Journal of Ginseng Research 46 (2022) 188-205

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Ginseng Research

journal homepage: https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/journal-of-ginsengresearch

Review article

Effects of *Panax ginseng* on hyperglycemia, hypertension, and hyperlipidemia: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Soo Hyun Park ^a, Sangwon Chung ^a, Min-Yu Chung ^a, Hyo-Kyoung Choi ^a, Jin-Taek Hwang ^{a, b}, Jae Ho Park ^{a, *}

^a Research Group of Healthcare, Korea Food Research Institute, Republic of Korea

^b Department of Food Biotechnology, University of Science and Technology, Republic of Korea

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 9 December 2020 Received in revised form 4 October 2021 Accepted 6 October 2021 Available online 13 October 2021

Keywords: Panax ginseng Blood glucose Body fat Blood pressure Blood lipids

ABSTRACT

Panax ginseng is a medicinal plant is a material with various pharmacological activities and research suggests that it is particularly effective in representative metabolic diseases such as hyperglycemia, hypertension, and hyperlipidemia. Therefore, in this study, systematic review and meta-analysis were performed to investigate the comprehensive effect of *P. ginseng* on metabolic parameters representing these metabolic diseases. A total of 23 papers were collected for inclusion in the study, from which 27 datasets were collected. The investigational products included *P. ginseng* and Korean Red ginseng. Across the included studies, the dose ranged from 200 mg to 8 g and the supplementation period lasted from four to 24 weeks. The study subjects varied from healthy adults to those with diabetes, hypertension, obesity, and/or hyperlipidemia. As a result of the analysis, the levels of glucose and insulin area under the curves, % body fat, systolic and diastolic blood pressures, total cholesterol, triglycerides, and low-density lipoprotein cholesterol were significantly reduced in the *P. ginseng* group as compared with in the placebo group. In conclusion, *P. ginseng* supplementation may act as an adjuvant to prevent the development of metabolic diseases by improving markers related to blood glucose, blood pressure, and blood lipids.

© 2021 The Korean Society of Ginseng. Publishing services by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

1. Introduction

The development of modern society has led to a convenient and affluent lifestyle for many that, combined with excessive nutrition, fast food consumption, reduced physical activity, and excessive stress, has become a major cause of various metabolic diseases. Typical metabolic diseases include diabetes, hypertension, and hyperlipidemia, which lead to serious conditions such as cardio-vascular disease, atherosclerosis, cerebrovascular disease, and cancer, increasing mortality rates. Since metabolic diseases are usually caused by lifestyle, multiple diseases can develop simultaneously as age increases. In particular, metabolic diseases showing abnormal levels. When various metabolic diseases are present, the incidence and mortality of severe diseases are remarkably increased [1-3]. The main cause of metabolic syndrome and

E-mail address: jaehopark@kfri.re.kr (J.H. Park).

metabolic diseases is insulin resistance [1,4,5]. Therefore, managing obesity, the main cause of insulin resistance, is as important as monitoring blood glucose, blood pressure, and blood lipid levels. The progression of various metabolic diseases, including metabolic syndrome, toward the onset of associated conditions can be mitigated by improving lifestyle habits. Therefore, many people are beginning to pay ample attention to correcting their eating habits and lifestyle to prevent diseases; in this vein, consumer demand for functional foods that support health also continues to increase.

Among the various functional foods, products made from ginseng are some of the most commonly consumed globally. Ginseng is a perennial plant of the *Araliaceae* family and a medicinal crop that has long been widely used in Asia. Ginseng includes various species such as *Panax ginseng*, *Panax quinquefolium*, *Panax notoginseng*, and *Panax japonicas*. Of these, *P. ginseng*, mainly grown in Korea and China, accounts for the largest proportion of global ginseng production [6]. The main component of *P. ginseng* is ginsenoside, one of the saponin groups; to date, more than about 100 kinds of ginsenosides have been reported [7,8]. To maximize the pharmacological activities of ginseng by increasing the

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jgr.2021.10.002







^{*} Corresponding author. 245, Nongsaengmyeong-ro, Iseo-myeon, Wanju-gun, Jeollabuk-do, 55365, Republic of Korea.

^{1226-8453/© 2021} The Korean Society of Ginseng. Publishing services by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



Fig. 1. Flow diagram of the included studies.

bioavailability of ginsenoside, red ginseng, black ginseng, and fermented ginseng, which have undergone steaming and fermentation processes, are also widely consumed [9-11]. The outstanding pharmacological activities of P. ginseng have been reported by many papers and various reviews, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses have been conducted with the accumulation of numerous data. Most of these studies were on cancer [12–15], diabetes [16–19], cardiovascular disease [20-24], and neurodegenerative diseases [25-29]. Regarding metabolic diseases, review articles on blood glucose [16–19], blood lipids [30], and obesity [31,32] have been published, while systematic reviews and meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have only covered blood glucose [18] and blood lipids [30] to date. In particular, in the case of the blood glucose study, only Korean Red ginseng was included as the investigational product, while the study population was limited to those patients with type 2 diabetes [18]. In addition, until now, no investigation has comprehensively and systemically reviewed the markers of P. ginseng related to metabolic diseases such as blood glucose, blood pressure, body fat, and blood lipids.

Given the growing aging society with a high probability of being exposed to multiple diseases at the same time and since the risk of metabolic disease is constantly increasing, it is important to reveal the multitarget efficacy of functional ingredients on metabolic diseases. Therefore, in this study, we analyzed the clinical effects of *P. ginseng* on metabolic parameters representing various metabolic diseases that are increasingly crucial factors to comprehend in terms of prevention and treatment. For this, a systematic review and meta-analysis were conducted by selecting RCTs that measured the effects of *P. ginseng* on metabolic parameters in various study populations.

2. Methods

2.1. Study registration

The study protocol (CRD42020208191) was registered in the PROSPERO database (https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/).

2.2. Criteria for considering studies

The studies included in this systematic review and metaanalysis were RCTs of *P. ginseng* on metabolic parameters. Studies

S.H. Park, S. Chung, M.-Y. Chung et al.

Table 1 Characteristics of included studies

| ciiui | deteristies of file | indeed state | | | | |
|-------|---|------------------------|--|--|---------------------|---|
| No | . First author (Year), Location | Study design | Types of interventions | Sample size | Duration (weeks) | Efficacy evaluation (metabolic marker) |
| Не | althy subjects | | | | | |
| 1 | Kim (2012), South Korea | RCT, parallel | RG 300 mg or RG 600 mg or placebo | 69 (23/group) | 8 | BMI, SBP, DBP |
| 2 | [34] Reay (2009), U.K. [35] | RCT, cross- over | Study 1: G115 200 mg or placebo Study 2: Cheong Kwan Jang 200 mg or placebo | Study 1: 23 Study 2: 14 | 8 | HbA1c, FG, FI |
| FG | T or IGT or type | e 2 diabeti | c subjects | | | |
| 3 | Bang (2014), South Korea | RCT, parallel | RG 5 g or placebo | 60 (30/group) | 12 | BMI, SBP, DBP, TG, TC, HDL-C, LDL-C, FG, PG, glucose AUC, HbA1c, FI, PI, insulin |
| 4 | Choi (2018), South Korea | RCT, parallel | Ginseng berry 1 g or placebo | 72 (34 in the ginseng berry group, 38 in the placebo | 12 | FG, PG, FI, PI, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C, TC, HbA1c |
| 5 | Kim (2011), South Korea | RCT, parallel | RG 780 mg or placebo | 46 (23/group) | 12 | FG, FI, HbA1c, TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C, weight, BMI, WC, SBP, DBP |
| 6 | Ma (2008), Hong Kong | RCT, crossover | Ginseng 2.214 g or placebo | 20 (10/group) | 4 | FG, PG, FI, PI, glucose AUC, insulin AUC |
| 7 | Oh (2014), South Korea | RCT, parallel | Fermented RG 2.7 g or placebo | 42 (21/group) | 4 | FG, PG, glucose AUC, FI, PI, TC, HDL-C, LDL-C, TG |
| 8 | Park (2020), South Korea | RCT, parallel | RG 3 g or placebo | 70 (35/group) | 24 | BMI, SBP, DBP, HbA1c, FG, FI |
| 9 | Park (2020), South Korea | RCT, parallel | RG 3 g or placebo | 70 (35/group) | 24 | BMI, SBP, DBP, HbA1c, FG, PG, FI, PI, TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C |
| 10 | Park 2014, South Korea | RCT, parallel | Ginseng 960 mg or placebo | 23 (12 in the ginseng group, 11 in the placebo group) | 8 | FG, PG, glucose AUC, FI, PI, insulin AUC |
| 11 | Reeds (2011), U.S. [44] | RCT, parallel | RG 3 g for 2 wks and then 8 g for 2 wks, ginsenoside Re 250 mg for 2 wks and then 500 mg for 2 wks, or placebo | 15 (5/group) | 4 | Weight, BMI, %BF, FG, glucose AUC, FI, insulin AUC, HbA1c, TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C |
| 12 | Vuksan (2008), Canada [45] | RCT, crossover | RG 6 g or placebo | 39 | 12 | HbA1c, FG, PG, glucose AUC, FI, PI, insulin AUC |
| 13 | Yoon (2012), South Korea [46] | RCT, parallel | Ginseng 1.5 g, 2 g, 3 g, or placebo | 72 (18/group) | 8 | FG, PG, HbA1c |
| Pr | ehypertensive o | or hyperte | nsive subjects | | | |
| 14 | Cha (2016), South Korea | RCT, parallel | RG 5 g or placebo | 70 (35/group) | 12 | BMI, SBP, DBP, TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C |
| 15 | [47] Rhee (2011), South Korea [48] | RCT, parallel | RG 3 g or placebo | 80 (40/group) | 12 | FG, TC, LDL-C, TG, HDL-C, SBP, DBP |
| Ov | erweight or ob | ese subjec | ts | | | |
| 16 | Cho (2013), South Korea | RCT, parallel | RG 6 g or placebo | 68 (34/group) | 12 | BMI, %BF, FG, FI, TC, LDL-C, HDL-C, TG |
| 17 | Kim (2002), South Korea | RCT, parallel | RG, exercise, exercise and RG, or placebo | 28(7/group) | 12 | Weight, %BF, TC, HDL-C, LDL-C, TG |
| 18 | [50] Kim (2002), South Korea [51] | RCT, parallel | Exercise, RG, exercise + RG, or placebo | 28(7/group) | 12 | TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C, weight, %BF |
| Hy | perlipidemic su | ıbjects | | | | |
| 19 | Delui (2013), Iran [52] | RCT, parallel | Ginseng 500 mg or placebo | 40 (20/group) | 8 | TC, TG, LDL-C, HDL-C, FG |
| Me | etabolic syndro | me | | | | |
| 20 | Jung (2016), South Korea [53] | RCT, parallel | RG 3 g or placebo | 72 (36/group) | 4 | BMI, SBP, DBP, FG, TC, TG, HDL-C, FI |

 Table 1 (continued)

| No | o. First author (Year), Location | Study design | Types of interventions | Sample size | Duration (weeks) | Efficacy evaluation (metabolic marker) |
|----|--|------------------|------------------------|---|---------------------|--|
| 21 | Park (2012), South Korea [54] | RCT, parallel | RG 3 g or placebo | 60 (30/group) | 12 | WC, SBP, DBP, TC, HDL-C, TG, FG, FI |
| 22 | Shim (2012), South Korea [55] | RCT, parallel | RG 4.5 g or placebo | 60 (29 in the KRG group, 31 in the placebo group) | 12 | SBP |
| Ро | stmenopausal | subjects | | | | |
| 23 | Kim (2012), South Korea [56] | RCT, parallel | RG 3 g or placebo | 72 (36/group) | 12 | TC, LDL-C, HDL-C, TG |

AUC, area under the curve; FG, fasting glucose; FI, fasting insulin; %BF, percent body fat; PG, postprandial glucose; PI, postprandial insulin; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglyceride; WC, waist circumference

with an intervention period lasting longer than four weeks were selected and there were no restrictions on the characteristics of the study subjects. Studies incorporating *P. ginseng* as a part of a complex intervention were excluded from this investigation.

2.3. Outcome measures

The effects of *P. ginseng* supplementation on metabolic parameters were evaluated by focusing on the following items: glucose [glucose (fasting, 2-h postprandial, area under the curve (AUC)), insulin (fasting, 2-h postprandial, AUC), and hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c)], blood pressure [systolic blood pressure (SBP) and diastolic blood pressure (DBP)], body fat [body weight, body mass index (BMI), % body fat, and waist circumference (WC)], and lipid levels [total cholesterol (TC), triglycerides (TG), high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C), and low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C)].

