OPEN

An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Duloxetine for Knee Osteoarthritis Pain

Bo Chen, MD, PhD, Jingrui Duan, MD, Shengyue Wen, MD, Jian Pang, MD, PhD, Min Zhang, MD, Hongsheng Zhan, MD, PhD, and Yuxin Zheng, MD

Objective: We conducted the updated systematic review and metaanalysis of the best available quantitative and qualitative evidence to evaluate the effects and safety of duloxetine for the treatment of knee osteoarthritis (OA) pain.

Methods: A comprehensive literature search used 3 English and 4 Chinese biomedical databases from inception through July 10, 2020. We included randomized controlled trials of duloxetine with intervention duration of 2 weeks or longer for knee OA. The primary outcome was pain intensity measured by Brief Pain Inventory and the Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC) pain subscale. Secondary outcome measurements included 36-Item Short Form Health Survey, Patient's Global Impression of Improvement, Clinical Global Impressions of Severity, and adverse events (AEs). The quality of all included studies was evaluated using the Cochrane risk-of-bias criteria. The review was registered in the PROSPERO (CRD 42020194072).

Results: Six studies totaling 2059 patients met the eligibility criteria. Duloxetine had significant reductions in Brief Pain Inventory 24 hours average pain (mean difference [MD] = -0.74; 95% confidence interval [CI], -0.92 to -0.57; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 13\%$; 5 trials; 1695 patients); patient general activity (MD = -0.76; 95% CI, -0.96 to -0.56; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 0\%$; 5 trials; 1694 patients) WOMAC physical function subscale (MD = -4.22; 95% CI, -5.14 to -3.30; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 26\%$; 5 trials; 1986 patients); Patient's Global Impression of Improvement (MD = -0.48; 95% CI, -0.58 to -0.37; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 29\%$; 5 trials; 1741 patients); and Clinical Global Impressions of Severity (MD = -0.34; 95% CI, -0.44 to -0.24;

Supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (no. 81774340, 81973875) and Shanghai Medical Innovation Research Project (no. 20MC1920600, 21Y11921600).

Y.Z. and B.C.: designed the review protocol. S.W. and J.D.: carried out the literature search. B.C. and M.Z.: contributed to data extraction. B.C. and J.P.: contributed to quality assessment. Y.Z. and H.Z.: provided statistical supports for meta-analysis. B.C. and J.D. performed the analyses and drafted the manuscript. Y.Z.: revised this manuscript. All authors were involved in drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content, and all authors approved the final version to be published.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

- Reprints: Yuxin Zheng, MD, Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Shuguang Hospital, 528 Zhangheng Road, Pudong New Area, Shanghai 201203, China (e-mail: sg_zyx1728@126.com).
- Copyright © 2021 The Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives License 4.0 (CCBY-NC-ND), where it is permissible to download and share the work provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be changed in any way or used commercially without permission from the journal.

DOI: 10.1097/AJP.000000000000975

P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 0\%$; 4 trials; 1178 patients) compared with placebo control. However, no difference on WOMAC pain subscale (standard mean difference = -1.68; 95% CI, -3.45 to 0.08; P = 0.06; $I^2 = 100\%$; 3 trials; 1104 patients) and in serious AEs (risk ratio = 0.92; 95% CI, 0.40-2.11; P = 0.84; $I^2 = 0\%$; 5 trials; 1762 patients) between duloxetine and placebo. Furthermore, duloxetine failed to show superior effects for improving the life quality and demonstrated more treatment-emergent AEs.

Conclusion: Duloxetine may be an effective treatment option for knee OA patients but further rigorously designed and well-controlled randomized trials are warranted.

Key Words: duloxetine, knee osteoarthritis, pain, treatment

(Clin J Pain 2021;37:852-862)

R nee pain is a common symptom in patients with knee osteoarthritis (OA),^{1,2} which is a major age-related public health problem and a leading cause of long-term disability and reduced quality of life.^{3–5} There are no effective disease-modifying remedies available to treat knee OA^6 and the underlying mechanisms of knee OA still remain unknown.7 Current guidelines of knee OA management recommend a comprehensive combination of educational, physical, behavioral, psychosocial, mindbody, and pharmacologic interventions, but the availability, accessibility, and affordability vary of these interventions.⁸ Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and acetaminophen are used to treat the OA but could increase the risk of side effects after the long-term utilization.^{9,10} In addition, depressed symptoms are reportedly associated with knee OA, especially among the geriatric community^{11,12} and in Asian Americans.¹³ Some studies revealed depression is prevalent among patients with chronic pain due to OA.^{14,15} However, the latest guidelines indicated that no interventions were strongly recommended for use in patients who have concomitant OA and depression.¹⁶ Therefore, other new safe and efficient therapeutic approaches are required that have been validated by clinical experience. As understanding of the pathophysiology of OA pain has progressed, it has become apparent that much of the refractory pain associated with OA may be of neurogenic origin or may be responsive to neutralizing specific neurotransmitters.^{17,18} Consequently, the centrally acting serotonin and norepinephrine reuptake inhibitor, duloxetine, was approved for the treatment of musculoskeletal pain, including OA.19,20

Duloxetine is a selective, relatively balanced serotonin and norepinephrine reuptake inhibitor with antidepressant, central pain inhibitory, and anxiolytic activities that has shown efficacy in the treatment of chronic pain conditions such as peripheral neuropathic pain, fibromyalgia, low back

Received for publication December 22, 2020; revised April 28, 2021; accepted July 12, 2021.

From the Research Institute of Orthopaedics and Traumatology, Shuguang Hospital affiliated to Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Shanghai, China.

B.C. and J.D. contributed equally.

pain, and knee OA pain.^{21–24} Research on duloxetine for knee OA has been growing, some systematic reviews were conducted to establish the association of duloxetine with knee OA pain,^{25–27} but none arrived at a definitive conclusion. In addition, more clinical trials of duloxetine and related therapies published in recent years were not included in previous systematic reviews.

In light of the growing number of clinical researches of duloxetine use for knee OA pain and the ensuing need for critical evaluation, we conducted the updated meta-analysis of all available data to determine the efficacy of duloxetine for pain relief in patients with knee OA to better inform future research and clinical practice.

METHODS

This meta-analysis is reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses statement guidelines.²⁸ The review was registered in the PROSPERO 2020 (registration number: CRD 42020194072).²⁹

Search Strategy

We conducted a comprehensive literature search on 3 English and 4 Chinese biomedical databases from inception through July 10, 2020. These databases included PubMed, the Cochrane Library, Springer, the Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure, Chongqing VIP information, Wanfang, and the Chinese Biomedical Databases. In addition, ClinicalTrials.gov and the reference lists of previously published reviews related to duloxetine and knee OA were also screened for eligible clinical trials. The search terms used duloxetine, cymbalta, knee pain, knee osteoarthritis, randomized controlled trial (RCT), and clinical trial.

Eligibility Criteria and Study Selection

We included RCTs that compared duloxetine with nonduloxetine intervention, usual care, or placebo in adults with knee pain. To be eligible for this study, each trial was required to have at least 2 weeks of duloxetine interventions with > 10 patients in each group, and report original data. There was no language restriction in the literature search. We excluded review articles and case reports.

Two authors independently screened all potential eligible studies. Titles and abstracts were first screened to exclude irrelevant citations. Full texts of all articles of potentially relevant abstracts were retrieved and screened according to the study eligibility criteria. Disagreements were resolved by consensus or discussion with a third author. The diagnostic criterion derived from the American College of Rheumatology (Table 1).³⁶

Primary outcomes concerned the pain intensity of knee joint as measured by validated instruments including Brief Pain Inventory Severity (BPI-S)³⁷ and the Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC)³⁸ pain subscale in this study. The interference of pain was also evaluated by Brief Pain Inventory-Interference (BPI-I).³⁷ Secondary outcomes were quality of life, measured on the 36-Item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36)³⁹ scale, illness severity and patient's global impression measured by Patient's Global Impression of Improvement (PGI-I)⁴⁰ and Clinical Global Impressions of Severity (CGI-S),⁴⁰ and adverse events (AEs).

References	Location	Age (y)	Diagnostic Criteria	Sample Size (Male/ Female); Duration of OA (y)	Treatment Group	Control Group	Main Outcome
Chappell et al ³⁰	USA	T: 62.1±9.5 C: 62.5±9.3	ACR OA criteria	T: 111 (41/70), 6.9 ± 8.4 C: 120 (39/81), 7.1 ± 7.2		Placebo	BPI-S; BPI-I; WOMAC; CGI-S; SF-36; EQ-5D; TEAEs; SAEs
Chappell et al ³¹	USA	T: 63.2 ± 8.8 C: 61.9 ± 9.2	ACR OA criteria	T: 128 (39/89), 6.2 ± 5.9 C: 128 (21/107), 5.6 ± 6.2	Duloxetine 60/ 120 mg/d for 13 wk	Placebo	BPI-S; BPI-I; WOMAC; CGI-S; SF-36; TEAEs; SAE:
Frakes et al ³²	USA	T: 61.6 ± 9.2 C: 60.3 ± 9.2	ACR OA criteria	T: 264 (112/152), 9.8 ± 8.9 C: 260 (113/147), 9.2 ± 8.9	Duloxetine 60/ 120 mg/d +NSAID +PPI for 8 wk	Placebo +NSAID +PPI	BPI-S; BPI-I; WOMAC; TEAEs; SAEs
Abou- Raya et al ³³	Egypt	T: 68.9 ± 6.2 C: 68.5 ± 5.8	ACR OA criteria	T: 144 (23/121), 5.7 ± 4.9 C: 144 (24/120), 5.6 ± 4.5	Duloxetine 60 mg/d for 16 wk	Placebo	WOMAC
Wang et al ³⁴	China	T: 61.2 ± 8.2 C: 59.8 ± 8.4	ACR OA criteria	T: 205 (45/160), 2.9 \pm 4.4 C: 202 (51/151), 2.7 \pm 4.2	Duloxetine 60 mg/d for 13 wk	Placebo	BPI-S; BPI-I; WOMAC; CGI-S; PGI-I; TEAEs; SAE
Uchio et al ³⁵	Japan	T: 65.5 ± 8.0 C: 66.4 ± 8.4	ACR OA criteria	T: 177 (35/142), 4.0 ± 4.2 C: 176 (44/132), 4.5 ± 4.3	Duloxetine 20-60 mg/ d for 14 wk	Placebo	BPI-S; BPI-I; CGI-S; PGI-I EQ-5D; SF-36; TEAEs; SAEs

ACR indicates American College of Rheumatology; BPI, Brief Pain Inventory; BPI-I, Brief Pain Inventory-Interference; BPI-S, Brief Pain Inventory-Severity; C, control group; CGI-S, Clinical Global Impressions of Severity; EQ-5D, European Quality of Life Questionnairee5 Dimension; NSAID, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug; OA, osteoarthritis; PGI-I, Patient's Global Impression of Improvement; PPI, proton pump inhibitor; SAEs, serious adverse events; SF-36, 36-Item Short-Form Health Status Survey; T, treatment group; TEAEs, treatment-emergent adverse events; WOMAC, Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index.

Data Collection and Quality Assessment

We extracted the data from included studies using a predesigned data extraction table, including publication information, origin of study, study setting, time frame of study, age, sex, definition of knee OA, detailed information of interventions and controls, outcome measures, and main conclusion. The accuracy of the data extraction was verified by another author (Table 1).

We assessed the risk of bias for each study using the items in Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing quality in randomized trials,⁴¹ which covered the following items: selection bias included random sequence generation and allocation concealment, blinding of participants, personnel, and outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective reporting, and other potential bias. Two authors independently evaluated the methodological quality of the included studies using the risk-of-bias tools. Disagreements were resolved by the third author through discussion.

Data Synthesis and Statistical Analysis

We qualitatively synthesized all included studies in summary Table 1. Included studies on pain were synthesized based on the BPI-S and the WOMAC pain subscale separately. The BPI³⁷ is a self-reported scale that measures the severity of pain and the interference of pain on function. Severity of pain is assessed with 4 questions: patients assign scores to characterize their worst pain, least pain, and average pain in the previous 24 hours and pain right now. Pain ratings range from 0 (no pain) to 10 (pain as severe as you can imagine). There are 7 questions assessing the interference of pain in the past 24 hours on patient general activity, mood, walking ability, normal work, relations with other people, sleep, and enjoyment of life. The interference ratings range from 0 (does not interfere) to 10 (completely interferes), and a mean across the interference items is derived as a summary interference measure. The WOMAC³⁸ scale is designed to assess pain, stiffness, and physical function in patients with OA of the knee or hip. It consists of 24 questions: 5 on pain, 2 on stiffness, and 17 on physical function. Higher scores on the WOMAC indicate worst pain, stiffness, and functional limitations.

