

The Effect of Acupuncture on Modulating Inflammatory Cytokines in Rodent Animal Models of Respiratory Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Serin Lee and Seung-Nam Kim*

College of Korean Medicine, Dongguk University, Goyang, South Korea

Purpose: Although respiratory diseases (RD) are rapidly becoming a global health issue due to their high mortality and prevalence, there are limitations to the currently available treatments. Acupuncture has been recognized to mitigate many diseases by reducing inflammation and modulating cytokines. However, no systematic analysis has been performed to examine the effects of acupuncture on RD. We aimed to evaluate the effects of acupuncture on rodent animal models of RD.

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Masato Kubo, Tokyo University of Science, Japan

Reviewed by:

Priscilla Christina Olsen, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil O. Sang Kwon, Wonkwang University, South Korea

*Correspondence:

Seung-Nam Kim snkim@dongguk.edu

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Inflammation, a section of the journal Frontiers in Immunology

Received: 18 February 2022 Accepted: 11 May 2022 Published: 15 June 2022

Citation:

Lee S and Kim S-N (2022) The Effect of Acupuncture on Modulating Inflammatory Cytokines in Rodent Animal Models of Respiratory Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Front. Immunol. 13:878463. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2022.878463 **Methods:** PubMed, EMBASE, MEDLINE, and the Research Information Service System were searched to retrieve studies that met our inclusion/exclusion criteria. The quality of each included study was evaluated using a 10-item checklist modified from the Collaborative Approach to Meta-Analysis and Review of Animal Data from Experimental Studies. With adequate data extracted, meta-analysis was performed using RevMan software.

Results: A total of 18 studies were included, and the mean quality assessment was 5.7. The meta-analysis revealed that acupuncture had a significant effect on changing the cytokine levels, including pro-/anti-inflammatory, Th1-, Th2- and Th17- specific cytokines.

Conclusion: Although there were limitations in the number of included studies, the results suggest that acupuncture can be a possible treatment for RD through its modulation of various cytokines, leading to reduced inflammation.

Keywords: respiratory diseases, animal models, inflammatory cytokines, acupuncture, meta-analysis

INTRODUCTION

Respiratory diseases (RD) are a major global health issue that have been a serious financial burden owing to the difficulty in treatment. RD encompasses various disorders such as sinusitis, asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), and even acute lung injury caused by other diseases. Although the lesions and symptoms of the aforementioned diseases may differ, most of them are associated with acute/chronic inflammation (1). Inflammation is a physiological immune process that includes both inflammatory and restorative responses. Among the factors that participate in this course of action, cytokines function as key mediators with different roles. For example, pro-inflammatory cytokines induce inflammation, while anti-inflammatory cytokines reduce inflammation and participate in the healing process (2). Cytokines can also be categorized according to the type of lymphocytes they are related to. Interleukin (IL)-4, 5, 9, and 13, which are known to be the CD4+ T helper 2 (Th2) cellresponsive cytokines, contribute to allergic airway inflammation. Meanwhile, IL-17, which is released from T helper 17 (Th17) cells, is known to exacerbate chronic lung inflammation (3). Although corticosteroids are currently being used for RD treatment, there are limitations yet to be solved as some cytokines mediate steroid-resistant airway inflammation and obstruction (4).

Acupuncture, which originates from traditional Chinese medicine, has long been acknowledged to mitigate many diseases. Acupuncture at the specific acupoint of ST36 has been reported to promote anti-inflammatory, anti-oxidative, and immuneenhancing effects (5-7). Moreover, the latest studies using animal models of sepsis showed that electroacupuncture at ST36 modulates endotoxin-induced systemic inflammation through the vagaladrenal anti-inflammatory axis (6, 8). Recently, clinical research in COPD (9), allergic rhinitis (10), asthma (11, 12) showed the possibility of acupuncture as a treatment for these pulmonary diseases. Moreover, there has been increasing evidence of potential therapeutic effects of acupuncture from research on the coronavirus disease 2019 (13). Although pulmonary dysfunction has various etiologies, inflammation mechanisms occur in the lung tissue and fluid. Therefore, it is important to determine which antiinflammatory mechanisms are linked to the effect of acupuncture on pulmonary diseases.

In this review, we performed a meta-analysis on inflammatory cytokines in various animal models of RD to determine the effects of acupuncture on RD.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Searching

Reports that examined the effect of acupuncture on inflammatory cytokines in rodent models of RD that were written in English were included in the present study. PubMed, EMBASE, MEDLINE, and Research Information Service System were searched from inception until December 2021 using the following search terms: "mouse (mice)" or "rat (rats)", and "acupuncture (electroacupuncture)" and "respiratory disease."

Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

Studies were included based on the following criteria: subjects (rodent models of RD), interventions (acupuncture as the main intervention but limited to manual acupuncture and electroacupuncture), and outcomes (the levels of each inflammatory cytokine were the main outcomes to evaluate the efficacy of acupuncture). Lung function test data were included as the subsequent outcomes. Along with those that did not provide access to the full text, studies that were not written in

English or focused on unrelated topics were excluded. After screening the full text, studies that did not meet our criteria in the methods and results were also excluded.

Data Extraction

Two authors (Kim and Lee) independently extracted the data on the publication year, name of the first author, type of rodent RD model, disease/condition, sample size, type of acupuncture, and type of specimen. Along with the mean value of inflammatory cytokines within each group (e.g., control group, disease group, intervention group), standard deviation or standard error of the mean were extracted to determine the effect measures and effect size of acupuncture on RD. Each value from the studies was extracted using the Engauge Digitizer software version 12. We estimated the number of animals in groups by calculating the mean number of animals per study. Lung function data, including the type of lung function test and the result, were collected as a secondary outcome.

Quality Assessment

The methodological quality of each included study was assessed by two authors (Kim and Lee) using a 10-item checklist modified from the Collaborative Approach to Meta-Analysis and Review of Animal Data from Experimental Studies (CAMARADES) checklist (14, 15): publication in a peer-reviewed journal, statements describing control of temperature, random allocation to treatment or control, blinded building of model, use of animals with hypertension or diabetes, blinded assessment of outcomes, use of anesthetic without marked intrinsic properties, sample size calculation, compliance with animal welfare regulations, and declared any potential conflict of interest. The sum of the quality scores was recorded for each article, with a possible total score of 10 points.

Statistics

In the present study, the ratios of cytokine levels in the disease and intervention groups to the control group were considered as continuous data. To compare studies that used different units for cytokine levels, the difference between the disease/control ratio and acupuncture/control ratio was calculated. Since all 18 studies set RD as an independent variable and analyzed the correlation with the outcomes, the standardized mean difference (SMD) was estimated based on a fixed-effect model. The meta-analysis was performed on each cytokine subgroup using RevMan version 5.4 (Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). The confidence interval (CI) was established at 95%, and *a p-value* < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. For the assessment of study heterogeneity, chi-squared and I² statistics were used.

RESULTS

Study Inclusion

Among the 100 studies selected, 57 studies were excluded because 50 were not written in English, five did not cover relevant topics, and two did not allow access to the full text. The full-text screening was performed on the remaining 43 studies, of which 25 were excluded due to deficiencies in the methodology and results. Eight studies used intervention other than manual acupuncture or electroacupuncture, 16 did not evaluate inflammatory cytokines, and 1 study did not include proper control group. Therefore, a total of 18 studies were included in this review. A flow diagram of the study selection process is shown in **Figure 1**.

Quality Assessment

The quality assessments of the included studies are summarized in **Table 1**. The quality score of the included studies ranged from 3 to 7 out of 10 points: three studies scored 7, eight scored 6, six scored 5, and one scored 3 points. All 18 studies were peer-reviewed and met animal welfare regulations. Twelve studies included statements describing the control of temperature. Fifteen studies specified the random allocation of subjects to treatment or control groups, and six described blinded assessment of the outcomes. Sixteen studies used anesthetics with no intrinsic properties, and 17 declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research. None of the 18 studies conducted blind building of the model or sample size calculation, and none used animals with hypertension or diabetes.

Study Characteristics

The characteristics of the included studies are summarized in **Table 2**. Among the 18 studies, 10 and eight studies were conducted using rats and mice, respectively. Six studies used an asthma model. Meanwhile, five used a COPD model, and only one used a chronic sinusitis model. Furthermore, six studies used an acute lung inflammation model induced by various preceding conditions, such as amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, thermal injury, cardiopulmonary bypass, or limb ischemia and reperfusion. Eleven studies used electroacupuncture, while seven used

manual acupuncture. Specimens were collected to measure the levels of cytokines, including lung tissue, bronchoalveolar lavage fluid, plasma, serum, and nasal tissue.

The Effect of Acupuncture on Inflammatory Cytokines

Cytokines, the principal mediators of inflammation, are composed of various subfamilies that play different roles. First, they are known to have function as pro- or anti-inflammation. Second, cytokines also can be categorized with the immune cells where they are released from, including CD4+ Th1, Th2 or Th17 cells. Figures 2, 3 show that 14 cytokines were analyzed in this study. Due to the diverse properties of these cytokines, we performed the metaanalysis by categorizing cytokines into separate subgroups: (1) pro-/anti-inflammatory cytokines, and (2) Th1-, Th2-, and Th17specific cytokines. The results revealed that rodent animal models with RD had higher levels of pro-inflammatory cytokines than the control group, and acupuncture lowered these levels (n = 207 for disease group, n = 205 for acupuncture group, SMD 2.18 [95% CI 1.90 ~ 2.46]; p < 0.00001; heterogeneity $X^2 = 89.74$, $I^2 = 72\%$, Figure 2A). Anti-inflammatory cytokines showed the opposite result, showing a decrease in the disease model and an increase with acupuncture treatment (n = 31, SMD -3.09 [95% CI -3.98 \sim -2.21]; p < 0.00001; heterogeneity $X^2 = 20.14$, $I^2 = 90\%$, Figure 2B). Most Th-1 specific cytokines seemed to have decreased by acupuncture treatment except for IFN-?. (n=178, SMD 1.98 [95% CI 1.69 ~ 2.28]; p < 0.00001; heterogeneity $X^2 = 28.75$, $I^2 = 73\%$, Figure 3A). Th2-specific cytokines had a similar tendency to that of pro-inflammatory cytokines (n = 124, SMD 2.24 [95% CI 1.84 -2.64]; p < 0.00001; heterogeneity $X^2 = 15.77$, $I^2 = 30\%$, Figure 3B). Lastly, Th-17 specific cytokines, which increased in the disease groups, were also shown to be regulated by acupuncture treatment (n = 39, SMD 1.73 [95% CI 1.18 – 2.27]; p < 0.00001; heterogeneity $X^2 = 1.92, I^2 = 0\%$, Figure 3C).



TABLE 1 | Quality Assessment.