2.4. Search methods

The present study was conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Metaanalyses (PRISMA) guidelines. PubMed/Medline, the Web of Science, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) were chosen as databases for literature searches and were reviewed for eligible studies published until September 2020. Key search terms included the following: [(Korean ginseng) OR (Panax ginseng Meyer) OR (red ginseng)] AND [(glucose) OR (blood sugar) OR (glucose intolerance) OR (insulin resistance) OR (insulin sensitivity) OR (hyperglycemia) OR (hyperinsulinemia) OR (diabet*) OR (T2DM) OR (lipid) OR (lipide*) OR (cholesterol) OR (triglyce*) OR (hypertension) OR (blood pressure) OR (obes*) OR (overweight) OR (body weight) OR (body mass index) OR (body fat) OR (waist circumference) OR (waist-hip ratio)] AND [(clinical trial) OR (clinical study) OR (human study) OR (intervention)]. To locate additional studies, all reference lists of the selected articles were reviewed (Supplementary Table 1).

2.5. Selection of studies and data extraction

For the selection of eligible studies for inclusion, two reviewers independently screened the search results, the first focusing on titles and/or abstracts and the second focusing on the full text. Any disagreements were resolved by consensus; when a consensus was not reached, a decision was made involving a third reviewer. Two reviewers independently extracted the following data using a standardized data extraction format, with inconsistent results solved through confirmation and discussion of the original paper: first author, publication year, study design, subjects' characteristics, types of interventions, and results of outcomes. Multiple supplement groups within one study were considered as individual data.

2.6. Assessment of the risk of bias

Two reviewers independently assessed the risk of bias among the included studies using the Cochrane risk of bias tool, which assesses the risk of bias in studies according to random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of the subjects and personnel, blinding of the outcomes assessment, incomplete outcomes data, selective reporting, and other biases.

2.7. Statistical analyses

A meta-analysis was performed using Review Manager version 5.4 (Cochrane Collaboration, London, England) and R software version 4.1.0 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). The units of all evaluation markers were properly standardized. We used the mean change and standard deviation (SD) values of the markers to investigate the effect size of the collected data. For studies that presented only standard error (SE), SE was converted into SD by multiplying the square root of the sample size.

Pooled data was analyzed using a fixed-effects model and the data were expressed as weighted mean difference (WMD) with 95 % confidence interval (CI) values for continuous outcomes. Moreover, subgroup analysis was performed based on clinical conditions of the subjects. The I^2 statistic test was used to estimate the percentage of heterogeneity between studies; heterogeneity was confirmed if the I^2 value was 50 % or more and, if heterogeneity was confirmed, data was analyzed by applying a random-effects model. A sensitivity analysis was conducted to estimate the effects of omission for each study. Publication bias was evaluated using funnel plot and Egger's weighted regression test, and when it was judged to be statistically significant, the effect was adjusted using the "trim and fill" method [33]. A *p*-value of less than 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.

3. Results

As a result of searching the literature databases to select RCTs that evaluated the effects of *P. ginseng* on metabolic parameters, a total of 1334 studies were collected after excluding duplicates. Of these, 1276 papers were further excluded following the title and/or

| | G | iinseng | | PI | lacebo | | | Mean Difference | Mean Difference | Risk of Bias |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------|-------|--------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Study or Subgroup | Mean | SD | Total | Mean | SD | Total | Weight | IV, Fixed, 95% CI | IV, Fixed, 95% CI | ABCDEFG |
| 6.1.1 Prediabetes or | Diabetes | | | | | | | | | |
| Bang 2014 | -0.80167 | 6.052839 | 21 | 0.1 | 5.70849432 | 20 | 11.1% | -0.90 [-4.50, 2.70] | | ?? |
| Choi 2018 | -0.62835 | 4.110611 | 29 | -0.12418519 | 3.90345657 | 34 | 36.5% | -0.50 [-2.49, 1.49] | | $\mathbf{+}$? + + + + + |
| Oh 2014 | -5.1 | 6.366318 | 21 | -1.1 | 3.20780299 | 21 | 15.5% | -4.00 [-7.05, -0.95] | | \bullet ? \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 71 | | | 75 | 63.1% | -1.43 [-2.95, 0.08] | - | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ² = | : 3.64, df = 2 | (P = 0.16); | I ² = 459 | 6 | | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect | Z = 1.86 (P | = 0.06) | | | | | | | | |
| 6.1.2 Diabetes | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ma 2008 | -0.01667 | 7.447595 | 20 | 2.15 | 7.73771428 | 20 | 6.5% | -2.17 [-6.87, 2.54] | | ?? |
| Vuksan 2008 | -2.13833 | 3.240396 | 19 | 0.25 | 3.60832948 | 19 | 30.4% | -2.39 [-4.57, -0.21] | | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 39 | | | 39 | 36.9% | -2.35 [-4.33, -0.37] | • | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ^z = | : 0.01, df = 1 | (P = 0.93); | I ² = 0% | | | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect | Z = 2.33 (P | = 0.02) | | | | | | | | |
| Total (95% CI) | | | 110 | | | 114 | 100.0% | -1.77 [-2.97, -0.57] | • | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ² = | 4.17, df = 4 | (P = 0.38); | I ² = 4% | | | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect | Z = 2.89 (P | = 0.004) | | | | | | | -10 -5 0 5 10 | |
| Test for subgroup dif | ferences: Cl | hi² = 0.52, d | lf=1 (P | = 0.47), I ² = 09 | 6 | | | | Favours (Ginseng) Favours (Flacebo) | |
| Risk of bias legend | | | | | | | | | | |
| (A) Random sequen | ce generatio | on (selectio | n bias) | | | | | | | |
| (B) Allocation concea | Iment (sele | ction bias) | | | | | | | | |
| (C) Blinding of partici | nante and n | orconnol (r | orform | anco hiac) | | | | | | |

inding of participants and personnel (perform nce bias)

(D) Blinding of participans and personnel (performanc (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias) (G) Other bias

(B) Sensitivity analysis

| Study amittad | Effecteize | 95% confide | ence interval | - n volue | Difference in means (95% CI) with | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Study offitted | Ellect Size | Lower limit | Upper limit | <i>p</i> -value | study omitted | | | | |
| Overall effect | -1.77 | -2.97 | -0.57 | 0.004 | | | | | |
| Bang 2014 | -1.88 | -3.16 | -0.61 | 0.004 | • • • | | | | |
| Choi 2018 | -2.5 | -4.01 | -0.99 | 0.001 | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • | | | | |
| Ma 2008 | -1.74 | -2.99 | -0.50 | 0.006 | • | | | | |
| Oh 2014 | -1.36 | -2.67 | -0.05 | 0.040 | ⊢ | | | | |
| Vuksan 2008 | -1.50 | -2.94 | -0.06 | 0.040 | • • • • • | | | | |
| | | | | | -2.97 -1.77 -0.57 | | | | |

(C) Funnel plot





| (A) | Forest | plot |
|-----|--------|------|
| | | |

| | Exp | erimental | | 0 | ontrol | | | Mean Difference | Mean Difference | Risk of Bias | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------|-------|--------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| Study or Subgroup | Mean | SD | Total | Mean | S D | Total | Weight | IV, Fixed, 95% CI | IV, Fixed, 95% CI | ABCDEFG | |
| 6.2.1 Prediabetes or | Diabetes | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bang 2014 | -100.355 | 287.8373 | 21 | -26.3216 | 244.4839 | 20 | 13.4% | -74.03 [-237.24, 89.17] | | ?? | |
| Choi 2018 | 8.44049 | 247.2796 | 29 | 35.99709 | 276.6432 | 34 | 21.3% | -27.56 [-156.97, 101.85] | | | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 50 | | | 54 | 34.7% | -45.50 [-146.90, 55.90] | - | | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ² = | 0.19, df = 1 | (P = 0.66); | I ² = 0% | | | | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect: | Z=0.88 (P | = 0.38) | | | | | | | | | |
| C 2 2 Dishetas | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.Z.Z Diabeles | 440 700 | 240 5044 | 20 | 07.04007 | 100.0010 | 20 | 0.70 | 4 40 75 4 074 05 00 451 | | 2288888 | |
| Ma 2008 | -113./33 | 340.5011 | 20 | 27.01007 | 402.0346 | 20 | 0.7% | -140.75 [-371.65, 90.15] | | | |
| Vuksan 2008 | -120.767 | 146.8506 | 19 | 8.75 | 92.4352 | 19 | 58.5% | -129.52 [-207.54, -51.49] | — | | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | 0.04 44 4 | (D. 0.00). | J9 17 000 | | | 29 | 05.5% | -150.07 [-204.59, -50.75] | • | | |
| Heterogeneity. Chir = | 0.01, 01 = 1 7 - 2 48 /D | (P = 0.93); = 0.0006) | 1-= 0% | | | | | | | | |
| restior overall ellect. | Z = 3.46 (P | = 0.0005) | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (95% CI) | | | 89 | | | 93 | 100.0% | -101.11 [-160.85, -41.38] | • | | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ² = | 1.97. df = 3 | (P = 0.58); | $ ^{2} = 0\%$ | | | | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect: | Z = 3.32 (P | = 0.0009) | | | | | | | -500 -250 U 250 500 | | |
| Test for subgroup diff | erences: Cl | ni² = 1.77, d | f=1 (P | = 0.18), l ² = | 43.5% | | | | Favours [Ginseng] Favours [Placebo] | | |
| Risk of bias legend | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (A) Random sequenc | e deneratio | n (selectio | n bias) | | | | | | | | |
| (B) Allocation conceal | ment (sele | ction bias) | | | | | | | | | |
| (C) Blinding of particip | C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) | | | | | | | | | | |
| (D) Blinding of outcom | ne assessn | nent (detec | tion bia | s) | | | | | | | |
| (E) Incomplete outcon | ne data (att | rition bias) | | - / | | | | | | | |

(F) Selective reporting (reporting bias) (G) Other bias

(B) Sensitivity anaysis

| Study omitted | Effecteize | 95% confide | ence interval | n volue | Difference in means (95% CI) with | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Study offitted | Ellect size | Lower limit | Upper limit | <i>p</i> -value | study omitted | | | | |
| Overall effect | -101.11 | -160.85 | -41.38 | <0.001 | | | | | |
| Bang 2014 | -105.30 | -169.49 | -41.12 | 0.001 | • | | | | |
| Choi 2018 | -121.03 | -188.36 | -53.70 | <0.001 | ⊢ | | | | |
| Ma 2008 | -98.27 | -160.11 | -36.44 | 0.002 | F | | | | |
| Vuksan 2008 | -60.90 | -153.74 | 31.94 | 0.200 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | |
| | | | | | -160.85 -101.11 -41.38 | | | | |

(C) Funnel plot



Fig. 3. Forest plot, sensitivity analysis, and publication bias of changes in insulin AUC: (A) forest plot, (B) sensitivity analysis, (C) publication bias.

