, mean difference (MD) was applied in continuous variables, such as neurological deficit score, coma index score, hematoma volume, edema volume, and hs-crp. Both OR and MD were expressed with 95% CI. *I*-square (I^2) and *P*-value were used to evaluate heterogeneity. Fixed effect model was adopted for meta-analysis in the case of no significant heterogeneity ($P \ge .1$, $I^2 \le 50\%$) and the total OR value or MD value and 95% CI were calculated. Random effect model was adopted for meta-analysis in the case of substantial heterogeneity among studies (P < .1, $I^2 > 50\%$). Subgroup analysis investigated the effect of various administration doses as well as administration courses of treatment on efficacy rate. The funnel plot was adopted to analyze the publication bias of enrolled researches.

3. Results

3.1. Inclusion of studies

A total of 1337 articles were retrieved according to the search strategy. After the title and abstracts screening, the studies including the duplicate reviews, animal experiments, reviews were excluded. After further reading, 10 studies combined with other medicines were excluded. Twenty-nine studies were eventually included in this meta-analysis (Fig. 1).^[11–39]

3.2. Characteristics of the included studies

All the 29 studies were designed as XNJi combined with conventional treatment versus conventional treatment (Table 1). A total of 2638 patients were included in this meta-analysis. Patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage diagnosed according to definite criteria and CT/MRI were included. The dose of XNJi varied from 20 to 60 mL and the course of XNJi ranged from 7 to 28 days. Conventional treatment included application of mannitol to reduce intracranial pressure, neurotrophic drugs, and antihypertensive drugs as well as prevention of infection and other symptomatic treatment.

3.3. Quality of study

None of the studies indicated whether the blind method and randomized hiding were used. Six studies carried out the research by a random number table allocation method.^[22–24,26–28] However, the remaining studies mentioned randomized method but did not explain the specific random grouping. All studies did not mention whether a hidden allocation was performed. None of the studies reported blinding of participants and personnel or blinding of outcome assessment. Moreover, the incomplete outcome data were low in all the studies. In addition, 2 studies^[11,36] got high risk of selective reporting and other studies were relatively low in this bias. There were unclear risks of bias in all the studies (Table 2).

3.4. Results of efficacy and safety analysis

3.4.1. Efficacy rate. Twenty-five studies reported the efficacy rate according to the "stroke in the 4th National Cerebrovascular Disease Conference".^[11-13,15-17,18-22,24,26-38] There was no heterogeneity (P=1.00, $I^2=0\%$), and the fixed-effect model was used to carry out the meta-analysis. The result demonstrated that compared with the conventional treatment, XNJi could significantly increase the efficacy rate of patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage (OR=3.37, 95% CI [2.65, 4.28] P < .00001) (Fig. 2).



3.4.2. Efficacy rate of XNJi in different courses and dosage. Three studies included the treatment for 7 days, $^{[24,28,37]}$ 13 studies included the course for 14 days $^{[13,15,16,18,19,22,26,27,30,33,34,36,38]}$ and 7 studies included the course for 21 days. $^{[11,12,20,21,31,32,35]}$ Moreover, 2 studies recorded the course for 28 days. $^{[17,29]}$ There was no substantial heterogeneity in these 4 subgroups ($P = .79, I^2 = 0\%$; $P = .99, I^2 = 0\%$; $P = .89, I^2 = 0\%$; $P = .15, I^2 = 52\%$), and the fixed-effect model was carried out. These results demonstrated that the efficacy rate of XNJi during 4 courses was significantly higher than that of conventional treatment respectively (OR = 3.05, 95% CI [1.64, 5.68] P = .0005; OR = 3.50, 95% CI [2.46, 4.98] P < .00001; OR = 2.94, 95% CI [1.89, 4.55] P < .00001; OR = 4.12, 95% CI [1.87, 9.08] P = .0004) (Fig. 3).

Additionally, subgroup analysis was carried out to investigate the influence of dosage. According to the dosage, there primarily existed 20 mL,^[12,13,18,19,21,22,26–28,31,33,36,38] 30 mL,^{[15–17,24,29, ^{32,34,37]} 40 mL,^[30] and 60 mL^[11,20,35] groups. There was no substantial heterogeneity in 20, 30, and 40 mL subgroups (P=.98, I^2 =0%; P=.76, I^2 =0%; P=.57, I^2 =0%). The above data and analysis showed that the efficacy rate of XNJi with 20, 30, and 60 mL were significantly higher than conventional treatment (OR=3.81, 95% CI [2.62, 5.54] P<.00001; OR= 3.33, 95% CI [2.14, 5.20] P<.00001; OR=3.06, 95% CI [1.72, 5.46] P=.0002). However, there was no difference of efficacy rate between XNJi in 40 mL and conventional treatment (OR = 2.62, 95% CI [0.87, 7.90] P=.09) (Fig. 4).}

3.4.3. Adverse reactions. A total of 6 studies reported adverse events.^[16,23,26,28,35,36] Among them, there were 17 cases of adverse reaction in the treatment group, including emesis, skin rash, diarrhea, and chest tightness. In the control group, there were 22 cases of adverse reaction events including emesis, diarrhea, nausea, somnolence, and tachycardia (Table 3). All these adverse reactions disappeared after withdrawal of intervention.