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Total
Jiang et al., 2011 (16)	1						1		1		3
Geng et al., 2013 (17)	1	1	1			1	1		1	1	7
Zhang et al., 2014 (18)	1	1				1	1		1	1	6
Li et al., 2016 (19)	1	1	1				1		1	1	6
Nurwati et al., 2015 (20)	1	1	1						1	1	5
Song et al., 2015 (21)	1		1				1		1	1	5
Wei et al., 2017 (22)	1		1				1		1	1	5
Wang et al., 2017 (23)	1	1	1				1		1	1	6
Dong et al., 2018 (24)	1	1	1				1		1	1	6
Dong et al., 2019 (25)	1	1	1				1		1	1	6
Zhang et al., 2018 (26)	1	1	1				1		1	1	6
Dhar et al., 2019 (27)	1		1				1		1	1	5
Huang et al., 2019 (28)	1	1	1			1	1		1	1	7
Zhou et al., 2019 (29)	1	1					1		1	1	5
Cui et al., 2021 (30)	1	1	1			1	1		1	1	7
Lou et al., 2020 (31)	1	1	1			1			1	1	6
Tang et al., 2021 (32)	1		1			1	1		1	1	6
Zhang et al., 2021 (33)	1		1				1		1	1	5

Q1, publication in a peer-reviewed journal; Q2, statements describing control of temperature; Q3, random allocation to treatment or control; Q4, blinded building of model; Q5, use of animals with hypertension or diabetes; Q6, blinded assessment of outcome; Q7, use of anesthetic without marked intrinsic properties; Q8, sample size calculation; Q9, compliance with animal welfare regulations; Q10, declared any potential conflict of interest.

The Effect of Acupuncture on the Lung Function in Animal Models of RD

Table 3 shows how acupuncture affected lung function in RD models after examining the results of pulmonary function tests (PFTS), lung resistance (RL), and lung dynamic compliance (Cdyn). PFTS data included forced expiratory volume in 0.1s (FEV_{0.1}), forced expiratory volume in 0.3s (FEV_{0.3}), the ratio between the aforementioned two and forced vital capacity (FEV_{0.1}/FVC, FEV_{0.3}/FVC), inspiratory capacity, peak expiratory flow, and minute volume. Among the 18 studies, seven measured RL and Cdyn, three conducted PFTS, and eight did not mention any lung function tests. Acupuncture was found to increase Cdyn and alleviate RL. It was also shown that acupuncture improved lung function in general by increasing FEVs, FVC, inspiratory capacity, peak expiratory flow, and minute volume.

DISCUSSION

Recently, a number of clinical studies have reported the effect of acupuncture on RD. Acupuncture enhanced the strength of diaphragm while relieving the respiratory muscle fatigue of COPD patients (9), mitigated overall symptoms of allergic rhinitis/rhinoconjunctivitis (10), and showed therapheutic effects on bronchial asthma as well (12). However, no studies oversee the RD animal studies and systematically analyzes the effect of acupuncture on inflammatory cytokine as its underlying mechanism. In this review, we systematically analyzed 18 acupuncture studies that used rodent models of RD to determine whether acupuncture can improve RD symptoms and/or pathology. Rat/mouse models of asthma, COPD, cardiopulmonary bypass-, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis-, reperfusion-induced lung inflammation, and chronic sinusitis were administered with manual or electroacupuncture, and the lung functions were then examined. To test lung function, the RL, Cdyn, FEV, FVC, peak expiratory flow, and minute volume were tested, and the results showed that acupuncture improved lung function in various inflammatory pulmonary disease animal models.

The following inflammatory cytokines were examined in lung tissue, fluids, or serum/plasma samples from animal models. Inflammatory cytokines can be specifically classified according to their functions: those that promote inflammation are known to be pro-inflammatory, while those that engage in restoring damages are considered anti-inflammatory cytokines. In pulmonary diseases, pro-inflammatory cytokines are known to trigger mucus secretion and airway fibrosis (34), while antiinflammatory cytokines have been reported to be deficient, especially in asthma and COPD (35). In our results, proinflammatory cytokines, such as IL-1, 6, 8, 18, and TNF- α , were lowered by acupuncture. In contrast, anti-inflammatory cytokines, such as IL-10, showed an opposite tendency. Thus, our results suggest that acupuncture can possibly ameliorate inflammation by inducing anti-inflammatory cytokines while reducing pro-inflammatory ones depending on the set condition. Meanwhile, some cytokines are not simple enough to categorize by their pro-/anti-inflammatory roles. IFN-?, for example, is a Th1 cytokine that counterbalances Th2 cytokines. However, its anti-inflammatory action has also been reported, suggesting that the functional roles of some cytokines are complex in immune diseases (36, 37).

Interestingly, acupuncture showed that it could possibility reduce Th2-related cytokine levels in asthma models, which might help maintain the balance between Th1 and Th2 cytokines. Asthma, an allergic inflammation driven by Th2 lymphocytes, shows representative pathology of higher levels of Th2 cytokines compared to Th1 cells (1). According to our study, Th2 cytokines such as IL-4, 5, 9, 13, 25, and 33 were downregulated by acupuncture treatment. This allows an