| Study or Subgroup | E) Moan | cperimental | Total | Moan | Control | Total | Weight | Mean Difference | Mean Difference | Risk of Bias | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|----------------------|----------|-------------|-------|---------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| 7.1.1 Prehypertensio | n or Hy | pertension | Total | Mean | 30 | Total | Weight | IV, HACU, 55/0 CI | 14,11,60, 55/0 CI | ADCDLIG | | | |
| Cha 2016 | -6.5 | 2.14553 | 31 | -2.6 | 2.212442 | 31 | 77.9% | -3.90 [-4.98, -2.82] | | | | | |
| Rhee 2011 | -4 | 12.12436 | 30 | -5 | 11.53256 | 34 | 2.7% | 1.00 [-4.82, 6.82] | | ?? | | | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 61 | | | 65 | 80.6% | -3.74 [-4.80, -2.67] | ♦ | | | | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ² = | 2.63, df | = 1 (P = 0.1 | 0); l² = | 62% | | | | | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect: | Test for overall effect: Z = 6.86 (P < 0.00001) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.1.2 Metabolic synd | rome | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jung 2016 | -8.2 | 13.17308 | 32 | 3.6 | 12.55269 | 30 | 2.2% | -11.80 [-18.20, -5.40] | | \bullet ? \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet | | | |
| Park 2012 | -7 | 15 | 23 | -6.8 | 7.6 | 25 | 2.0% | -0.20 [-7.02, 6.62] | | | | | |
| Shim 2012 | -7 | 13.08472 | 21 | -6.9 | 12.14455 | 24 | 1.7% | -0.10 [-7.51, 7.31] | | ?? | | | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 76 | | | 79 | 5.9% | -4.58 [-8.53, -0.63] | - | | | | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ² = | 7.87, df | = 2 (P = 0.0 | 2); I² = | 75% | | | | | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect: | Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.27$ (P = 0.02) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.1.3 Prediabetes or | Diabete | s | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bang 2014 | -1.76 | 15.01806 | 21 | -1.05 | 12.7539 | 20 | 1.3% | -0.71 [-9.22, 7.80] | | ?? | | | |
| Kim 2011 | -5.75 | 16.59187 | 20 | -3.89 | 15.50387 | 18 | 0.9% | -1.86 [-12.07, 8.35] | | ???++++ | | | |
| Park 2020a | 1 | 15.5718 | 28 | -2 | 18.13969 | 31 | 1.2% | 3.00 [-5.60, 11.60] | | | | | |
| Park 2020b | 1 | 15.5718 | 30 | -2 | 18.13969 | 31 | 1.3% | 3.00 [-5.47, 11.47] | | • ? • • • • • • | | | |
| Vuksan 2008 | -1.5 | 9.589578 | 19 | -1.2 | 13.0767 | 19 | 1.7% | -0.30 [-7.59, 6.99] | | | | | |
| Yoon 2012a | -1.22 | 10.39952 | 18 | 0.55 | 14.51719 | 18 | 1.3% | -1.77 [-10.02, 6.48] | | | | | |
| Yoon 2012b | -1.55 | 13.33973 | 18 | 0.55 | 14.51719 | 18 | 1.1% | -2.10 [-11.21, 7.01] | | | | | |
| Yoon 2012c | 1.75 | 11.95115 | 18 | 0.55 | 14.51719 | 18 | 1.2% | 1.20 [-7.49, 9.89] | | | | | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 172 | | | 173 | 10.0% | 0.12 [-2.90, 3.14] | - | | | | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ² = | 1.56, df | '= 7 (P = 0.9 | 8); I² = | 0% | | | | | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect: | Z = 0.08 | 3 (P = 0.94) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.1.4 Healthy | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kim 2012a | 0 | 13,78157 | 19 | -0.6 | 11.34922 | 19 | 1.4% | 0.60 [-7.43, 8.63] | | ?? | | | |
| Kim 2012b | 0.7 | 9.394615 | 19 | -0.6 | 11.34922 | 19 | 2.1% | 1.30 [-5.32, 7.92] | | ?? | | | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 38 | | | 38 | 3.5% | 1.02 [-4.09, 6.13] | - | | | | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ² = | 0.02. df | = 1 (P = 0.9 | 0); ² = | 0% | | | | | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect: | Z = 0.39 | 9 (P = 0.70) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (95% CI) | | | 347 | | | 355 | 100.0% | -3.23 [-4.19, -2.27] | • | | | | |
| Heterogeneity Chi ² = | 20.78 | f = 14 (P = 1 | 1111 | = 33% | | 000 | 1001070 | onco [mio, cher] | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect: | 7=6.6 | I (P < 0.000) | 11) | - 00 % | | | | | -20 -10 0 10 20 | | | | |
| Test for subgroup diff | erences | : Chi ² = 8.71 |) df=3 | B (P = 0 | 03) IF = 65 | 5% | | | Favours [Ginseng] Favours [Placebo] | | | | |
| Risk of bigs legend | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (A) Random sequence | National Index Regions | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (B) Allocation conceal | (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (D) Blinding of outcon | (c) Blinding of putches assessment (detection bias) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (c) incomplete outcome data (diffution bias) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (F) Selective reporting | (c) incomplete outcome data (automotioas) (f) Selective reporting (reporting files) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (G) Other bias | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

(B) Sensitivity analysis

| Church and | Effect size | 95% confide | ence interval | n velve | Difference in means (95% CI) with |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Study omitted | Effect size | Lower limit | Upper limit | - <i>p</i> -value | study omitted |
| Overall effect | -3.23 | -4.19 | -2.27 | <0.0001 | |
| Bang 2014 | -3.26 | -4.23 | -2.30 | <0.0001 | ₽ |
| Cha 2016 | -0.88 | -2.91 | 1.16 | 0.400 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Jung 2016 | -3.03 | -4.00 | -2.07 | <0.0001 | ↓ |
| Kim 2011 | -3.24 | -4.20 | -2.28 | <0.0001 | • • • |
| Kim 2012a | -3.29 | -4.25 | -2.32 | <0.0001 | ri |
| Kim 2012b | -3.33 | -4.29 | -2.36 | <0.0001 | r r |
| Park 2012 | -3.29 | -4.26 | -2.32 | <0.0001 | ri |
| Park 2020a | -3.31 | -4.27 | -2.35 | <0.0001 | P |
| Park 2020b | -3.31 | -4.27 | -2.35 | <0.0001 | r1 |
| Rhee 2011 | -3.35 | -4.32 | -2.38 | <0.0001 | ₽ ₽ |
| Shim 2012 | -3.28 | -4.25 | -2.32 | <0.0001 | rt |
| Vuksan 2008 | -3.28 | -4.25 | -2.32 | <0.0001 | ▶ |
| Yoon 2012a | -3.25 | -4.21 | -2.29 | <0.0001 | |
| Yoon 2012b | -3.24 | -4.21 | -2.28 | <0.0001 | •I |
| Yoon 2012c | -3.29 | -4.25 | -2.32 | <0.0001 | ₽ <mark></mark> ₽1 |
| | | | | | -4.19 -3.23 -2.27 |

Fig. 4. Forest plot, sensitivity analysis, and publication bias of changes in SBP: (A) forest plot, (B) sensitivity analysis, (C) trim and fill publication bias.

(C) Trim and fill funnel plot



Fig. 4. (continued).

abstract review and 35 papers were additionally following the fulltext review; finally, 23 articles were included in this systematic review and meta-analysis (Fig. 1). A total of 27 *P. ginseng* group datasets were included given the approval for the inclusion of multiple supplement groups from a single study.

3.1. Study description

Eligible studies' characteristics are detailed in Table 1. The selected 23 studies were all RCTs, including 20 that were paralleldesign studies and three that were crossover-design studies. The characteristics of the subjects of each study are as follows: two studies included healthy subjects [34,35]; 11 studies included impaired glucose tolerance, or diabetic subjects [36-46]; two studies included prehypertensive or hypertensive subjects [47,48]; three studies included overweight or obese subjects [49-51]; one study included hyperlipidemic subjects [52]; three studies included subjects with metabolic syndrome [53-55]; and one study included postmenopausal subjects [56]. Of the 23 studies, five used P. ginseng [35,39,43,46,52], 17 used Korean Red Ginseng [34,36,38,40-42,44,45,47-51,53-56], and one used P. ginseng berry [37] as investigational products, respectively. All studies measured metabolic disease-related markers such as blood glucose, blood pressure, body fat, and blood lipid levels. The mean dosage of the investigational products was 2.85 ± 2.00 g (range: 200 mg–8 g), and the mean study period was 10.78 \pm 5.18 weeks (range: 4-24 weeks).

3.2. Changes in blood glucose-related markers

Of the 27 *P. ginseng* group datasets, a total of 20 datasets were measured for blood glucose–related markers, with the resultant details as follows: 19 included fasting glucose (FG, n = 872)

[35-48,52,54], 18 included fasting insulin (FI, n = 750) [35-47,53,54], nine included 2-h postprandial glucose (PG, n = 375) [36,37,39,40,42,43,46], six included 2-h postprandial insulin (PI, n = 267) [36,37,39,40,42,43], five included glucose AUC (n = 224) [36,37,39,40,45], four included insulin AUC (n = 182) [36,37,39,45], and 12 included HbA1c (n = 476) [36-38,41-43,46,54].

In all cases, the heterogeneity was judged to be low (I² values of 13 %, 0 %, 0 %, 23 %, 4 %, 0 %, and 18 % for FG, FI, 2-h PG, 2-h PI, glucose AUC, glucose insulin, and HbA1c, respectively), so it was analyzed using a fixed-effects model. Upon analyzing the effects size of *P. ginseng* supplementation, as compared with the placebo, it was revealed that the glucose AUC was decreased by 1.77 mmol/L*hr (95 % CI: -2.97 to -0.57) and the insulin AUC was decreased by 101.11 pmol/L*hr (95 % CI: -160.85 to -41.38), showing a statistically significant difference (p = 0.0004 and p = 0.0009). However, there was no statistically significant difference in FG, FI, 2-h PG, 2-h PI, or HbA1c between the P. ginseng and placebo supplementation groups (data not shown). In subgroup analysis, the effects of P. ginseng supplementation on glucose AUC and insulin AUC were stronger in diabetic subjects than in prediabetic subjects (Figs. 2A, 3A). Glucose AUC was robust in the sensitivity analysis but insulin AUC decreased by 8.77 when one study was omitted, resulting in a loss of significance (p = 0.200) (Figs. 2B, 3B) [45]. Funnel plot and Egger's test revealed that there were no publication bias for glucose AUC and insulin AUC. Funnel plots of glucose AUC and insulin AUC are shown in Figs. 2C and 3C.

3.3. Changes in blood pressure-related markers

Of the 27 *P. ginseng* group datasets, a total of 15 datasets were measured for blood pressure–related markers, with the resultant details as follows: 15 included SBP (n = 702)

| | E | operimental | | | Control | | | Mean Difference | Mean Difference | Risk of Bias | | |
|---|---|------------------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|-------|---------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------|--|--|
| Study or Subaroup | Mean | SD | Total | Mean | SD | Total | Weight | IV. Random, 95% CI | IV. Random, 95% CI | ABCDEFG | | |
| 7.2.1 Prehypertensio | n or Hy | pertension | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cha 2016 | -5 | 1 205031 | 31 | -0.9 | 1 289457 | 31 | 17.2% | -4 10 [-4 72 -3 48] | • | | | |
| Rhop 2011 | - 4 | 10 | 30 | -4 | 0.620202 | 34 | 7 296 | 0.00 [4:12, 0:40] | | 224444 | | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | -4 | 10 | 61 | -4 | 3.333332 | 65 | 24.4% | 27716530901 | - | ••••• | | |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ² – | 5 35° C | biz - 2.75 d | f - 1 /P | - 0.10) | · IZ - 64% | | 2.111/0 | -2111 [-0100, 0100] | | | | |
| Toot for everall offect: | 7 - 1 4 | 111 – 2.75, u 179 – 0.16) | i = i (r | - 0.10) | 1,1 = 04 % | | | | | | | |
| restion overall ellect. | 2 - 1.4 | + (P = 0.13) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.2.2 Metabolic synd | rome | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jung 2016 | -5.6 | 10.7 | 37 | 0.5 | а апепеа | 30 | 6 7% | -6 10 [.11 23 .0 07] | | | | |
| Park 2012 | -3.6 | 86 | 22 | -4.2 | 5.500055 | 26 | 9.7% | 0.10[11.23, 0.37] | | | | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | -0.0 | 0.5 | 55 | -4.2 | 0.0 | 55 | 15.4% | 2 52 [0 17 4 14] | | | | |
| Heterogeneity Tau ² - | 17.52 | Chiž – 4 13 | df - 1 / | P - 0 0/ | 1): 12 - 76% | 55 | 13.470 | -2.52 [-5.11, 4.14] | | | | |
| Tect for overall effect: | 7 = 0.7 | 1/P = 0.48 | ui – i (i | 0.04 | +),1 = 70% | | | | | | | |
| restion overall effect. | 2 - 0.74 | + (F = 0.40) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.2.3 Prediabetes or | Diabete | s | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bang 2014 | -0.05 | 8.626569 | 21 | 1.13 | 8.733041 | 20 | 6.4% | -1.18 [-6.50, 4.14] | | ?? | | |
| Kim 2011 | -2.8 | 10.8222 | 20 | -3.4 | 10.29369 | 18 | 4.7% | 0.60 [-6.12, 7.32] | _ | ????++++ | | |
| Park 2020a | 2 | 8.955429 | 28 | -1 | 13.06121 | 31 | 5.9% | 3.00 [-2.67, 8.67] | | | | |
| Park 2020b | 2 | 8.955429 | 30 | -1 | 13.06121 | 31 | 6.0% | 3.00 [-2.60, 8.60] | | •••• | | |
| Vuksan 2008 | -0.8 | 6.97424 | 19 | 0.7 | 9.15369 | 19 | 6.6% | -1.50 [-6.67, 3.67] | | | | |
| Yoon 2012a | -1.56 | 7.685935 | 18 | 1.45 | 8.908625 | 18 | 6.2% | -3.01 [-8.45, 2.43] | | | | |
| Yoon 2012b | -3.27 | 7.563888 | 18 | 1.45 | 8.908625 | 18 | 6.3% | -4.72 [-10.12, 0.68] | | •••• | | |
| Yoon 2012c | 2.83 | 10.66911 | 18 | 1.45 | 8.908625 | 18 | 5.0% | 1.38 [-5.04, 7.80] | | | | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 172 | | | 173 | 47.2% | -0.50 [-2.50, 1.50] | * | | | |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ² = | 0.00; C | hi² = 6,77, di | f = 7 (P | = 0.45) | : I ² = 0% | | | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect: | Z = 0.49 | P = 0.62 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.2.4 Healthy | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kim 2012a | -3.3 | 8.999622 | 19 | -1 | 8.20342 | 19 | 6.2% | -2.30 [-7.78, 3.18] | | ?? | | |
| Kim 2012b | -2.2 | 7.680944 | 19 | -1 | 8.20342 | 19 | 6.8% | -1.20 [-6.25, 3.85] | | ?? | | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 38 | | | 38 | 13.0% | -1.71 [-5.42, 2.01] | | | | |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ² = | 0.00; C | hi² = 0.08, di | f = 1 (P | = 0.77) | ; I ² = 0% | | | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect: | Z = 0.90 |) (P = 0.37) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (95% CI) | | | 326 | | | 331 | 100.0% | -1.48 [-3.18, 0.21] | • | | | |
| Heterogeneity: Tau ² = | +eterogeneity: Tau ² = 4.24; Chi ² = 26.87, df = 13 (P = 0.01); l ² = 52% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect: | Test for overall effect: Z = 1.72 (P = 0.09) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Test for subgroup diff | Festfor subgroup differences: Chi₹= 1.36, df= 3 (P = 0.72), i₹= 0% Favours [experimental] Favours [control] | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk of bias legend | Risk of bias legend | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (A) Random sequence | e aenei | ration (selec | tion bia | is) | | | | | | | | |
| (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (C) Blinding of particip | B) Allocation concealment (selection bias) C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) | | | | | | | | | | | |