Characteristic	s of incluc	led studies.					
Included study (year)	(E/C)	Age Range (mean)	Time course/size/location	Intervening measure (E/C)	XNJi dosage	Duration	Outcome measures
Liao 2013	25/25	E:52-81 (53.7) C:40-70 (51.4)	Within 2 days∕ ≤30 mL/lobe, thalamus, basal ganglia	CT+ XNJi /CT	20 mL/d	21 Days	Hematomas, efficacy rate, neurologic impairment, ADL
Yang 2016	32/32	C.43-79 (J1.4) E:50-75	NR	CT+ XNJi /CT	20 mL/d	14 days	NIHSS, GCS, efficacy rate
Gu 2014 Wang 2014	40/40 45/45	35–76 (52.5) 35–76 (52.5) E: 37–72 (55)	Within 48 hours/NR/lobe, brainstem, basal ganglia, cerebellum NR/ventricle, basal ganglia, brainstem	CT+ XNJI /CT CT+ XNJI /CT	20 mL/d 20 mL/d	14 days 15 days	NHISS, GCS NHISS, ADL, efficacy rate
Liu 2015	30/30	C:3/-/8 (5/) E: 39-71 C: 36 70	NR/lobe, brainstern, basal ganglia, cerebellum	CT+XNJI/CT	60 mL/d	21 days	Cerebral hematoma, efficacy rate, hematomas
Cheng 2015	1 00/1 00	U: 30-72 E: 36-82 (60.8) C: 26 00 (60.4)	NR	CT+XNJI/CT	30 mL/day	14 days	Efficacy rate, neurologic impairment
He 2009	28/28	C: 30-82 (00.1) E: 52-81 (64.7) C: 40 70 (63.3)	$1.5-72 \text{ h}/\leq 30 \text{ mL/lobe}$, thalamus, basal ganglia, brainstem	CT+XNJI/CT	20 mL/d	14 days	GCS, hs-crp, cerebral hematoma
Jia 2006 Lin 2011	34/31 30/30	C: 49-70 (02.3) 36-78 (56.8) E: 46-78 (63.8)	Within 24h/18.67 \pm 4.69 mU/obe, brainstern, basal ganglia, cerebellum 1.5–72 h/NR/lobe, thalamus, basal ganglia, brainstern	CT+XNJI/CT CT+XNJI/CT	60 mL/d 20 mL/d	21 days 14 days	Efficacy rate, neurologic impairment, hematomas NIHSS, GCS, efficacy rate
Xin 2013	40/38	C: 42-/9 (02.3) E: 39-81 (59.3) C: 40-70 (59.5)	Within 24 h/ \leq 30 mL/lobe, basal ganglia	CT+XNJI/CT	40 mL/d	14 days	Efficacy rate, neurologic impairment
Yang 2011	64/64	C: 40-79 (30.3) E: 45-85 (59.2) C: 20 80 (68.5)	NR/ \leq 30 mL/lobe, thalamus, basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum	CT+XNJI/CT	30 mL/d	21 days	Hematomas, efficacy rate
Yu 2009	42/42	U: 39-80 (30.3) E: 37-78 C: 25-70	NR/lobe, brainstem, basal ganglia, cerebellum	CT+XNJI/CT	60 mL/d	21 days	Hematomas, efficacy rate, neurologic impairment, cerebral edema
Zhang 2009	60/63	E: 42–78 (66)	Within 48 hours /NR/basal ganglia, thalamus	CT+XNJI/CT	30 mL/d	14 days	Neurologic impairment, efficacy rate
Zhang 2016	60/50	U: 43-03 (02) E:(65.0) C.(66.0)	Within 48 hours/NR/putamen, thalamus, cerebellum	CT+XNJI/CT	30 mL/d	7 days	Neurologic impairment, hs-crp, efficacy rate
Zheng 2012	30/31	C. 45-78 (65)	3 hours-5 days/putamen, thalamus, cerebellum, pons	CT+XNJI/CT	20 mL/d	14 days	hs-crp, GCS, neurologic impairment, efficacy rate
Kong 2014	47/44	U. 42-00 (03) E: 47-67 (56.5) C. 46 70 (67.0)	0.2–27.7 h/ 4.3–30.1 mL/lobe, brainstem, cerebellum,	CT+XNJI/CT	10 mL/d	28 days	GCS, hs-crp, hematomas,cerebral edema, NHISS
Li 2014	49/49	C. 57-76 (65.2) C. 58 77 (65.2)	unaurus, basar gangua 4–24 hours/18.2–34.4 mL/lobe, thalamus, basal ganglia	CT+XNJI/CT	20 mL/d	14 days	NIHSS, efficacy rate, ADL
Li 2016	34/34	C. 30-11 (02.0) E: 60-78 (72.4) C. 60 00 772 1)	NR	CT+XNJ/CT	20 mL/d	21 days	ADL, efficacy rate
Li (2) 2016	49/49	E: 35-72 (53.9) C: 27 71 (64.6)	1-43 hours/NR/ lobe, thalamus, basal ganglia, cerebellum	CT+XNJI/CT	20 mL/d	14 days	NIHSS, GCS, hs-c-rp, efficacy rate
Yu 2015	60/60	C. 37-71 (34.0) E: 39-80 (57.9) C. 39 80 (57.9)	0.2-27.6 hours/ NR/ lobe, thalamus, putamen, cerebellum	CT+XNJI/CT	20 mL/d	14 days	NIHSS, efficiency, ADL, efficacy rate
Zhang (2) 2016	40/40	U. 30-02 (30.3) E: 42-73 (57.5) C. 41 72 (66.6)	0.5-29h/4-29mL/lobe, brainstem, cerebellum	CT+XNJI/CT	20 mL/d	28 days	GCS, NIHSS, hs-crp, hematomas, cerebral edema
Heng 2010 Pan 2016	50/50 48/48	E: 44–79 (61.5) E/C: 50–70 E: 44–79 (61.5)	Within 48 hours /NRYlobe, brainstem, cerebellum, basal ganglia Within 15 hours/≤30 mL/thalamus, basal ganglia	CT+XNJI/CT CT+XNJI/CT	20 mL/d 20 mL/d	14 days 10 days	GCS, NIHSS, efficacy rate GCS, NIHSS, efficacy rate
Huang 2006	23/23	C: 40-/8 (01.0) E: 43-76 (60) C: 44 75 (60)	24-48 h/NR	CT+XNJI/CT	20 mL/d	21 days	Hematomas, efficacy rate, neurologic impairment
Ma 2016	41/41	U: 44-73 (0U) E: (61.3) C: 162 A	Within 24h/NR	CT+XNJI/CT	30 mL/d	7 days	NIHSS, ADL, efficacy rate
Wu 2014	45/45	C: (02.4) E: 41–78 (62.4) C: 45 70 (60.4)	Within 72h/NRV lobe, putamen, thalamus	CT+XNJI/CT	20 mL/d	14 days	NHISS, hematomas, cerebral edema
Yan 2010	80/80	C. 43-73 (00.4) E: 44-70 (62.2) C. 46 70 (62.1)	Within 24 h/NR	CT+XNJI/CT	20 mL/d	14 days	Neurologic impairment, hs-crp, efficacy rate
Yuan 2016	40/40	C. 40-70 (00.1) E: 27-73 (56.7) C. 25-75 (56.2)	1 hour-4 d/NR	CT+XNJI/CT	30 mL/d	30 days	NIHSS, GCS, efficacy rate
Dong 2011	09/09	C: (61.7) C: (61.7)	Within 24 hours /NR/brainstem, cerebellum	CT+XNJi/CT	30 mL/d	28 days	GCS, neurologic impairment, efficacy rate
C = control group, CT: XNJi = Xingnaojing inj	= conventional t ection treatmen	treatment (mainly includi it.	ing decreasing blood pressure, maintaining water and electrolyte balance, and neuropro	rotective agent), E = experi	mental group, G(SS = Glasgow Co	ma Scale, NIHSS = National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale, NR = no report,

Table 1

Medicine

4

Table 2

Risk of bias sur	nmary.						
Included study (year)	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of participants and personnel	Blinding of outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other bias
Liao 2013	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Yang 2016	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Gu 2014	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Wang 2014	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Liu 2015	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	High	Unclear
Cheng 2015	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
He 2009	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Jia 2006	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Lin 2011	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Xin 2013	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Yang 2011	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Yu 2009	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	High	Unclear
Zhang 2009	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Zhang 2016	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Zheng 2012	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Kong 2014	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Li 2014	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Li 2016	High	High	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Li (2) 2016	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Yu 2015	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Zhang (2) 2016	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Heng 2010	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Pan 2016	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Huang 2006	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Ma 2016	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Wu 2014	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Yan 2010	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Yuan 2016	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear
Dong 2011	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Unclear

High = high risk of bias, Low = low risk of bias, Unclear = unclear risk of bias.