Study or Subgroup Mean SD Total Weight W. Fixed. 95% Cl Year W. Fixed. 95% Cl Iarag 2011 4.543 1.769 5 1.47 7 4.643 7 1.440 1.078 0.284 7 1.440 1.078 0.284 7 1.440 1.078 0.284 7 1.440 0.697 7 2.75 1.47 (0.242, 270) 2013		Dise	ase	Acı	ipunctur	е		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean	Difference
1.1 Th The a larg 2011 4.543 1.769 5 1.167 0.544 5 2.44% 2.32 [0.52, 4.12] 2011 7.152 0.51 0.54 0.122 0.152 0.174 0.24 2.70 2013 7.68 0.264 0.137 8 1.065 0.069 7 4.176 2.22 0.263 0.174 0.24, 2.70 2013 7.165 0.167 0.174 0.24 2.70 2013 7.165 0.167 0.174 0.24 2.70 2013 7.165 0.167 0.174 0.174 1.2 1.285 0.069 7 4.176 2.202 1.15 [0.262, 2.03] 2016 7.150 0.171 1.196 1.268 10 6.116 1.355 10 4.1% 3.30 [1.71, 4.48] 2017 7.196 0.12 0.298 10 6.561 2.244 10 7.5% 1.54 [0.51, 2.65] 2018 7.100 0.2020 7.169 0.181 6 1.352 0.268 6 3.27% 2.260 (0.64, 3.77) 2018 7.160 0.2020 7.176 0.018 1 3.270 0.118 6 4.370 2.218 2.271 (1.21, 3.34] 2021 7.171 1.058 0.268 10 0.298 6 3.27% 2.258 [0.69, 4.28] 2019 7.100 0.2021 7.076 0.028 12 0.294 0.089 12 6.9% 2.271 (1.21, 3.34] 2021 7.1078 0.028 12 0.294 0.089 12 6.9% 2.271 (1.21, 3.34] 2021 7.171 (1.35, 2.07] 7.108 0.25 12 0.294 0.089 12 6.9% 2.271 (1.21, 3.34] 2021 7.11 0.054 7 1.11 0.054 7 5.5% 1.148 [0.25, 2.71] 2013 7.161 6 4.369 0.344 8 1.051 0.299 8 0.5% 0.03 [3.29, 1.278] 2014 7.11 0.156 7.493 10 2.494 1.563 10 5.25% 2.250 (1.27, 7.37] 2017 7.121 7.11 (1.35, 2.07] 7.11 (1.35, 2.07] 7.101 7.11 (1.35, 2.07]	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD Tota	I Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI Year	IV, Fixe	d, 95% Cl
lang 2011 4 5.43 1.769 5 1.187 0.544 5 2.4% 2.32 [0.52, 4.12] 2011 Theorem 2014 1.078 0.028 8 0.646 0.069 7 4.1% 2.28 [0.69, 3.67] 2014 Theorem 2014 1.078 0.028 8 0.646 0.069 7 4.1% 0.276 1.15, 0.81] 2015 1.2016 1.7.45 0.44 12 1.283 0.324 12 10.2% 1.15 [0.28, 2.03] 2016 1.2016 1.7.45 0.44 12 1.283 0.324 12 10.2% 1.15 [0.28, 2.03] 2016 1.2017 1.961 2.163 10 6.116 1.355 10 4.1% 3.30 [1.7,4 6.3] 2017 1.961 2.163 10 6.116 1.355 10 4.1% 3.30 [1.7,4 6.3] 2017 1.2016 1.655 1.266 2.018 1.267 3.132 6 1.5% 3.398 [1.7,3 6.23] 2017 1.016 1.065 1.268 10 6.166 1.264 2.244 10 7.5% 1.146 [0.26, 2.71] 2018 1.66 1.267 0.238 6 1.2% 2.20 [0.44, 3.77] 2018 1.167 0.028 0.1 1.268 0.218 1.267 3.132 0.17 1.268 0.228 0 6 3.2% 2.20 [0.44, 3.77] 2018 1.167 0.028 0.1 1.268 0.218 1.267 3.132 0.201 1.078 0.023 12 0.058 0.069 12 0.63% 0.29% 2.27 [1.2, 3.4] 2021 1.167 0.028 0.1 1.269 2.018 1.171 [1.35, 2.07] 1.167 0.028 12 0.058 0.069 12 0.63% 0.29% 2.27 [1.2, 3.4] 2021 1.166 1.269 2.010 1.175 0.007 1.27 9.7 d = 11 (P = 0.003), P = 61% 3.157 0.218 (P = 0.003); P = 61% 3.167 0.299 (P = 0.0001); P = 61% 3.168 0.10 (2017 1.269 2.013 1.171 [1.35, 2.07] 1.160 0.054 7 7 5.1% 1.140 [0.25, 2.71] 2013 1.12016 1.120	1.1.1 TNF-a									
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Jiang 2011	4.543 1.	769 5	5 1.187	0.544	5	2.4%	2.32 [0.52, 4.12] 2011		
Thang 2014 1.078 0.028 8 0.954 0.069 7 4.4% 2.28 0.08.3.67 2014 The second state of t	Geng 2013	1.768 0.	284 7	7 1.404	0.162	7	5.2%	1.47 [0.24, 2.70] 2013		-
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Zhang 2014	1.078 0.	028 8	0.954	0.069	7	4.1%	2.28 [0.89, 3.67] 2014		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Song 2015	1.064 0.	137 8	3 1.085	0.09	8	8.1%	-0.17 [-1.15, 0.81] 2015	-	ŧ
$ \begin{split} & Vel 2017 & 11.961 2.168 & 10 & 6.116 & 1.355 & 10 & 4.1\% & 3.10 & 1.71, 4.48 & 2017 \\ & Veng 2017 & 0.104 & 8.43 & 6 & 12.674 & 3.132 & 6 & 1.9\% & 3.89 & [17.6, 6.23 & 2017 \\ & Veng 2018 & 10.051 & 2.098 & 10 & 6.561 & 2.244 & 10 & 7.5\% & 1.54 & [0.51, 2.56] & 2018 \\ & Veng 2013 & 2.571 & 0.230 & 6 & 1.926 & 0.286 & 6 & 2.7\% & 2.58 & [0.84, 2.47] & 2018 \\ & Veng 2021 & 1.078 & 0.028 & 12 & 0.954 & 0.669 & 12 & 0.9\% & 2.27 & [1.21, 3.34] & 2021 \\ & Veng 2021 & 1.078 & 0.028 & 12 & 0.954 & 0.669 & 12 & 0.9\% & 2.27 & [1.21, 3.34] & 2021 \\ & Veng 2021 & 1.078 & 0.028 & 12 & 0.954 & 0.669 & 12 & 0.9\% & 2.27 & [1.21, 3.34] & 2021 \\ & Veng 2021 & 1.078 & 0.028 & 12 & 0.954 & 0.669 & 12 & 0.9\% & 2.27 & [1.21, 3.34] & 2021 \\ & Veng 2021 & 1.078 & 0.028 & 12 & 0.954 & 0.669 & 12 & 0.9\% & 0.31 & 5.271 & 2013 \\ & Veng 2013 & 2.764 & 0.853 & 7 & 1.663 & 0.489 & 7 & 5.7\% & 1.48 & [0.25, 2.71] & 2013 \\ & Veng 2015 & 4.399 & 0.344 & 8 & 1.661 & 0.209 & 8 & 0.6\% & 0.03 & [5.20, 12.76] & 2014 \\ & Veng 2017 & 4.045 & 7.459 & 6 & 14.245 & 4.66 & 6 & 1.6\% & 3.89 & 1.66, 6.10 & 2017 \\ & Veng 2017 & 4.045 & 7.459 & 6 & 1.424 & 4.66 & 6 & 1.6\% & 3.89 & 1.66, 6.10 & 2017 \\ & Veng 2016 & 5.234 & 0.797 & 6 & 1.647 & 0.344 & 6 & 0.9\% & 5.53 & [2.26, 8.49] & 2019 \\ & Veng 2016 & 1.677 & 0.324 & 8 & 1.57 & 0.12 & 6 & 2.8\% & 2.26 & [2.59, 2.35] & 2020 \\ & Ventral effect Z = 5.73 & [P < 0.0001) \\ & Veng 2016 & 1.676 & 0.232 & 8 & 0.23\% & 16.95 & [1.0.11, 2.378] & 2015 \\ & Ventral effect Z = 7.3 & [P < 0.0001) \\ & Ventral effect Z = 7.3 & [P < 0.0001) \\ & Ventral effect Z = 7.3 & [P < 0.00001) \\ & Ventral effect Z = 5.99 & [P < 0.00001) \\ & Ventral effect Z = 5.99 & [P < 0.00001) \\ & Ventral effect Z = 4.88 & (P < 0.00001) \\ & Ventral effect Z = 5.99 & [P < 0.00001) \\ & Ventral effect Z = 5.99 & [P < 0.00001) \\ & Ventral effect Z = 4.88 & (P < 0.00001) \\ & Ventral effect Z = 4.88 & (P < 0.00001) \\ & Ventral effect Z = 4.89 & (P < 0.00001) \\ & Ventral effect Z = 4.89 & (P < 0.00001) \\ & Ventral effect Z = 4.88 & (P < 0.00001) \\ & Ventral$	Li 2016	1.745 ().44 12	2 1.283	0.324	12	10.2%	1.15 [0.28, 2.03] 2016		-
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Wei 2017	11.961 2.	168 10	6.116	1.355	10	4.1%	3.10 [1.71, 4.48] 2017		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Wang 2017	40.104 8.	436 6	5 12.674	3.132	6	1.6%	3.98 [1.73, 6.23] 2017		
Theng 2018 2.571 0.239 6 1.926 0.298 6 3.2% 2.20 [0.64, 3.77] 2018 $\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline $1078 0.28 12 0.954 0.069 12 6.9% 2.27 [1.21, 3.34] 2021 \\ \hline $1078 0.28 12 0.954 0.069 12 6.9\% 2.27 [1.21, 3.34] 2021 \\ \hline $1080 2021 1.078 0.028 12 0.954 0.069 12 6.9\% 2.27 [1.21, 3.34] 2021 \\ \hline $1080 2021 1.078 0.028 12 0.954 0.069 17 6.0.4\% 1.71 [1.35, 2.07] \\ \hline $1eterogenety: ChP = 2.73, Cf = 1(P = 0.003), P = 61\% \\ \hline $108 2011 1.10 0.45 8 1.019 0.054 7 5.1\% 1.74 [0.49, 2.98] 2014 \\ \hline $109 2013 1.2764 0.853 7 1.163 0.489 7 5.2\% 1.48 [0.25, 2.71] 2013 \\ \hline $109 2015 1.363 10 2.428 15.63 10 5.2\% 2.59 [1.27, 3.73] 2017 \\ \hline $109 2017 6.239 1.353 10 2.428 15.63 10 5.2\% 2.59 [1.27, 3.73] 2017 \\ \hline $109 2017 6.239 1.353 10 2.428 15.63 10 5.2\% 2.59 [1.27, 3.73] 2017 \\ \hline $109 2017 6.239 1.353 10 2.428 15.63 10 5.2\% 2.59 [1.27, 3.73] 2017 \\ \hline $109 2017 6.239 1.353 10 2.428 15.63 10 5.2\% 2.59 [1.27, 3.73] 2017 \\ \hline $109 2017 6.239 1.353 10 2.428 15.63 10 5.2\% 2.59 [1.27, 3.73] 2017 \\ \hline $109 2017 6.239 1.353 10 2.428 15.63 10 5.2\% 2.59 [1.27, 3.73] 2017 \\ \hline $109 2017 6.239 1.353 10 2.428 15.63 10 1.0\% 5.55 [2.62, 8.49] 2019 \\ \hline $100 2020 1.767 0.232 8 1.327 0.12 8 4.4\% 2.25 [0.27, 3.58] 2020 \\ \hline $100 2020 1.767 0.232 8 1.327 0.12 8 4.4\% 2.25 [0.27, 3.58] 2020 \\ \hline $100 2020 1.767 0.328 8 0.580 0.149 8 2.2\% 2.28 [1.04, 4.61] 2018 \\ \hline $100 2020 1.1677 0.301 6 0.581 2.25\% 2.28 2.10.4, 4.61] 2018 \\ \hline $100 2020 1.492 0.132 8 0.585 0.149 8 2.0\% 4.29 [2.32, 6.27] 2020 \\ \hline $140 200 200 1.492 0.132 8 0.585 0.149 8 2.0\% 4.29 [2.32, 6.27] 2020 \\ \hline $140 200 200 1.492 0.132 8 0.585 0.149 8 2.0\% 4.29 [2.32, 6.27] 2020 \\ \hline $140 200 200 1.492 0.132 8 0.585 0.149 8 2.0\% 4.29 [2.32, 6.27] 2020 \\ \hline $140 201 (95\% C1) 2 2 2.161 0.328 12 5.0\% 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] 2016 \\ \hline $140 200 200 1.492 0.301 6 0.516 6 2.5\% 3.309 [1.85, 4.34] 2016 \\ \hline $140 2019 11.807 1.299 6 6.717 1.303 6 1.8\% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] 2019 \\ \hline $140 201 (95\% C1) 1 2 0 6 6.717 1.303 6 1.8\% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] 2019 \\ \hline $140 201 (95\% C1) 1 2 0.207 \\ \hline $140 204 (95\% C1) 1 2 0.207 \\ \hline $140 205$	Dong 2018	10.051 2.	098 10	6.561	2.244	10	7.5%	1.54 [0.51, 2.56] 2018		
$\begin{aligned} \int_{161}^{172} (319) = 3.098 \ 0.564 \ 6 \ 1.77 \ 0.388 \ 6 \ 2.7\% \ 2.58 \ 0.88 \ 4.28 \ 2019 \$	Zhang 2018	2.571 0.	239 6	5 1.926	0.298	6	3.2%	2.20 [0.64, 3.77] 2018		
$\begin{array}{c} \text{du}(220) & 1, \text{fr}9 & 0.181 & 8 & 1.327 & 0.181 & 8 & 1.387 & 2.31 [0.96, 3.65] & 2020 \\ \text{barbotal} & 1.078 & 0.028 & 12 & 0.954 & 0.069 & 12 & 6.9% \\ \text{barbotal} & 2.27 [1.21, 3.34 & 2021 \\ \text{barbotal} & 2.764 & 0.853 & 7 & 1.663 & 0.489 & 7 & 5.2\% & 1.48 [0.25, 2.71] & 2013 \\ \text{hang} & 2013 & 2.764 & 0.853 & 7 & 1.663 & 0.489 & 7 & 5.2\% & 1.48 [0.25, 2.71] & 2013 \\ \text{hang} & 2014 & 1.11 & 0.045 & 8 & 1.019 & 0.054 & 7 & 5.1\% & 1.74 [0.49, 2.99] & 2014 \\ \text{bing} & 2015 & 4.369 & 0.344 & 8 & 1.651 & 0.209 & 8 & 0.6\% & 9.03 [5.29, 12.76] & 2015 \\ \text{Valg} & 2017 & 4.465 & 7.459 & 6 & 14.245 & 4.66 & 6 & 1.6\% & 3.89 [1.66, 6.10] & 2017 \\ \text{Vang} & 2017 & 40.465 & 7.459 & 6 & 14.245 & 4.66 & 6 & 1.6\% & 3.89 [1.66, 6.10] & 2017 \\ \text{Vang} & 2017 & 40.465 & 7.459 & 6 & 14.245 & 4.66 & 6 & 1.6\% & 3.89 [1.66, 6.10] & 2017 \\ \text{Vang} & 2017 & 40.465 & 7.459 & 6 & 1.4245 & 4.66 & 6 & 1.6\% & 3.89 [1.66, 6.10] & 2017 \\ \text{Vang} & 2017 & 40.465 & 7.459 & 6 & 1.4245 & 4.66 & 6 & 1.6\% & 3.89 [1.66, 6.10] & 2017 \\ \text{Vang} & 2017 & 4.245 & 4.968 & 1.501 & 6 & 0.9\% & 5.55 [2.62, 8.49] & 2019 \\ \text{valueg} & 2019 & 10.374 & 0.797 & 6 & 1.647 & 0.364 & 6 & 0.9\% & 5.55 [2.62, 8.49] & 2019 \\ \text{valueg} & 2019 & 16.737 & 3.141 & 6 & 2.496 [1.50, 1.1] & 2.378] & 2015 \\ \text{valueg} & 2020 & 1.767 & 0.232 & 8 & 1.327 & 0.12 & 8 & 4.4\% & 2.25 [0.92, 3.56] & 2020 \\ \text{valued} & 1.163 & 0.031 & 6 & 0.419 & 0.156 & 6 & 2.5\% & 2.82 [1.04, 4.61] & 2018 \\ \text{valued} & 1.291 & 1.63 & 0.031 & 2.28 & 2.0\% & 4.29 [2.3, 6.27] & 2.2920 \\ \text{valued} & 1.291 & 2.28 & 2.24 & 4.7\% & 3.97 [2.67, 5.27] \\ \text{valued} & 1.6\% & 1.29 & 6 & 6.717 & 1.303 & 6 & 1.8\% & 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] & 2019 \\ \text{valued} & 1.6\% & 1.29 & 6 & 6.717 & 1.303 & 6 & 1.8\% & 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] & 2019 \\ \text{valued} & 1.6\% & 1.29 & 6 & 6.717 & 1.303 & 6 & 1.8\% & 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] & 2019 \\ \text{valued} & 1.6\% & 0.00001) \\ \text{valued} & 1.5\% & 1.807 & 1.29 & 6 & 6.717 & 1.303 & 6 & 1.8\% & 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] & 2019 \\ \text{valued} & 1.6\% & 0.00001) \\ \text{valued} & 1.807 & 1.29 & 6 & 6.717 & 1.303 & 6 & 1.8\%$	Dhar 2019	3.098 0.	564 6	5 1.777	0.358	6	2.7%	2.58 [0.89, 4.28] 2019		
hang 2021 1. 10.76 0.028 12 0.994 0.008 12 6.9% 22.7 [1.21, 3.34] 2021 Heterogeneity: $Ch^2 = 27.9$, $df = 11$ ($P = 0.003$); $P = 61\%$ rest for overall effect: Z = 9.2 ($P < 0.0001$) 1.12 1L-15 Seng 2013 2.764 0.853 7 1.663 0.489 7 5.2% 1.48 [0.25, 2.71] 2013 Thang 2014 1.11 0.045 8 1.019 0.054 7 5.1% 1.74 [0.49, 2.96] 2014 Song 2015 4.360 0.344 8 1.651 0.209 8 0.6% 9.03 [5.29, 1.27, 3.73] 2017 Vang 2017 6.239 1.353 10 2.428 1.563 10 5.2% 2.50 [1.27, 3.73] 2017 Vang 2017 40.465 7.459 6 14.245 4.466 1 6.8% 3.89 [1.66, 6.10] 2017 Jong 2018 9.263 1.999 10 3.904 1.306 10 4.2% 3.04 [1.67, 4.41] 2018 Jong 2019 16.737 3.141 6 2.495 1.501 6 1.0% 5.54 [2.5, 6.49] 2019 Huang 2019 16.737 3.141 6 2.495 1.501 6 1.0% 5.54 [2.5, 6.49] 2019 Jutotal (9% Cl) 69 66 28.1% 2.26 [10.11, 23.78] 2015 Heterogeneity: $Ch^2 = 25.44$, $df = 8 (P = 0.0001$; $P = 69\%$ rest for overall effect: Z = 9.73 ($P < 0.00004$; $P = 87\%$ rest for overall effect: Z = 5.99 ($P < 0.00004$; $P = 87\%$ rest for overall effect: Z = 5.99 ($P < 0.00004$; $P = 87\%$ rest for overall effect: Z = 5.99 ($P < 0.00004$; $P = 87\%$ rest for overall effect: Z = 5.99 ($P < 0.00004$; $P = 87\%$ rest for overall effect: Z = 5.99 ($P < 0.00004$; $P = 87\%$ rest for overall effect: Z = 5.99 ($P < 0.00004$; $P = 87\%$ rest for overall effect: Z = 4.86 ($P < 0.00001$; $P = 72\%$ Heterogeneity: $Ch^2 = 25.48 (P < 0.00001$; $P = 72\%$ Heterogeneity: $Ch^2 = 9.97, (d = 20(P < 0.00001)$; $P = 72\%$ Heterogeneity: $Ch^2 = 9.97, (d = 20(P < 0.00001)$; $P = 72\%$ Heterogeneity: $Ch^2 = 9.97, (d = 20(P < 0.00001)$; $P = 72\%$ Heterogeneity: $Ch^2 = 9.97, (d = 20(P < 0.00001)$; $P = 72\%$ Heterogeneity: $P = 89.74, (d = 25(P < 0.00001)$; $P = 72\%$ Heterogeneity: $P = 89.74, (d = 25(P < 0.00001)$; $P = 72\%$ Heterogeneity: $P = 89.74, (d = 25(P < 0.00001)$; $P = 72\%$ Heterogeneity: $P = 89.74, (d = 25(P < 0.00001)$; $P = 72\%$	Lou 2020	1.769 0.	181 8	3 1.327	0.181	8	4.3%	2.31 [0.96, 3.65] 2020		<u> </u>
$\begin{aligned} \text{Januclus (1978 Cl)} &= 93 \text{gs}^{-1} \text{Journal (1978 Cl)} &= 27.97, \text{ df} = 11 (P = 0.003); P = 61\% \\ \text{feet orgeneity: Ch^{-1} = 27.97, \text{ df} = 11 (P = 0.003); P = 61\% \\ \text{feet orgeneity: Ch^{-1} = 25.84, \text{ df} = 8 (P = 0.0001); P = 61\% \\ \text{Januclus (1978 Cl)} &= 15.4, \text{ df} = 10.99 0.054, 7 5.1\% 1.74 [0.49, 2.88] 2014 \\ \text{Januclus (1978 Cl)} &= 15.4, \text{ df} = 10.99 10 30.054, 7 5.1\% 1.74 [0.49, 2.88] 2014 \\ \text{Januclus (1978 Cl)} &= 15.4, \text{ df} = 10.99 10 30.094 1.306 10 4.2\% 2.50 [1, 27, 3, 73] 2017 \\ \text{Vang 2015} &= 4.248 1.663 0.489 7.52\% 2.50 [1, 27, 3, 73] 2017 \\ \text{Vang 2017} &= 4.0465 7.459 6 1.4245 4.66 6 1.6\% 3.89 [1.86, 6.10] 2017 \\ \text{Jang 2018} &= 2.645 1.501 4.245 1.501 6 1.0\% 5.54 [2, 2.6, 8.18] 2019 \\ \text{Jance 2020} &= 1.767 0.232 8 1.327 0.12 8 4.4\% 2.25 [0.92, 3.58] 2020 \\ \text{Jubtoal (196% Cl)} &= 6 8.28 1.327 0.12 8 4.4\% 2.25 [0.92, 3.58] 2020 \\ \text{Jubtoal (196\% Cl)} &= 9.73 (P < 0.0001) \\ \text{J.1 II-6} \\ \text{Jang 2015} 1.163 0.031 6 0.819 0.156 6 2.5\% 2.82 [1.04, 4.61] 2015 \\ \text{Jang 2015} 1.163 0.031 6 0.819 0.156 6 2.5\% 2.82 [1.04, 4.61] 2018 \\ \text{Jubtoal (195\% Cl)} &= 27.3 (P < 0.00001) \\ \text{J.1 II-6} \\ \text{Jang 2015} 1.163 0.031 6 0.819 0.156 6 2.5\% 2.82 [1.04, 4.61] 2018 \\ \text{Jubtoal (95\% Cl)} &= 15.54, \text{ df} = 2 (P = 0.0004); P = 87\% \\ \text{is thor overall effect: Z = 4.86 (P < 0.00001) \\ \text{J.1 II-8} \\ \text{Jubtoal (95\% Cl)} &= 12 2 2.161 0.328 12 5.0\% 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] 2016 \\ \text{Jubtoal (95\% Cl)} &= 12.99 6 6 6.717 1.303 6 1.8\% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] 2019 \\ \text{Jubtoal (95\% Cl)} &= 20.74, \text{ df} = 5 (P < 0.00001) \\ \text{J.1 II-7} \\ \text{Har 2019} 1.1807 1.299 6 6.717 1.303 6 1.8\% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] 2019 \\ \text{Jubtoal (95\% Cl)} &= 6 6 6 1.8\% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] 2019 \\ \text{Jubtoal (95\% Cl)} &= 6 6 6 1.8\% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] 2019 \\ \text{Jubtoal (95\% Cl)} &= 20.74, \text{ df} = 20 (P < 0.00007) \\ Jubt$	Zhang 2021	1.078 0.	028 12	2 0.954	0.069	12	6.9%	2.27 [1.21, 3.34] 2021		•
$\begin{array}{c} \text{the for quarties if or varial effect: $Z = 3.28 (P < 0.00001) \\ \text{i.1.2 IL-1b} \\ \hline \text{Jeng 2013} & 2.764 & 0.853 & 7 & 1.663 & 0.489 & 7 & 5.2\% & 1.48 [0.25, 2.71] & 2013 \\ \hline \text{Jeng 2014} & 1.11 & 0.045 & 8 & 1.019 & 0.054 & 7 & 5.1\% & 1.74 [0.49, 2.98] & 2014 \\ \hline \text{Jeng 2015} & 4.369 & 0.344 & 8 & 1.651 & 0.209 & 8 & 0.6\% & 9.03 [5.29, 12.76] & 2015 \\ \hline \text{Val 2017} & 6.239 & 1.353 & 10 & 2.428 & 1.663 & 10 & 5.2\% & 2.50 [1.27, 3.73] & 2017 \\ \hline \text{Vang 2017} & 4.0465 & 7.459 & 6 & 1.4245 & 4.66 & 6 & 1.6\% & 3.89 [1.68, 6.10] & 2017 \\ \hline \text{Jong 2018} & 9.263 & 1.999 & 10 & 3.904 & 1.306 & 10 & 4.2\% & 3.04 [1.67, 4.41] & 2018 \\ \ \text{Jong 2019} & 16.737 & 3.141 & 6 & 2.495 & 1.501 & 6 & 1.0\% & 5.55 [2.6, 8.49] & 2019 \\ \ \text{Juar 2019} & 16.737 & 3.141 & 6 & 2.495 & 1.501 & 6 & 1.0\% & 5.35 [2.62, 8.49] & 2019 \\ \ \text{Juar 2019} & 1.673 & 7.3141 & 6 & 2.495 & 1.501 & 6 & 1.0\% & 5.34 [2.50, 3.18] & 2019 \\ \ \text{Juar 2019} & 1.633 & 0.31 & 6 & 0.819 & 0.156 & 2.5\% & 2.82 [1.04, 4.61] & 2018 \\ \ \text{our 2020} & 1.767 & 0.232 & 8 & 0.853 & 0.149 & 8 & 2.0\% & 4.29 [2.32, 6.27] & 2020 \\ \ \text{Jubtotal (95\% CI)} & 12 & 22 & 22 & 4.7\% & 3.97 [2.67, 5.27] \\ \ \text{leterogeneity: Ch^2 = 5.54, df = 2 (P = 0.00001) \\ \ \textbf{1.4 IL-8} \\ \ \text{lottotal (95\% CI)} & 12 & 2.161 & 0.328 & 12 & 5.0\% & 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] & 2016 \\ \ \text{Jubtotal (95\% CI)} & 12 & 2.161 & 0.328 & 12 & 5.0\% & 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] & 2016 \\ \ \text{leterogeneity: Not applicable} \\ \ \text{rest for overall effect: $Z = 3.86 (P < 0.00001) \\ \ \textbf{1.5 IL-18} \\ \ \text{thar 2019} & 1.1807 & 1.299 & 6 & 6.717 & 1.303 & 6 & 1.8\% & 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] & 2019 \\ \ \text{leterogeneity: Not applicable} \\ \ \text{rest for overall effect: $Z = 3.38 (P = 0.0007) \\ \ \text{rest for overall effect: $Z = 3.38 (P = 0.0007) \\ \ \text{rest for overall effect: $Z = 4.86 (P < 0.00001) \\ \ \textbf{1.5 IL-78} \\ \ \text{therogeneity: Not applicable} \\ \ \text{rest for overall effect: $Z = 3.38 (P = 0.0007) \\ \ \text{rest for overall effect: $Z = 3.38 (P = 0.0007) \\ \ \text{rest for overall effect: $Z = 4.86 (P < 0.00001) \\ \ \textbf{1.5 IL-78} \\ \ therogene$	Subtotal (95% Cl)	27.07 df = 1	90 1 (D = 0.0))))) 2 - 6	10/	97	00.4 %	1.71[1.35, 2.07]		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Test for overall effect:	Z = 9.29 (P	< 0.00001)	JS), I ⁻ – C	170					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	1.1.2 IL-1b									