Other measures included the PGI-I and CGI-S⁴⁰ to assess the patient's global impression and the SF-36 to observe the life quality of patients. The safety of duloxetine versus placebo were assessed during the treatment phase of the study and were based on the incidence rate of treatment-emergent adverse events (TEAEs) and serious adverse events (SAEs).

We used RevMan V.5.3 software (The Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, England, available online at www. cochrane.com) to perform the meta-analysis of the outcome data.⁴² Statistical heterogeneity across included studies was estimated using the Cochran Q statistic (considered significant when the P < 0.10) and quantified the extent of heterogeneity with the I^2 index.⁴³ Continuous outcomes, such as pain (measured by BPI or WOMAC pain subscale) and quality of life (measured by SF-36 scale), were expressed as mean difference (MD) with a 95% confidence interval (CI). Other forms of continuous data were converted into MD values. Dichotomous data, such as AEs, were expressed as risk ratio (RR) with a 95% CI. Other binary data were converted into an RR value. The fixed-effect model was used if $I^2 < 50\%$ and the random-effect model was used if I^2 > 50%. All reported P values were 2 sided and a P value < 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.



FIGURE 1. Study selection flow chart.

RESULTS

Studies Selection

Figure 1 summarizes the detailed study selection process. We screened a total of 2473 abstracts identified from 3 English and 4 Chinese databases and additional records from ClinicalTrials.gov. After initially screening, we excluded 2341 abstracts which did not meet the inclusion criteria (ie, participants did not have knee OA, reviews, case reports or duplicate publications). We retrieved and reviewed 132 full articles. A total of 125 articles were excluded due to lack of randomization or absence of a control group, and insufficient data for meta-analysis. Finally, 6 RCTs^{30–35} involving 2059 patients met our inclusion criteria.

Study Characteristics

Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of the 6 trials. $^{30-35}$ These studies were published from 2009 to 2018.

Three studies^{30–32} were conducted in the United States, and 1 each in Egypt,³³ China,³⁴ and Japan.³⁵ The number of participants in the studies varied from 231 to 524. The mean age was 63 years and 71.49% were women. The mean disease duration was 5.85 years, and the treatment duration ranged from 8 to 16 weeks with 20 to 120 mg/d of duloxetine in these included trials. Study participants were diagnosed with knee OA by the American College of Rheumatology criteria.³⁶

Quality Assessment

The quality assessment of the trials was performed using the Cochrane Collaboration's risk-of-bias tool. The detailed results are presented in Figure 2. Randomization sequence generation was adequate in all 6 trials (100%). Three studies^{30,33,34} declared appropriate allocation concealment (50.0%) but other 3 trials^{31,32,35} were unclear





Copyright © 2021 The Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc.

(50.0%). Blinding of participants and personnel occurred in all 6 trial (100%), but blinding of outcome assessment was unclear in 5 trials (83.3%).^{30–33,35} One study³³ had a high risk of bias due to incomplete outcome data and only reported the WOMAC score data with high risk of bias of selective reporting (16.7%). In addition, regarding other potential sources of bias, no studies reported intention-to-treat items and 1 study³³ with high risk of bias due to insufficient information about the treatment.

Meta-analysis

In the 6 eligible RCTs, 5 trials^{30–32,34,35} measured pain level using the BPI and 3 trials^{30,32,34} assessed by the WOMAC pain subscale. Six trials^{30–35} evaluated the physical function using WOMAC physical function and stiffness subscale, 3 trials^{30,31,35} assessed the quality of life by SF-36, and some trials compared the patient's global impression measured by PGI-I^{30–32,34,35} and CGI-S.^{30,31,34,35} Six trials^{30–35} mentioned the AEs and 5 trials^{30–32,34,35} of them reported the numbers of TEAEs and SAEs.

Pain Reductions

Five trials^{30-32,34,35} contributed to the meta-analysis of pain outcomes based on the BPI-S. The fixed-effects metaanalysis results indicated that patients in the duloxetine groups had significant reductions in the previous 24 hours on average pain (1695 patients; MD = -0.74; 95% CI, -0.92 to -0.57; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 13\%$) (Fig. 3A); worst pain (1696 patients; MD = -0.87; 95% CI, -1.07 to -0.66; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 0\%$) (Fig. 3B); least pain (1696 patients; MD = -0.54; 95% CI, -0.71 to -0.37; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 0\%$) (Fig. 3C); and pain right now (1696 patients; MD = -0.68; 95% CI, -0.87 to -0.48; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 0\%$) (Fig. 3D) than those in the placebo control groups after 8 to 14 weeks of 60/120 mg duloxetine treatment. These studies suggest that duloxetine was associated with significant pain reduction in patients with knee OA.

However, meta-analysis of 3 trials^{30,32,34} involving 1104 patients failed to show superior analgesic effects of duloxetine on WOMAC pain subscale (standard MD = -2.11; 95% CI, -4.93 to 0.72; P = 0.14) with a high heterogeneity score ($I^2 = 100\%$) (Fig. 4).

The Interference of Pain

Five trials^{30–32,34,35} contributed to the meta-analysis of the interference of pain based on the BPI-I. Compared with the placebo control group, the duloxetine group showed significant improvement in the interference of pain on patient general activity (5 trials; 1694 patients, MD = -0.76; 95% CI, -0.96 to -0.56; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 0\%$) (Fig. 5A); mood (4 trials; 1438) patients, MD = -0.55; 95% CI, -0.75 to -0.35; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 9\%$) (Fig. 5B); walking ability (4 trials; 1438 patients, MD = -0.71; 95% CI, -0.93 to -0.50; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 4\%$) (Fig. 5C); normal work (5 trials; 1694 patients, MD = -0.70; 95% CI, -0.90 to -0.50; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 49\%$) (Fig. 5D); relations with other people (4 trials; 1437 patients, MD = -0.40; 95% CI, -0.75 to -0.06; P = 0.02; $I^2 = 70\%$) (Fig. 5E); sleep (4 trials; 1438 patients, MD = -0.53; 95% CI, -0.81 to -0.25; P = 0.0002; $\hat{I}^2 = 52\%$) (Fig. 5F); enjoyment of life (4 trials; 1438) patients, MD = -0.60; 95% CI, -1.03 to -0.17; P = 0.006; $I^2 = 76\%$) (Fig. 5G); and average interference (3 trials; 924) patients, MD = -0.46; 95% CI, -0.66 to -0.27; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 45\%$ (Fig. 5H) in the past 24 hours, which indicated that duloxetine can improve the interference of pain significantly.

Physical Function and Quality of Life

Six trials^{30–35} reported specific relevant data for the metaanalysis showed that duloxetine had a significant improvement on WOMAC physical function subscale (1986 patients; MD = -4.22; 95% CI, -5.14 to -3.30; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 26\%$) (Fig. 6A), and on WOMAC stiffness subscale (2002 patients; MD = -0.47; 95% CI, -0.60 to -0.34; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 21\%$) (Fig. 6B). These evidences showed that duloxetine can improve the physical function for the knee OA patients.

However, the results of the random-effects metaanalysis of 3 trials^{30,31,35} involving 826 patients reported the negative effects of duloxetine for improving the life quality measured by SF-36 physical functional subscale (MD = 1.62; 95% CI, 0.12-3.13; P = 0.03; $l^2 = 61\%$) (Fig. 6C) and by SF-36 bodily pain subscale (MD = 1.22; 95% CI, 0.08-2.35; P = 0.04; $l^2 = 84\%$) (Fig. 6D). There was also no significant difference in SF-36 role physical subscale (MD = 1.04; 95% CI, -0.10 to 2.18; P = 0.07; $l^2 = 88\%$) (Fig. 6E).

Patient's Global Impression

Meta-analysis showed that duloxetine had significantly improvement of patient's global impression measured by PGI-I (1741 patients; MD = -0.48; 95% CI, -0.58 to -0.37; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 29\%$) (Fig. 7A) in 5 trials^{30–32,34,35} and by CGI-S (1178 patients; MD = -0.34; 95% CI, -0.44 to -0.24; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 0\%$) (Fig. 7B) in 4 trials^{30,31,34,35} compared with placebo control.

Safety

Six trials^{30–35} described the reasons of main TEAEs in the duloxetine group were constipation, nausea, hyperhidrosis, cough, myalgia, arthralgia, palpitations, dry mouth, and so on. No deaths or suicide-related events were reported. Five trials^{30–32,34,35} involving 1762 patients compared the safety of duloxetine with placebo control interventions. The results of our meta-analysis showed that duloxetine had higher incidence of TEAEs (RR = 1.31; 95% CI, 1.20-1.43; P < 0.00001; $I^2 = 0\%$) (Fig. 8A), but there was no significant difference in the rate of SAEs between duloxetine and control groups (RR = 0.92; 95% CI, 0.40-2.11; P = 0.84; $I^2 = 0\%$) (Fig. 8B).

DISCUSSION

This updated systemic review and meta-analysis of 6 RCTs in 2059 individuals indicate that duloxetine appears to be effective on pain reduction on BPI-S and benefit for improving of the physical function and patient's global impression compared with placebo for people who with knee OA. However, duloxetine failed to demonstrate superior analgesic effects on the WOMAC pain subscale and beneficial effects on quality of life improvement. In addition, there was no substantial difference between duloxetine and the control groups in the incidence of SAEs.

Three systematic reviews have been published.²⁵⁻²⁷ In a system review and meta-analysis of 3 RCTs enrolled 1011 patients published in 2015 revealed that duloxetine 60/ 120 mg/d resulted in a greater reduction in pain improved function and patient-rated impression of improvement, and acceptable AEs for treating knee OA pain after ~10 to 13 weeks of treatment.²⁵ Another system review and meta-analysis conducted in 2018 indicated that duloxetine has statistically significant, moderate benefits on pain, function, and quality of life in knee OA patients, but use of this drug is associated with a significantly higher risk of AEs.²⁶ The third

Ą	Expe	erimen	tal	C	ontrol			Mean Difference		Me	an Differer	ice	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI		IV,	Fixed, 95%	CI	
Chappell 2009	-2.82	2.16	107	-1.85	2.28	116	9.4%	-0.97 [-1.55, -0.39]			-		
Chappell 2011	-2.51	2.26	128	-1.72	2.04	128	11.4%	-0.79 [-1.32, -0.26]			-		
Frakes 2011	-2.56	2.25	258	-1.54	2.72	256	17.1%	-1.02 [-1.45, -0.59]					
Uchio 2018	-2.57	1.6	177	-1.8	1.59	176	28.7%	-0.77 [-1.10, -0.44]		-			
Wang 2017	-2.23	1.46	172	-1.73	1.48	177	33.4%	-0.50 [-0.81, -0.19]			-		
Total (95% CI)			842			853	100.0%	-0.74 [-0.92, -0.57]		+			
Heterogeneity: Chi2=	4.60, df	= 4 (P	= 0.33)	; I ² = 13	%								
Test for overall effect	Z = 8.17	(P < (0.00001)					-2	-1	0	1	2
									Favo	ours (Duloex	tine] Favo	urs [Contr	ol]

В	Dul	oxetin	е	С	ontrol			Mean Difference		Me	an Differen	ice	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl		IV,	Fixed, 95%	CI	
Chappell 2009	-3.29	2.42	107	-2.23	2.33	117	11.1%	-1.06 [-1.68, -0.44]		•	-		
Chappell 2011	-2.77	2.6	128	-1.95	2.49	128	11.1%	-0.82 [-1.44, -0.20]					
Frakes 2011	-2.71	2.57	258	-1.61	2.56	256	21.9%	-1.10 [-1.54, -0.66]					
Uchio 2018	-2.92	1.96	177	-2.13	1.95	176	25.9%	-0.79 [-1.20, -0.38]			-		
Wang 2017	-2.71	1.79	172	-2	1.82	177	30.0%	-0.71 [-1.09, -0.33]		-	-		
Total (95% CI)			842			854	100.0%	-0.87 [-1.07, -0.66]		•			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	2.25, df	= 4 (P	= 0.69); I ² = 09	6				<u> </u>				<u> </u>
Test for overall effect	Z = 8.19) (P < (0.0000	1)					-2	-1	0	1	2

Favours [Duloxetine] Favours [Control]

0	Dul	oxetin	ine Control					Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Chappell 2009	-2.4	2.23	107	-1.64	2.24	117	8.7%	-0.76 [-1.35, -0.17]	
Chappell 2011	-1.89	2.38	128	-1.28	2.26	128	9.3%	-0.61 [-1.18, -0.04]	
Frakes 2011	-1.95	2.09	258	-1.25	2.08	256	23.0%	-0.70 [-1.06, -0.34]	
Uchio 2018	-1.61	1.42	177	-1.05	1.48	176	32.7%	-0.56 [-0.86, -0.26]	_
Wang 2017	-1.48	1.59	172	-1.2	1.62	177	26.4%	-0.28 [-0.62, 0.06]	
Total (95% CI)			842			854	100.0%	-0.54 [-0.71, -0.37]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	3.66, df	= 4 (P	= 0.45); I ² = 09	6				
Test for overall effect	Z= 6.13	B (P < (0.00001	1)					-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1
									Favours [Duloxetine] Favours [Control]

C	Dul	oxetin	e	С	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Chappell 2009	-3.17	2.31	107	-2.26	2.58	117	9.2%	-0.91 [-1.55, -0.27]	
Chappell 2011	-2.5	2.38	128	-1.81	2.26	128	11.6%	-0.69 [-1.26, -0.12]	
Frakes 2011	-2.51	2.41	258	-1.8	2.4	256	21.7%	-0.71 [-1.13, -0.29]	_
Uchio 2018	-2.29	1.69	177	-1.52	1.75	176	29.1%	-0.77 [-1.13, -0.41]	
Wang 2017	-2.21	1.79	172	-1.74	1.67	177	28.4%	-0.47 [-0.83, -0.11]	
Total (95% CI)			842			854	100.0%	-0.68 [-0.87, -0.48]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi2 =	2.04, df	= 4 (P	= 0.73); I ² = 09	6			-	
Test for overall effect	Z = 6.83) (P < (0.0000	1)					-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1
				153					Favours [Duloxetine] Favours [Control]

FIGURE 3. Effects of duloxetine on pain measured by Brief Pain Inventory-Severity: (A) average pain; (B) worst pain; (C) least pain; and (D) pain right now. CI indicates confidence interval.