3.5. Neural functional deficit score

Twenty-six studies reported the neural functional deficit score. The *I*-square (I^2) statistic indicated that there was significant heterogeneity among 26 trials (National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale [NIHSS], $I^2 = 96\%$, P < .00001; GCS, $I^2 = 82\%$, P < .00001), and random-effect model was used to pool the results of these trials.^[13-29,30,31,33-35,36-39] Twelve studies were based on the score of Chinese stroke scale (CSS, the fourth national cerebrovascular disease meeting about the degree of neurological impairment standard neurological deficit scores in 1995).^[15–17,20,21,30,31,34,35,37–39] The result showed that compared with conventional treatment, XNJi significantly improved the neurological function in patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage (MD = -4.74, 95% CI [-5.89, -3.60], P < .00001) (Fig. 5A). In addition, 14 studies evaluated the neural functional deficit score according to NIHSS.^[13,14,18,19,22-29,33,36] The result displayed that compared with conventional treatment, XNJi could remarkably improve the neurological function in patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage (MD = -4.45, 95% CI [-5.49, -3.41], *P* < .00001) (Fig. 5B).

3.6. Serum level of hs-crp

Eight studies assessed serum hs-crp in patients.^[15,23,24,27,36–39] As shown in Fig. 6, there was a substantial heterogeneity (P < .00001, $I^2 = 89\%$), and therefore the random-effect model was used. The result demonstrated that XNJi could significantly

reduce the serum level of hs-crp compared with conventional therapy in patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage (MD=-6.50, 95% CI [-7.79, -5.21], P < .00001) (Fig. 6).

3.7. GCS index

Twelve studies employed the GCS to evaluate prognosis for patients.^[17–19,23,25–29,33,38,39] The I^2 statistic showed that there was a significant heterogeneity among 12 trials ($I^2 = 78\%$, P < .00001), and random-effect model was used to pool the result of these trials. Data analysis showed that compared with the conventional treatment, XNJi was able to remarkably improve the score of GCS in patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage (MD=2.72, 95% CI [2.09, 3.35], P < .00001) (Fig. 7).

3.8. Activities of daily living

Five studies adopted ADL score to evaluate prognosis for patients. There was no significant heterogeneity (P=.24, I^2 = 27%) and a fixed-effect model was used.^[12,22,24,31,36] The result indicated that XNJi significantly increased the scores of ADL compared with conventional treatment in patients (MD=20.38, 95% CI [17.98, 22.79], P<.00001) (Fig. 8).

3.9. Cerebral hematoma volume

Eight of the enrolled studies evaluated the hematoma volume of patients.^[11,14,21,23,25,28,31,35] The I^2 showed that there was

	Experim	ental	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	
Cheng 2015	92	100	81	100	8.3%	2.70 [1.12, 6.49]		
Dong 2011	51	60	40	60	7.6%	2.83 [1.16, 6.89]		
Gu 2014	36	40	31	40	3.9%	2.61 [0.73, 9.32]		
Heng 2010	49	50	45	50	1.1%	5.44 [0.61, 48.40]	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	_
Huang 2006	22	23	15	20	0.9%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24]		-
Jia 2006	23	34	16	31	6.9%	1.96 [0.72, 5.36]		
Li (2) 2016	44	49	34	49	4.4%	3.88 [1.28, 11.74]		
_i 2014	47	49	37	49	1.9%	7.62 [1.61, 36.19]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-
Li 2016	30	34	24	34	3.6%	3.13 [0.87, 11.21]		
Liao 2013	18	25	14	25	5.0%	2.02 [0.62, 6.56]		
_in 2011	28	30	22	30	1.9%	5.09 [0.98, 26.43]		
Liu 2015	23	30	14	30	4.2%	3.76 [1.24, 11.38]		
Ma 2016	38	41	33	41	3.1%	3.07 [0.75, 12.53]		
Pan 2016	45	48	37	48	2.9%	4.46 [1.16, 17.18]		
Wang 2014	41	45	34	45	3.8%	3.32 [0.97, 11.36]		
Xin 2013	34	40	26	38	5.1%	2.62 [0.87, 7.90]		
Yan 2010	38	40	31	40	2.0%	5.52 [1.11, 27.43]		
Yang 2011	56	60	46	54	4.1%	2.43 [0.69, 8.60]		
Yang 2016	30	32	22	32	1.8%	6.82 [1.36, 34.27]		
Yu 2009	32	42	19	42	5.8%	3.87 [1.52, 9.86]		
Yu 2015	57	60	55	60	3.5%	1.73 [0.39, 7.58]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Yuan 2016	39	40	29	40	0.9%	14.79 [1.81, 121.14]		
Zhang 2009	54	60	44	63	5.5%	3.89 [1.43, 10.57]		
Zhang 2016	46	60	28	50	9.1%	2.58 [1.14, 5.85]		
Zheng 2012	27	30	22	31	2.8%	3.68 [0.89, 15.27]		
Fotal (95% CI)		1122		1102	100.0%	3.37 [2.65, 4.28]	•	
Total events	1000		799					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	9.45, df = 2	24 (P = 1	.00); 12 =	0%				4.0
lest for overall effect:	Z = 9.97 (F	< 0.000	001)					100

Figure 2. Efficacy rate of XNJi combined with conventional treatment versus conventional treatment. *P* and *P* are the criterion for the heterogeneity test, ♦ pooled odds ratio, -■- odds ratio and 95% Cl.

significant heterogeneity among these 8 trials ($I^2 = 95\%$, P < .00001) and random-effect model was used to pool the result. The result revealed that XNJi was able to significantly reduce the cerebral hematoma volume compared with the conventional treatment (MD = -2.53, 95% CI [-4.75, -0.31] P = 0.03(Fig. 9A). In addition, the sensitivity analysis showed that the study "Pan 2016" might be the main impact of heterogeneity. After carefully comparing with other included studies, it indicated that there was difference of treatment course between pan 2016 and other studies (10 days and 14–21 days, respectively). Therefore, the length of treatment course might be the main generation of heterogeneity (Fig. 9B).

3.10. Cerebral edema

Five studies assessed the cerebral edema. There was significant heterogeneity among 5 trials ($I^2 = 82\%$, P = .0002) and random-effect model was applied.^[11,14,23,25,35] The result demonstrated that XNJi significantly reduced the cerebral edema in patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage compared with conventional treatment (MD=-1.74 95% CI [-2.42, -1.07] P < .00001) (Fig. 10).

3.11. Bias analysis

Funnel plot was used to assess the publication bias of included studies (Fig. 11). In this analysis, the funnel plot was asymmetric, suggesting that potential publication bias might affect the result. This publication bias might be related to the small sample size and quality of included studies.

4. Discussion

Acute cerebral hemorrhage is a common cerebral vascular disease with high mortality and disability rate. Till now, there is no specific treatment at home and abroad. The main clinical manifestations were headache, dizziness, confusion, coma, movement, and language barrier.^[40] Recent studies have suggested that hematoma enlargement was one of the most important causes of neurological deterioration. Cerebral edema can be caused by coagulation and surrounding brain tissue within minutes after intra-cerebral hemorrhage. The formation of cerebral edema is one of the most important causes of the structural and functional damage in nerve system after acute cerebral hemorrhage.^[41] Moreover, hematoma continues to expand as the first cause of neurological deterioration after 3 hours.^[42,43] After the hematoma formation and expansion, mechanical compression injury and ischemic changes occurs and results in a series of pathological changes.