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Geng 2013	2.764 0.	853 7	1.663	0.489	7	5.2%	1.48 [0.25, 2.71] 2013		 - -
$\begin{aligned} & \text{Song } 2015 & 4.369 & 0.344 & 8 & 1.651 & 0.209 & 8 & 0.6\% & 9.03 [5.29, 12.76] & 2015 \\ & \text{Vel } 2017 & 6.233 & 1.353 & 10 & 2.428 & 1.563 & 10 & 5.2\% & 2.50 [1.27, 3.73] & 2017 \\ & \text{Vang } 2017 & 40.465 & 7.459 & 6 & 14.245 & 4.66 & 6 & 1.6\% & 3.88 [1.68, 6.10] & 2017 \\ & \text{Jong } 2018 & 9.263 & 1.999 & 10 & 3.904 & 1.306 & 10 & 4.2\% & 3.04 [1.67, 4.41] & 2018 \\ & \text{Johar } 2019 & 16.737 & 3.141 & 6 & 2.495 & 1.501 & 6 & 1.0\% & 5.34 [2.50, 8.18] & 2019 \\ & \text{Juang } 2019 & 16.737 & 3.141 & 6 & 2.495 & 1.501 & 6 & 1.0\% & 5.34 [2.50, 8.18] & 2019 \\ & \text{Juang } 2019 & 16.737 & 3.141 & 6 & 2.495 & 1.501 & 6 & 1.0\% & 5.34 [2.50, 8.18] & 2019 \\ & \text{Juang } 2019 & 16.737 & 3.141 & 6 & 2.495 & 1.501 & 6 & 1.0\% & 5.34 [2.50, 8.18] & 2019 \\ & \text{Juang } 2019 & 1.673 & 0.314 & 6 & 0.819 & 0.156 & 6 & 2.5\% & 2.62 [1.04, 4.61] & 2018 \\ & \text{Justotal } (195\% \text{ CI}) & 69 & 68 & 28.1\% & 2.62 [2.09, 3.15] \\ & \text{Jetterogeneiity: Chi2 = 25.84 , df = 8 (P = 0.0001); P = 69\% \\ & \text{Jest for overall effect: } Z = 9.73 (P < 0.00001) \\ & \textbf{1.13 IL-6} \\ & \text{Jong } 2015 & 3.034 & 0.11 & 8 & 1.295 & 0.082 & 8 & 0.2\% & 16.95 [10.11, 23.78] & 2015 \\ & \text{Juang } 2018 & 1.163 & 0.031 & 6 & 0.819 & 0.156 & 6 & 2.5\% & 2.82 [1.04, 4.61] & 2018 \\ & \text{Juang } 2018 & 1.163 & 0.031 & 6 & 0.819 & 0.156 & 6 & 2.5\% & 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] & 2016 \\ & \text{Juang } 2018 & 1.492 & 0.132 & 8 & 0.653 & 0.149 & 8 & 2.0\% & 4.29 [2.32, 6.27] & 2020 \\ & \text{Juand } 16\text{ fect: } Z = 5.99 (P < 0.00001) \\ & \textbf{1.41 L-8} \\ & 12016 & 3.098 & 0.252 & 12 & 2.161 & 0.328 & 12 & 5.0\% & 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] & 2016 \\ & \text{Juand } 1.807 & 1.29 & 6 & 6.717 & 1.303 & 6 & 1.8\% & 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] & 2019 \\ & \text{Juang } 1.807 & 1.29 & 6 & 6.717 & 1.303 & 6 & 1.8\% & 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] & 2019 \\ & \text{Juand } 1.807 & 1.29 & 6 & 6.717 & 1.303 & 6 & 1.8\% & 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] & 2019 \\ & \text{Juang } 1.807 & 1.29 & 6 & 6.717 & 1.303 & 6 & 1.8\% & 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] & 2019 \\ & \text{Juang } 1.807 & 1.29 & 6 & 6.717 & 1.303 & 6 & 1.8\% & 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] & 2019 \\ & \text{Juand } 1.807 & 1.29 & 6 & 6.717 & $	Zhang 2014	1.11 0.	045 8	3 1.019	0.054	7	5.1%	1.74 [0.49, 2.98] 2014		+
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Song 2015	4.369 0.	344 8	3 1.651	0.209	8	0.6%	9.03 [5.29, 12.76] 2015		
Wang 2017 40.465 7.459 6 14.245 4.66 6 1.6% $3.89 [1.68, 6.10] 2017$ Jong 2018 9.263 1.999 10 3.904 1.306 10 4.2% $3.04 [1.67, 4.11] 2018$ Johar 2019 5.374 0.797 6 1.647 0.364 6 0.9% 5.55 [2.62, 8.49] 2019 Juang 2019 16.737 3.141 6 2.495 1.501 6 1.0% $5.34 [2.50, 8.18] 2019$ Juang 2019 16.737 3.141 6 2.495 1.501 6 1.0% $5.34 [2.50, 8.18] 2019$ Juang 2019 16.737 3.141 6 2.495 1.501 6 1.0% $5.34 [2.50, 8.18] 2019$ Juang 2019 16.737 0.232 8 1.327 0.12 8 4.4% 2.25 [0.92, 3.58] 2020 Jubtotal (95% CI) 69 68 28.1% 2.62 [1.09, 3.15] Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 25.84, df = 8 ($P = 0.001$); $P = 69\%$ The storoverall effect: $Z = 9.73 (P < 0.00001$) 1.13 L-6 Jong 2015 3.034 0.11 8 1.295 0.082 8 0.2% 16.95 [10.11, 23.78] 2015 Juang 2018 1.163 0.031 6 0.819 0.156 6 2.5% 2.82 [1.04, 4.61] 2018 Jubtotal (95% CI) 22 2 22 4.7% 3.97 [2.67, 5.27] Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 15.54, df = 2 ($P = 0.0004$); $P = 87\%$ The terogeneity: Chi ² = 15.54, df = 2 ($P = 0.0004$); $P = 87\%$ The terogeneity: Chi ² = 15.54, df = 2 ($P = 0.0004$); $P = 87\%$ The terogeneity: Chi ² = 15.54, df = 2 ($P = 0.0004$); $P = 87\%$ The terogeneity: Not applicable The terogeneity: Chi ² = 89.74, df = 25 ($P < 0.00007$) The terogeneity: Chi ² = 89.74, df = 25 ($P <$	Wei 2017	6.239 1.	353 10	2.428	1.563	10	5.2%	2.50 [1.27, 3.73] 2017		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Wang 2017	40.465 7.	459 6	6 14.245	4.66	6	1.6%	3.89 [1.68, 6.10] 2017		
Dhar 2019 5.374 0.797 6 1.647 0.364 6 0.9% $5.55 [2.62, 8.49] 2019 thuang 2019 16.737 3.141 6 2.495 1.501 6 1.0\% 5.34 [2.50, 8.18] 2019to 2020 1.767 0.232 8 1.327 0.12 8 4.4\% 2.25 [0.92, 3.56] 2020Subtotal (95% CI) 69 -0.001); P = 69%rest for overall effect: Z = 9.73 (P < 0.0001); P = 72%1.3 IL-6Song 2015 3.034 0.11 8 1.295 0.062 8 0.2\% 16.95 [10.11, 23.78] 2015 Thang 2018 1.163 0.031 6 0.819 0.156 6 2.5\% 2.82 [1.04, 4.61] 2018Subtotal (95% CI) 22 22 4.7\% 3.97 [2.67, 5.27]Test for overall effect: Z = 5.99 (P < 0.00001); P = 87%rest for overall effect: Z = 5.99 (P < 0.00001)1.4 IL-8i 2016 3.098 0.252 12 2.161 0.328 12 5.0\% 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] 2016Subtotal (95% CI) 12 12 12 5.0\% 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] 2016Subtotal (95% CI) 12 12 5.0\% 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] 2016Subtotal (95% CI) 6 6 6.717 1.303 6 1.8\% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] 2019Subtotal (95% CI) 6 6 6.717 1.303 6 1.8\% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] 2019Subtotal (95% CI) 6 6 6.717 1.303 6 1.8\% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] 2019Subtotal (95% CI) 6 6 6.717 1.303 6 1.8\% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] 0.019Subtotal (95% CI) 6 0.00001)1.5 IL-18Subtotal (95% CI) 207 205 100.0\% 2.18 [1.90, 2.46]Feterogeneity: Not applicablerest for overall effect: Z = 3.38 (P = 0.0007)$	Dong 2018	9.263 1.	999 10	3.904	1.306	10	4.2%	3.04 [1.67, 4.41] 2018		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Dhar 2019	5.374 0.	797 6	5 1.647	0.364	6	0.9%	5.55 [2.62, 8.49] 2019		——
$\begin{array}{c} \text{ou} \ 2020 & 1.767 \ 0.232 \ 8 \ 1.327 \ 0.12 \ 8 \ 4.4\% & 2.25 \ [0.92, 3.58] \ 2020 \\ \text{Subtotal} \ (95\% \ Cl) & 69 \ 68 \ 28.1\% \ 2.62 \ [2.09, 3.15] \\ \text{fest for overall effect: } Z = 9.73 \ (P < 0.0001) \\ \textbf{.1.3 IL-6} \\ \text{Jong 2015} & 3.034 \ 0.11 \ 8 \ 1.295 \ 0.082 \ 8 \ 0.2\% \ 16.95 \ [10.11, 23.78] \ 2015 \\ \text{thang 2018} & 1.163 \ 0.031 \ 6 \ 0.819 \ 0.156 \ 6 \ 2.5\% \ 2.82 \ [1.04, 4.61] \ 2018 \\ \text{ou} \ 2020 \ 1.492 \ 0.132 \ 8 \ 0.859 \ 0.149 \ 8 \ 2.0\% \ 4.29 \ [2.32, 6.27] \ 2020 \\ \textbf{Jubtotal} \ (95\% \ Cl) \ 22 \ 22 \ 4.7\% \ 3.97 \ [2.67, 5.27] \\ \text{fest for overall effect: } Z = 5.99 \ (P < 0.00001); P = 87\% \\ \text{rest for overall effect: } Z = 5.99 \ (P < 0.00001); P = 87\% \\ \text{rest for overall effect: } Z = 5.99 \ (P < 0.00001) \\ \textbf{1.4 IL-8} \\ i \ 2016 \ 3.098 \ 0.252 \ 12 \ 2.161 \ 0.328 \ 12 \ 5.0\% \ 3.09 \ [1.85, 4.34] \ 2016 \\ \text{Jubtotal} \ (95\% \ Cl) \ 12 \ 12 \ 5.0\% \ 3.09 \ [1.85, 4.34] \ 2016 \\ \text{Jubtotal} \ (95\% \ Cl) \ 12 \ 12 \ 5.0\% \ 3.09 \ [1.85, 4.34] \ 2016 \\ \text{Jubtotal} \ (95\% \ Cl) \ 6 \ 6 \ 6.717 \ 1.303 \ 6 \ 1.8\% \ 3.61 \ [1.52, 5.71] \ 2019 \\ \text{Jubtotal} \ (95\% \ Cl) \ 6 \ 6 \ 1.8\% \ 3.61 \ [1.52, 5.71] \ 2019 \\ \text{Jubtotal} \ (95\% \ Cl) \ 6 \ 6 \ 1.8\% \ 3.61 \ [1.52, 5.71] \ 2019 \\ \text{Jubtotal} \ (95\% \ Cl) \ 6 \ 6 \ 1.8\% \ 3.61 \ [1.52, 5.71] \ 2019 \\ \text{Jubtotal} \ (95\% \ Cl) \ 6 \ 6 \ 1.8\% \ 3.61 \ [1.52, 5.71] \ 2019 \\ \text{Jubtotal} \ (95\% \ Cl) \ 6 \ 6 \ 1.8\% \ 3.61 \ [1.52, 5.71] \ 2019 \\ \text{Jubtotal} \ (95\% \ Cl) \ 6 \ 6 \ 1.8\% \ 3.61 \ [1.52, 5.71] \ 2019 \\ \text{Jubtotal} \ (95\% \ Cl) \ 6 \ (9 \ 0.0007) \ (1.57) \ 1.303 \ 6 \ 1.8\% \ 3.61 \ [1.52, 5.71] \ 2019 \\ \text{Jubtotal} \ (95\% \ Cl) \ 6 \ (9 \ 0.0007) \ (1.57) \ 1.303 \ 6 \ 1.8\% \ 3.61 \ [1.52, 5.71] \ 2019 \\ \text{Jubtotal} \ (95\% \ Cl) \ 6 \ (9 \ 0.0007) \ (1.57$	Huang 2019	16.737 3.	141 6	5 2.495	1.501	6	1.0%	5.34 [2.50, 8.18] 2019		——
Subtotal (95% CI) 69 68 28.1% 2.62 [2.09, 3.15] Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 25.84, df = 8 (P = 0.001); i ² = 69% Fest for overall effect: Z = 9.73 (P < 0.00001) 1.1.3 IL-6 Song 2015 3.034 0.11 8 1.295 0.082 8 0.2% 16.95 [10.11, 23.78] 2015 Thang 2018 1.163 0.031 6 0.819 0.156 6 2.5% 2.82 [1.04, 4.61] 2018 Soutbotal (95% CI) 22 22 4.7% 3.97 [2.67, 5.27] Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 15.54, df = 2 (P = 0.0004); i ² = 87% Fest for overall effect: Z = 5.99 (P < 0.00001) 1.4 IL-8 i 2016 3.098 0.252 12 2.161 0.328 12 5.0% 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) 12 12 12 5.0% 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] Heterogeneity: Not applicable Fest for overall effect: Z = 4.86 (P < 0.00001) 1.5 IL-18 That 2019 11.807 1.299 6 6.717 1.303 6 1.8% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] 2019 Subtotal (95% CI) 6 1.8% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] Heterogeneity: Not applicable Fest for overall effect: Z = 3.38 (P = 0.0007) Total (95% CI) 207 205 100.0% 2.18 [1.90, 2.46] Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 89.74, df = 25 (P < 0.00001); i ² = 72%	Lou 2020	1.767 0.	232 8	3 1.327	0.12	8	4.4%	2.25 [0.92, 3.58] 2020		1
$\begin{aligned} & \text{Iderogeneity: } Ch^2 = 25.84, \text{ df} = 8 \ (P = 0.001); \ ^2 = 69\% \\ & \text{Fest for overall effect: } Z = 9.73 \ (P < 0.00001) \\ & \text{I.1.3 IL-6} \\ & \text{Song 2015} & 3.034 & 0.11 & 8 & 1.295 & 0.082 & 8 & 0.2\% & 16.95 \ [10.11, 23.78] & 2015 \\ & \text{thang 2018} & 1.163 & 0.031 & 6 & 0.819 & 0.156 & 6 & 2.5\% & 2.82 \ [1.04, 4.61] & 2018 \\ & \text{ou 2020} & 1.492 & 0.132 & 8 & 0.853 & 0.149 & 8 & 2.0\% & 4.29 \ [2.32, 6.27] & 2020 \\ & \text{Subtotal (95\% CI)} & 22 & 22 & 4.7\% & 3.97 \ [2.67, 5.27] \\ & \text{teterogeneity: } Ch^2 = 15.54, \ df = 2 \ (P = 0.0004); \ ^2 = 87\% \\ & \text{est for overall effect: } Z = 5.99 \ (P < 0.00001) \\ & \text{I.1.4 IL-8} \\ & \text{i 2016} & 3.098 & 0.252 & 12 & 2.161 & 0.328 & 12 & 5.0\% & 3.09 \ [1.85, 4.34] & 2016 \\ & \text{iubtotal (95\% CI)} & 12 & 12 & 5.0\% & 3.09 \ [1.85, 4.34] & 2016 \\ & \text{iubtotal (95\% CI)} & 12 & 12 & 5.0\% & 3.09 \ [1.85, 4.34] \\ & \text{tetrogeneity: Not applicable} \\ & \text{est for overall effect: } Z = 4.86 \ (P < 0.00001) \\ & \text{I.1.5 IL-18} \\ & \text{Thag 2019} & 11.807 \ 1.29 & 6 & 6.717 \ 1.303 & 6 & 1.8\% & 3.61 \ [1.52, 5.71] \ 2019 \\ & \text{iubtotal (95\% CI)} & 6 & 6 & 1.8\% & 3.61 \ [1.52, 5.71] \ 2019 \\ & \text{iubtotal (95\% CI)} & 6 & 6.717 \ 1.303 & 6 & 1.8\% & 3.61 \ [1.52, 5.71] \ 2019 \\ & \text{iubtotal (95\% CI)} & 6 & 6.717 \ 1.303 & 6 & 1.8\% & 3.61 \ [1.52, 5.71] \ 2019 \\ & \text{iubtotal (95\% CI)} & 6 & 6.717 \ 1.29 \ (P = 0.0007) \\ & \text{otal (95\% CI)} & 207 & 205 \ 100.0\% & 2.18 \ [1.90, 2.46] \\ & \text{teterogeneity: Ch^2 = 89.74, \ df = 25 \ (P < 0.00007) \\ & \text{otal (95\% CI)} & 207 & 205 \ 100.0\% & 2.18 \ [1.90, 2.46] \\ & \text{teterogeneity: Ch^2 = 89.74, \ df = 25 \ (P < 0.00007) \\ & \text{otal (95\% CI)} & 0 & 0.0007 \\ & \text{otal (95\% CI)} & 0 & 0.0007 \\ & \text{otal (95\% CI)} & 0 & 0.0007 \\ & \text{otal (95\% CI)} & 0.0007 \\ & otal (95\% CI)$	Subtotal (95% CI)		69)		68	28.1%	2.62 [2.09, 3.15]		•
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	25.84, df = 8 Z = 9.73 (P	(P = 0.00 < 0.00001)	1); I² = 69	%					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1.1.3 IL-6									
Thang 2018 1.163 0.031 6 0.819 0.156 6 2.5% 2.82 [1.04, 4.61] 2018 ou 2020 1.492 0.132 8 0.853 0.149 8 2.0% 4.29 [2.32, 6.27] 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) 22 22 4.7% $3.97 [2.67, 5.27]$ teterogeneity: Chi ² = 15.54, df = 2 (P = 0.0004); l ² = 87% 'est for overall effect: Z = 5.99 (P < 0.00001) 1.4 IL-8 i 2016 $3.098 0.252 12 2.161 0.328 12 5.0% 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] 2016$ Subtotal (95% CI) 12 12 5.0% $3.09 [1.85, 4.34]$ teterogeneity: Not applicable 'est for overall effect: Z = 4.86 (P < 0.00001) 1.5 IL-18 'har 2019 11.807 1.299 6 6.717 1.303 6 1.8% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] 2019 Subtotal (95% CI) 6 6 717 1.303 6 1.8% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] 2019 Subtotal (95% CI) 6 7 0.00001) 	Song 2015	3.034 ().11 8	3 1.295	0.082	8	0.2%	16.95 [10.11, 23.78] 2015		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Zhang 2018	1.163 0.	031 6	0.819	0.156	6	2.5%	2.82 [1.04, 4.61] 2018		
Subtotal (95% Cl) 22 22 4.7% $3.97 [2.67, 5.27]$ teterogeneity: Ch ² = 15.54, df = 2 (P = 0.0004); l ² = 87% rest for overall effect: Z = 5.99 (P < 0.00001) 1.1.4 IL-8 i 2016 $3.098 \ 0.252 \ 12 \ 2.161 \ 0.328 \ 12 \ 5.0\% \ 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] 2016 subtotal (95% Cl) 12 12 5.0\% \ 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] 2016 subtotal (95% Cl) 12 12 5.0\% \ 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] 2016 i 2016 3.098 \ 0.252 \ 12 \ 2.161 \ 0.328 \ 12 \ 5.0\% \ 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] 2016 subtotal (95% Cl) 12 12 5.0\% \ 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] 2016 i 2016 3.098 \ 0.252 \ 12 \ 2.161 \ 0.328 \ 12 \ 5.0\% \ 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] 2016 i 2016 3.098 \ 0.252 \ 12 \ 2.161 \ 0.328 \ 12 \ 5.0\% \ 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] $	Lou 2020	1.492 0.	132 8	0.853	0.149	8	2.0%	4.29 [2.32, 6.27] 2020		
$\begin{array}{c} \text{leterogeneity: } \text{Chi}^2 = 15.54, \text{ df} = 2 \ (P = 0.0004); \ P = 87\% \\ \text{Fest for overall effect: } Z = 5.99 \ (P < 0.00001) \\ \textbf{.1.4 IL-8} \\ \textbf{.2016} & 3.098 \ 0.252 \ 12 \ 2.161 \ 0.328 \ 12 \ 5.0\% \ 3.09 \ [1.85, 4.34] \ 2016 \\ \textbf{.2016} & \textbf{.2016} \\$	Subtotal (95% CI)		22	2		22	4.7%	3.97 [2.67, 5.27]		•
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	15.54, df = 2 Z = 5.99 (P	(P = 0.000 < 0.00001)	04); I² = 8	7%					
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	1.1.4 IL-8									
Subtotal (95% Cl) 12 12 5.0% 3.09 [1.85, 4.34] teterogeneity: Not applicable 'est for overall effect: Z = 4.86 (P < 0.00001) 1.5 IL-18 Thar 2019 11.807 1.299 6 6.717 1.303 6 1.8% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] 2019 Subtotal (95% Cl) 6 6 1.8% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] teterogeneity: Not applicable 'est for overall effect: Z = 3.38 (P = 0.0007) 'otal (95% Cl) 207 205 100.0% 2.18 [1.90, 2.46] teterogeneity: Chi ² = 89.74, df = 25 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 72%	Li 2016	3.098 0.	252 12	2 2.161	0.328	12	5.0%	3.09 [1.85, 4.34] 2016		
Heterogeneity: Not applicable Fest for overall effect: Z = 4.86 (P < 0.00001)	Subtotal (95% CI)		12	2		12	5.0%	3.09 [1.85, 4.34]		◆
Fest for overall effect: Z = 4.86 (P < 0.00001)	Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.86 (P	< 0.00001)							
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	1.1.5 IL-18									
Subtotal (95% Cl) 6 6 1.8% 3.61 [1.52, 5.71] leterogeneity: Not applicable • • • 'otal (95% Cl) 207 205 100.0% 2.18 [1.90, 2.46] leterogeneity: Chi ² = 89.74, df = 25 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 72% • • •	Dhar 2019	11.807 1.	299 6	6.717	1.303	6	1.8%	3.61 [1.52, 5.71] 2019		
leterogeneity: Not applicable 'est for overall effect: Z = 3.38 (P = 0.0007) 'otal (95% Cl) 207 205 100.0% 2.18 [1.90, 2.46] leterogeneity: Chi² = 89.74, df = 25 (P < 0.00001); l² = 72%	Subtotal (95% CI)		6	5		6	1.8%	3.61 [1.52, 5.71]		-
Total (95% CI) 207 205 100.0% 2.18 [1.90, 2.46] leterogeneity: Chi² = 89.74, df = 25 (P < 0.00001); I² = 72%	Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	plicable Z = 3.38 (P	= 0.0007)							
teterogeneity: Chi ² = 89.74, df = 25 (P < 0.00001); l ² = 72%	Total (95% CI)		207	,		205	100.0%	2.18 [1.90, 2.46]		•
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	89.74, df = 2	5 (P < 0.0	0001); l ² :	= 72%			· · ·	20 10	
'est for overall effect: Z = 15.21 (P < 0.0001)	Test for overall effect:	Z = 15.21 (F	< 0.0000	I)					-20 -10 Favours [Discoso]	Eavours [Acupuncture]