	Dule	pextin	в	C	ontrol		5	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Chappell 2009	-4.64	3.83	107	-3.24	3.89	117	18.4%	-0.36 [-0.63, -0.10]	
Frakes 2011	-22.05	1.1	258	-15.6	1.15	256	8.4%	-5.72 [-6.12, -5.33]	
Risser 2013	-4.41	3	264	-3.12	3	260	42.8%	-0.43 [-0.60, -0.26]	
Wang 2017	-3.03	2.8	184	-2.32	2.81	182	30.4%	-0.25 [-0.46, -0.05]	
Total (95% CI)			813			815	100.0%	-0.81 [-0.92, -0.69]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	663.01,	df = 3 (P < 0.0	0001);	² = 10	0%			
Test for overall effect	: Z = 13.9	5 (P <	0.0000	1)					-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1
									Favours (Duloxetine) Favours (Control)

FIGURE 4. Effects of duloxetine on pain measured by Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index pain subscale. Cl indicates confidence interval.

Copyright © 2021 The Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc.

Study or Subarara		oextine sn			ontrol SD	Tetat	Weintet	Mean Difference	Mean Diffe	
Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009	-2.72	2.31	Total 104	-2.01	2.6	118	Weight 9.9%	-0.71 [-1.36, -0.06]	IV, Fixed, 9	an u
Chappell 2011	-2.16		128	-1.66		128	12.8%	-0.50 [-1.07, 0.07]		
Frakes 2011		2.57	258	-1.56		256	19.7%	-1.04 [-1.50, -0.58]		
Uchio 2018 Wang 2017	-2.42	1.82	177	-1.52	1.81	176	28.8% 28.8%	-0.90 [-1.28, -0.52] -0.56 [-0.94, -0.18]		
trung 2011	2.00	1.1.0		1.00						
Total (95% CI)			839			855	100.0%	-0.76 [-0.96, -0.56]	•	
Heterogeneity: Chi* = Test for overall effect					6				-2 -1 0	1 2
restion overall ellect	L Z = 7.33	0.0-	.0000	0					Favours [Duloextine] F	avours [Control]
3		oxetine			ontrol		18 failed at	Mean Difference	Mean Diffe	
Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009	-2.04	2.38	104	-1.64	2.48	Total 118	Weight 10.0%	-0.40 [-1.04, 0.24]	IV, Fixed, 9	578 CI
Frakes 2011	-2.43		258	-1.56	2.4	256	23.7%	-0.87 [-1.29, -0.45]		
Uchio 2018	-1.95		177	-1.43		176	33.1%	-0.52 [-0.87, -0.17]		
Wang 2017	-1.43	1.66	172	-1.04	1.69	177	33.2%	-0.39 [-0.74, -0.04]		
Total (95% CI)			711			727	100.0%	-0.55 [-0.75, -0.35]	•	
Heterogeneity: Chi*=					6				-2 -1 0	1 2
Test for overall effect	: Z = 5.3U) (P < U	.0000	0					Favours [Duloxetine] F	and the second firms
-										
Study or Subgroup	Dul	oextine SD	Total	Mean	ontrol SD	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI	Mean Diffe IV, Fixed, 9	
Chappell 2009	-3.02	2.38	104	-2.39	2.72	118	10.4%	-0.63 [-1.30, 0.04]		
Frakes 2011	-2.67	2.73	258	-1.73	2.58	258	22.3%	-0.94 [-1.40, -0.48]		
Uchio 2018 Wang 2017	-2.58		177	-1.74		176	32.5% 34.9%	-0.84 [-1.22, -0.46]		
Wang 2017	-2.35	1.79	1/2	-1.88	1.09	111	34.9%	-0.47 [-0.84, -0.10]		
Total (95% CI)			711			727	100.0%	-0.71 [-0.93, -0.50]	•	20 D
Heterogeneity: Chi# =					6				-2 -1 0	1 2
Test for overall effect	Z = 6.46	0 × 4) ¢	0000	0					-2 -1 U Favours (Duloxetine) F	
`				72						
Study or Subgroup	Dui Mean	oextine SD	e Total	C Mean	ontrol SD	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% Cl	Mean Diffe IV, Fixed, 9	
Chappell 2009	-2.75	2.56	104	-2.24	2.58	118	8.9%	+0.51 [-1.19, 0.17]		
Chappell 2011	-2.16	2.49	128	-1.31	2.38	128	11.4%	-0.85 [-1.45, -0.25]		
Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018	-2.68	2.57	258	-1.61	2.58	256	20.7% 30.6%	-1.07 [-1.51, -0.63] -0.81 [-1.18, -0.44]		
Wang 2017	-2.48		172	-1.76		170	28.4%	-0.30 [-0.68, 0.08]		
								and the second secon	-	
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	795	- 4 /0	839	18-34	196	855	100.0%	-0.70 [-0.90, -0.50]		
					9.20				-1 -0.5 0	0.5 1
Test for overall effect	$L_{L} = 0.77$	(P < U	0000	0					-1 -0.0 0	0.5 1
Test for overall effect	1.2=0.77	(P < U	.0000	0					Favours [Duloxetine] F	
l est for overall effect					ontrol			Mean Difference	Favours (Duloxetine) F	avours [Control]
E		oxetine			ontrol SD	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Favours (Duloxetine) F	avours [Control] rence
Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009	Dul Mean -1.53	oxetine SD 2.35	Total 104	C Mean -1.25	SD 2.45	Total 118	16.6%	N. Random, 95% Cl -0.28 [-0.91, 0.35]	Favours (Duloxetine) F	avours [Control] rence
Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011	Duk Mean -1.53 -1.85	0xetine SD 2.35 2.09	Total 104 258	Co Mean -1.25 -1.01	SD 2.45 2.24	118 255	16.6% 25.8%	V. Random, 95% Cl -0.28 [-0.91, 0.35] -0.84 [-1.22, -0.46]	Favours (Duloxetine) F	avours [Control] rence
Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018	Duk Mean -1.53 -1.85 -1.23	2.35 2.09 1.48	Total 104 258 177	C Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41	118 255 176	16.6% 25.8% 28.9%	W. Random, 95% CI -0.28 [-0.91, 0.35] -0.84 [-1.22, -0.46] -0.42 [-0.72, -0.12]	Favours (Duloxetine) F	avours [Control] rence
Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011	Duk Mean -1.53 -1.85 -1.23	0xetine SD 2.35 2.09	Total 104 258	Co Mean -1.25 -1.01	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41	118 255	16.6% 25.8%	V. Random, 95% Cl -0.28 [-0.91, 0.35] -0.84 [-1.22, -0.46]	Favours (Duloxetine) F	avours [Control] rence
Study or Subaroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI)	Dul Mean -1.53 -1.85 -1.23 -0.9	oxetine SD 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46	Total 104 258 177 172 711	C <u>Mean</u> -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48	118 255 176 177 726	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0%	W. Random, 95% CI -0.28 [-0.91, 0.35] -0.84 [-1.22, -0.46] -0.42 [-0.72, -0.12]	Favours (Duloxetine) F	avours [Control] rence
Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneth; Tau ^a :	Dul Mean -1.53 -1.85 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; Cl	2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 hi ^a = 10	Total 104 258 177 172 711	C <u>Mean</u> -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48	118 255 176 177 726	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0%	V. Random, 95% CI -0.28 [-0.91, 0.35] -0.84 [-1.22, -0.46] -0.42 [-0.72, -0.12] -0.06 [-0.37, 0.25]	Favours [Duloxetine] F	avours (Control) rence
Study or Subaroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI)	Dul Mean -1.53 -1.85 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; Cl	2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 hi ^a = 10	Total 104 258 177 172 711	C <u>Mean</u> -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48	118 255 176 177 726	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0%	V. Random, 95% CI -0.28 [-0.91, 0.35] -0.84 [-1.22, -0.46] -0.42 [-0.72, -0.12] -0.06 [-0.37, 0.25]	Favours (Duloxetine) F	avours (Control) rence .95% Cl
Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneth; Tau ^a :	Dull Mean -1.53 -1.85 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; Cl : Z = 2.28	2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 hi ^a = 10 0 (P = 0.	Total 104 258 177 172 711 0.08, dt 02)	C -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P =	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48	118 255 176 177 726	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0%	M. Bandem, 95% C1 -0.28 [-0.91, 0.35] -0.84 [+1.22, -0.46] -0.42 [-0.72, -0.12] -0.06 [-0.37, 0.25] -0.40 [-0.75, -0.06]	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random M. Random J. Random J. Random J. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F	avours [Control] rence .95% CI 0.5 1 avours [Control]
Study or Subaroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneik; Tau ² Test for overall effect	Dul <u>Mean</u> -1.53 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; Cl = 2.28 Dul	2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 hi ^a = 10 (P = 0.	Total 104 258 177 172 711 0.08, dt 02)	C <u>Mean</u> -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P =	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48	118 255 176 177 726 ; I*= 70	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0%	M. Random, 95% CI -0.28 [-0.31, 0.35] -0.84 [-1.22, 0.48] -0.42 [-0.72, -0.12] -0.06 [-0.37, 0.25] -0.40 [-0.75, -0.06] Mean Difference	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random -1 -0.5 0 Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe	avours (Control) rence
Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneth; Tau ^a :	Dull Mean -1.53 -1.85 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; Cl : Z = 2.28	2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 hi ^a = 10 (P = 0.	Total 104 258 177 172 711 0.08, dt 02)	C -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P =	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.02	118 255 176 177 726	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0% 3% Weight 13.1%	M. Random, 95% CI -0.28 [-0.91, 0.35] -0.84 [-1.22, -0.46] -0.42 [-0.72, -0.12] -0.06 [-0.37, 0.25] -0.40 [-0.75, -0.06] Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI -0.84 [-131, 0.03]	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random M. Random J. Random J. Random J. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F	avours (Control) rence
Study or Subaroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Total or Subaroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011	Dulk Mean -1.53 -1.85 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; Cl = 2.28 Dulk Mean -2.22 -2.52	oxetine <u>SD</u> 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 hi ^a = 10 (P = 0) oextine <u>SD</u> 2.56 2.25	Total 104 258 177 172 711 .08, dt 02) Total 104 258	C <u>Mean</u> -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P = C <u>Mean</u> -1.58 -1.68	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.02) ontrol SD 2.52 1.6	118 255 176 177 726 ; * = 70 <u>Total</u> 118 256	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0% 3% <u>Weight</u> 13.1% 28.9%	M. Random. <u>95%</u> C1 -0.28 [-0.81, 0.35] -0.84 [-1.22, -0.46] -0.42 [-0.72, -0.12] -0.06 [-0.37, 0.25] -0.40 [-0.75, -0.06] Mean Difference <u>M. Random. <u>95%</u> C1 -0.84 [-1.31, 0.03]</u>	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random -1 -0.5 0 Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe	avours (Control) rence
Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% C) Heterogeneily: Tau ² + Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018	Dul Mean -1.53 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; Cl : Z = 2.28 Dul Mean -2.22 -2.52 -1.65	SD 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 bi* = 10 (P = 0. oextime SD 2.56 2.25 1.48	Total 104 258 177 172 711 .08, dt 02) Total 104 258 177	C <u>Mean</u> -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P = 3 (P <u>Mean</u> -1.58 -1.68 -1.9	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.02) ontrol SD 2.52 1.6 1.48	118 255 176 177 726 ; * = 70 Total 118 256 176	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0% 3%	M. Random. 95% CI - 0.28 (-914, 0.35) - 0.28 (-914, 0.35) - 0.24 (-1, 22, -0.46) - 0.06 (-0.37, 0.55) - 0.06 (-0.37, 0.55) - 0.06 (-0.37, 0.56) Mean Difference M. Random. 95% CI - 0.64 (-1, 1.10, 0.03) - 0.46 (-1, 77, -0.15) - 0.46 (-1, 77, -0.15)	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random -1 -0.5 0 Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe	avours (Control) rence
Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^a : Test for overall effect	Dulk Mean -1.53 -1.85 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; Cl = 2.28 Dulk Mean -2.22 -2.52	SD 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 bi* = 10 (P = 0. oextime SD 2.56 2.25 1.48	Total 104 258 177 172 711 .08, dt 02) Total 104 258	C <u>Mean</u> -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P = C <u>Mean</u> -1.58 -1.68	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.02) ontrol SD 2.52 1.6 1.48	118 255 176 177 726 ; * = 70 <u>Total</u> 118 256	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0% 3% <u>Weight</u> 13.1% 28.9%	M. Random. <u>95%</u> C1 -0.28 [-0.81, 0.35] -0.84 [-1.22, -0.46] -0.42 [-0.72, -0.12] -0.06 [-0.37, 0.25] -0.40 [-0.75, -0.06] Mean Difference <u>M. Random. <u>95%</u> C1 -0.84 [-1.31, 0.03]</u>	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random -1 -0.5 0 Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe	avours (Control) rence