In recent years, XNJi is widely used for acute cerebral hemorrhage. Researches have shown that the bioactive compounds of XNJi are germacrone, curdione, β -elemene, Camphor, curcumenol, muscone, (+) – borneol, (-) – borneol, and so on.^[44] It is commonly applied with a range of dose and period for the effect of reducing the blood brain barrier permeability, alleviating hydrocephalus, scavenging free radicals, promoting patient recovery, shortening coma time, as well as reducing

	Experime	ental	Contr	ol	100000	Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
3.3.1 7 days							
Ma 2016	38	41	33	41	20.4%	3.07 [0.75, 12.53]	
Pan 2016	45	48	37	48	19.5%	4.46 [1.16, 17.18]	
Zhang 2016	46	60	28	50	60.1%	2.58 [1.14, 5.85]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		149		139	100.0%	3.05 [1.64, 5.68]	
Total events	129		98				
leterogeneity: Chi ² = 0	0.46, df = 2	(P = 0.7)	$(9); I^2 = 0^4$	%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.51 (P	= 0.000	05)				
3.3.2 14 days							
Cheng 2015	92	100	81	100	17.9%	2.70 [1.12, 6.49]	The second se
Gu 2014	36	40	31	40	8.6%	2.61 [0.73, 9.32]	
leng 2010	49	50	45	50	2.5%	5.44 [0.61, 48,40]	
i (2) 2016	44	49	34	49	9.6%	3.88 [1.28, 11,74]	
12014	47	49	41	49	4.6%	4.59 [0.92, 22,83]	
in 2011	28	30	22	30	4.0%	5.09 [0.98, 26 43]	
Vang 2014	41	45	34	45	8.3%	3.32 [0.97, 11.36]	
(in 2013	34	40	26	38	11.0%	2 62 10 87 7 901	
(an 2010	38	40	31	40	4 3%	5 52 [1 11 27 43]	
ang 2016	30	32	22	32	3.8%	6 82 [1 36 34 27]	
/u 2015	57	60	55	60	7.6%	1 73 10 30 7 581	
7hang 2000	54	60	14	63	11.8%	3 80 11 43 10 571	
Zhang 2003	27	20	22	21	6.0%	3.69 [1.45, 10.57]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	21	625	22	627	100.0%	3.50 [2.46 4.98]	•
		020		021	100.070	3.30 [2.40, 4.30]	
Fatal aveata	E77		400				1.25-2
Total events	577		488	-			
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3	577 3.20, df = 1	2 (P = 0	488 .99); l² = 1	0%			
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3 Test for overall effect:	577 3.20, df = 1 Z = 6.96 (P	2 (P = 0 < 0.000	488 .99); l² = (001)	0%			
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3 Fest for overall effect:	577 3.20, df = 1 Z = 6.96 (P	2 (P = 0 < 0.000	488 .99); I ² = (001)	0%			
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3 Fest for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P	2 (P = 0 < 0.000	488 .99); I ² = (001)	20	2.0%	7 33 10 78 60 241	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Test for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23	2 (P = 0 < 0.000	488 .99); I ² = (001) 15	20 21	2.9%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Test for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Jia 2006 Jia 2006	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 20	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 24	488 .99); I ² = ()01) 15 16 24	20 31	2.9% 22.7%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Test for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Jia 2006 Jia 2016 Jian 2012	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 19	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 34 34	488 .99); I ² = 0 001) 15 16 24	20 31 34	2.9% 22.7% 11.8%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Test for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Lia 2006 Li 2016 Liao 2013 Liao 2015	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 34 25	488 .99); I ² = 1 001) 15 16 24 14	20 31 34 25	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3 Test for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Jia 2006 Ji 2016 Jiao 2013 Jiu 2015 Gene 2011	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18 23	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 34 25 30	488 .99); I ² = 1 001) 15 16 24 14 14	20 31 34 25 30	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4% 13.7%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56] 3.76 [1.24, 11.38]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Lia 2006 Li 2016 Lia 2013 Liu 2015 Yang 2011 Yang 2011	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18 23 56 20	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 34 25 30 60	488 .99); l ² = (001) 15 16 24 14 14 46	20 31 34 25 30 54	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4% 13.7% 13.5%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56] 3.76 [1.24, 11.38] 2.43 [0.69, 8.60]	
Total events leterogeneity: Chi² = 1 rest for overall effect: 3.3.3.21 days luang 2006 lia 2006 lia 2006 i.i 2016 .iao 2013 .iu 2015 Yang 2011 Yu 2009	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18 23 56 32	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 34 34 25 30 60 42	488 .99); ² = (001) 15 16 24 14 14 46 19	20 31 34 25 30 54 42	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4% 13.7% 13.5% 18.9%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56] 3.76 [1.24, 11.38] 2.43 [0.69, 8.60] 3.87 [1.52, 9.86]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Test for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2016 Lia 2013 Liu 2015 Yang 2011 Yu 2009 Subtotal (95% CI)	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18 23 56 32	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 34 25 30 60 42 248	488 .99); l ² = 1 001) 15 16 24 14 14 46 19	20 31 34 25 30 54 42 236	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4% 13.7% 13.5% 18.9% 100.0%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56] 3.76 [1.24, 11.38] 2.43 [0.69, 8.60] 3.87 [1.52, 9.86] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Fest for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2016 Liao 2013 Liu 2015 Yang 2011 Yu 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18 23 56 32 204	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 34 25 30 60 42 248	488 .99); l ² = 1 001) 15 16 24 14 14 46 19 148	20 31 34 25 30 54 42 236	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4% 13.7% 13.5% 18.9% 100.0%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56] 3.76 [1.24, 11.38] 2.43 [0.69, 8.60] 3.87 [1.52, 9.86] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Test for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Li 2006 Li 2006 Li 2016 Liao 2013 Liu 2015 Yang 2011 Yu 2009 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = :	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18 23 56 32 204 2.27, df = 6	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 34 25 30 60 42 248 (P = 0.8	488 .99); l ² = 1 001) 15 16 24 14 46 19 148 89); l ² = 0	20 31 34 25 30 54 42 236	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4% 13.7% 13.5% 18.9% 100.0%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56] 3.76 [1.24, 11.38] 2.43 [0.69, 8.60] 3.87 [1.52, 9.86] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Fest for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2016 Liao 2013 Liao 2013 Liao 2013 Liao 2013 Liao 2015 (ang 2011 (\u03c0 2015) (ang 2011 (\u03c0 2009) Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Fest for overall effect:	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18 23 56 32 204 2.27, df = 6 Z = 4.81 (P	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 34 25 30 60 42 248 (P = 0.8 < 0.000	488 .99); ² = 001) 15 16 24 14 14 46 19 148 39); ² = 0' 001)	20 31 34 25 30 54 42 236	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4% 13.7% 13.5% 18.9% 100.0%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56] 3.76 [1.24, 11.38] 2.43 [0.69, 8.60] 3.87 [1.52, 9.86] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Fest for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2016 Lia 2013 Liu 2015 Yang 2011 Yu 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Fest for overall effect: 3.3.4 28 