	D	isease		Acu	punctu	re	:	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean	Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed	1, 95% CI
1.3.1 IL-1										
Dhar 2019	5.374	0.797	6	1.647	0.364	6	1.0%	5.55 [2.62, 8.49]		
Dong 2018	9.263	1.999	10	3.904	1.306	10	4.6%	3.04 [1.67, 4.41]		
Geng 2013	2.764	0.853	7	1.663	0.489	7	5.7%	1.48 [0.25, 2.71]		
Huang 2019	16.737	3.141	6	2.495	1.501	6	1.1%	5.34 [2.50, 8.18]		
Lou 2020	1.767	0.232	8	1.327	0.12	8	4.9%	2.25 [0.92, 3.58]		
Song 2015	4.369	0.344	8	1.651	0.209	8	0.6%	9.03 [5.29, 12.76]		
Wang 2017	40.465	7.459	6	14.245	4.66	6	1.8%	3.89 [1.68, 6.10]		
Wei 2017	6.239	1.353	10	2.428	1.563	10	5.7%	2.50 [1.27, 3.73]		
Zhang 2014	1.11	0.045	8	1.019	0.054	7	5.6%	1.74 [0.49, 2.98]		- <u>-</u> -
Subtotal (95% CI)			69			68	30.9%	2.62 [2.09, 3.15]		•
Test for overall effect	: Z = 9.73	– o (P – (P < 0.0	0.001)	, 1 091	70					
1.3.2 IL-18	44.007	4 000		0 7 4 7	4 000	-	0.00/	0.04.14.50.5.741		
Dhar 2019 Subtetel (05% CI)	11.807	1.299	6	6.717	1.303	6	2.0%	3.61 [1.52, 5.71]		
Subtotal (95% CI)			0			0	2.0%	3.01 [1.52, 5.71]		•
Heterogeneity: Not ap		(D - 0 0	007)							
Test for overall effect	. 2 - 3.30	(P - 0.0	007)							
1.3.3 TNF-a										
Dhar 2019	3.098	0.564	6	1.777	0.358	6	3.0%	2.58 [0.89, 4.28]		
Dong 2018	10.051	2.098	10	6.561	2.244	10	8.2%	1.54 [0.51, 2.56]		-
Geng 2013	1.768	0.284	7	1.404	0.162	7	5.7%	1.47 [0.24, 2.70]		
Jiang 2011	4.543	1.769	5	1.187	0.544	5	2.7%	2.32 [0.52, 4.12]		
Li 2016	1.745	0.44	12	1.283	0.324	12	11.3%	1.15 [0.28, 2.03]		
Lou 2020	1.769	0.181	8	1.327	0.181	8	4.8%	2.31 [0.96, 3.65]		
Song 2015	1.064	0.137	8	1.085	0.09	8	9.0%	-0.17 [-1.15, 0.81]	-	-
Wang 2017	40.104	8.436	6	12.674	3.132	6	1.7%	3.98 [1.73, 6.23]		
Wei 2017	11.961	2.168	10	6.116	1.355	10	4.5%	3.10 [1.71, 4.48]		
Zhang 2014	1.078	0.028	8	0.954	0.069	7	4.5%	2.28 [0.89, 3.67]		
Zhang 2018	2.571	0.239	6	1.926	0.298	6	3.5%	2.20 [0.64, 3.77]		_ _ _
Zhang 2021	1.078	0.028	12	0.954	0.069	12	7.6%	2.27 [1.21, 3.34]		T T
Subtotal (95% CI)			98			97	66.5%	1.71 [1.35, 2.07]		•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect	27.97, df : Z = 9.29	= 11 (P (P < 0.0	= 0.003 0001)	8); I ² = 6 ⁻	1%					
1.3.4 IFN-g										
Zhou 2019 Subtotal (95% CI)	0.387	0.056	5 5	0.814	0.064	5 5	0.6% 0.6%	-6.41 [-10.23, -2.60] -6.41 [-10.23, -2.60]		
Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect	oplicable : Z = 3.29	(P = 0.0	010)							
Total (95% CI)			178			176	100.0%	1.98 [1.69, 2.28]		•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	82.56, df	= 22 (P	< 0.000	001); l² =	73%					
Test for overall effect	: Z = 13.21	I (P < 0.	00001)						-20 -10 (Favours [experimental]	Favours [control]