Study or Subaroom Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect Study or Subaroom Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct)	Duk Mean -1.53 -1.25 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; Cl = 2.28 Duk Mean -2.22 -2.55 -1.21	st st 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 1.40 0.0P = 0. 0.0P = 0. 0.0P = 0.	Total 104 258 177 172 711 0.08, dt 002) Total 104 258 177 172 711	C Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P + C Mean -1.58 -1.58 -1.58 -1.89 -0.99	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.02) 0000000000000000000000000000000000	118 255 176 177 726 ; * = 71 <u>Total</u> 118 256 176 177 727	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0%)% <u>Weight</u> 13.1% 28.9% 31.0% 27.0% 100.0%	M. Random. 95% CI - 0.28 (-914, 0.35) - 0.28 (-914, 0.35) - 0.24 (-1, 22, -0.46) - 0.06 (-0.37, 0.55) - 0.06 (-0.37, 0.55) - 0.06 (-0.37, 0.56) Mean Difference M. Random. 95% CI - 0.64 (-1, 1.10, 0.03) - 0.46 (-1, 77, -0.15) - 0.46 (-1, 77, -0.15)	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random -1 -0.5 0 Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe	avours (Control) rence
Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneily: Tau ² : Testfor overall effect Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Cl)	Dul Mean -1.53 -1.85 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; Cl : Z = 2.28 Dul Mean -2.22 -2.52 -1.65 -1.21 = 0.04; Cl	oxetine <u>SD</u> 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 hi ^p = 10 8 (P = 0 0 0 2.56 2.25 1.48 1.79 hi ^p = 6.	Total 104 258 177 172 711 .08, dt 02) Total 104 258 177 172 711 31, df	C Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P + C Mean -1.58 -1.58 -1.58 -1.89 -0.99	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.02) 0000000000000000000000000000000000	118 255 176 177 726 ; * = 71 <u>Total</u> 118 256 176 177 727	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0%)% <u>Weight</u> 13.1% 28.9% 31.0% 27.0% 100.0%	M. Randem. 95% CI 0.28 (-0.41, 0.35) 0.42 (-0.72, -0.12) 0.40 (-0.75, -0.06] 0.40 (-0.75, -0.06] Mean Difference M. Random. 95% CI 0.64 (+1.31, 0.03) 0.64 (+1.31, 0.03) 0.64 (+1.31, 0.03) 0.64 (+1.18, 0.50) 0.64 (+1.72, 0.15) 0.64 (-0.57, 0.15)	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random -1 -0.5 0 Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe	avours (Control) s9% Cl - 0.5 1 avours (Control) rence 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² + Testfor overall effect Study or Subdroup Study or Subdroup Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017	Dul Mean -1.53 -1.85 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; Cl : Z = 2.28 Dul Mean -2.22 -2.52 -1.65 -1.21 = 0.04; Cl	oxetine <u>SD</u> 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 hi ^p = 10 8 (P = 0 0 0 2.56 2.25 1.48 1.79 hi ^p = 6.	Total 104 258 177 172 711 .08, dt 02) Total 104 258 177 172 711 31, df	C Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P + C Mean -1.58 -1.58 -1.58 -1.89 -0.99	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.02) 0000000000000000000000000000000000	118 255 176 177 726 ; * = 71 <u>Total</u> 118 256 176 177 727	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0%)% <u>Weight</u> 13.1% 28.9% 31.0% 27.0% 100.0%	M. Randem. 95% CI 0.28 (-0.41, 0.35) 0.42 (-0.72, -0.12) 0.40 (-0.75, -0.06] 0.40 (-0.75, -0.06] Mean Difference M. Random. 95% CI 0.64 (+1.31, 0.03) 0.64 (+1.31, 0.03) 0.64 (+1.31, 0.03) 0.64 (+1.18, 0.50) 0.64 (+1.72, 0.15) 0.64 (-0.57, 0.15)	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random -1 -0.5 0 Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe	avours [Control] rence 95% CI - - 0.5 1 avours [Control] rence 95% CI
Study or Subaroup Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity: Tau** Testfor overall effect Study or Subaroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity: Tau*	Dull Mean 1.53 -1.85 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; Cl Z = 2.28 Dull Mean -2.22 -2.52 -2.52 -1.65 -1.21 = 0.04; Cl Z = 3.67	SD 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 hi ^a = 10 (P = 0. 2.56 2.25 1.48 1.79 hi ^a = 6.: (P = 0.	Total 104 258 177 172 711 0.08, dt 002) 710 104 258 177 172 711 31, dt= 00002)	CC Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P = -1.58 -1.68 -1.58 -1.19 -0.99 = 3 (P =	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.02) = 0.02) 1.6 1.48 1.69 0.10); =	118 255 176 177 726 ; * = 71 <u>Total</u> 118 256 176 177 727	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0%)% <u>Weight</u> 13.1% 28.9% 31.0% 27.0% 100.0%	M. Random. 95% CI 0.29 (-041, 0.35) -0.42 (-0.72, -0.12) -0.40 (-0.75, -0.06] -0.40 (-0.75, -0.06] Mean Difference M. Random. 95% CI -0.64 (+1, 31, 0.03) -0.84 (+1, 18, -0.50) -0.46 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.46 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.45 (-0.59, 0.15) -0.53 (-0.81, -0.25)	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random -1 -0.5 0 Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random -2 -1 0 Favours [Duloxetine] F	avours [Control] rence
Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² + Test for overall effect	Dult Mean -1.53 -1.85 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; C Z = 2.28 Dult Mean -2.22 -2.52 -1.65 -1.21 = 0.04; C Z = 3.67 Dult	SD 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 1.46 hi ^a = 100 (P = 0 0.09 2.56 2.25 1.48 1.79 1.79 hi ^a = 6.3 0.00	Total 104 258 177 172 711 .08, dt 002) Total 104 258 177 172 711 31, df= 00002)	C Mean -1.25 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P = -0.84 = 3 (P = -1.58 -1.68 -1.19 -0.99 = 3 (P = -0.99	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.02) 000000000000000000000000000000000000	118 255 176 177 726 726 727 727 727 727 727 727	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0% 3% <u>Weight</u> 13.1% 28.9% 31.0% 27.0% 100.0%	M. Randen. 95% CI 0.28 (-041, 0.35) -0.48 (-12, -0.46) -0.42 (-0.72, -0.12) -0.40 (-0.75, -0.06) Mean Difference M. Random. 95% CI -0.64 (-131, 0.03) -0.48 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.48 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.48 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.53 (-0.81, -0.25) Mean Difference	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe	avours [Control] rence s5% Cl
Study or Subaroup Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity: Tau** Testfor overall effect Study or Subaroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity: Tau*	Dult Mean -1.53 -1.85 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; C Z = 2.28 Dult Mean -2.22 -2.52 -1.65 -1.21 = 0.04; C Z = 3.67 Dult	so extine SD 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 hi ^a = 10 0 (P = 0 0 2.56 2.25 1.48 1.79 hi ^a = 6. (P = 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Total 104 258 177 172 711 .08, dt 002) Total 104 258 177 172 711 31, df= 00002)	CC Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P = -1.58 -1.68 -1.58 -1.19 -0.99 = 3 (P =	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.02) = 0.02) 1.6 1.48 1.69 0.10); =	118 255 176 177 726 726 727 727 727 727 727 727	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0%)% <u>Weight</u> 13.1% 28.9% 31.0% 27.0% 100.0%	M. Random. 95% CI 0.29 (-041, 0.35) -0.42 (-0.72, -0.12) -0.40 (-0.75, -0.06] -0.40 (-0.75, -0.06] Mean Difference M. Random. 95% CI -0.64 (+1, 31, 0.03) -0.84 (+1, 18, -0.50) -0.46 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.46 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.45 (-0.59, 0.15) -0.53 (-0.81, -0.25)	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random -1 -0.5 0 Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random -2 -1 0 Favours [Duloxetine] F	avours [Control] rence s5% Cl
Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Tau?- Testfor overall effect Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Tau?- Testfor overall effect	Dull Mean -1.53 -1.83 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; CC Z = 2.28 Mean -2.22 -2.52 -1.65 -1.21 = 0.04; CC Z = 3.67 Dull Mean -1.14 -1.78	$\frac{SD}{2.35}$ 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 $hi^{\mu} = 10$ 0 $Q^{\mu} = 0$ 0 $Q^{\mu} = 0$ 1.48 1.79 $hi^{\mu} = 6.3$ $(Q^{\mu} = 0)$ $hi^{\mu} = 6.3$ $(Q^{\mu} = 0)$ $hi^{\mu} = 10$ $(Q^{\mu} = 0)$ $(Q^{\mu} = 0)$ $hi^{\mu} = 10$ $(Q^{\mu} = 0)$ $hi^{\mu} = 10$ $hi^{\mu} = 1$	Total 104 258 177 172 711 0.08, dt 002) 104 258 177 172 711 31, df 31, d	C Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P = -1.58 -1.68 -1.68 -1.68 -1.68 -1.68 -1.69 -3 (P = -2.57) -3 (P = -2.57) -1.16 -1.57 -1.17 -1.57 -1	<u>SD</u> 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.02) 0.02) 2.52 1.6 1.48 1.69 0.10); SD 0.10); SD 0.10); 1.69	118 255 176 177 726 118 256 176 177 727 727 727 727 727 727 727 727 727 727 726 177 177	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0% 13.1% 27.0% 100.0% %	Meanoten	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe	avours [Control] rence s5% Cl
Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau ² + Testfor overall effect Study or Subaroun Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Tetal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau ² + Test for overall effect Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018	Dush Mean. -1.53 -1.83 -0.9 = 0.08; Cl Z = 2.26 Dush Mean. -2.22 -2.52 -1.21 -1.21 -2.52 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.23 -1.23 -2.58 -1.21 -1.23 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -2.59 -2.58 -	xetine <u>SD</u> 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 0 (P = 0 0 (P = 0 <u>SD</u> 2.56 2.25 1.48 1.79 hP = 6 (P = 0 hP = 0 <u>SD</u> 1.66 1.55 2.41	Total 104 258 177 172 711 0.08, dd 02) 711 104 258 177 172 711 31, df 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 258	C Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P = -1.58 -1.68 -1.68 -1.68 -1.69 -0.99 = 3 (P = -0.99 = 3 (P = -0.99 = 3 (P = -1.16 -1.58 -1.16 -1.58 -1.25 -1.15 -1.19 -1.28 -1.19 -1.58 -1.19 -1.58 -1.19 -1.58 -1.19 -1.58 -1.19 -1.58 -1.19 -1.19 -1.19 -1.19 -1.19 -1.11 -1.15 -1.11 -1.15	SD 2.45 2.245 2.24 2.25 2.24 1.41 1.48 1.41 1.48 0.023 2.52 0.10); 1.69 0.10); 1.69 1.69 1.55 2.56 2.56	118 255 776 177 726 117 118 256 177 727 727 727 727 727 727 727 727 727	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0% 1% 100.0% 5% 100.0% 5%	M. Randem. 95% CI 0.28 (-0.41, 0.35) -0.42 (-0.72, -0.12) -0.40 [-0.75, -0.06] -0.40 [-0.75, -0.06] Mean Difference M. Random. 95% CI -0.44 [-1.18, -0.50] -0.45 [-1.31, 0.03] -0.46 [-1.77, -0.15] -0.46 [-0.77, -0.15] -0.46 [-0.77, -0.15] -0.46 [-0.77, -0.15] -0.46 [-0.72, -0.15] -0.46 [-0.42, -0.81, -0.25] Mean Difference M. Random. 95% CI -0.07 [-0.42, 0.28] -0.47 [-0.42, 0.24, -0.80] -0.47 [-0.42, 0.24, -0.80] -0.47 [-0.42, 0.24, -0.80] -0.47 [-0.42, 0.24, -0.80] -0.47 [-0.42, 0.24, -0.80] -0.47 [-0.42, 0.24, -0.80] -0.42 [-0.42, -0.30] -0.42 [-0.42, -0.80] -0.42 [-0.42, -0.80]	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe	avours [Control] rence s5% Cl
Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Tau?- Testfor overall effect Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Tau?- Testfor overall effect	Dush Mean. -1.53 -1.83 -0.9 = 0.08; Cl Z = 2.26 Dush Mean. -2.22 -2.52 -1.21 -1.21 -2.52 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.23 -1.23 -2.58 -1.21 -1.23 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -1.23 -2.58 -2.59 -2.58 -	$\frac{SD}{2.35}$ 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 $hi^{\mu} = 10$ 0 $Q^{\mu} = 0$ 0 $Q^{\mu} = 0$ 1.48 1.79 $hi^{\mu} = 6.3$ $(Q^{\mu} = 0)$ $hi^{\mu} = 6.3$ $(Q^{\mu} = 0)$ $hi^{\mu} = 10$ $(Q^{\mu} = 0)$ $(Q^{\mu} = 0)$ $hi^{\mu} = 10$ $(Q^{\mu} = 0)$ $hi^{\mu} = 10$ $hi^{\mu} = 1$	Total 104 258 177 172 711 0.08, dd 02) 711 104 258 177 172 711 31, df 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 258	C Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P = -1.58 -1.68 -1.68 -1.68 -1.68 -1.68 -1.69 -3 (P = -2.57) -3 (P = -2.57) -1.16 -1.57 -1.17 -1.57 -1	SD 2.45 2.245 2.24 2.25 2.24 1.41 1.48 1.41 1.48 0.023 2.52 0.10); 1.69 0.10); 1.69 1.69 1.55 2.56 2.56	118 255 176 177 726 118 256 176 177 727 727 727 727 727 727 727 727 727 727 726 177 177	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0% 13.1% 27.0% 100.0% %	Meanoten	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe	avours [Control] rence s5% Cl