days	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18 23 56 32 204 2.27, df = 6 Z = 4.81 (P	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 25 30 60 42 248 (P = 0.8 < 0.000	488 .99); ² = 001) 15 16 24 14 14 46 19 148 39); ² = 0' 001)	20 31 34 25 30 54 42 236	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4% 13.7% 13.5% 18.9% 100.0%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56] 3.76 [1.24, 11.38] 2.43 [0.69, 8.60] 3.87 [1.52, 9.86] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Fest for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2013 Lia 2013 (ang 2013 (ang 2011 (u 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Fest for overall effect: 3.3.4 28 days Dong 2011	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18 23 56 32 204 2.27, df = 6 Z = 4.81 (P 51	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 34 25 30 60 42 248 (P = 0.8 < 0.000 60	488 .99); ² = 1 001) 15 16 24 14 14 46 19 148 39); ² = 0' 001) 40	20 31 34 25 30 54 42 236 %	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4% 13.7% 13.5% 18.9% 100.0%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56] 3.76 [1.24, 11.38] 2.43 [0.69, 8.60] 3.87 [1.52, 9.86] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Test for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Lia 2006 Li 2016 Liao 2013 Liu 2015 Yang 2011 Yu 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Test for overall effect: 3.3.4 28 days Dong 2011 Yuan 2016	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18 23 56 32 204 2.27, df = 6 Z = 4.81 (P 51 39	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 34 25 30 60 42 248 (P = 0.8 < 0.000 60 40	488 .99); ² = 1 001) 15 16 24 14 14 46 19 148 39); ² = 0 001) 40 29	20 31 34 25 30 54 42 236 %	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4% 13.7% 13.5% 18.9% 100.0% 89.2% 10.8%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56] 3.76 [1.24, 11.38] 2.43 [0.69, 8.60] 3.87 [1.52, 9.86] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55] 2.83 [1.16, 6.89] 14.79 [1.81, 121.14]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Fest for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Jia 2006 Jia 2006 Jia 2006 Jia 2006 Jia 2007 Jia 2015 Jia	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18 23 56 32 204 2.27, df = 6 Z = 4.81 (P 51 39	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 34 25 30 60 42 248 (P = 0.8 < 0.000 60 40 100	488 .99); ² = 1 001) 15 16 24 14 14 46 19 148 39); ² = 0' 001) 40 29	20 31 34 25 30 54 42 236 %	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4% 13.7% 13.5% 18.9% 100.0% 89.2% 10.8% 100.0%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56] 3.76 [1.24, 11.38] 2.43 [0.69, 8.60] 3.87 [1.52, 9.86] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55] 2.83 [1.16, 6.89] 14.79 [1.81, 121.14] 4.12 [1.87, 9.08]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Test for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Jia 2006 Jia 2006 Jia 2006 Jia 2015 Yang 2011 Yu 2009 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Test for overall effect: 3.3.4 28 days Dong 2011 Yuan 2016 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18 23 56 32 204 2.27, df = 6 Z = 4.81 (P 51 39 90	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 34 25 30 60 42 248 (P = 0.8 < 0.000 60 40 100	488 .99); ² = 1 001) 15 16 24 14 46 19 148 39); ² = 0' 001) 40 29 69	20 31 34 25 30 54 42 236 % 60 40 100	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4% 13.7% 13.5% 13.5% 13.5% 100.0%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56] 3.76 [1.24, 11.38] 2.43 [0.69, 8.60] 3.87 [1.52, 9.86] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55] 2.83 [1.16, 6.89] 14.79 [1.81, 121.14] 4.12 [1.87, 9.08]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Test for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2015 Yang 2011 Yu 2009 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : 3.3.4 28 days Dong 2011 Yuan 2016 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Het	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18 23 56 32 204 2.27, df = 6 Z = 4.81 (P 51 39 90 2.10, df = 1	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 25 30 60 42 248 (P = 0.8 < 0.000 60 40 100 (P = 0.1	488 .99); ² = 1 001) 15 16 24 14 14 46 19 148 39); ² = 0 001) 40 29 69 (5); ² = 5	200 31 34 25 30 54 42 236 % 60 40 100	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4% 13.7% 13.5% 18.9% 100.0% 89.2% 10.8% 100.0%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56] 3.76 [1.24, 11.38] 2.43 [0.69, 8.60] 3.87 [1.52, 9.86] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55] 2.83 [1.16, 6.89] 14.79 [1.81, 121.14] 4.12 [1.87, 9.08]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Test for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2016 Lia 2013 Liu 2015 Yang 2011 Yu 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : 3.3.4 28 days Dong 2011 Yuan 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18 23 56 32 204 2.27, df = 6 Z = 4.81 (P 51 39 90 2.10, df = 1 Z = 3.52 (P	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 25 30 60 42 248 (P = 0.8 < 0.000 60 40 100 (P = 0.7 = 0.000	488 .99); ² = 001) 15 16 24 14 14 46 19 148 39); ² = 0' 001) 40 29 (5); ² = 5;	200 31 34 25 30 54 42 236 % 60 40 100 2%	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4% 13.7% 13.5% 18.9% 100.0% 89.2% 10.8% 100.0%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56] 3.76 [1.24, 11.38] 2.43 [0.69, 8.60] 3.87 [1.52, 9.86] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55] 4.79 [1.81, 121.14] 4.12 [1.87, 9.08]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Test for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2016 Lia 2013 Liu 2015 Yang 2011 Yu 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : 3.3.4 28 days Dong 2011 Yuan 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Fest for overall effect: 1000 1	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18 23 56 32 204 2.27, df = 6 Z = 4.81 (P 51 39 90 2.10, df = 1 Z = 3.52 (P	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 34 25 30 60 42 248 (P = 0.8 < 0.000 60 40 100 (P = 0.1 = 0.000	488 $.99); 2 = 1$ $101)$ 15 16 24 14 14 46 19 148 $39); 2 = 0'$ 148 $39); 2 = 0'$ 148 $39); 2 = 0'$ 69 69 $15); 2 = 5;$ $14)$	200 31 34 25 30 54 42 236 % 60 40 100 22%	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4% 13.7% 13.5% 18.9% 100.0% 89.2% 10.8% 100.0%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56] 3.76 [1.24, 11.38] 2.43 [0.69, 8.60] 3.87 [1.52, 9.86] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55] 2.83 [1.16, 6.89] 14.79 [1.81, 121.14] 4.12 [1.87, 9.08]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Test for overall effect: 3.3.3 21 days Huang 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2006 Lia 2013 Liu 2015 Yang 2011 Yu 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Test for overall effect: 3.4.28 days Dong 2011 Yuan 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Heterogene	577 3.20, df = 1: Z = 6.96 (P 22 23 30 18 23 56 32 204 2.27, df = 6 Z = 4.81 (P 51 39 90 2.10, df = 1 Z = 3.52 (P	2 (P = 0 < 0.000 23 34 34 34 25 30 60 42 248 (P = 0.8 < 0.000 60 40 100 (P = 0.1 = 0.000	488 $.99); 2 = 1$ $101)$ 15 16 24 14 14 46 19 148 $39); 2 = 0'$ 148 $39); 2 = 0'$ 148 $39); 2 = 5;$ 69 $15); 2 = 5;$ 40	20 31 34 25 30 54 42 236 % 60 40 100	2.9% 22.7% 11.8% 16.4% 13.7% 13.5% 18.9% 100.0% 89.2% 10.8% 100.0%	7.33 [0.78, 69.24] 1.96 [0.72, 5.36] 3.13 [0.87, 11.21] 2.02 [0.62, 6.56] 3.76 [1.24, 11.38] 2.43 [0.69, 8.60] 3.87 [1.52, 9.86] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55] 2.94 [1.89, 4.55] 2.83 [1.16, 6.89] 14.79 [1.81, 121.14] 4.12 [1.87, 9.08]	