	D	isease		Αςι	punctu	re	S	Std. Mean Difference		Std. Mean D	ifference
Study or Subgroup 1.4.1 IL-4	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% C	Year	IV, Fixed,	95% CI
Tang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI)	4.714	1.238	5 5	0.976	0.357	5 5	2.3% 2.3%	3.71 [1.28, 6.13] 3.71 [1.28, 6.13]	2021		•
Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	plicable Z = 2.99	(P = 0.	003)								
1.4.2 IL-5											
Wei 2017	5.082	1.498	10	2.138	1.389	10	11.0%	1.95 [0.85, 3.06]	2017		-
Dong 2019	2.259	0.457	14	1.115	0.428	14	12.8%	2.51 [1.48, 3.53]	2019		
Cui 2021	2.035	0.435	6	1.47	0.258	6	7.5%	1.46 [0.12, 2.80]	2021	_	-
Tang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI)	4.114	1.09	5 35	1.114	0.614	5 35	3.0% 34.2%	3.06 [0.94, 5.19] 2.15 [1.52, 2.77]	2021		•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	2.33, df = Z = 6.72	= 3 (P = : (P < 0.	: 0.51); 00001)	l² = 0%							
1.4.3 IL-9											
Cui 2021 Subtotal (95% CI)	2.5	0.324	6 6	1.729	0.378	6 6	5.9% 5.9%	2.02 [0.52, 3.52] 2.02 [0.52, 3.52]	2021	-	•
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable	(D = 0	000)								
Test for overall effect.	2 - 2.04	· (F = 0.	008)								
1.4.4 IL-10											
Dong 2019	0.614	0.257	14	1.928	0.756	14	14.0%	-2.26 [-3.24, -1.28]	2019		
Zhou 2019	0.521	0.017	5	0.794	0.076	5	1.7%	-4.48 [-7.29, -1.67]	2019		
Zhang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI)	0.875	0.022	12 31	1.041	0.011	12 31	1.5% 17.3%	-9.22 [-12.18, -6.25] -3.09 [-3.98, -2.21]	2021	•	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	20.14, df Z = 6.88	f = 2 (P 5 (P < 0.	< 0.000 00001)	01); I² =	90%						
1.4.5 IL-25											
Cui 2021	3.001	0.711	6	1.281	0.419	6	4.4%	2.72 [0.98, 4.47]	2021		-
Subtotal (95% CI)			6			6	4.4%	2.72 [0.98, 4.47]			•
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable										
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.06	(P = 0.	002)								
1.4.6 IL-33		4 0 7 0									-
Dong 2018	4.84	1.876	10	2.901	1.012	10	14.1%	1.23 [0.26, 2.21]	2018	_	
Gui 2021 Subtotal (95% CI)	2.297	0.914	6 16	1.106	0.237	6 16	7.0% 21.1%	1.65 [0.26, 3.03]	2021		•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	0.23, df :	= 1 (P =	0.63);	l² = 0%		10	21.170	1.37 [0.37, 2.17]			•
l est for overall effect:	Z = 3.36	(P = 0.	0008)								
1.4.7 IL-13											
Dong 2019	2.985	0.557	14	1.213	0.414	14	8.8%	3.51 [2.27, 4.74]	2019		
Cui 2021	3.192	0.374	6	1.653	0.309	6	2.5%	4.14 [1.82, 6.46]	2021		
Tang 2021 Subtotal (95% CI)	6.868	2.169	5 25	1.796	1.146	5 25	3.6% 14.8%	2.64 [0.71, 4.58] 3.40 [2.45, 4.35]	2021		•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	1.01, df = Z = 7.02	= 2 (P = ! (P < 0.	0.60); 00001)	l² = 0%							
Total (95% CI)			124			124	100.0%	1.32 [0.95, 1.69]			•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	152.24, 0	df = 14	(P < 0.0	00001);	l² = 91%)			-		5 10
Test for overall effect:	Z = 7.06	(P < 0.	00001)							Favours [Disease] F	avours [Control]