(C) Blinding of participants and personnel (periormant (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias) (G) Other bias

(B) Sensitivity analysis

| Study omitted Effect size - | | 95% confide | ence interval | | Difference in means (95% CI) with |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|---|
| Study omitted | Effect size | Lower limit | Upper limit | - <i>p</i> -value | study omitted |
| Overall effect | -1.65 | -3.36 | 0.07 | 0.060 | |
| Bang 2014 | -1.66 | -3.47 | 0.16 | 0.070 | F1 |
| Cha 2016 | -1.08 | -2.61 | 0.45 | 0.170 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Jung 2016 | -1.28 | -3.10 | 0.54 | 0.170 | • • • • |
| Kim 2011 | -1.58 | -3.32 | 0.15 | 0.070 | ıı |
| Kim 2012a | -1.76 | -3.52 | 0.00 | 0.050 | • • • • |
| Kim 2012b | -1.56 | -10.12 | 0.68 | 0.090 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Park 2012 | -1.66 | -3.48 | 0.16 | 0.070 | ۰ <u>۰</u> |
| Park 2020a | -1.94 | -3.67 | -0.02 | 0.030 | • |
| Park 2020b | -2.05 | -3.68 | -0.43 | 0.010 | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • |
| Rhee 2011 | -2.06 | -3.69 | -0.44 | 0.010 | └ |
| Vuksan 2008 | -1.79 | -3.57 | -0.01 | 0.050 | • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Yoon 2012a | -1.63 | -3.45 | 0.20 | 0.080 | • • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Yoon 2012b | -1.51 | -3.35 | 0.33 | 0.110 | ↓i |
| Yoon 2012c | -1.39 | -3.22 | 0.45 | 0.140 | · |
| | | | | | -3.18 -1.48 0.21 |

Fig. 5. Forest plot, sensitivity analysis, and publication bias of changes in DBP: (A) forest plot, (B) sensitivity analysis, (C) trim and fill publication bias.

(C) Trim and fill funnel plot



[34,36,38,41,42,45-48,53-55] and 14 included diastolic DBP (n = 621) [34,36,38,41,42,45-48,53,54].

SBP with low heterogeneity was analyzed using a fixed-effects model ($I^2 = 33$ %), and DBP with high heterogeneity was analyzed using a random-effects model ($I^2 = 51$ %). Upon analyzing the effects size of P. ginseng supplementation, as compared with the placebo, it was revealed that the SBP was decreased by 3.23 mmHg (95 % CI: -4.19 to -2.27), showing a statistically significant difference (p < 0.00001). In subgroup analysis, the effects of *P. ginseng* supplementation on SBP was stronger in prehypertension, hypertension, and metabolic syndrome subjects (Fig. 4A). Meanwhile, the DBP decreased by 1.48 mmHg (95 % CI: -3.18 to 0.21) in the P. ginseng supplementation group as compared with in the placebo group, but this result was not statistically significant (p = 0.09) (Fig. 5A). As a result of the sensitivity analysis, SBP decreased by 0.88 when one study omitted, resulting in a loss of significance (p = 0.400) (Fig. 4B) [47]. DBP obtained significance by decreasing by -1.94, -2.05, and -2.06 when the three studies were omitted (p = 0.03, p = 0.01, p = 0.01) (Fig. 5B) [41,42,48]. Egger's test revealed that there were publication bias for SBP and DBP (p = 0.021, p = 0.002). Six studies had to be trimmed and filled by trim and fill analysis to adjust the publication bias of SBP. As a result, the effect size increased and the direction of effect did not changed (MD = -3.76, 95 % CI: -4.67, -2.84). In DBP, seven studies had to be trimmed and filled, resulting in an increase in effect size and no change in effect direction (MD: -3.783, 95 % CI: -5.380, -2.187). Trim and fill funnel plots of SBP and DBP are shown in Figs. 4C–5C.

3.4. Changes in body fat-related markers

Of the 27 *P. ginseng* group datasets, a total of 16 datasets were measured for body fat-related markers, with the resultant details as follows: four included body weight (n = 76) [38,44,50,51], 12 included BMI (n = 491) [34,36,38,41,42,44,46,47,52,56], four included % body fat (n = 106) [44,49–51], and five included WC (n = 194) [38,46,54].

In all cases, the heterogeneity was judged to be low (all l² values were 0%), so it was analyzed using a fixed-effects model. Upon analyzing the effects size of *P. ginseng* supplementation, as compared with the placebo, it was revealed that the % body fat was decreased by 2.11 % (95 % CI: -3.98 to -0.23), showing a statistically significant difference (p = 0.03). Conversely, there were no statistically significant differences in body weight, BMI, or WC between the *P. ginseng* and placebo supplementation groups (data not shown). In subgroup analysis, the effect on % body fat was stronger in studies that enrolled obese subjects based on % body fat rather than BMI (Fig. 4) (Fig. 6A). As a result of the sensitivity analysis, % body fat decreased by 1.25 when one study omitted, resulting in a loss of significance (p = 0.28) (Fig. 6B) [51]. Funnel plot and Egger's test manifested that there was no publication bias. The funnel plot of % body fat are shown in Fig. 6C.

3.5. Changes in blood lipid-related markers

Of the 27 *P. ginseng* group datasets, a total of 18 datasets were assessed for blood lipid—related markers, with the resultant details

| | | Ex | perimental | 1 | | Control | | | Mean Difference | Mean Difference | Risk of Bias |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------|----------------------|-------|--------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| _ | Study or Subgroup | Mean | SD | Total | Mean | SD | Total | Weight | IV, Fixed, 95% CI | IV, Fixed, 95% CI | ABCDEFG |
| | 1.1.1 BMI≥23 kg/m^2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| | Cho 2013 | 0 | 8.806816 | 34 | 0.8 | 6.321392 | 34 | 26.4% | -0.80 [-4.44, 2.84] | | ?? |
| | Reeds 2011 | 0 | 10.24695 | 5 | 0 | 8.062258 | 5 | 2.7% | 0.00 [-11.43, 11.43] | | |
| | Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 39 | | | 39 | 29.1% | -0.73 [-4.20, 2.75] | • | |
| | Heterogeneity: Chi ² = I | 0.02. df | = 1 (P = 0.9 | 0); I ^z = | 0% | | | | | | |
| | Test for overall effect: J | Z= 0.41 | (P = 0.68) | | | | | | | | |
| | | | . , | | | | | | | | |
| | 1.1.2 %Body fat≥30% | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Kim 2002a | -1.69 | 3.66951 | 7 | -0.06 | 1.589748 | 7 | 40.0% | -1.63 [-4.59, 1.33] | | ???++++ |
| | Kim 2002b | -3.15 | 4.059594 | 7 | 0.87 | 2.053582 | 7 | 30.9% | -4.02 [-7.39, -0.65] | | ???++++ |
| | Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 14 | | | 14 | 70.9% | -2.67 [-4.90, -0.45] | ◆ | |
| | Heterogeneity: Chi ² = | 1.09, df | = 1 (P = 0.3 | 0); l ^z = | 8% | | | | | | |
| | Test for overall effect: | Z = 2.35 | (P = 0.02) | -71 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total (95% CI) | | | 53 | | | 53 | 100.0% | -2.11 [-3.98, -0.23] | • | |
| | Heterogeneity: Chi ² = | 1.96, df | = 3 (P = 0.5 | 8); I ² = | 0% | | | | | | |
| | Test for overall effect: | Z = 2.20 | (P = 0.03) | | | | | | | -20 -10 0 10 20 | |
| | Test for subaroup diffe | erences | : Chi ² = 0.88 | 6. df = 1 | (P = 0. | 36), ² = 0% | | | | Favours (Ginseng) Favours (Placebo) | |
| | Risk of higs legend | | | | | ///- | | | | | |

(A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)

(B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)

(C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)

(D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)

(E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)

(F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)

(G) Other bias

(B) Sensitivity analysis

| Study omitted | Effect size | 95% confide | ence interval | n velue | Difference in means (95% CI) with study omitted | | | |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|---|--|--|--|
| | Ellect Size | Lower limit | Upper limit | - p-value | | | | |
| Overall effect | -2.11 | -3.98 | -0.23 | 0.030 | | | | |
| Cho 2013 | -2.57 | -4.76 | -0.39 | 0.020 | • • | | | |
| Kim 2002a | -2.42 | -4.84 | -0.00 | 0.050 | F | | | |
| Kim 2002b | -1.25 | -3.50 | 1.00 | 0.280 | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • | | | |
| Reeds 2011 | -2.16 | -4.06 | -0.26 | 0.030 | ⊢ | | | |
| | | | | | -3.98 -2.11 -0.23 | | | |





Fig. 6. Forest plot, sensitivity analysis, and publication bias of changes in % body fat: (A) forest plot, (B) sensitivity analysis, (C) publication bias.

| | Exp | erimental | | (| Control | | | Mean Difference | Mean Difference | Risk of Bias |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|---------------|----------|----------|----------------|---|--|--------------|
| Study or Subgroup | Mean | \$D | Total | Mean | SD | Total | Weight | IV, Fixed, 95% C | I IV, Fixed, 95% CI | ABCDEF |
| B.1.1 Hyperlipidemia | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delui 2013 Subtotal (95% CI) | -1.05724 | 1.000705 | 18 18 | -0.77571 | 1.120749 | 18 18 | 2.9% 2.9% | -0.28 [-0.98, 0.41] - 0.28 [-0.98, 0.41] | | |
| Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2 | olicable Z = 0.79 (P : | = 0.43) | | | | | | | | |
| 8.1.2 Metabolic syndro | ome | | | | | | | | | |
| Jung 2016 | 0.33411 | 1.078109 | 32 | 0.11137 | 0.928836 | 30 | 5.5% | 0.22 [-0.28, 0.72] | n — | |
| Kim 2012c | -0.75861 | 1.174823 | 36 | -0.01269 | 1.028839 | 36 | 5.3% | -0.75 [-1.26, -0.24] | | |
| Park 2012 Subtotal (95% CI) | 0.10878 | 0.42217 | 23 | 0.03108 | 0.62937 | 25 91 | 15.3% 26.1% | 0.08 [-0.22, 0.38] | | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8 Test for overall effect: 2 | 3.98, df = 2 Z = 0.50 (P : | (P = 0.01); P = 0.61) | °= 78% | , | | | 2011/0 | 0.000[0.120,0111] | | |
| 1 2 Overweight er O | hogitu | 0.01) | | | | | | | | |
| The 2013 | n | 0.915964 | 34 | 0.0260 | 0.974966 | 34 | 9 6 94 | -0.03 [-0.43 0.50 | n <u> </u> | ?? |
| /im 20029 | 0 459690 | 0.010001 | 7 | 0.0209 | 1 260442 | 34 | 1 1 96 | -0.10[-1.22_0.05] | | 222000 |
| Xim 2002a Xim 2002a | -0.22169 | 0.700909 | 7 | 0.001120 | 0.246900 | 7 | 0.204 | -0.18[*1.33, 0.85] | 1 | 222000 |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | -0.32108 | 0.420366 | 48 | 0.080348 | 0.340039 | 49 | 18 0% | -0.42 [-0.03, -0.01] | • | |
| Hoterogeneity Chiz - 1 | 81 df = 2 | (P = 0.41); P | | | | -10 | 10.070 | -0.22 [-0.00, 0.00] | · · · | |
| Telefoyeneity. Cfill = 1 | .or, ur≓ Z 7 = 1.64 /D | (r = 0.41); r = 0.12) | - 0.70 | | | | | | | |
| estion overall effect. 2 | 2 - 1.04 (F | - 0.12) | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1.4 Prediabetes or E |)iabetes | | | | | | | | | |
| 3ang 2014 | -0.09738 | 0.8118 | 21 | 0.12173 | 0.799777 | 20 | 5.7% | -0.22 [-0.71, 0.27] |] | <u></u> |
| Choi 2018 | 0.040145 | 0.829931 | 29 | 0.147889 | 0.794119 | 34 | 8.5% | -0.11 [-0.51, 0.30] | ı] ———————————————————————————————————— | |
| <im 2011<="" td=""><td>0.053095</td><td>1.044457</td><td>20</td><td>0.008547</td><td>1.110864</td><td>18</td><td>2.9%</td><td>0.04 [-0.64, 0.73]</td><td>1]</td><td><u>???</u></td></im> | 0.053095 | 1.044457 | 20 | 0.008547 | 1.110864 | 18 | 2.9% | 0.04 [-0.64, 0.73] | 1] | <u>???</u> |
| Dh 2014 | -0.5 | 0.916515 | 21 | -0.1 | 0.916515 | 21 | 4.5% | -0.40 [-0.95, 0.15] | i] | |
| Park 2020b | 0.2072 | 1.012756 | 30 | 0.259 | 0.958152 | 31 | 5.6% | -0.05 [-0.55, 0.44] | | |
| Reeds 2011 | 0.0259 | 1.563682 | 5 | -0.3108 | 1.085021 | 5 | 0.5% | 0.34 [-1.33, 2.00] |] | |
| roon 2012a | -0.37 | 0.937443 | 18 | 0.05 | 0.842852 | 18 | 4.1% | -0.42 [-1.00, 0.16] | i] | |
| roon 2012b | -0.18 | 0.949052 | 18 | 0.05 | 0.842852 | 18 | 4.0% | -0.23 [-0.82, 0.36] | i] | |
| Yoon 2012c | -0.24 | 0.739121 | 18 | 0.05 | 0.842852 | 18 | 5.2% | -0.29 [-0.81, 0.23] | | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 180 | | | 183 | 41.0% | -0.20 [-0.38, -0.01] | 1 • | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2 | 2.61, df = 8 | (P = 0.96); P | ² =0% | | | | | | | |
| Fest for overall effect: 2 | Z = 2.11 (P | = 0.04) | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1.5 Prehypertension | or Hypert | ension | | | | | | | | |
| Cha 2016 | 0.09583 | 0.878491 | 31 | 0.17871 | 1.001888 | 31 | 6.3% | -0.08 [-0.55, 0.39] | | |
| Rhee 2011 | -0.1295 | 1.014077 | 30 | 0.1813 | 0.9842 | 34 | 5.7% | -0.31 [-0.80, 0.18] | | <u></u> |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 61 | | | 65 | 12.0% | -0.19 [-0.53, 0.15] | 1 - | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ² = (| J.43, df = 1 | (P = 0.51); P | "= 0% | | | | | | | |
| l est for overall effect: 2 | 2 = 1.11 (P : | = U.27) | | | | | | | | |
| Fotal (95% CI) | 5 00 K | | 398 | ~ | | 405 | 100.0% | -0.17 [-0.28, -0.05] | a <u> </u> | _ |
| Heterogeneity: Chi* = 1 | 15.U2, 0T=1 | 0.000 |); I*= 0' | 70 | | | | | -2 -1 0 1 2 | |
| lest for overall effect: 2 | .= 2.78 (P | = 0.005) | | 0.000 | | | | | Favours [experimental] Favours [control] | |
| l est for subgroup diffe | rences: Ch | u*= 1.20, df | = 4 (P : | = 0.88), l² = | 0% | | | | | |
| Risk of bias legend | | | | | | | | | | |
| (A) Random sequence | e generatio | n (selection | bias) | | | | | | | |
| (B) Allocation conceal | ment (selec | tion bias) | | | | | | | | |
| | | record (no | o reference en | non hinn) | | | | | | |