Figure 3. Efficacy rate of XNJi in different courses. I² and P are the criterion for the heterogeneity test, ♦ pooled odds ratio, --- odds ratio and 95% CI.

complications in cerebral diseases. Meanwhile, XNJi is reported as an efficient agent for accelerating construction of collateral circulation, increasing capillary network and reducing vascular pressure in hemorrhage site. Several studies report that XNJi and conventional therapy combined with therapies such as decreasing blood pressure, maintaining water and electrolyte balance, and neuroprotective agent. It also developed the systematic analysis of the studies to confirm the value of treating acute cerebral hemorrhage.^[45,46]

The results from our meta-analysis indicated that applying XNJi combined with conventional therapy could enhance the total response rate in patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage. In terms of short-term improvement on neurological impairment, daily activities of patients, coma status, inflammatory level, hematoma volume and cerebral edema volume, treatment group was also superior to control group. It could be speculated from the systemic analysis that XNJi might get superior efficacy to conventional therapy in reducing patient inflammatory level, hematoma volume, and cerebral edema volume, as well as in promoting patient consciousness and mobility recovery.

The result of the analysis indicated that there was potential efficacy of XNJi on patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage. It demonstrated improvement of CSS, NHISS and impairment of hs-crp, hematoma, and edema compared with conventional treatment. Moreover, in our research, the appropriate time for XNJi on acute cerebral hemorrhage in the course ranged from 1

Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H. Fixed, 95% C	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
8.2.1 20ml	LVCIILS	Total	EVENIS	Total	Height	m-n, rixeu, 35/0 C	
Gu 2014	26	40	21	40	10.0%	2 61 10 72 0 221	
Hong 2010	10	50	45	50	2 0%	5 44 [0 61 48 40]	
Huang 2006	22	23	15	20	2.0%	7 33 [0 78 60 24]	
Huang 2000	11	20	24	20	11 20/	2 00 [4 20 44 74]	
LI (2) 2010	44	49	27	49	11.270	7 62 [1.20, 11.74]	
LI 2014	4/	49	31	49	4.970	7.02 [1.01, 30.19]	
Li 2010	10	04	24	34	9.170	3.13 [0.67, 11.21]	
Liao 2013	10	20	14	25	12.0%	2.02 [0.02, 0.00]	
	20	30	22	30	4.1%	5.09 [0.98, 26.43]	
Pan 2016	40	48	31	48	1.4%	4.40 [1.10, 17.18]	
Wang 2014	41	45	34	45	9.7%	3.32 [0.97, 11.36]	
Yan 2010	38	40	31	40	5.0%	5.52 [1.11, 27.43]	
Yang 2016	30	32	22	32	4.4%	6.82 [1.36, 34.27]	
Yu 2015	57	60	55	60	8.9%	1.73 [0.39, 7.58]	
Zheng 2012	27	30	22	31	7.0%	3.68 [0.89, 15.27]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		555		553	100.0%	3.81 [2.62, 5.54]	
Total events	512		423				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4	4.76, df = 1	3(P = 0)	$(.98); ^2 =$	0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 6.99 (F)	< 0.000	001)				
8.2.2 30ml							
Cheng 2015	92	100	81	100	28.0%	2.70 [1.12, 6.49]	
Dong 2011	51	60	40	60	25.9%	2.83 [1.16, 6.89]	
Ma 2016	38	41	33	41	10.4%	3.07 [0.75, 12.53]	
Yang 2011	56	60	46	54	13.9%	2.43 [0.69, 8.60]	
Yuan 2016	39	40	29	40	3.1%	14.79 [1.81, 121.14]	
Zhang 2009	54	60	44	63	18.6%	3.89 [1.43, 10.57]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		361		358	100.0%	3.33 [2.14, 5.20]	
Total events	330		273				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = :	2.62, df = 5	(P = 0.1)	76); $I^2 = 0$	%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 5.31 (P	< 0.000	001)				
9 2 2 40ml							
0.2.3 40mm	24	40	00	20	100.00/	0 00 10 07 7 001	
Xin 2013	34	40	26	38	100.0%	2.62 [0.87, 7.90]	
Subiolal (95% CI)		40	00	30	100.0%	2.02 [0.07, 7.90]	
Total events	34		26				
Heterogeneity: Not app	plicable						
lest for overall effect:	Z = 1.71 (F	r = 0.09					
8 2 4 60ml							
lia 2006	22	24	10	24	41 00/	1 06 10 70 5 201	
Jia 2000	23	34	10	31	41.0%	2 76 [1 04 44 00]	
Liu 2015	23	30	14	30	24.1%	3.70 [1.24, 11.38]	
Subtotal (05% CI)	32	42	19	42	34.3%	3.87 [1.52, 9.86]	
Table and the second second	70	100	40	103	100.0%	3.00 [1.72, 5.40]	
	/8		49	0/			
Total events	1.13, df = 2	(P = 0.1)	$(57); 1^2 = 0$	%			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =		r = 0.000	J2)				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.79 (P	C 10 10 10 10 10 10 10					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.79 (P						
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.79 (F	6 m 1996 To 20					0.01 0.1 1 10 10

1 m m		
	 (<u>–</u> 1	FC 18

The adverse events in XNJi and conventional treatment.

Included study (year)	XNJi group	Conventional treatment group
Yang 2016	1 nausea; 2 diarrhea	2 emesis
Cheng 2015	1 skin rash	NR
Kong 2014	1 diarrhea; 1 emesis	1 diarrhea; 3 emesis
Yu 2015	2 nausea; 2 emesis; 2 diarrhea	1 emesis; 1 nausea
Zhang (2) 2016	1 emesis; 2 diarrhea	2 emesis; 2 diarrhea
Pan 2016	2 chest tightness	3 emesis; 5 somnolence;
		2 tachycardia

 $NR\!=\!no$ report, $XNJi\!=\!Xingnaojing$ injection treatment.

hour to 5 days. XNJi got remarkable efficacy at the dose of 20, 30, 60 mL and from 7 to 28 days. In addition, no serious adverse reactions occurred. Therefore, it might provide a potential therapeutic option for patients. Especially, several large-scale, high quality and reasonable design plan, strict follow-up, and randomized uniform criteria are needed to verify its ideal application of dosage and course.

5. Conclusion

The systematic review and meta-analysis indicated that XNJi was effective in treating acute cerebral hemorrhage with significant decrease of neurologic impairment and no serious adverse



Figure 5. Improvement of neurological deficit score. (A) The forest plot of score of CSS. (B) The forest plot of evaluation of nerve function defect in accordance with NIHSS. l^2 and P are the criterion for the heterogeneity test, \blacklozenge pooled mean difference, $-\bullet-$ mean difference and 95% CI. CSS=Chinese stroke scale, NIHSS= National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale.

reactions. The results suggested that XNJi can be used accompany with conventional treatment at the dose of 20, 30, 60 mL and from 7 to 28 days from the course of 1 hour to 5 days. The meta-analysis of this research was based on several small-

sample and few high-quality studies. Therefore, studies with rigorous, large-scale RCTs of XNJi in treating acute cerebral hemorrhage were further needed to confirm its efficacy, safety, and detailed characteristic of application.