Study or Subgroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity: Tau ² - Test for overall effect Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity: Tau ² - Test for overall effect	Dula Mean -1.53 -1.85 -1.23 -0.9 -0.08; Cl Z = 2.28 Dula Mean -1.21 -2.52 -1.21 -1.21 -2.52 -1.21 -0.9 -1.21 -2.22 -3.67 -1.21 -0.9 -1.23 -0.9 -1.23 -0.9 -2.22 -2.58 -1.21 -1.23 -0.9 -1.23 -2.22 -2.58 -1.21 -1.23 -2.22 -2.58 -1.21 -1.23 -2.22 -2.58 -1.21 -1.23 -2.22 -2.58 -1.21 -1.21 -2.22 -2.58 -1.21 -1.21 -2.22 -2.58 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.21 -1.25 -1.21 -1.25 -1.21 -1.21 -1.25 -1.21 -1.25 -1.21 -1.25 -1.21 -1.25 -1.25 -1.21 -1.25 -1.21 -1.25 -2.23 -2.25 -2.23 -2.33 -2.23 -2.33 -2.23 -2.23 -2.33 -2.23 -2.33 -2.23 -2.33 -2.23 -2.33 -2.23 -2.33 -2.23 -2.33 -2.23 -2.33 -2.23 -2.33 -2.23 -2.33 -2.23 -2.33 -2.23 -2.33	SD SD 2.35 2.09 1.46 1.60 hi ^a = 10 0 0 (P = 0. 0 1.79 0 hi ^a = 6. 1.55 1.55 1.48 1.55 2.25	Total 104 258 177 172 711 .08, dd 002) 701 104 258 177 172 711 31, df 258 100 258 104 711	C Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P = 3 (P -1.58 -1.19 -0.99 = 3 (P = -1.68 -1.19 -0.99 = 3 (P = -1.68 -1.19 -0.99 = 3 (P = -1.25 -1.11 -1.25 -1.11 -1.25	<u>SD</u> 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.022 1.6 1.48 1.69 0.10); <u>SD</u> 1.55 2.56 2.55	118 255 176 177 726 177 726 177 726 178 178 177 727 727 727 727 727 727 727	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.9% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0% Weight 13.1% 27.9% 100.0% % Weight 10.0.0%	M. Randem. 95% Cl 0.28 (-0.41, 0.35) -0.42 (-0.72, -0.12) -0.40 [-0.75, -0.06] -0.40 [-0.75, -0.06] Mean Difference M. Random. 95% Cl -0.64 [-1.31, 0.03] -0.44 [-1.18, -0.50] -0.45 [-1.31, 0.03] -0.46 [-0.77, -0.15] -0.46 [-0.77, -0.15] -0.45 [-0.53] [-0.81, -0.25] Mean Difference M. Random. 95% Cl -0.45 [-0.73, -0.48] -0.45 [-0.73, -0.48] -0.45 [-0.73, -0.48] -0.45 [-0.73, -0.48] -0.46 [-0.77, -0.15] -0.46 [-0.77, -0.15] -0.46 [-0.77, -0.15] -0.46 [-0.77, -0.15] -0.46 [-0.77, -0.15] -0.46 [-0.77, -0.15] -0.46 [-0.77, -0.15] -0.46 [-0.77, -0.15] -0.47 [-0.42, -0.28] -0.52 [-0.94, -0.30] -0.37 [-0.34, -0.40] -0.37 [-0.45, -0.10] -0.37 [-0.45, -0.10]	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe	avours [Control] rence s5% Cl
Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect Study or Subaroun Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect Study or Subaroun Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Study or Subaroun Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Study or Subaroun Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017	Dusk Mean. -1.53 -1.23 -0.9 -1.23 -0.9 -2.22 -2.52 -2.52 -1.65 -1.21 -2.22 -2.62 Z = 3.67 -1.65 -1.21 -1.65 -1.23 -0.9 -1.65 -1.23 -0.9 -2.22 -2.58 -1.23 -0.9 -2.22 -2.58 -1.23 -0.9 -1.23 -2.25 -2.25 -2.26 -2.25 -2.26 -2.25 -2.36 -1.21 -1.75 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.36 -1.77 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.36 -1.77 -2.56 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.36 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.35 -2.25 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.25 -2.35 -2.25 -2.35 -2.25 -2.35 -2.25 -2.35 -2.25 -2.35 -2.25 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.55 -2.35 -2.35 -2.55 -2.35 -2.55 -2.35 -2.55 -2.35 -2.55 -2.35 -2.55 -2.35 -2.55 -2.35 -2.55 -2.35 -2.55	SD SD 2.35 2.09 2.09 2.09 0.07 = 0.00 0.07 = 0.00 0.07 = 0.00 0.07 = 0.00 0.07 = 0.00 0.07 = 0.00 0.07 = 0.00 0.00 0.07 = 0.00 0.00 0.08 = 0.00 0.00 0.09 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 <	Total 104 258 177 172 711 0.08, df 002) 711 104 258 177 172 711 104 258 177 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 177 172 177 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 715 715 715 715 715 715 715 715 715 715	C Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P = 3 (P -1.58 -1.19 -0.99 = 3 (P = -1.68 -1.19 -0.99 = 3 (P = -1.68 -1.19 -0.99 = 3 (P = -1.25 -1.11 -1.25 -1.11 -1.25	<u>SD</u> 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.022 1.6 1.48 1.69 0.10); <u>SD</u> 1.55 2.56 2.55	118 255 176 177 726 177 726 177 726 178 178 177 727 727 727 727 727 727 727	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.9% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0% Weight 13.1% 27.9% 100.0% % Weight 10.0.0%	M. Randem. 95% CI 0.28 (-0.41, 0.35) -0.42 (-0.72, -0.12) -0.40 (-0.75, -0.06) -0.40 (-0.75, -0.06) Mean Difference M. Random. 95% CI -0.44 (-1.18, -0.50) -0.45 (-1.31, 0.03) -0.46 (-1.77, -0.15) -0.46 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.46 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.46 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.46 (-0.42, -0.28) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.28) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.28) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.48 (-0.40) -0.48 (-0.42, 0.24)	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe	avours [Control] rence s5% Cl
Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ch Heterogeneity, Tau ²⁺ Testfor overall effect Study or Subaroun Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Tetal (95% Ch Heterogeneity, Tau ²⁺ Test for overall effect Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Study or Subaroun Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ch	Dusk Mean. -1.53 -1.23 -0.9 -1.23 -0.9 -2.22 -2.52 -2.52 -1.65 -1.21 -2.22 -2.62 Z = 3.67 -1.65 -1.21 -1.65 -1.23 -0.9 -1.65 -1.23 -0.9 -2.22 -2.58 -1.23 -0.9 -2.22 -2.58 -1.23 -0.9 -1.23 -2.25 -2.25 -2.26 -2.25 -2.26 -2.25 -2.36 -1.21 -1.75 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.36 -1.77 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.36 -1.77 -2.56 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.36 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.25 -2.35 -2.25 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.25 -2.35 -2.25 -2.35 -2.25 -2.35 -2.25 -2.35 -2.25 -2.35 -2.25 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.35 -2.55 -2.35 -2.35 -2.55 -2.35 -2.55 -2.35 -2.55 -2.35 -2.55 -2.35 -2.55 -2.35 -2.55 -2.35 -2.55 -2.35 -2.55	SD SD 2.35 2.09 2.09 2.09 0.07 = 0.00 0.07 = 0.00 0.07 = 0.00 0.07 = 0.00 0.07 = 0.00 0.07 = 0.00 0.07 = 0.00 0.00 0.07 = 0.00 0.00 0.08 = 0.00 0.00 0.09 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 0.00 = 0.00 0.00 <	Total 104 258 177 172 711 0.08, df 002) 711 104 258 177 172 711 104 258 177 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 177 172 177 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 715 715 715 715 715 715 715 715 715 715	C Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P = 3 (P -1.58 -1.19 -0.99 = 3 (P = -1.68 -1.19 -0.99 = 3 (P = -1.68 -1.19 -0.99 = 3 (P = -1.25 -1.11 -1.25 -1.11 -1.25	<u>SD</u> 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.022 1.6 1.48 1.69 0.10); <u>SD</u> 1.55 2.56 2.55	118 255 176 177 726 177 726 177 726 178 178 177 727 727 727 727 727 727 727	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.9% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0% Weight 13.1% 27.9% 100.0% % Weight 10.0.0%	M. Randem. 95% CI 0.28 (-0.41, 0.35) -0.42 (-0.72, -0.12) -0.40 (-0.75, -0.06) -0.40 (-0.75, -0.06) Mean Difference M. Random. 95% CI -0.44 (-1.18, -0.50) -0.45 (-1.31, 0.03) -0.46 (-1.77, -0.15) -0.46 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.46 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.46 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.46 (-0.42, -0.28) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.28) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.28) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.47 (-0.42, 0.24) -0.48 (-0.40) -0.48 (-0.42, 0.24)	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random -1 -0.5 0 Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random -2 -1 0 Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random	avours [Control] rence
Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ch Heterogeneity, Tau ²⁺ Testfor overall effect Study or Subaroun Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Tetal (95% Ch Heterogeneity, Tau ²⁺ Test for overall effect Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Study or Subaroun Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ch	Dula Mean -1.53 -1.85 -1.23 -0.9 =0.08; Cl Z = 2.28 Mean -2.22 -2.62 -1.65 -1.21 =0.04; Cl Z = 3.67 Mean -1.14 -1.78 -2.58 -2.3 =0.4; Cl -2.58 -2.58 -1.21 -2.58 -2.58 -1.21 -2.58 -2.58 -1.21 -2.58 -2.58 -1.21 -2.58 -2.58 -1.21 -2.58 -1.21 -2.58 -1.21 -2.58 -2.58 -1.21 -2.58 -1.21 -2.58 -1.21 -2.58 -1.21 -2.58 -1.21 -2.58 -1.21 -2.58 -1.21 -2.58 -1.21 -1.78 -2.58 -1.21 -1.78 -2.58 -1.21 -1.78 -2.58 -1.78 -2.58 -1.78 -2.58 -1.78 -2.58 -1.78 -2.58 -2.58 -1.78 -2.58 -2.58 -1.78 -2.58 -2.58 -1.78 -2.58 -2.58 -1.78 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -1.78 -2.574 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.574 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.574 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.58 -2.574 -2.58 -2.574 -2.58 -2.574 -2.58 -2.574 -2.58 -2.574 -2.58 -2.574 -2.58 -2.574 -2.58 -2.574 -2.58 -2.574 -2.58 -2.574 -2.58 -2.574 -2.58 -2.574 -2.58 -2.5744 -2.574 -2.	$\begin{array}{l} \begin{array}{l} \begin{array}{l} \text{sp}\\ \text{sp}\\ 2.35\\ 2.09\\ 2.35\\ 1.48\\ 1.46\\ 1.6\\ 0\\ \text{cectime}\\ 5\\ 2.25\\ 2.25\\ 1.48\\ 1.79\\ 1.6\\ 1.55\\ 1.55\\ 2.41\\ 2.55\\ 1.55\\ 1.6\\ 1.55\\ 1.55\\ 1.6\\ 1.55\\ 1.5\\ 1.5\\ 1.5\\ 1.5\\ 1.5\\ 1.6\\ 1.5\\ 1.5\\ 1.5\\ 1.5\\ 1.5\\ 1.5\\ 1.5\\ 1.5$	Total 104 258 177 172 711 0.08, d1 0.08, d1 0.08, d1 0.08, d1 0.08, d1 0.08, d1 0.08, d1 0.08, d1 104 258 177 172 711 712 711	CC Mean -1.25 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P = CC Mean -1.68 -1.19 -0.99 = 3 (P = CC Mean -1.71 -1.68 -1.19 -0.99 = 3 (P = -1.51 -1.01 -1.51 -1.01 -1.51 -1.01 -1.52 -1.52	<u>SD</u> 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.02j 2.52 1.6 1.48 1.69 0.10); <u>SD</u> 2.52 2.56 2.65 2.65	118 255 176 177 726 177 726 177 726 178 178 177 727 727 727 727 727 727 727	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.9% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0% Weight 13.1% 27.9% 100.0% % Weight 10.0.0%	Meandem.95% Cl 0.28 (-0.41, 0.35) -0.42 (-0.72, -0.12) -0.40 (-0.75, -0.06] Mean Difference M. Random.95% Cl -0.46 (-1.72, -0.12) -0.61 (-0.75, -0.06] Mean Difference M. Random.95% Cl -0.46 (-1.72, -0.15) -0.46 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.47 (-0.72, -0.15) -0.48 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.48 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.48 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.48 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.48 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.48 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.48 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.48 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.48 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.48 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.48 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.48 (-0.77, -0.15) -0.48 (-0.72, -0.25) Mean Difference M. Random, 95% Cl -0.07 (-0.42, -0.28) -0.28 (-0.42, -0.28) -0.28 (-0.42, -0.28) -0.28 (-0.42, -0.28) -0.28 (-0.42, -0.28) -0.28 (-1.48, -0.10) -0.60 (-1.03, -0.17)	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random -1 -0.5 0 Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F	avours [Control] rence \$5% CI
Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^{2, 2} Testfor overall effect Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^{2, 2} Testfor overall effect Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^{2, 2} Testfor overall effect Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ^{2, 2} Testfor overall effect	Dul Mean. -1.53 -1.25 -1.25 -0.9 = 0.08; CC Z = 2.28 Dul Mean. -2.22 -2.52 -1.21 = 0.04; CC Z = 3.67 Dul Mean. -1.14 -1.78 -2.28 = 0.4; CC Z = 2.74 Dul Mean. -1.14 -2.28 -2.23	oxetime SD 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 hi ^p = 10 0 (P = 0 oextime SD hi ^p = 6 SD hi ^p = 12 ((P = 0 oextime SD b) b) b) b) b) b) c) c) c) c) c) c) c) c) c) c	Total 104 258 177 112 711 008, dt 002) 104 258 107 711 104 258 104 177 258 104 711 177 258 104 56, dt 0006)	CC Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 =3 (P+ -1.58 -1.58 -1.58 -1.19 -0.99 -3 (P= CC Mean -1.57 -1.52 -	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.023 ontrol SD 2.52 1.69 0.10); 1.69 1.69 1.55 2.55 2.65 0.004	118 255 176 177 726 177 726 177 178 256 118 177 727 727 176 118 256 118 727 5); (* = ?)	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.8% 100.0% 13.1% 28.9% 27.0% 100.0% 6 Weight 100.0% 6 Weight 100.0% 6 Weight 100.0% 6 Weight 100.0%	Mean difference Mean Di	Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Duloxetine] F Favours [Duloxetine] F	avours [Control] rence
Study or Subaroup Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% C) Heterogenety, Tau*1 Test for overall effect Study or Subaroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% C) Heterogenety, Tau*1 Test for overall effect Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Study or Subaroup Heterogenety, Tau*1 Test for overall effect Heterogenety, Tau*3 Test for overall effect	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Dulk}\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -1.53\\ -1.85\\ -1.23\\ -0.9\\ 0.08; Cl \\ Z=228\\ \textbf{Dulk}\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -2.22\\ -2.52\\ -1.21\\ \textbf{Dulk}\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -2.22\\ -2.52\\ -1.21\\ \textbf{Dulk}\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -2.58\\ -2.38\\ 0.14; Cl \\ 2.2 \\ 2.74\\ \textbf{Dulk}\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -2.38\\ -2.38\\ -2.38\\ -2.38\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -2.38\\ -2.38\\ -2.38\\ -2.38\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -2.38\\ -$	oxetime SD 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 hi ^a = 100 (P = 0. soextime SD 1.48 1.79 1.68 1.55 2.41 2.56 hi ^a = 12 (P = 0. soextime SD .241 2.55 2.41 2.55 2.41 2.52 1.68 .52 2.41 2.55 2.218	Total 104 258 177 172 711 0.08, dd 02) 104 104 258 177 172 258 104 172 177 258 104 711 .56, dd 0006)	CC Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 = 3 (P -1.58 -1.68 -1.68 -1.69 -0.99 -3 (P = -1.16 -1.55 -1.52	SD 2.45 2.24 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.02) 2.52 1.6 1.69 0.10); 1.55 2.56 2.55 2.56 2.55 2.56 2.55 2.56 2.55 2.56 2.55 2.65 = 0.000	118 255 176 177 726 117 177 726 118 256 177 727 727 727 727 727 727 727 727 727	16.6% 25.8% 28.9% 28.6% 100.0% 31.31% 28.9% 27.0% 100.0% % Weight 12.7% 25.4% 100.0% 6% Weight 10.0%	M. Random. 95% Cl 0.29 (-0.41, 0.35) -0.42 (-0.72, -0.12) -0.40 (-0.75, -0.06] Mean Difference M. Random. 95% Cl -0.40 (-0.75, -0.06] -0.40 (-0.75, -0.06] -0.40 (-0.75, -0.06] -0.40 (-0.75, -0.06] -0.46 (-0.77, -0.15] -0.46 (-0.77, -0.15] -0.22 (-0.59, 0.15] -0.23 (-0.59, -0.15] -0.25 (-0.59, -0.15] -0.27 (-0.42, 0.28) -0.37 (-1.45, -0.017) -0.60 (-1.03, -0.17) Mean Difference M. Random. 95% Cl -0.57 (-1.15, 0.02)	Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe	avours [Control] rence
Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity: Tau ²⁺ Testfor overall effect Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity: Tau ²⁺ Testfor overall effect Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity: Tau ²⁺ Testfor overall effect Chappell 2009 Chappell 2009 Chappell 2009 Chappell 2009 Uchio 2018 Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Chappell 2009	Dul Mean. -1.53 -1.25 -1.25 -0.9 -0.9 -0.2 Z = 2.28 -2.22 -2.52 -1.21 = 0.04; Cl Z = 3.67 -1.21 = 0.04; Cl Z = 2.74 -1.21 = 0.04; Cl Z = 2.74 -1.21 = 0.04; Cl Z = 2.74 -1.21 = 0.04; Cl Z = 2.74 -1.21 = 0.04; Cl Z = 2.74 -1.21 -2.22 -2.23 -2.23 -2.23 -2.23 -2.23 -2.24 -2.23 -2.24 -2.23 -2.24 -2	oxetime SD 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 hi ^p = 10 0 cextime SD 1.66 1.55 1.69 1.55 1.69 1.55 1.69 1.55 1.69 1.55 1.69 1.55 1.48 1.79 0 cextime SD 2.41 2.55 1.48 1.69 1.55 1.66 1.55 1.48 1.69 1.55 1.68 1.55 1.48 1.68 1.55 1.68 1.55 1.48 1.68 1.55 1.68 1.55 1.48 1.68 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48	Total 104 258 177 172 711 0.08, dt 002) 711 104 258 177 172 711 31, df 104 177 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 772 711 772 711 772 711 772 711 772 711 772 711 772 711 772 711 772 711 772 711 772 711 772 771 777 771 772 771 772 771 772 771 772 771 777 771 771 777 771	CC Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 =3 (P+ -1.58 -1.58 -1.58 -1.19 -0.99 -3 (P= CC Mean -1.57 -1.52 -	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.023 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 1.69 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 1.69 0.103; 1.69 0.104; 1.69 0.105; 2.56 2.655 0.000 2.33 1.48	118 255 176 177 726 118 256 177 727 726 118 256 177 727 727 727 176 177 176 177 176 177 176 176	16.6% 25.8% 28.6% 28.6% 3% Weisht 13.1% 27.7% 27.0% 27.0% 27.0% 27.0% 10.00% 5 Weisht 18.3% 56 6%	Mean difference Mean Di	Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe	avours [Control] rence
Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity, Tau ^{2, 2} Testfor overall effect Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity, Tau ^{2, 2} Testfor overall effect Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity, Tau ^{2, 3} Testfor overall effect Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2016 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneity, Tau ^{2, 4} Testfor overall effect Chappell 2009 Uchio 2016 Wang 2017	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Dulk}\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -1.53\\ -1.85\\ -1.23\\ -0.9\\ 0.08; Cl \\ Z=228\\ \textbf{Dulk}\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -2.22\\ -2.52\\ -1.21\\ \textbf{Dulk}\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -2.22\\ -2.52\\ -1.21\\ \textbf{Dulk}\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -2.58\\ -2.38\\ 0.14; Cl \\ 2.2 \\ 2.74\\ \textbf{Dulk}\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -2.38\\ -2.38\\ -2.38\\ -2.38\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -2.38\\ -2.38\\ -2.38\\ -2.38\\ \textbf{Mean}\\ -2.38\\ -$	oxetime SD 2.35 2.09 1.48 1.46 hi ^p = 10 0 cextime SD 1.66 1.55 1.69 1.55 1.69 1.55 1.69 1.55 1.69 1.55 1.69 1.55 1.48 1.79 0 cextime SD 2.41 2.55 1.48 1.69 1.55 1.66 1.55 1.48 1.69 1.55 1.68 1.55 1.48 1.68 1.55 1.68 1.55 1.48 1.68 1.55 1.68 1.55 1.48 1.68 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48 1.55 1.48	Total 104 258 711 .08, dd 002) 711 104 258, dd 0002) 711 31, df 172 711 31, df 172 711 31, df 172 711 172 711 172 711 104 177 711 172 711 711 712 711 717 711 717 711 717 711 717 711 717 711 717 711 711 717 711 711 717 71177	CC Mean -1.25 -0.81 -0.84 -1.68 -1.58 -1.68 -1.58 -1.68 -1.58 -1.68 -1.58 -1.68 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.54 -1.58	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.023 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 1.69 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 0.103; 1.69 0.103; 1.69 0.104; 1.69 0.105; 2.56 2.655 0.000 2.33 1.48	118 255 176 177 726 118 118 128 177 727 727 727 727 727 727 727	16.6% 25.8% 28.6% 28.6% 28.6% 3% Weisht 13.1% 27.7% 27.7% 27.7% 27.7% 10.0% 5 Weisht 13.1% 27.7% 10.0% 5 Weisht 10.0% 5 6%	Mean difference Mean Di	Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe	avours [Control] rence
Study or Subaroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% C) Heterogenety, Tau*1 Test for overall effect Study or Subaroup Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Tau*1 Test for overall effect Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Tau*4 Test for overall effect Study or Subaroup Heterogeneity, Tau*4 Test for overall effect Study of Subaroup Heterogeneity, Tau*4 Test for overall effect Chappell 2009 Chappell 2009 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% C)	Dub Mean. -1.53 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; CI 2 = 2.28 -2.52 -1.21 = 0.04; CI 2 = 2.62 -1.21 = 0.04; CI 2 = 2.62 -2.52 -2.52 -2.52 = 0.04; CI 2 = 2.74 -2.52 = 0.04; CI 2 = 2.74 -2.54	oxetime $\frac{SD}{2.35}$ 2.35 2.09 1.48 $hl^{\mu} = 10$ 0 ($P = 00$ ($P = 01.681.79hl^{\mu} = 6.32.412.552.412.521.652.412.562.251.611.652.412.562.251.611.652.412.562.251.611.652.412.562.251.611.652.411.552.181.481.33$	Total 104 258 711 107 177 711 108, dt 0002) 711 104 258 104 177 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 104 258 0002) 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 104 258 711 172 711 104 258 711 172 711 104 258 711 172 711 172 711 104 258 711 172 711 717 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 172 711 717 711 725 711 772 711 772 711 772 711 772 711 772 711 772 711 772 771 771	CC Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 -1.08 -1.88 -1.19 -0.99 -0.99 -3 (P = CC Mean -1.07 -1.55 -1.52 = 3 (P + -1.8 -1.8 -1.9 -1.9 -1.9 -1.9 -1.9 -1.9 -1.19 -0.99 -1.19 -0.99 -1.19 -1.55 -1.52 -1.55 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.55 -1.52	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.02] 0.102 1.69 0.100; 1.55 2.56 2.55 2.55 2.56 2.55 2.55 2.56 2.55 2.55 1.55 2.65 1.55 2.65	118 255 176 177 726 118 256 118 256 177 727 727 727 727 727 727 727	16.6% 25.8% 28.6% 100.0% 13.1% 23.7% 100.0% 100.0% 5 Weight 100.0% 5 Weight 10.0% 100.0%	Mean difference Mean Di	Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe	avours [Control] rence
Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneily: Tau ^{2, 2} Testfor overall effect Study or Subaroun Chappell 2009 Frakes 2011 Uchio 2018 Wang 2017 Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneily: Tau ^{2, 2} Total (95% Ct) Heterogeneily: Tau	Dudi Mean. -1.53 -1.85 -1.23 -0.9 = 0.08; CC Z = 2.28 -2.22 -2.52 -1.21 = 0.04; CC Z = 3.67 -1.21 = 0.04; CC Z = 3.67 -1.21 = 0.04; CC Z = 2.74 Dudi Mean. -2.38 = 0.14; CC Z = 2.74 Dudi Mean. -2.38 = 0.14; CC Z = 2.74 Dudi Mean. -2.38 = 0.14; CC Z = 2.74 Dudi Mean. -2.38 = 0.14; CC Z = 2.74 Dudi Mean. -2.14; CC Z = 2.74 Dudi Mean. -2.24 -2.54 -2.	oxetime $\frac{SD}{2.35}$ 2.269 1.48 $hi^{\mu} = 10$ (P = 0 $\frac{SD}{2.56}$ 2.25 1.48 1.79 $hi^{\mu} = 6.2$ (P = 0 $\frac{SD}{2.55}$ $hi^{\mu} = 12$ (P = 0 $\frac{SD}{2.55}$ $hi^{\mu} = 12$ (P = 0 $\frac{SD}{2.55}$ $hi^{\mu} = 12$ $\frac{SD}{2.41}$ $\frac{SD}{2.41}$ $\frac{SD}{2.41}$ $\frac{SD}{2.41}$ $\frac{SD}{2.41}$ $\frac{SD}{2.18}$ 1.48 1.33 $hi^{\mu} = 3.1$	Total 104 258 177 177 711 008, dd 002) 711 104 258 177 172 258 104 177 172 711 172 711 177 172 711 177 172 177 172 177 172 177 172 177 172 177 172 177 172 104 104 258 104 104 258 104 104 258 104 104 258 104 104 258 104 104 258 104 104 258 104 104 258 104 104 258 104 104 258 104 104 258 104 104 258 104 104 258 104 107 177 172 258 104 104 258 104 104 258 107 177 172 258 104 104 258 104 107 177 172 258 104 104 258 107 177 172 104 104 104 107 177 172 104 104 104 104 104 104 104 104 104 104	CC Mean -1.25 -1.01 -0.81 -0.84 -1.68 -1.68 -1.68 -1.68 -1.68 -1.68 -1.69 -0.99 -0.107 -1.107 -1.55 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.52 -1.34 -1.3	SD 2.45 2.24 1.41 1.48 = 0.02] 0.102 1.69 0.100; 1.55 2.56 2.55 2.55 2.56 2.55 2.55 2.56 2.55 2.55 1.55 2.65 1.55 2.65	118 255 176 177 726 118 256 118 256 177 727 727 727 727 727 727 727	16.6% 25.8% 28.6% 100.0% 13.1% 23.7% 100.0% 100.0% 5 Weight 100.0% 5 Weight 10.0% 100.0%	Mean difference Mean Di	Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe M. Random Favours [Dulovetine] F Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe Mean Diffe	avours [Control] rence