(E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias) (G) Other bias

(B) Sensitivity analysis

| Study omitted Effect size Lower limit Upper limit p-value study omitted Overall effect -0.17 -0.28 -0.04 0.005 0.005 Bang 2014 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.008 | Study omitted Effect size | 95% confide | ence interval | | Difference in means (95% CI) with | |
|---|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Overall effect -0.17 -0.28 -0.05 0.005 Bang 2014 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.008 Cha 2016 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Cho 2013 -0.18 -0.30 -0.06 0.004 Choi 2018 -0.17 -0.30 -0.05 0.006 Delui 2013 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Jung 2016 -0.19 -0.31 -0.07 0.002 Kim 2002a -0.17 -0.28 -0.05 0.006 Kim 2011 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Kim 2012c -0.13 -0.26 -0.01 0.030 Oh 2014 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Park 2012 -0.21 -0.34 -0.08 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0. | | Lower limit | Upper limit | - p-value | study omitted | |
| Bang 2014 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.008 Cha 2016 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Cho 2013 -0.18 -0.30 -0.06 0.004 Choi 2018 -0.17 -0.30 -0.05 0.006 Delui 2013 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Jung 2016 -0.19 -0.31 -0.07 0.002 Kim 2002a -0.17 -0.28 -0.05 0.006 Kim 2012c -0.13 -0.26 -0.01 0.030 Oh 2014 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Park 2012 -0.21 -0.34 -0.08 0.001 Park 2020b -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012c -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.00 | Overall effect | -0.17 | -0.28 | -0.05 | 0.005 | |
| Cha 2016 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Cho 2013 -0.18 -0.30 -0.06 0.004 Choi 2018 -0.17 -0.30 -0.05 0.006 Delui 2013 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Jung 2016 -0.19 -0.31 -0.07 0.002 Kim 2002a -0.17 -0.28 -0.05 0.006 Kim 2012 -0.14 -0.27 -0.02 0.020 Kim 2012c -0.13 -0.26 -0.01 0.030 Oh 2014 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Park 2012 -0.21 -0.34 -0.08 0.001 Park 2020b -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 | Bang 2014 | -0.16 | -0.28 | -0.04 | 0.008 | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • |
| Cho 2013 -0.18 -0.30 -0.06 0.004 Choi 2018 -0.17 -0.30 -0.05 0.006 Delui 2013 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Jung 2016 -0.19 -0.31 -0.07 0.002 Kim 2002a -0.17 -0.28 -0.05 0.006 Kim 2012b -0.14 -0.27 -0.02 0.020 Kim 2012c -0.13 -0.26 -0.01 0.030 Oh 2014 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Park 2012 -0.21 -0.34 -0.08 0.001 Park 2020b -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Rhee 2011 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 | Cha 2016 | -0.17 | -0.29 | -0.05 | 0.005 | · |
| Choi 2018 -0.17 -0.30 -0.05 0.006 Delui 2013 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Jung 2016 -0.19 -0.31 -0.07 0.002 Kim 2002a -0.17 -0.28 -0.05 0.006 Kim 2012b -0.14 -0.27 -0.02 0.020 Kim 2011 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Kim 2012c -0.13 -0.26 -0.01 0.030 Oh 2014 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Park 2012 -0.21 -0.34 -0.08 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 | Cho 2013 | -0.18 | -0.30 | -0.06 | 0.004 | ı — • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Delui 2013 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Jung 2016 -0.19 -0.31 -0.07 0.002 Kim 2002a -0.17 -0.28 -0.05 0.006 Kim 2012b -0.14 -0.27 -0.02 0.020 Kim 2011 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Kim 2012c -0.13 -0.26 -0.01 0.030 Oh 2014 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Park 2012 -0.21 -0.34 -0.08 0.001 Park 2020b -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.009 | Choi 2018 | -0.17 | -0.30 | -0.05 | 0.006 | F |
| Jung 2016 -0.19 -0.31 -0.07 0.002 Kim 2002a -0.17 -0.28 -0.05 0.006 Kim 2002b -0.14 -0.27 -0.02 0.020 Kim 2011 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Kim 2012c -0.13 -0.26 -0.01 0.030 Oh 2014 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Park 2012 -0.21 -0.34 -0.08 0.001 Park 2020b -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Yoon 2012c -9.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.009 | Delui 2013 | -0.16 | -0.28 | -0.04 | 0.007 | • |
| Kim 2002a -0.17 -0.28 -0.05 0.006 Kim 2002b -0.14 -0.27 -0.02 0.020 Kim 2011 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Kim 2012c -0.13 -0.26 -0.01 0.030 Oh 2014 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Park 2012 -0.21 -0.34 -0.08 0.001 Park 2020b -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Yoon 2012c -9.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 | Jung 2016 | -0.19 | -0.31 | -0.07 | 0.002 | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • |
| Kim 2002b -0.14 -0.27 -0.02 0.020 Kim 2011 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Kim 2012c -0.13 -0.26 -0.01 0.030 Oh 2014 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Park 2012 -0.21 -0.34 -0.08 0.001 Park 2020b -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Yoon 2012c -9.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 | Kim 2002a | -0.17 | -0.28 | -0.05 | 0.006 | • |
| Kim 2011 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Kim 2012c -0.13 -0.26 -0.01 0.030 Oh 2014 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Park 2012 -0.21 -0.34 -0.08 0.001 Park 2020b -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 | Kim 2002b | -0.14 | -0.27 | -0.02 | 0.020 | ۰ |
| Kim 2012c -0.13 -0.26 -0.01 0.030 Oh 2014 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Park 2012 -0.21 -0.34 -0.08 0.001 Park 2020b -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Yoon 2012c -9.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.009 | Kim 2011 | -0.17 | -0.29 | -0.05 | 0.005 | • |
| Oh 2014 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Park 2012 -0.21 -0.34 -0.08 0.001 Park 2020b -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Yoon 2012c -9.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 | Kim 2012c | -0.13 | -0.26 | -0.01 | 0.030 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Park 2012 -0.21 -0.34 -0.08 0.001 Park 2020b -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Rhee 2011 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 | Oh 2014 | -0.16 | -0.28 | -0.04 | 0.010 | •••• |
| Park 2020b -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Reeds 2011 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Rhee 2011 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 | Park 2012 | -0.21 | -0.34 | -0.08 | 0.001 | ↓ |
| Reeds 2011 -0.17 -0.29 -0.05 0.005 Rhee 2011 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 | Park 2020b | -0.17 | -0.29 | -0.05 | 0.005 | • |
| Rhee 2011 -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Yoon 2012c -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 | Reeds 2011 | -0.17 | -0.29 | -0.05 | 0.005 | • |
| Yoon 2012a -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.010 Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 Yoon 2012c -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.009 | Rhee 2011 | -0.16 | -0.28 | -0.04 | 0.010 | • |
| Yoon 2012b -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.007 | Yoon 2012a | -0.16 | -0.28 | -0.04 | 0.010 | • |
| Yoon 2012c -0.16 -0.28 -0.04 0.009 | Yoon 2012b | -0.16 | -0.28 | -0.04 | 0.007 | • |
| | Yoon 2012c | -0.16 | -0.28 | -0.04 | 0.009 | ¹ |

Fig. 7. Forest plot, sensitivity analysis, and publication bias of changes in TC: (A) forest plot, (B) sensitivity analysis, (C) publication bias.

(C) Funnel plot



Fig. 7. (continued).

as follows: 18 included TC (n = 803) [36–38,40,42,44,46–54,56], 17 included TG (n = 741) [36–38,40,42,44,46–52,54,56], 16 included HDL-C (n = 753) [36–38,40,42,44,46,47,49,50,52–54,56], and 15 included LDL-C (n = 657) [36–38,44,46–52,54,56].

In all cases, the heterogeneity was judged to be low (all I² values were 0%), so the data were analyzed using a fixed-effects model. Upon analyzing the effect size of P. ginseng supplementation, as compared with the placebo, it was revealed that the TC was decreased by 0.17 mmol/L (95 % CI: -0.28 to -0.05), the TG was decreased by 0.11 mmol/L (95 % CI: -0.21 to -0.01), and the LDL-C was decreased by 0.24 mmol/L (95 % CI: -0.36 to -0.13), showing a statistically significant difference (p = 0.005, p = 0.030, and p < 0.0001). There was no statistically significant difference in HDL-C between the P. ginseng and placebo supplementation groups (data not shown). In subgroup analysis, the effect of P. ginseng supplementation on TC was stronger in prediabetic or diabetic subjects. The effect on TG was more significant overweight or obese subjects, and LDL-C was more significant in metabolic syndrome or postmenopausal women; overweight or obese subjects; prediabetic or diabetic subjects (Figs. 7A, 8A and 9A). Total cholesterol and LDL cholesterol were robust in the sensitivity analysis but TG decreased by 0.10, 0.09, 0.08, and 0.11 when the four studies were omitted, resulting in a loss of significance (p = 0.06, p = 0.08, p = 0.17, p = 0.06) (Figs. 7B, 8B and 9B) [50-52,56]. Funnel plot and Egger's test manifested that there were no publication bias for TC, TG, and LDL-C. Funnel plots of TC, TG, and LDL-C are shown in Figs. 7C, 8C and 9C.

4. Discussion

The present systematic review and meta-analysis were conducted to verify the effects of *P. ginseng* supplementation on metabolic disease—related markers. For this, 23 RCT papers were collected and the changes in markers related to blood glucose, blood pressure, body fat, and blood lipids, which are major markers of metabolic diseases, were compared with those following placebo treatment using data from 27 ginseng supplement groups. As a result of this analysis, it was found that glucose AUC, insulin AUC, SBP, DBP, % body fat, TC, TG, and LDL-C were significantly decreased by *P. ginseng* supplementation.