TABLE 2 | Study Characteristics.

	Animal Species	Disease Model	Intervention	Specimen	Cytokines
Jiang et al., 2011 (16)	Mouse	ALS induced lung inflammation	EA	Lung tissue	TNF-a, IL-6
Geng et al., 2013 (17)	Rat	COPD	EA	BALF	TNF-a, IL-1β
Zhang et al., 2014 (18)	Rat	COPD	EA	BALF	TNF-α, IL-1β
Li et al., 2016 (19)	Rat	COPD	MA	BALF	TNF-a, IL-8
Nurwati et al., 2015 (20)	Mouse	Asthma	MA	Plasma	IL-17
Song et al., 2015 (21)	Rat	Thermal injury induced lung inflammation	EA	Plasma	TNF-α, IL-1β, IL-6
Wei et al., 2017 (22)	Mouse	Asthma	MA	Serum	TNF-α, IL-1β, IL-5
Wang et al., 2017 (23)	Rat	CPB induced lung inflammation	EA	Lung tissue	TNF-α, IL-1β
Dong et al., 2018 (24)	Mouse	Asthma	MA	Serum	TNF-α, IL-1β, IL-33
Dong et al., 2019 (25)	Mouse	Asthma	MA	Serum	IL-5, IL-10, IL-13, IL-17A
Zhang et al., 2018 (26)	Rat	COPD	EA	BALF, Lung tissue	TNF-a, IL-6
Dhar et al., 2019 (27)	Rat	CPB induced lung inflammation	EA	Lung tissue	TNF-α, IL-1β, IL-18
Huang et al., 2019 (28)	Rat	CPB induced lung inflammation	EA	BALF, Serum	IL-1β
Zhou et al., 2019 (29)	Mouse	Chronic sinusitis	EA	Nasal tissue	IL-10, IFN-γ
Cui et al., 2021 (30)	Mouse	Asthma	MA	Serum	IL-5, IL-9, IL-13, IL-33, IL-25
Lou et al., 2020 (31)	Rat	Limb ischemia/reperfusion induced lung inflammation	EA	Lung tissue	TNF-α, IL-1, IL-6,
Tang et al., 2021 (32)	Mouse	Asthma	MA	BALF, Serum	IL-4, IL-5, IL-13, IL-17A
Zhang et al., 2021 (33)	Rat	COPD	EA	BALF	TNF-α, IL-10, IL-17