FIGURE 5. Effects of duloxetine in the interference of pain measured by Brief Pain Inventory-Interference: (A) patient general activity; (B) mood; (C) walking ability; (D) normal work; (E) relations with other people; (F) sleep; (G) enjoyment of life; and (H) average interference. CI indicates confidence interval.

system review and meta-analysis published in 2019 is effective in the management of chronic pain and loss of physical function but having no advantage in treating joint stiffness.²⁷ The consistent findings from above system reviews and metaanalyses were duloxetine had a beneficial impact on pain relief, function improvement across all studies. In addition, our evidence showed that duloxetine can also ameliorate the knee stiffness, although the significant change in the quality

A	Dul	oextine		С	ontrol			Mean Difference		Me	an Differe	nce	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI		IV,	Fixed, 95%	6 CI	
Abou-Raya 2012	24.6	8.4	144	30.3	9.8	144	19.0%	-5.70 [-7.81, -3.59]	3	-			
Chappell 2009	-16.46	14.65	104	-11.58	12.39	115	6.5%	-4.88 [-8.49, -1.27]	-		-		
Chappell 2011	-12.69	13.01	128	-9.43	12.22	128	8.8%	-3.26 [-6.35, -0.17]					
Frakes 2011	-15.09	13.01	251	-10.25	13.12	253	16.2%	-4.84 [-7.12, -2.56]			·		
Uchio 2018	-11.77	8.91	177	-7.07	8.76	176	24.9%	-4.70 [-6.54, -2.86]					
Wang 2017	-9.64	9.14	184	-7.28	8.96	182	24.6%	-2.36 [-4.21, -0.51]		2	-		
Total (95% CI)			988			998	100.0%	-4.22 [-5.14, -3.30]		•			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	6.80, df=	= 5 (P =	0.24);1	² = 26%							<u> </u>		
Test for overall effect	Z= 9.00	(P < 0.0	00001)						-10	-5	0	5	10
									Favou	irs (Duloxe	tine] Fav	ours [Cont	rol]

В	Dul	oextin	е	С	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Abou-Raya 2012	-0.3	1.86	144	-0.1	1.58	144	11.4%	-0.20 [-0.60, 0.20]	
Chappell 2009	-1.99	1.76	107	-1.34	1.74	118	8.6%	-0.65 [-1.11, -0.19]	
Chappell 2011	-1.63	1.66	128	-1.36	1.71	128	10.6%	-0.27 [-0.68, 0.14]	
Frakes 2011	-1.88	1.77	258	-1.45	1.92	256	17.7%	-0.43 [-0.75, -0.11]	
Uchio 2018	-1.66	1.2	177	-0.98	1.19	176	29.0%	-0.68 [-0.93, -0.43]	
Wang 2017	-0.83	1.38	184	-0.44	1.37	182	22.7%	-0.39 [-0.67, -0.11]	
Total (95% Cl)			998			1004	100.0%	-0.47 [-0.60, -0.34]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	6.35, df	= 5 (P	= 0.27); I ² = 21	%				- + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
Test for overall effect	Z = 6.85	i (P < (0.00001)					-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1

Favours [Duloxetine] Favours [Control]

C	Du	loextine	e	C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference				
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI		IV, Ra	andom, 9	5% CI	
Chappell 2009	3.3	4.64	128	2.16	4.3	128	44.8%	1.14 [0.04, 2.24]			-		
Chappell 2011	2.92	4.8	104	1.99	4.78	113	41.3%	0.93 [-0.35, 2.21]			+		
Uchio 2018	11.44	16.85	177	6.23	16.8	176	14.0%	5.21 [1.70, 8.72]			-		_
Total (95% CI)			409			417	100.0%	1.62 [0.12, 3.13]			•	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 1.00; C	hi² = 5.1	7, df=	2 (P = 0	.08); P	= 61%		-			-		<u> </u>
Test for overall effect	Z= 2.12	P = 0.	03)						-10	-5	0	5	10
									Favours	[Duloext	tine] Fav	ours [Co	ontrol]

)	Du	loextine	e	Control		Control			Control Mean Difference			Mean Difference		Mea	n Differe	ence	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl		IV, Ra	ndom, 9	5% CI					
Chappell 2009	1.64	1.92	128	1.04	1.92	128	46.0%	0.60 [0.13, 1.07]			-						
Chappell 2011	2.04	2.14	104	1.33	1.97	113	44.7%	0.71 [0.16, 1.26]									
Uchio 2018	16.32	16.18	177	9.63	16.13	176	9.3%	6.69 [3.32, 10.06]				-					
Total (95% CI)			409			417	100.0%	1.22 [0.08, 2.35]			•						
Heterogeneity: Tau ² :	= 0.68; CI	hi ² = 12	30, df :	= 2 (P =	0.002);	² = 84	%				-		+				
Test for overall effect				0					-10	-5	0	5	10				

Favours [Doluextine] Favours [Control]

	Du	loextine	е	C	ontrol	Mean Difference				nce					
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI		IV, Random, 95% Cl					
Chappell 2009	1.13	1.81	128	0.59	1.7	128	45.8%	0.54 [0.11, 0.97]			-				
Chappell 2011	1.13	1.61	104	0.83	1.58	113	45.8%	0.30 [-0.12, 0.72]							
Uchio 2018	11.44	17.12	177	3.66	17.14	176	8.4%	7.78 [4.21, 11.35]							
Total (95% CI)			409			417	100.0%	1.04 [-0.10, 2.18]			٠				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.69; C	hi² = 16	.79, df=	= 2 (P =	0.0002)	; l² = 8	B%		-	- +	<u> </u>	- 1	+		
Test for overall effect	Z=1.79	P = 0.	07)						-10	-5	0	5	10		
									Favou	s [Duloex	tine) Fav	ours [Con	trol]		

FIGURE 6. Effects of duloxetine on the physical function measured by (A) Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index physical function subscale and (B) Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index stiffness subscale. The quality of life measured by (C) 36-Item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36) physical functional subscale, (D) SF-36 bodily pain subscale, and (E) SF-36 role physical subscale. CI indicates confidence interval.

of life cannot be verified. In terms of safety, all the studies demonstrated that duloxetine is at higher risk for TEAEs, but that there is no substantial SAEs between duloxetine and the control group. This research suggests that the side effects of duloxetine are mild to moderate in severity and can be appropriate. Previous study had found that the most TEAEs occur early in therapy, and have been steadily tolerated by extending the length of therapy.⁴⁴

There is increasing evidence indicated that a correlation between pain and depression can be promoted by norepinephrine systems and 5-hydroxytryptamine.^{45,46} Serotonin and noradrenaline can dampen peripheral pain

A	Duloextine			С	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference				
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI				
Chappell 2009	2.38	1.22	104	2.91	1.28	114	10.3%	-0.53 [-0.86, -0.20]					
Chappell 2011	2.77	1.24	128	3.07	1.13	128	13.4%	-0.30 [-0.59, -0.01]					
Frakes 2011	2.33	1.27	264	2.94	1.27	260	23.9%	-0.61 [-0.83, -0.39]					
Uchio 2018	2.23	1.14	177	2.84	1.17	176	19.5%	-0.61 [-0.85, -0.37]					
Wang 2017	2.73	0.93	194	3.09	0.94	196	32.9%	-0.36 [-0.55, -0.17]					
Total (95% CI)			867			874	100.0%	-0.48 [-0.58, -0.37]	•				
Heterogeneity: Chi2=	= 5.66, df	= 4 (P	= 0.23); I ² = 29	1%			1999 (1997) - 1999 (1997) - 1999 (1997) - 1997) - 1997) - 1997 (1997) - 1997) - 1997 (1997) - 1977) - 1977) -					
Test for overall effect	: Z = 8.80	(P < (0.00001	1)					-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1				
									Favours [Duloextine] Favours [Control]				
3	Duloextine			Control				Mean Difference	Mean Difference				
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI				
Channell 2009	-2 37	218	104	-1.8	233	118	81%	-0.57 [-1.16, 0.02]					



FIGURE 7. Effects of duloxetine in patient's global impression measured by: (A) Patient's Global Impression of Improvement; (B) Clinical Global Impression of Severity. Cl indicates confidence interval.

signals by mediating a bidirectional feedback between a central pain modulation system and a peripheral nociceptive stimulus such as OA pain.^{47,48} Duloxetine can be effective in alleviating pain by modulating the descending brain and spinal cord pressure pathways as a selective, relatively controlled serotonin and norepinephrine reuptake inhibitor.