As previously reported, there were no significant changes in FG, PG, or HbA1c among the blood glucose—related markers [18]. FG, PG, and HbA1c have traditionally been used as key markers to determine whether blood glucose is well-regulated, but there are limitations in providing accurate information about blood glucose responses and changes after meals by presenting values only at a specific point in time [57]. On the other hand, glucose and insulin AUC have the advantage of being able to determine whether blood glucose and insulin are normally regulated by observing the pattern of changes in blood glucose and insulin for a certain period of time, not a specific time point after oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT); these parameters have therefore been considered key measurements in efforts to determine glucose intolerance in recent years [58]. It has already been found in preclinical studies that ginseng administration improves insulin sensitivity by enhancing insulin

| Study or Subgroup | Exp | perimental | Total | (Moan | Control | Total | Weight | Mean Difference | Mean Difference | Risk of Bias |
|---|----------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------|-------|--------|----------------------|--|--------------|
| 8.2.1 Hyperlipidemi | a | 30 | Total | moun | 30 | Total | Weight | 14,11X60,35% C | | ADCDLIC |
| Delui 2013 | -0.60738 | 0.933449 | 18 | -0.20397 | 0.772058 | 18 | 3.1% | -0.40 [-0.96, 0.16] | 1 | ??•••• |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 18 | | | 18 | 3.1% | -0.40 [-0.96, 0.16] | - | |
| Heterogeneity: Not a | applicable | | | | | | | | | |
| Fest for overall effec | t: Z = 1.41 (P | = 0.16) | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2.2 Metabolic syn | drome or Po | stmenopau | sal wo | men | | | | | | |
| <im 2012c<="" td=""><td>-0 10701</td><td>0.501431</td><td>36</td><td>0.012204</td><td>0.550034</td><td>36</td><td>16.6%</td><td>-0.12 [-0.36, 0.12]</td><td>ı —</td><td></td></im> | -0 10701 | 0.501431 | 36 | 0.012204 | 0.550034 | 36 | 16.6% | -0.12 [-0.36, 0.12] | ı — | |
| Park 2012 | 0.05763 | 0.8475 | 23 | -0.32092 | 1 54019 | 25 | 2.0% | 0.38 [-0.32 1.07] | i — | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | 0.001.00 | 0.0110 | 59 | 0.02002 | 1.01010 | 61 | 18.7% | -0.07 [-0.29, 0.16] | i 🔶 | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ^z | = 1.75. df = 1 | (P = 0.19): I | ² = 43% | 6 | | | | | | |
| Fest for overall effec | t: Z = 0.56 (P | = 0.58) | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2.3 Overweight of | Obesity | | | | | | | | | |
| Cho 2013 | 0.1356 | 0.679366 | 34 | 0.0452 | 0.969103 | 34 | 6.2% | 0.09 [-0.31, 0.49] | 1 | ?? |
| <im 2002a<="" td=""><td>-0.24216</td><td>0.488093</td><td>7</td><td>0.1243</td><td>0.284694</td><td>7</td><td>5.6%</td><td>-0.37 [-0.79, 0.05]</td><td>i —</td><td>222444</td></im> | -0.24216 | 0.488093 | 7 | 0.1243 | 0.284694 | 7 | 5.6% | -0.37 [-0.79, 0.05] | i — | 222444 |
| Kim 2002b | -0.15492 | 0.204438 | 7 | 0.019436 | 0.146832 | 7 | 28.3% | -0.17 [-0.36, 0.01] | i — | ??? |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 48 | | | 48 | 40.1% | -0.16 [-0.32, -0.00] | • • | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ² | = 2.48. df = 2 | (P = 0.29); I | ² = 19% | 6 | | | | | • | |
| Fest for overall effec | t: Z = 2.01 (P | = 0.04) | | | | | | | | |
| .2.4 Prediabetes o | r Diabetes | | | | | | | | | |
| 3ang 2014 | 0.102265 | 1.006427 | 21 | -0.10927 | 1.028363 | 20 | 2.5% | 0.21 [-0.41, 0.83] | 1 | ?? |
| Choi 2018 | 0.008362 | 1.522956 | 29 | -0.00904 | 0.905506 | 34 | 2.5% | 0.02 [-0.61, 0.65] | i — — | |
| ≺im 2011 | 0.071303 | 0.483302 | 20 | 0.132888 | 0.604565 | 18 | 8.0% | -0.06 [-0.41, 0.29] | i — | ???+++ |
| Oh 2014 | 0.3 | 0.916515 | 21 | 0.1 | 0.916515 | 21 | 3.2% | 0.20 [-0.35, 0.75] | i — | |
| Park 2020b | -0.0791 | 1.319034 | 30 | 0.4633 | 1.762012 | 31 | 1.6% | -0.54 [-1.32, 0.24] | i ———————————————————————————————————— | • ? • • • • |
| Reeds 2011 | -0.0791 | 0.83536 | 5 | -0.113 | 0.647659 | 5 | 1.1% | 0.03 [-0.89, 0.96] | i — — | |
| Yoon 2012a | -0.15 | 1.025037 | 18 | 0.05 | 0.478435 | 18 | 3.6% | -0.20 [-0.72, 0.32] | i —+ | |
| Yoon 2012b | -0.11 | 0.653376 | 18 | 0.05 | 0.478435 | 18 | 7.0% | -0.16 [-0.53, 0.21] | 1 - + | |
| Yoon 2012c | -0.18 | 1.427901 | 18 | 0.05 | 0.478435 | 18 | 2.0% | -0.23 [-0.93, 0.47] | | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 180 | | | 183 | 31.6% | -0.08 [-0.25, 0.10] | 1 🕈 | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ² | = 3.89, df = 8 | (P = 0.87); I | ²=0% | | | | | | | |
| Fest for overall effec | t: Z = 0.85 (P | = 0.39) | | | | | | | | |
| .2.5 Prehypertens | ion or Hypert | tension | | | | | | | | |
| Cha 2016 | -0.00339 | 1.03962 | 31 | -0.0904 | 1.0272 | 31 | 3.7% | 0.09 [-0.43, 0.60] |] | |
| Rhee 2011 | 0.3729 | 0.935856 | 30 | 0.2938 | 1.498561 | 34 | 2.7% | 0.08 [-0.53, 0.68] | | ?? 🕈 🖶 🖶 🖣 |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 61 | | | 65 | 6.4% | 0.08 [-0.31, 0.48] | 1 🕈 | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi² | = 0.00, df = 1 | (P = 0.98); I | ²=0% | | | | | | | |
| Fest for overall effec | t: Z = 0.42 (P | = 0.68) | | | | | | | | |
| Fotal (95% CI) | | | 366 | | | 375 | 100.0% | -0.11 [-0.21, -0.01] | 1 , • , . | |
| leterogeneity: Chi ^z | = 10.79, df = | 16 (P = 0.82 |); I * = 0 | % | | | | | -2 -1 0 1 2 | |
| Fest for overall effec | t: Z = 2.13 (P | = 0.03) | | | | | | | Favours (experimental) Favours (control) | |
| Fest for subgroup d | ifferences: Cl | hi² = 2.67, df | = 4 (P | = 0.61), I² = | 0% | | | | formed a second se | |
| Risk of bias legend | | | | | | | | | | |
| A) Random seque | nce generatio | on (selection | bias) | | | | | | | |
| B) Allocation conce | alment (sele | ction bias) | | | | | | | | |
| C) Blinding of partic | cipants and p | ersonnel (p | erforma | ance bias) | | | | | | |
| D) Blinding of outco | me assessr | ment (detecti | ion bias | 3) | | | | | | |

(D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detect (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias) (G) Other bias

(B) Sensitivity analysis

| Study omitted Effect size | one (QE% CI) with |
|---|-------------------|
| Study omitted Effect size p-value study | ans (35% CI) with |
| | omitted |
| Overall effect -0.11 -0.21 -0.01 0.03 | |
| Bang 2014 -0.12 -0.22 -0.02 0.02 | |
| Cha 2016 -0.12 -0.22 -0.01 0.03 | |
| Cho 2013 -0.12 -0.22 -0.02 0.02 | |
| Choi 2018 -0.11 -0.21 -0.01 0.03 | |
| Delui 2013 -0.10 -0.20 0.00 0.06 | • |
| Kim 2002a -0.09 -0.19 0.01 0.08 | • |
| Kim 2002b -0.08 -0.20 0.04 0.17 | • |
| Kim 2011 -0.11 -0.22 -0.01 0.03 | |
| Kim 2012c -0.11 -0.21 0.00 0.06 | |
| Oh 2014 -0.12 -0.22 -0.02 0.02 | |
| Park 2012 -0.12 -0.22 -0.02 0.02 | |
| Park 2020b -0.10 -0.20 -0.00 0.05 | • |
| Reeds 2011 -0.11 -0.21 -0.01 0.03 | |
| Rhee 2011 -0.11 -0.21 -0.01 0.03 | |
| Yoon 2012a -0.10 -0.21 -0.00 0.04 | • |
| Yoon 2012b -0.10 -0.21 -0.00 0.05 | • |
| Yoon 2012c -0.11 -0.21 -0.01 0.04 | |

Fig. 8. Forest plot, sensitivity analysis, and publication bias of changes in TG: (A) forest plot, (B) sensitivity analysis, (C) publication bias.





signaling [59,60]. Therefore, as our results have shown, significant decreases in glucose and insulin AUC can be an important basis for improving glucose intolerance by ginseng supplementation. In particular, as a result of subgroup analysis, it was found that the effect was stronger in diabetic patients than in prediabetic subjects. However, it is a concern that the range of study types and the size of the overall study population are still relatively limited, and since the importance of AUC measurement is increasingly emerging, clinical studies on this subject should be continued in the future.

The main cause of various metabolic diseases, including metabolic syndrome, is insulin resistance, which is derived from obesity due to excess body fat [1,2,4]. Obesity is judged by weight, BMI, WC, and % body fat. Because weight and BMI are also affected by muscle mass, the use of WC or % body fat is considered more appropriate [61–63]. In this study, it was confirmed that the % body fat was decreased from the pooled data of three clinical trials that enrolled subjects who were overweight or obesity (BMI \geq 23 kg/m² or % body fat \geq 30 %). Although significant effects could not be confirmed among other markers, a significant decrease in % body fat was confirmed in a small sample size. Moreover, in subgroup analysis, the effect of reducing % body fat was stronger when obese subjects were selected based on % body fat rather than BMI. It is already known through several studies that P. ginseng and ginsenoside inhibit adipogenesis and lipid accumulation in adipocytes [64,65]. Therefore, if well-designed clinical studies that established appropriate inclusion criteria to determine obesity are sufficiently accumulated, significant results could be expected for other markers as well.

In addition, *P. ginsesng* has been proven to reduce blood lipids in various clinical studies and, in this study, as in a previously reported meta-analysis, TC, TG, and LDL-C were decreased [30]. Subgroup analysis of subjects with hyperlipidemia showed no significant reductions in TC, TG, and LDL-C. However since only one study selected hyperlipidemic subjects, it is insufficient to evaluate the effect. On the other hand, as a result of analyzing subjects with metabolic diseases such as metabolic syndrome, menopause, obesity, and diabetes into subgroups, blood lipids were significantly decreased. Many studies have shown that obesity, diabetes, and menopause are highly correlated with hyperlipidemia [66–68].

Therefore, although hypolipidemic effect of *P. ginseng* was confirmed through this study, a clearer effect can be expected if more studies are conducted on subjects with dyslipidemia in the future.

In this study, blood pressure was also significantly improved in the *P. ginseng* supplement group. In preclinical studies, ginseng administration decreased the blood pressure through the activation of endothelial nitric oxide synthase and the release of nitric oxide [69,70]. Similarly, SBP and DBP were decreased in this study, which analyzed various subject groups ranging from healthy individuals to hypertensive patients. Subgroup analysis showed a greater effect in subjects with prehypertension or hypertension and metabolic syndrome. Therefore, it was confirmed once again that the selection of appropriate study subjects is important.

A comprehensive analysis showed that the major markers of metabolic syndrome and metabolic diseases were significantly improved when *P. ginseng* products were consumed for a long period lasting four weeks or longer. Based on this result, it can be expected that the intake of *P. ginseng* can play a sufficient role as an adjuvant for the prevention and improvement of metabolic diseases. To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review and meta-analysis to simultaneously evaluate the effects of *P. ginseng* on several markers related to metabolic diseases. However, the study subjects surveyed in this study were varied, ranging from healthy individuals to menopausal women and patients with obesity, diabetes, hypertension, and hyperlipidemia, so, while it is good to generalize these results, there was a limit to obtaining more specific results. Therefore, more clinical trials on metabolic syndrome should be accumulated in the future for further investigation.