Figure 6. Forest plot of the hs-crp index. *P* and *P* are the criterion for the heterogeneity test, ♦ pooled mean difference, —■— mean difference and 95% CI. GCS = Glasgow Coma Scale.

	Expe	erimen	tal	C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% CI
Dong 2011	10.12	3.16	60	9.06	3.68	60	8.2%	1.06 [-0.17, 2.29]	
Gu 2014	13.35	4.16	40	11.35	5.57	40	5.0%	2.00 [-0.15, 4.15]	
He 2009	14.18	1.97	28	12.61	2.43	28	8.5%	1.57 [0.41, 2.73]	
Heng 2010	13.76	4.98	50	11.02	5.96	50	5.0%	2.74 [0.59, 4.89]	
Kong 2014	14.01	2.28	44	11.24	2.18	44	9.4%	2.77 [1.84, 3.70]	
Li (2) 2016	11.79	2.47	49	9.31	2.08	49	9.5%	2.48 [1.58, 3.38]	
Lin 2011	18.65	2.01	30	12.78	2.65	30	8.3%	5.87 [4.68, 7.06]	
Pan 2016	13.45	1.02	48	10.23	0.98	48	11.3%	3.22 [2.82, 3.62]	-
Yang 2016	14.85	2.46	32	11.24	2.73	32	8.0%	3.61 [2.34, 4.88]	
Yuan 2016	14.63	2.38	40	12.14	2.57	40	8.8%	2.49 [1.40, 3.58]	
Zhang (2) 2016	14.11	2.27	40	11.23	2.17	40	9.3%	2.88 [1.91, 3.85]	
Zheng 2012	14.18	1.95	30	12.61	2.43	31	8.7%	1.57 [0.47, 2.67]	
Total (95% CI)			491			492	100.0%	2.72 [2.09, 3.35]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.87; Ch	ni² = 48	.99, df	= 11 (P	< 0.00	0001); 1	² = 78%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 8.44	(P < 0	.00001)					Favours [CT] Favours [XNJ+CT]

Figure 7. Forest plot of the serum level of GCS. I² and P are the criterion for the heterogeneity test, \blacklozenge pooled mean difference, $-\blacksquare$ - mean difference and 95% CI.



	Expe	erimen	tal	C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% CI
Huang 2006	8.5	6	23	12.5	4	20	11.1%	-4.00 [-7.01, -0.99]	
Kong 2014	9.48	3.89	44	9.51	3.9	44	13.0%	-0.03 [-1.66, 1.60]	
Liao 2013	3.98	5.48	25	9.78	8.35	25	9.7%	-5.80 [-9.72, -1.88]	
Liu 2015	7.2	3.3	30	8.1	3.5	30	12.9%	-0.90 [-2.62, 0.82]	
Pan 2016	19.45	1.02	48	25.64	2.34	48	13.8%	-6.19 [-6.91, -5.47]	-
Wu 2014	12.4	2.12	45	12.9	1.31	45	13.8%	-0.50 [-1.23, 0.23]	
Yu 2009	7.3	3.2	42	8.2	3.6	42	13.2%	-0.90 [-2.36, 0.56]	
Zhang (2) 2016	9.42	3.83	40	12.31	4.94	40	12.6%	-2.89 [-4.83, -0.95]	1.000
Total (95% CI)			297			294	100.0%	-2.53 [-4.75, -0.31]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	9.20; Ch	ni ² = 14	8.20, d	f = 7 (P	< 0.00	0001); 1	² = 95%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.23	(P = 0	0.03)						-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [XNJ+CT] Favours [CT]
	Expe	rimen	tal	C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV. Random, 95% CI

	LAP	of infine in	Lett	-	onuoi			moun Dinerence	Moun Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% C	IV. Random, 95% CI
Huang 2006	8.5	6	23	12.5	4	20	8.4%	-4.00 [-7.01, -0.99]	
Kong 2014	9.48	3.89	44	9.51	3.9	44	16.1%	-0.03 [-1.66, 1.60]	
Liao 2013	3.98	5.48	25	9.78	8.35	25	5.8%	-5.80 [-9.72, -1.88]	
Liu 2015	7.2	3.3	30	8.1	3.5	30	15.4%	-0.90 [-2.62, 0.82]	
Wu 2014	12.4	2.12	45	12.9	1.31	45	23.0%	-0.50 [-1.23, 0.23]	
Yu 2009	7.3	3.2	42	8.2	3.6	42	17.4%	-0.90 [-2.36, 0.56]	
Zhang (2) 2016	9.42	3.83	40	12.31	4.94	40	13.9%	-2.89 [-4.83, -0.95]	
Total (95% CI)			249			246	100.0%	-1.49 [-2.56, -0.42]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	1.15; Cl	ni² = 16	6.38, df	= 6 (P =	= 0.01)	; l ² = 63	3%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.73	(P = 0	0.006)						-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [XNJ+CT] Favours [CT]

в

Figure 9. Forest plot of cerebral hematoma volume. (A) Forest plot of cerebral hematoma volume of all the 8 studies; (B) the forest plot of cerebral hematoma volume except the study "Pan 2016". l^2 and P are the criterion for the heterogeneity test, \blacklozenge pooled mean difference, $-\bullet-$ mean difference and 95% Cl.



Figure 10. Forest plot of cerebral edema. I² and P are the criterion for the heterogeneity test, \blacklozenge pooled mean difference, --- mean difference and 95% Cl.



Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank reviewers for their critical comments provided during revision and also wish to thank all authors of references.

Author contributions

XM, TW and JXW performed the search and wrote the manuscript. TW and YXY analyzed the data. YXY, TW and JW performed the data extraction. XM, WJZ, NZ and JW designed the study and amended the paper.

References

- Liu L, Wang D, Wong KS, et al. Stroke and stroke care in China huge burden, significant workload, and a national priority. Stroke 2011; 42:3651–4.
- [2] Rincon F, Mayer SA. The Epidemiology of Intracerebral Hemorrhage in the United States from 1979 to 2008. Neurocrit Care 2013;19:95–102.
- [3] Hart RG, Diener HC, Yang S, et al. Intracranial hemorrhage in atrial fibrillation patients during anticoagulation with warfarin or dabigatran: the RE-LY trial. Stroke 2012;43:1511–7.

- [4] Zhao XR, Sun GH. Dimethyl fumarate protects brain from damage produced by intracerebral hemorrhage by mechanism involving Nrf2. Stroke 2015;46:1923–8.
- [5] Qureshi AI. Antihypertensive treatment of acute cerebral hemorrhage (ATACH): rationale and design. Neurocrit Care 2007;6:56–66.
- [6] Abe M, Kaizu K, Matsumoto K. A case report of acute renal failure and fulminant hepatitis associated with edaravone administration in a cerebral infarction patient. Ther Apher Dial 2007;11:235–40.
- [7] Dai YY. Analysis of cerebrovascular disease and lipid related factors in elderly patients. China Pract Med 2014;9:76–7.
- [8] Wei J, Yang L, Zhao W, et al. Alteration of glutamate/GABA balance during acute alcohol intoxication in rats: effect of Xingnaojinginjection. J Ethnopharmacol 2015;166:333–9.
- [9] Huang JY. Effect of Xingnaojing injection combined with minimally invasive percutaneous drainage in treating brain edema and content of serum AQP4 in patients with moderate hypertensive basal ganglia hemorrhage. Zhongguo Zhong Yao Za Zhi 2014;39:2564–8.
- [10] Tu Y, Yang XP, Shang CZ. Protective effect of Xingnaojing Injection on traumatic brain injury. Chin J Appl Physiol 2014;30:230–2. 236.
- [11] Liu FX, Qin SR. Clinical observation of Xingnaojing Injection in treating acute cerebral hemorrhage. Med Aesthet Cosmetol 2015; 3:258.
- [12] Li XH, Li ZY, Yu XK. Clinical observation of Xingnaojing injection on acute cerebral hemorrhage treatment. Chin J Trauma Disabil Med 2016;24:76–7.