Our study also has limitations. First, in this metaanalysis, we included only 6 trials although we screened all the available studies using the comprehensive literature search strategy, and most of the included trials had a high quality and lower risk bias. Second, this meta-analysis lacked long-term follow-up studies as the qualifying criteria for inclusion, but the potential value of duloxetine during long-term therapy has been shown by a study undertaken in China to be effective and tolerable.⁴⁹ Third, the trials compared treatment of knee OA pain between duloxetine and other therapies are still lacking. There is a study have demonstrated that both duloxetine and gabapentin have similar and acceptable effects on pain reduction and improvement of functional status in patients with knee

	Duloextine		Control			Risk Ratio								
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl							
Chappell 2009	55	111	49	120	19.2%	1.21 [0.91, 1.61]					-			
Chappell 2011	64	128	43	128	18.6%	1.49 [1.10, 2.01]				-				
Frakes 2011	167	264	130	260	24.4%	1.27 [1.09, 1.47]					13			
Uchio 2018	77	178	26	176	15.1%	2.93 [1.98, 4.34]						_		
Wang 2017	121	199	83	198	22.7%	1.45 [1.19, 1.77]					-			
Total (95% Cl)		880		882	100.0%	1.51 [1.21, 1.90]								
Total events	484		331											
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.05; Chi	i ² = 17.3	20. df = 4	(P = 0.	002); I ² =	77%	+-					- 1	-+	
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.57 (P = 0.0004)					0.1	0.2	0.5	1	2	5	10			
		Ĩ.	1	Favours [Duloxetine							ours (Co	ontrol]		



FIGURE 8. Effects of duloxetine in patient's safety: (A) incidence rate of treatment-emergent adverse events, and (B) serious adverse events. CI indicates confidence interval.

OA,⁵⁰ but no methodologically rigorous studies directly compared duloxetine with other first-line therapies, including nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, in the treatment of OA.⁵¹ Fourth, in this meta-analysis, we found the included trials concentrated on the knee joint and synthesized evidence from studies of patients affected by knee OA. Four studies^{30,31,34,35} explicitly excluded the patients who had the depressive disorders, and 1 study³³ excluded the participants if they were taking any other antidepressants, while duloxetine has been reported to be effective for other chronic pain conditions with depression or anxiety symptoms.^{52,53} Even though 4 trials^{30,32,34,35} involving 1438 patients showed significant improvement in mood and relations with other people based on the BPI-I (Figs. 5B, E), future studies should indicate the real benefits to support the clinical application of duloxetine for patients suffering from knee OA and depression simultaneously.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, our study reveals that duloxetine may be an effective treatment option for knee OA patients. However, owing to the presence of some contradictory pain relief evidence and the higher risk of AEs, duloxetine still requires further additional large-scale, high-quality, rigorously designed, and well-controlled RCTs to evaluate the longterm safety and determine the advantage for patients with knee OA and depressive conditions at the same time.

REFERENCES

- 1. Busija L, Bridgett L, Williams SR, et al. Osteoarthritis. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol.* 2010;24:757–768.
- 2. Zhang Q, Yue J, Golianu B, et al. Updated systematic review and meta-analysis of acupuncture for chronic knee pain. *Acupunct Med.* 2017;35:392–403.
- Wang C, Schmid CH, Iversen MD, et al. Comparative effectiveness of Tai Chi versus physical therapy for knee osteoarthritis: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med.* 2016;165:77–86.
- McAlindon TE, Cooper C, Kirwan JR, et al. Determinants of disability in osteoarthritis of the knee. *Ann Rheum Dis.* 1993;52: 258–262.
- Muraki S, Akune T, Oka H, et al. Association of occupational activity with radiographic knee osteoarthritis and lumbar spondylosis in elderly patients of population-based cohorts: a large-scale population-based study. *Arthritis Rheum.* 2009;61:779–786.
- Jotanovic Z, Mihelic R, Sestan B, et al. Emerging pathways and promising agents with possible disease modifying effect in osteoarthritis treatment. *Curr Drug Targets*. 2014;15:635–661.
- Liu R, Yuan X, Yu J, et al. An updated meta-analysis of the asporin gene D-repeat in knee osteoarthritis: effects of gender and ethnicity. J Orthop Surg. 2017;12:148.
- Kolasinski SL, Neogi T, Hochberg MC, et al. 2019 American College of Rheumatology/Arthritis Foundation Guideline for the Management of Osteoarthritis of the Hand, Hip, and Knee. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2020;72:149–162.
- Smalley WE, Griffin MR. The risks and costs of upper gastrointestinal disease attributable to NSAIDs. *Gastroenterol Clin North Am.* 1996;25:373–396.
- Nagi R, Yashoda Devi BK, Rakesh N, et al. Clinical implications of prescribing nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs in oral health care–a review. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol.* 2015;119:264–271.
- Sugai K, Takeda-Imai F, Michikawa T, et al. Association between knee pain, impaired function, and development of depressive symptoms. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2018;66:570–576.
- depressive symptoms. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2018;66:570–576.
 12. Chen YP, Huang YY, Wu Y, et al. Depression negatively affects patient-reported knee functional outcome after intraarticular hyaluronic acid injection among geriatric patients with knee osteoarthritis. J Orthop Surg. 2019;14:387.

Copyright © 2021 The Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc.

- 13. Ahn H, Weaver M, Lyon D, et al. Depression and pain in Asian and White Americans with knee osteoarthritis. *J Pain*. 2017;18:1229–1236.
- 14. Russell IJ, Mease PJ, Smith TR, et al. Efficacy and safety of duloxetine for treatment of fibromyalgia in patients with or without major depressive disorder: results from a 6-month, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, fixed-dose trial. *Pain.* 2008;136:432–444.
- Mossey JM, Gallagher RM. The longitudinal occurrence and impact of comorbid chronic pain and chronic depression over two years in continuing care retirement community residents. *Pain Med.* 2004;5:335–348.
- Bannuru RR, Osani MC, Vaysbrot EE, et al. OARSI guidelines for the non-surgical management of knee, hip, and polyarticular osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2019;27: 1578–1589.
- Malfait AM, Schnitzer TJ. Towards a mechanism-based approach to pain management in osteoarthritis. *Nat Rev Rheumatol.* 2013; 9:654–664.
- Miller RE, Miller RJ, Malfait AM. Osteoarthritis joint pain: the cytokine connection. *Cytokine*. 2014;70:185–193.
- Miller RE, Malfait AM, Block JA. Current status of nerve growth factor antibodies for the treatment of osteoarthritis pain. *Clin Exp Rheumatol.* 2017;35(suppl 107):85–87.
- 20. Smelter E, Hochberg MC. New treatments for osteoarthritis. *Curr Opin Rheumatol.* 2013;25:310–316.
- Smith EM, Pang H, Cirrincione C, et al. Effect of duloxetine on pain, function, and quality of life among patients with chemotherapy-induced painful peripheral neuropathy: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA. 2013;309:1359–1367.
- Bidari A, Moazen-Zadeh E, Ghavidel-Parsa B, et al. Comparing duloxetine and pregabalin for treatment of pain and depression in women with fibromyalgia: an open-label randomized clinical trial. *Daru.* 2019;27:149–158.
- Konno S, Oda N, Ochiai T, et al. Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase III trial of duloxetine monotherapy in Japanese patients with chronic low back pain. *Spine*. 2016;41: 1709–1717.
- 24. Lunn MP, Hughes RA, Wiffen PJ. Duloxetine for treating painful neuropathy, chronic pain or fibromyalgia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2014;1:CD007115.
- Wang ZY, Shi SY, Li SJ, et al. Efficacy and safety of duloxetine on osteoarthritis knee pain: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Pain Med.* 2015;16:1373–1385.
- Osani MC, Bannuru RR. Efficacy and safety of duloxetine in osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Korean J Intern Med.* 2019;34:966–973.
- 27. Chen L, Gong M, Liu G, et al. Efficacy and tolerability of duloxetine in patients with knee osteoarthritis: a meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Intern Med J.* 2019;49: 1514–1523.
- Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. *PLoS Med.* 2009;6:e1000100.
- Bo Chen MZ, Lin X, Pang J, et al. An updated systematic review and meta-analysis of Duloxetine for knee pain. 2020. Available at: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/display_ record.php?RecordID=194072.
- Chappell AS, Ossanna MJ, Liu-Seifert H, et al. Duloxetine, a centrally acting analgesic, in the treatment of patients with osteoarthritis knee pain: a 13-week, randomized, placebocontrolled trial. *Pain*. 2009;146:253–260.
- 31. Chappell AS, Desaiah D, Liu-Seifert H, et al. A double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled study of the efficacy and safety of duloxetine for the treatment of chronic pain due to osteoarthritis of the knee. *Pain Pract.* 2011;11:33–41.
- 32. Frakes EP, Risser RC, Ball TD, et al. Duloxetine added to oral nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs for treatment of knee pain due to osteoarthritis: results of a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2011;27: 2361–2372.

- Abou-Raya S, Abou-Raya A, Helmii M. Duloxetine for the management of pain in older adults with knee osteoarthritis: randomised placebo-controlled trial. *Age Ageing*. 2012;41:646–652.
- 34. Wang G, Bi L, Li X, et al. Efficacy and safety of duloxetine in Chinese patients with chronic pain due to osteoarthritis: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2017;25:832–838.
- 35. Uchio Y, Enomoto H, Alev L, et al. A randomized, doubleblind, placebo-controlled Phase III trial of duloxetine in Japanese patients with knee pain due to osteoarthritis. *J Pain Res.* 2018;11:809–821.
- 36. Altman R, Asch E, Bloch D, et al. Development of criteria for the classification and reporting of osteoarthritis. Classification of osteoarthritis of the knee. Diagnostic and Therapeutic Criteria Committee of the American Rheumatism Association. *Arthritis Rheum.* 1986;29:1039–1049.
- Cleeland CS, Ryan KM. Pain assessment: global use of the Brief Pain Inventory. Ann Acad Med Singap. 1994;23:129–138.
- Bellamy N, Buchanan WW, Goldsmith CH, et al. Validation study of WOMAC: a health status instrument for measuring clinically important patient relevant outcomes to antirheumatic drug therapy in patients with osteoarthritis of the hip or knee. J Rheumatol. 1988;15:1833–1840.
- Ware JE, Snow KK, Kosinski M, et al. SF-36 health survey manual and interpretation guide. Boston, MA: The Health Institute New England Medical Center; 1993.
- Guy W. ECDEU Assessment Manual for Psychopharmacology. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Mental Health (U.S.). Psychopharmacology Research Branch. Division of Extramural Research Programs; 1976.
- Higgins JP, Altman DG, Sterne JA. Chapter 8: assessing risk of bias in included studies. In: Higgins JPT, Green S, eds. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 5.1.0.2011.
- 42. Review Manager (RevMan). Version 5.3 ed: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration; 2014.

- Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, et al. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*. 2003;327:557–560.
- 44. Brunton S, Wang F, Edwards SB, et al. Profile of adverse events with duloxetine treatment: a pooled analysis of placebocontrolled studies. *Drug Saf.* 2010;33:393–407.
- 45. Iyengar S, Webster AA, Hemrick-Luecke SK, et al. Efficacy of duloxetine, a potent and balanced serotonin-norepinephrine reuptake inhibitor in persistent pain models in rats. J Pharmacol Exp Ther. 2004;311:576–584.
- 46. Wong DT, Bymaster FP. Dual serotonin and noradrenaline uptake inhibitor class of antidepressants potential for greater efficacy or just hype? *Prog Drug Res.* 2002;58:169–222.
- Hirakawa N, Tershner SA, Fields HL, et al. Bi-directional changes in affective state elicited by manipulation of medullary pain-modulatory circuitry. *Neuroscience*. 2000;100:861–871.
- Fields HL. Pain modulation: expectation, opioid analgesia and virtual pain. Prog Brain Res. 2000;122:245–253.
- Wang G, Bi L, Li X, et al. Maintenance of effect of duloxetine in Chinese patients with pain due to osteoarthritis: 13-week open-label extension data. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2019; 20:174.
- Enteshari-Moghaddam A, Azami A, Isazadehfar K, et al. Efficacy of duloxetine and gabapentin in pain reduction in patients with knee osteoarthritis. *Clin Rheumatol.* 2019;38: 2873–2880.
- Weng C, Xu J, Wang Q, et al. Efficacy and safety of duloxetine in osteoarthritis or chronic low back pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2020;28:721–734.
- 52. Happich M, Schneider E, Wilhelm S, et al. Depression treatment with duloxetine and reduction of inability to work. *Depress Res Treat.* 2012;2012:264854.
- 53. Russell JM, Weisberg R, Fava M, et al. Efficacy of duloxetine in the treatment of generalized anxiety disorder in patients with clinically significant pain symptoms. *Depress Anxiety*. 2008;25: E1–E11.