5. Conclusions

A systematic review and meta-analysis were conducted by collecting studies that evaluated changes in metabolic disease—related markers driven by the long-term use of *P. ginseng* in various study populations. Significant changes were found in markers related to blood glucose, insulin resistance, blood pressure, and blood lipids. Based on these findings, supplementation with *P. ginseng* could be adopted as adjuvant therapy for diabetes, hypertension, and

| | Exp | erimental | | 0 | Control | | | Mean Difference | Mean Difference | Risk of Bias |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------|----------|----------------|--|--|---|
| Study or Subgroup | Mean | SD | Total | Mean | SD | Total | Weight | IV, Fixed, 95% C | I IV, Fixed, 95% CI | ABCDEFG |
| 8.3.1 Hyperlipidemia Delui 2013 Subtotal (95% CI) | -0.71873 | 0.927789 | 18 18 | -0.60347 | 0.906699 | 18 18 | 3.6% | -0.12 [-0.71, 0.48 | | ??**** |
| Heterogeneity: Not a Test for overall effect | pplicable : Z = 0.38 (P | = 0.71) | | | | | 01070 | 0.12 [0.1 1, 0.10 | | |
| 8.3.2 Metabolic synd | frome or Po | stmenopau | isal wo | men | | | | | | |
| Kim 2012c Subtotal (95% CI) | -0.46879 | 0.688934 | 36 36 | -0.04792 | 0.756649 | 36 36 | 11.6% 11.6% | -0.42 [-0.76, -0.09 -0.42 [-0.76, -0.09 | | ••••• |
| Heterogeneity: Not a Test for overall effect | pplicable : Z = 2.47 (P | = 0.01) | | | | | | | | |
| 8.3.3 Overweight or | Obesity | | | | | | | | | |
| Cho 2013 | -0.0259 | 0.760433 | 34 | 0.0777 | 0.751944 | 34 | 10.0% | -0.10 [-0.46, 0.26 | i | ?? |
| Kim 2002a | 0.736337 | 0.533769 | 7 | 0.529137 | 0.991871 | 7 | 1.9% | 0.21 [-0.63, 1.04 | i <u> </u> | ???++++ |
| Kim 2002b | -0.48407 | 0.465383 | 7 | 0.128205 | 0.319901 | 7 | 7.4% | -0.61 [-1.03, -0.19 | i <u> </u> | ???++++ |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 48 | | | 48 | 19.3% | -0.27 [-0.53, -0.01 | i 🔶 | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ² = | = 4.65, df = 2 | (P = 0.10); | I ² = 579 | 6 | | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect | : Z= 2.03 (P | = 0.04) | | | | | | | | |
| 8.3.4 Prediabetes of | Diabetes | | | | | | | | | |
| Bang 2014 | -0.14349 | 0.910073 | 21 | 0.184408 | 0.712254 | 20 | 5.2% | -0.33 [-0.83, 0.17 | 1 | |
| Choi 2018 | -0.11888 | 0.850208 | 29 | 0.072261 | 0.805475 | 34 | 7.7% | -0.19 [-0.60, 0.22 | | |
| Kim 2011 | -0.09324 | 0.046545 | 20 | 0.056203 | 0.971866 | 18 | 4.1% | -0.15 [-0.71, 0.42 | | |
| Un 2014 Darly 2020h | -0.4 | 0.916515 | 21 | -0.3 | 0.916515 | 21 | 4.2% | -0.10 [-0.65, 0.45 | | |
| Park 20200 Poodo 2011 | 0.1295 | 1 100200 | 30 | 0.1030 | 1 000760 | 51 | 8.0% | 0.03 [-0.38, 0.43 | ij | |
| Yoon 2012a | -0.2072 | 0.640959 | 10 | 2102.0- | 1.0097000 | 10 | 7 9 96 | -0.2010.71.011 | 1 | |
| Yoon 2012b | -0.24 | 0.040000 | 18 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 18 | 7.0% | -0.30[-0.71, 0.11 | 1 n — | |
| Yoon 2012c | -0.17 | 0.033703 | 18 | 00.0 | 0.61 | 18 | 7.0% | -0.23 [-0.00, 0.20 | · · · · | |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | -0.25 | 0.000100 | 180 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 183 | 52.6% | -0.19 [-0.35, -0.04 | i 🔶 | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ² = | = 2.91. df = 8 | (P = 0.94): | $ ^2 = 0.96$ | | | | | | | |
| Test for overall effect | : Z= 2.40 (P | = 0.02) | | | | | | | | |
| 8.3.5 Prehypertensi | on or Hypert | ension | | | | | | | | |
| Cha 2016 | 0.05957 | 0.802436 | 31 | 0.32893 | 0.871769 | 31 | 7.5% | -0.27 [-0.69, 0.15 | a + | \bullet ? $\bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet \bullet$ |
| Rhee 2011 | -0.2331 | 1.027222 | 30 | 0.0518 | 0.9583 | 34 | 5.4% | -0.28 [-0.77, 0.20 | | ?? |
| Subtotal (95% CI) | | | 61 | | | 65 | 12.9% | -0.28 [-0.59, 0.04 | 1 🔶 | |
| Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect | = 0.00, df = 1 : 7 = 1 70 (P | (P = 0.96); = 0.09) | I² = 0% | | | | | | | |
| Tatal (05% CI) | | 5.00, | 242 | | | 250 | 400.05 | 0.041.0.26 0.40 | | |
| Total (95% CI) | 0.04 46 4 | c (D - 0.000 | 343 | , | | 350 | 100.0% | -0.24 [-0.36, -0.13 | ı ▼ | _ |
| Helerogeneity: Chi*= | = 9.31, 01 = 1 = 7 = 4.4 g/D | 5 (P = 0.86) | , i*= 09 | 6 | | | | | -2 -1 0 1 2 | |
| Test for subgroup di | ∠= 4.10 (P fforoncoc: O | ≂ 0.0001) 5i≆ – 1.74 ≪ | f = 1 (D | -0.70) 12- | 0% | | | | Favours [experimental] Favours [control] | |
| Pick of biog locand | ilerences. Cr | n = 1.74, u | i – 4 (P | - 0.78), F= | 0.20 | | | | | |
| (A) Pondom occurre | co gonorofio | n (coloction | hine) | | | | | | | |
| (A) Random sequen | ce generalio | ction biac) | ruias) | | | | | | | |
| (C) Blinding of partic | inante and n | erconnel (n | orform | ance hige) | | | | | | |
| (D) Blinding of partic | me assess | nent (detect | ion his | s) | | | | | | |
| (E) Incomplete outco | me data (att | rition bias) | aon bio | ., | | | | | | |
| (a) meen proto outoo | aana (am | | | | | | | | | |

(F) Selective reporting (reporting bias) (G) Other bias

(B) Sensitivity analysis

| Otrada and the d | Effect air i | 95% confide | ence interval | | Difference in means (95% CI) with |
|------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|---|
| Study omitted | Effect size | Lower limit | Upper limit | - p-value | study omitted |
| Overall effect | -0.24 | -0.35 | -0.12 | <0.0001 | |
| Bang 2014 | -0.23 | -0.35 | -0.11 | 0.0002 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Cha 2016 | -0.23 | -0.36 | -0.11 | 0.0002 | F4 |
| Cho 2013 | -0.25 | -0.38 | -0.13 | <0.0001 | · |
| Choi 2018 | -0.24 | -0.36 | -0.12 | 0.0001 | F |
| Delui 2013 | -0.24 | -0.36 | -0.12 | <0.0001 | • |
| Kim 2002a | -0.24 | -0.36 | -0.13 | <0.0001 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Kim 2002b | -0.20 | -0.33 | -0.08 | 0.001 | I |
| Kim 2011 | -0.24 | -0.36 | -0.12 | 0.0001 | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • |
| Kim 2012c | -0.21 | -0.34 | -0.08 | 0.001 | • • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Oh 2014 | -0.24 | -0.35 | -0.12 | <0.0001 | r |
| Park 2020b | -0.24 | -0.36 | -0.12 | <0.0001 | · |
| Reeds 2011 | -0.26 | -0.38 | -0.14 | <0.0001 | ⊢ |
| Rhee 2011 | -0.24 | -0.36 | -0.12 | <0.0001 | F1 |
| Yoon 2012a | -0.23 | -0.36 | -0.11 | 0.0002 | F 1 |
| Yoon 2012b | -0.23 | -0.35 | -0.11 | 0.0003 | F4 |
| Yoon 2012c | -0.24 | -0.36 | -0.11 | 0.0002 | - 1 |
| | - | | | | -0.36 -0.24 -0.13 |



(C) Funnel plot



hyperlipidemia. Through this study, *P. ginseng* supplementation has established an academic basis that it can be used as adjuvant

Declaration of competing interest

All contributing authors declare no conflicts of interest exist.

therapy for diabetes, hypertension, and hyperlipidemia.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by the Main Research Program from the Korea Food Research Institute (KFRI), funded by the Ministry of Science, ICT and Future Planning (E0210601-01).

Author contribution

Conception and design of the study: S. H. P., S. W. C., H. K. C., M. Y. C., J. T. H., and J. H. P.; acquisition of data or analysis and interpretation of data: S. H. P. and S. W. C.; drafting of the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content: S. H. P. and S. W. C.; and final approval of the version to be published: S. H. P., S. W. C., H. K. C., M. Y. C., J. T. H., and J. H. P.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jgr.2021.10.002.

References

- Doyle SL, Donohoe CL, Lysaght J, Reynolds JV. Visceral obesity, metabolic syndrome, insulin resistance and cancer. Proc Nutr Soc 2012;71(1):181–9.
- [2] Hess PL, Al-Khalidi HR, Friedman DJ, Mulder H, Kucharska-Newton A, Rosamond WR, Lopes RD, Gersh BJ, Mark DB, Curtis LH, et al. The metabolic syndrome and risk of sudden cardiac death: the atherosclerosis risk in communities study. J Am Heart Assoc 2017;6(8).
- [3] Tune JD, Goodwill AG, Sassoon DJ, Mather KJ. Cardiovascular consequences of metabolic syndrome. Transl Res 2017;183:57–70.
- [4] Bagry HS, Raghavendran S, Carli F. Metabolic syndrome and insulin resistance: perioperative considerations. Anesthesiology 2008;108(3):506–23.

- [5] Gallagher EJ, LeRoith D, Karnieli E. The metabolic syndrome-from insulin resistance to obesity and diabetes. Endocrinol Metab Clin N Am 2008;37(3): 559–79 [vii].
- [6] Baeg IH, So SH. The world ginseng market and the ginseng (Korea). J Ginseng Res 2013;37(1):1-7.
- [7] Hong HD, Choi SY, Kim YC, Cho CW. Rapid determination of ginsenosides Rb1, Rf, and Rg1 in Korean ginseng using HPLC. J Ginseng Res 2009;33(1):8–12.
- [8] Kim JH, Yi YS, Kim MY, Cho JY. Role of ginsenosides, the main active components of Panax ginseng, in inflammatory responses and diseases. J Ginseng Res 2017;41(4):435–43.
- [9] Lee SM, Bae BS, Park HW, Ahn NG, Cho BG, Cho YL, Kwak YS. Characterization of Korean red ginseng (Panax ginseng Meyer): history, preparation method, and chemical composition. J Ginseng Res 2015;39(4):384–91.
- [10] Metwaly AM, Lianlian Z, Luqi H, Deqiang D. Black ginseng and its saponins: preparation, phytochemistry and pharmacological effects. Molecules 2019;24(10).
- [11] Ryu JS, Lee HJ, Bae SH, Kim SY, Park Y, Suh HJ, Jeong YH. The bioavailability of red ginseng extract fermented by Phellinus linteus. J Ginseng Res 2013;37(1): 108–16.
- [12] Li X, Chu S, Lin M, Gao Y, Liu Y, Yang S, Zhou X, Zhang Y, Hu Y, Wang H, et al. Anticancer property of ginsenoside Rh2 from ginseng. Eur J Med Chem 2020;203:112627.
- [13] Ahuja A, Kim JH, Kim JH, Yi YS, Cho JY. Functional role of ginseng-derived compounds in cancer. J Ginseng Res 2018;42(3):248-54.
- [14] Guo YH, Kuruganti R, Gao Y. Recent advances in ginsenosides as potential therapeutics against breast cancer. Curr Top Med Chem 2019;19(25): 2334–47.
- [15] Wang CZ, Anderson S, Du W, He TC, Yuan CS. Red ginseng and cancer treatment. Chin J Nat Med 2016;14(1):7–16.
- [16] Zhou P, Xie W, He S, Sun Y, Meng X, Sun G, Sun X. Ginsenoside Rb1 as an antidiabetic agent and its underlying mechanism analysis. Cells 2019;8(3).
- [17] Ng TB, Yeung HW. Hypoglycemic constituents of Panax ginseng. Gen Pharmacol 1985;16(6):549-52.
- [18] Kim S, Shin BC, Lee MS, Lee H, Ernst E. Red ginseng for type 2 diabetes mellitus: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. Chin J Integr Med 2011;17(12):937–44.
- [19] Bai L, Gao J, Wei F, Zhao J, Wang D, Wei J. Therapeutic potential of ginsenosides as an adjuvant treatment for diabetes. Front Pharmacol 2018;9:423.
- [20] Irfan M, Kim M, Rhee MH. Anti-platelet role of Korean ginseng and ginsenosides in cardiovascular diseases. J Ginseng Res 2020;44(1):24–32.
- [21] Chen X. Cardiovascular protection by ginsenosides and their nitric oxide releasing action. Clin Exp Pharmacol Physiol 1996;23(8):728–32.
 [22] Luo BY, Jiang JL, Fang YF, Yang F, Yin MD, Zhang BC, Zhao RR, Shao JW. The
- [22] Luo BY, Jiang JL, Fang YF, Yang F, Yin MD, Zhang BC, Zhao RR, Shao JW. The effects of ginsenosides on platelet aggregation and vascular intima in the treatment of cardiovascular diseases: from molecular mechanisms to clinical applications. Pharmacol Res 2020;159:105031.
- [23] Kim JH. Pharmacological and medical applications of Panax ginseng and ginsenosides: a review for use in cardiovascular diseases. J Ginseng Res 2018;42(3):264–9.
- [24] Zheng SD, Wu HJ, Wu DL. Roles and mechanisms of ginseng in protecting heart. Chin J Integr Med 2012;18(7):548–55.