- [13] Wang Y, Wei B, Zhang GF. The clinical curative effect of Naloxone and Xingnaojing in treatment of acute cerebral hemorrhage. World Latest Med Inform 2014;14:16–7.
- [14] Wu YL. Clinical efficacy of Xingnaojing Injection on acute cerebral hemorrhage. Chin Foreign Med Res 2014;12:6–7.
- [15] Yan RY, Zeng XJ. Awoke the brain inoculation fluid to acute cerebral hemorrhage patient blood serum C response protein level influence. Chin Manipulat Rehabil Med 2010;21:15–6.
- [16] Cheng XW. Awake brain injection for treatment of acute cerebral hemorrhage. China Foreign Med Treat 2015;28:151–5.
- [17] Dong F, Lu GJ. The observation efficacy of Xingnaojing Injection in treating acute cerebral hemorrhage patients associated with disturbance of consciousness. J Emerg Trad Chin Med 2011;20:191–227.
- [18] Gu LNC, Nuerbiya AHT. Efficacy of Xingnaojing injection combined with naloxone in treating acute cerebral hemorrhage. Contemp Med Forum 2014;12:217–8.
- [19] Heng JF. The efficacy evaluation of Xingnaojing injection combined with naloxone on acute cerebral hemorrhage. J Emerg Trad Chin Med 2010;19:1521–2.
- [20] Jia WG, Zhang Y. Observation efficacy of Xingnaojing injection on acute cerebral hemorrhage. J Emerg Trad Chinese Med 2006;15:154–67.
- [21] Huang M. Clinical observation of Xingnaojing injection in the treatment of acute cerebral hemorrhage. Mod Med J China 2006;8:75–6.
- [22] Li B, Huang Y, Chen DJ, et al. Observation of edaravone and Xingnaojing injection in treatment of patients with acute intra- cerebral hemorrhage. Chin J Diff Complicat Cases 2014;13:671–3.
- [23] Kong QZ, Chen GC, Lin JZ, et al. Effect of Xingnaojing Injections combined with edaravone in the treatment of acute cerebral hemorrhage. China Pharmacist 2014;17:1896–900.
- [24] Ma MH. Xingnaojing injection in the treatment of acute cerebral hemorrhage and its effect on serum high-sensitivity C-reactive protein. J Aerospace Med 2016;27:48–50.
- [25] Zhang XL. The clinical efficacy of Xingnaojing injection combined with edaravone in treatment of acute cerebral hemorrhage. J Qiqihar Med Coll 2016;37:867–8.
- [26] Yang YX. Clinical observation of edaravone combined with Xingnaojing injection in treating acute intracerebral hemorrhage. Public Med Forum Mag 2016;20:2208–9.
- [27] Li YL, Liu CY. The neurological function efficacy of Xingnaojing injection combined with edaravone on acute cerebral hemorrhage patients. Chin J Pract Nervous Dis 2016;19:64–6.
- [28] Pan JX, Wu Y, Chen X, et al. Efficacy of Xingnaojing injection combined with naloxone on neurological function in patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage accompanied with consciousness disorder. Mod J Integrat Trad Chin Western Med 2016;25:2829–31.
- [29] Yuan RQ. The efficacy and safety of Xingnaojing injection on patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage. Cardiovasc Dis J Integr Trad Chin West Med 2016;4:148–9.

- [30] Xin HB. Clinical observation of Xingnaojing injection in treating acute cerebral hemorrhage. Pract J Card Cereb Pneumal Vasc Dis 2013; 21:128–9.
- [31] Liao XS. The efficacy of Xingnaojing injection combined with edaravone injection on 50 cases of patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage. Guide China Med 2013;1:680–1.
- [32] Yang XL, Wang XH. The efficacy of Xingnaojing injection on 64 cases of patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage. J Emerg Trad Chin Med 2011;20:1472.
- [33] Lin RF. Clinical observation of Xingnaojing Injection in treating 30 cases of patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage. Hebei J Trad Chin Med 2011;33:1546–7.
- [34] Zhang L. The efficacy of Xingnaojing Injection on acute intracerebral hemorrhage in 60 cases of patients. Shanxi J Trad Chin Med 2009; 25:19–20.
- [35] Yu CB, Hua SY. The Clinical analysis of Xingnaojing Injection in treatment with acute cerebral hemorrhage. Chin Prim Health Care 2009;23:128–9.
- [36] Yu YF, Tao JS, Lu JB. Clinical effect of Xingnaojing Injection combined with edaravone in the treatment of acute cerebral hemorrhage. China Pharmacist 2015;18:1533–5.
- [37] Zhang WX. Clinical efficacy analysis of Xingnaojing Injection on acute cerebral hemorrhage. Chin J Integr Med Cardio-/Cerebrovasc Dis 2016;14:2442–5.
- [38] Zheng HJ. The efficacy of Xingnaojing Injection in treating 30 cases of patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage. China J Pharma Econ 2012;1:117–8.
- [39] He P. Clinical application of Xingnaojing injection for acute cerebral hemorrhage. Clin J Trad Chin Med 2009;21:38–9.
- [40] Li Q. The effect study of nursing on the complications of cerebral hemorrhage and clinical symptoms. China Mod Med 2012;19:114–5.
- [41] Arima H, Wang JG, Huang Y, et al. Significance of perihematomal edema in acute intracerebral hemorrhage: the INTERACT trial. Neurology 2009;73:1963–8.
- [42] Arima H, Anderson CS, Wang JG, et al. Lower treatment blood ressure is associated with greatest reduction in hematoma growth after acute intracerebral hemorrhage. Hypertension 2010;56:852–8.
- [43] Elliott J, Smith M. The acute management of intracerebral hemorrhage: a clinical review. Anesth Analg 2010;110:1419–27.
- [44] Li RL, Zhang T, Liu WJ, et al. Influence of Xingnaojing Injection active pharmaceutical ingredients on the secretion of interleukin-1 receptor antagonist in BV-2 cell. Chin J Clin Pharmacol 2018;34:2331–4.
- [45] Zhu BX, Zhang BG. The neuroprotective effect and mechanism of Xingnaojing Injection on patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage. Shandong Med J 2015;33:38–9.
- [46] Zhang H, Fan T, Shi YJ, et al. Xingnaojing Injection on expressions of PS-1 and TTBK-1 in hippocampus of postoperative cognitive impairment elderly rats. Chin Arch Trad Chin Med 2016;10:2488–90.