- [25] Kim KH, Lee D, Lee HL, Kim CE, Jung K, Kang KS. Beneficial effects of Panax ginseng for the treatment and prevention of neurodegenerative diseases: past findings and future directions. J Ginseng Res 2018;42(3):239–47.
- [26] Hou W, Wang Y, Zheng P, Cui R. Effects of ginseng on neurological disorders. Front Cell Neurosci 2020;14:55.
- [27] Huang X, Li N, Pu Y, Zhang T, Wang B. Neuroprotective effects of ginseng phytochemicals: recent perspectives. Molecules 2019;24(16).
- [28] Kim HJ, Jung SW, Kim SY, Cho IH, Kim HC, Rhim H, Kim M, Nah SY. Panax ginseng as an adjuvant treatment for Alzheimer's disease. J Ginseng Res 2018;42(4):401-11.
- [29] Razgonova MP, Veselov VV, Zakharenko AM, Golokhvast KS, Nosyrev AE, Cravotto G, Tsatsakis A, Spandidos DA. Panax ginseng components and the pathogenesis of Alzheimer's disease (Review). Mol Med Rep 2019;19(4): 2975–98.
- [30] Hernandez-Garcia D, Granado-Serrano AB, Martin-Gari M, Naudi A, Serrano JC. Efficacy of Panax ginseng supplementation on blood lipid profile. A meta-analysis and systematic review of clinical randomized trials. J Ethnopharmacol 2019;243:112090.
- [31] Park HS, Cho JH, Kim KW, Chung WS, Song MY. Effects of Panax ginseng on obesity in animal models: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Evid Based Complement Alternat Med 2018;2018:2719794.
- [32] Zhang L, Virgous C, Si H. Ginseng and obesity: observations and understanding in cultured cells, animals and humans. J Nutr Biochem 2017;44: 1–10.
- [33] Duval S, Tweedie R. Trim and fill: a simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. Biometrics 2000;56(2):455–63.
- [34] Kim JY, Park JY, Kang HJ, Kim OY, Lee JH. Beneficial effects of Korean red ginseng on lymphocyte DNA damage, antioxidant enzyme activity, and LDL oxidation in healthy participants: a randomized, double-blind, placebocontrolled trial. Nutr J 2012;11:47.
- [35] Reay JL, Scholey AB, Milne A, Fenwick J, Kennedy DO. Panax ginseng has no effect on indices of glucose regulation following acute or chronic ingestion in healthy volunteers. Br J Nutr 2009;101(11):1673–8.
- [36] Bang H, Kwak JH, Ahn HY, Shin DY, Lee JH. Korean red ginseng improves glucose control in subjects with impaired fasting glucose, impaired glucose tolerance, or newly diagnosed type 2 diabetes mellitus. J Med Food 2014;17(1):128–34.
- [37] Choi HS, Kim S, Kim MJ, Kim MS, Kim J, Park CW, Seo D, Shin SS, Oh SW. Efficacy and safety of Panax ginseng berry extract on glycemic control: a 12wk randomized, double-blind, and placebo-controlled clinical trial. J Ginseng Res 2018;42(1):90–7.
- [38] Kim HO, Park MJ, Han JS. Effects of fermented red ginseng supplementation on blood glucose and insulin resistance in type 2 diabetic patients. J Korean Soc Food Sci Nutr 2011;40(5):696–703.
- [39] Ma SW, Benzie IF, Chu TT, Fok BS, Tomlinson B, Critchley LA. Effect of Panax ginseng supplementation on biomarkers of glucose tolerance, antioxidant status and oxidative stress in type 2 diabetic subjects: results of a placebocontrolled human intervention trial. Diabetes Obes Metabol 2008;10(11): 1125–7.
- [40] Oh MR, Park SH, Kim SY, Back HI, Kim MG, Jeon JY, Ha KC, Na WT, Cha YS, Park BH, et al. Postprandial glucose-lowering effects of fermented red ginseng in subjects with impaired fasting glucose or type 2 diabetes: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial. BMC Compl Alternative Med 2014;14:237.
- [41] Park K, Ahn CW, Kim Y, Nam JS. The effect of Korean red ginseng on sarcopenia biomarkers in type 2 diabetes patients. Arch Gerontol Geriatr 2020;90: 104108.
- [42] Park K, Kim Y, Kim J, Kang S, Park JS, Ahn CW, Nam JS. Supplementation with Korean red ginseng improves current perception threshold in Korean type 2 diabetes patients: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. J Diabetes Res 2020;2020:5295328.
- [43] Park SH, Oh MR, Choi EK, Kim MG, Ha KC, Lee SK, Kim YG, Park BH, Kim DS, Chae SW. An 8-wk, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial for the antidiabetic effects of hydrolyzed ginseng extract. J Ginseng Res 2014;38(4):239–43.
- [44] Reeds DN, Patterson BW, Okunade A, Holloszy JO, Polonsky KS, Klein S. Ginseng and ginsenoside Re do not improve beta-cell function or insulin sensitivity in overweight and obese subjects with impaired glucose tolerance or diabetes. Diabetes Care 2011;34(5):1071–6.
- [45] Vuksan V, Sung MK, Sievenpiper JL, Stavro PM, Jenkins AL, Di Buono M, Lee KS, Leiter LA, Nam KY, Arnason JT, et al. Korean red ginseng (Panax ginseng) improves glucose and insulin regulation in well-controlled, type 2 diabetes: results of a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study of efficacy and safety. Nutr Metabol Cardiovasc Dis 2008;18(1):46–56.
- [46] Yoon JW, Kang SM, Vassy JL, Shin H, Lee YH, Ahn HY, Choi SH, Park KS, Jang HC, Lim S. Efficacy and safety of ginsam, a vinegar extract from Panax

ginseng, in type 2 diabetic patients: results of a double-blind, placebocontrolled study. J Diabetes Investig 2012;3(3):309-17.

- [47] Cha TW, Kim M, Kim M, Chae JS, Lee JH. Blood pressure-lowering effect of Korean red ginseng associated with decreased circulating Lp-PLA2 activity and lysophosphatidylcholines and increased dihydrobiopterin level in prehypertensive subjects. Hypertens Res 2016;39(6):449–56.
- [48] Rhee MY, Kim YS, Bae JH, Nah DY, Kim YK, Lee MM, Kim HY. Effect of Korean red ginseng on arterial stiffness in subjects with hypertension. J Alternative Compl Med 2011;17(1):45–9.
- [49] Cho YH, Ahn SC, Lee SY, Jeong DW, Choi EJ, Kim YJ, Lee JG, Lee YH, Shin BC. Effect of Korean red ginseng on insulin sensitivity in non-diabetic healthy overweight and obese adults. Asia Pac J Clin Nutr 2013;22(3):365–71.
- [50] Kim SS, Kim JD, Kim H, Shin MS, Park CK, Park MH, Yang JW. The effects of red ginseng product and combined exercise on blood lipids and body composition of obese women in their twenties. J Ginseng Res 2002;26(2):59–66.
- [51] Kim SS, Park HY, Byun YH, Hwang BG, Lee JH, Shim YJ, Park CK, Yang JW. The effects on the blood lipid profiles and body fat by long term administration of red ginseng product. J Ginseng Res 2002;26(2):67–73.
- [52] Delui MH, Fatehi H, Manavifar M, Amini M, Ghayour-Mobarhan M, Zahedi M, Ferns G. The effects of Panax ginseng on lipid profile, pro-oxidant: antioxidant status and high-sensitivity C reactive protein levels in hyperlipidemic patients in Iran. Int J Prev Med 2013;4(9):1045–51.
- [53] Jung DH, Lee YJ, Kim CB, Kim JY, Shin SH, Park JK. Effects of ginseng on peripheral blood mitochondrial DNA copy number and hormones in men with metabolic syndrome: a randomized clinical and pilot study. Compl Ther Med 2016;24:40–6.
- [54] Park BJ, Lee YJ, Lee HR, Jung DH, Na HY, Kim HB, Shim JY. Effects of Korean red ginseng on cardiovascular risks in subjects with metabolic syndrome: a double-blind randomized controlled study. Korean J Fam Med 2012;33(4): 190–6.
- [55] Shim JY. Korean red ginseng and metabolic syndrome. In: ClinicalTrials.gov; 2012.
- [56] Kim SY, Seo SK, Choi YM, Jeon YE, Lim KJ, Cho S, Choi YS, Lee BS. Effects of red ginseng supplementation on menopausal symptoms and cardiovascular risk factors in postmenopausal women: a double-blind randomized controlled trial. Menopause 2012;19(4):461–6.
- [57] Kuzuya T, Nakagawa S, Satoh J, Kanazawa Y, Iwamoto Y, Kobayashi M, Nanjo K, Sasaki A, Seino Y, Ito C, et al. Report of the Committee on the classification and diagnostic criteria of diabetes mellitus. Diabetes Res Clin Pract 2002;55(1):65–85.
- [58] Sakaguchi K, Takeda K, Maeda M, Ogawa W, Sato T, Okada S, Ohnishi Y, Nakajima H, Kashiwagi A. Glucose area under the curve during oral glucose tolerance test as an index of glucose intolerance. Diabetol Int 2016;7(1):53–8.
- [59] Lee HJ, Lee YH, Park SK, Kang ES, Kim HJ, Lee YC, Choi CS, Park SE, Ahn CW, Cha BS, et al. Korean red ginseng (Panax ginseng) improves insulin sensitivity and attenuates the development of diabetes in Otsuka Long-Evans Tokushima fatty rats. Metabolism 2009;58(8):1170–7.
- [60] Lee SH, Lee HJ, Lee YH, Lee BW, Cha BS, Kang ES, Ahn CW, Park JS, Kim HJ, Lee EY, et al. Korean red ginseng (Panax ginseng) improves insulin sensitivity in high fat fed Sprague-Dawley rats. Phytother Res 2012;26(1):142–7.
- [61] Joseph L, Wasir JS, Misra A, Vikram NK, Goel K, Pandey RM, Chandra M, Poddar P, Kondal D. Appropriate values of adiposity and lean body mass indices to detect cardiovascular risk factors in Asian Indians. Diabetes Technol Therapeut 2011;13(9):899–906.
- [62] Prentice AM, Jebb SA. Beyond body mass index. Obes Rev 2001;2(3):141-7.
- [63] Pi-Sunyer FX. Obesity: criteria and classification. Proc Nutr Soc 2000;59(4): 505-9.
- [64] Chen G, Li H, Zhao Y, Zhu H, Cai E, Gao Y, Liu S, Yang H, Zhang L. Saponins from stems and leaves of Panax ginseng prevent obesity via regulating thermogenesis, lipogenesis and lipolysis in high-fat diet-induced obese C57BL/6 mice. Food Chem Toxicol 2017;106(Pt A):393–403.
- [65] Shin SS, Yoon M. Korean red ginseng (Panax ginseng) inhibits obesity and improves lipid metabolism in high fat diet-fed castrated mice. J Ethnopharmacol 2018;210:80–7.
- [66] Klop B, Elte JW, Cabezas MC. Dyslipidemia in obesity: mechanisms and potential targets. Nutrients 2013;5(4):1218–40.
- [67] Phan BA, Toth PP. Dyslipidemia in women: etiology and management. Int J Womens Health 2014;6:185–94.
- [68] O'Brien T, Nguyen TT, Zimmerman BR. Hyperlipidemia and diabetes mellitus. Mayo Clin Proc 1998;73(10):969–76.
- [69] Hong SY, Kim JY, Ahn HY, Shin JH, Kwon O. Panax ginseng extract rich in ginsenoside protopanaxatriol attenuates blood pressure elevation in spontaneously hypertensive rats by affecting the Akt-dependent phosphorylation of endothelial nitric oxide synthase. J Agric Food Chem 2012;60(12):3086–91.
- [70] Nagar H, Choi S, Jung SB, Jeon BH, Kim CS. Rg3-enriched Korean Red Ginseng enhances blood pressure stability in spontaneously hypertensive rats. Integr Med Res 2016;5(3):223–9.