ALS, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CPB, cardiopulmonary bypass; EA, electroacupuncture; MA, manual acupuncture; BALF, bronchoalveolar lavage fluid.

TABLE 3 | Results of Lung Function Tests.

	Results	Lung Function Tests
Jiang et al., 2011 (16)	N/A	
Jiang et al., 2011 (16)	Improved	RL ↓, Cdyn ↑
Zhang et al., 2014 (18)	Improved	FEV _{0.1} ↑, FEV _{0.3} ↑, FEV _{0.1} /FVC ↑ FEV _{0.3} /FVC ↑
Li et al., 2016 (19)	Improved	IC ↑, PEF ↑, MV ↑
Nurwati et al., 2015 (20)	N/A	
Song et al., 2015 (21)	N/A	
Wei et al., 2017 (22)	Improved	RL ↓, Cdyn ↑
Wang et al., 2017 (23)	N/A	
Dong et al., 2018 (24)	Improved	RL ↓, Cdyn ↑
Dong et al., 2019 (25)	Improved	RL ↓, Cdyn ↑
Zhang et al., 2018 (26)	Improved	FEV _{0.1} ↑, FEV _{0.3} ↑, FEV _{0.1} /FVC ↑ FEV _{0.3} /FVC ↑
Dhar et al., 2019 (27)	N/A	
Huang et al., 2019 (28)	N/A	
Zhou et al., 2019 (29)	N/A	
Cui et al., 2021 (30)	Improved	RL ↓, Cdyn ↑
Lou et al., 2020 (31)	N/A	
Tang et al., 2021 (32)	Improved	RL ↓, Cdyn ↑
Zhang et al., 2021 (33)	Improved	RL ↓, Cdyn ↑

N/A, not applicable; RL, lung resistance; Cdyn, dynamic compliance; FEV0.1, forced expiratory volume in 0.1s; FEV0.3, forced expiratory volume in 0.3s; FVC, Forced vital capacity; IC, inspiratory capacity; PEF, peak expiratory flow; MV, minute volume.

additional interpretation of how acupuncture can normalize Th2 cytokine levels to alleviate inflammation in asthma. Furthermore, IL-17, which is released by Th17 cells, leads to the aggravation of allergic inflammation and airway hyper-responsiveness by causing neutrophilia and eosinophilia (38, 39). In our study, acupuncture significantly modulated abnormal levels of IL-17, again implying its effect on RD *via* Th17 cell control. As Th2 and

Th17 cells play a crucial role in RD pathology (40), the T-cellregulating ability of acupuncture deserves further investigation (41).

There are a few limitations to the present study. First, cytokines were not classified in a disease-specific manner, as this study encompassed overall effects of acupuncture on RD. Second, the fact that cytokines can play a different role

depending on the situation could obscure the purpose of this review. This also caused some difficulties in categorizing them. In order to prevent aforementioned problem, we referred to how each study interpreted the role of cytokines. Third, the number of included studies was not conducive for a thorough systematic review, which implies the limited research investigating the effects of acupuncture. However, it is meaningful in that this study evaluated the efficacy of acupuncture on RD for the first time by analyzing inflammatory cytokines. In order to reveal the hidden mechanism of acupuncture, further research investigating each RD is needed.

CONCLUSION

In summary, this review showed that acupuncture treatment might ameliorate lung dysfunction in RD by regulating inflammatory cytokines. Results showed that when mitigating RD, acupuncture modulates pro/anti-inflammatory, Th1-, Th2-, and Th17-specific cytokines. We look forward to further research on the therapeutic effects of

REFERENCES

- Aghasafari P, George U, Pidaparti R. A Review of Inflammatory Mechanism in Airway Diseases. *Inflammation Res* (2019) 68:59–74. doi: 10.1007/s00011-018-1191-2
- Opal SM, Depalo VA. Anti-Inflammatory Cytokines. Chest (2000) 117:1162– 72. doi: 10.1378/chest.117.4.1162
- Hirahara K, Nakayama T. CD4+ T-Cell Subsets in Inflammatory Diseases: Beyond the Th1/Th2 Paradigm. *Int Immunol* (2016) 28:163–71. doi: 10.1093/ intimm/dxw006
- Mckinley L, Alcorn JF, Peterson A, Dupont RB, Kapadia S, Logar A, et al. TH17 Cells Mediate Steroid-Resistant Airway Inflammation and Airway Hyperresponsiveness in Mice. *J Immunol* (2008) 181:4089–97. doi: 10.4049/ jimmunol.181.6.4089
- Torres-Rosas R, Yehia G, Pena G, Mishra P, Del Rocio Thompson-Bonilla M, Moreno-Eutimio MA, et al. Dopamine Mediates Vagal Modulation of the Immune System by Electroacupuncture. *Nat Med* (2014) 20:291–5. doi: 10.1038/nm.3479
- Liu S, Wang Z, Su Y, Qi L, Yang W, Fu M, et al. A Neuroanatomical Basis for Electroacupuncture to Drive the Vagal-Adrenal Axis. *Nature* (2021) 598:641– 5. doi: 10.1038/s41586-021-04001-4
- Oh JE, Kim SN. Anti-Inflammatory Effects of Acupuncture at ST36 Point: A Literature Review in Animal Studies. *Front Immunol* (2021) 12:813748. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2021.813748
- Liu S, Wang ZF, Su YS, Ray RS, Jing XH, Wang YQ, et al. Somatotopic Organization and Intensity Dependence in Driving Distinct NPY-Expressing Sympathetic Pathways by Electroacupuncture. *Neuron* (2020) 108:436–50: e437. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2020.07.015
- Liu Q, Duan H, Lian A, Zhuang M, Zhao X, Liu X. Rehabilitation Effects of Acupuncture on the Diaphragm Dysfunction in Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease: A Systematic Review. Int J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis (2021) 16:2023–37. doi: 10.2147/COPD.S313439
- Yin Z, Geng G, Xu G, Zhao L, Liang F. Acupuncture Methods for Allergic Rhinitis: A Systematic Review and Bayesian Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Chin Med* (2020) 15:109. doi: 10.1186/s13020-020-00389-9
- 11. Yin LM, Wang Y, Fan L, Xu YD, Wang WQ, Liu YY, et al. Efficacy of Acupuncture for Chronic Asthma: Study Protocol for a Randomized Controlled Trial. *Trials* (2015) 16:424. doi: 10.1186/s13063-015-0947-z

acupuncture and hope that the current review will be a good reference in this field of study.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

SL searched the database and extracted data. S-NK designed and supervised the study. SL and S-NK analyzed the data and wrote the paper. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

FUNDING

This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea funded by the Korean government (MSIT) (NRF-2020R1C1C1004107) and from the Ministry of Health & Welfare through the Korea Health Industry Development Institute (KHIDI) (grant no. HF21C0018).

- Hu J, Zhang C, Zhao S, Ge K, Di K, Wang H, et al. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Acupoint Application Combined With Western Medicine Therapy in the Treatment of Bronchial Asthma. *Ann Palliat Med* (2021) 10:11473–81. doi: 10.21037/apm-21-2507
- Chen C, Zhan J, Wen H, Wei X, Ding L, Tao C, et al. Current State of Research About Acupuncture for the Treatment of COVID-19: A Scoping Review. *Integr Med Res* (2021) 10:100801. doi: 10.1016/j.imr.2021.100801
- Sena E, van der Worp HB, Howells D, Macleod M. How can We Improve the Pre-Clinical Development of Drugs for Stroke? *Trends Neurosci* (2007) 30:433–9. doi: 10.1016/j.tins.2007.06.009
- Auboire L, Sennoga CA, Hyvelin JM, Ossant F, Escoffre JM, Tranquart F, et al. Microbubbles Combined With Ultrasound Therapy in Ischemic Stroke: A Systematic Review of *In-Vivo* Preclinical Studies. *PLoS One* (2018) 13: e0191788. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0191788
- Jiang JH, Yang EJ, Baek MG, Kim SH, Lee SM, Choi SM. Anti-Inflammatory Effects of Electroacupuncture in the Respiratory System of a Symptomatic Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Animal Model. *Neurodegener Dis* (2011) 8:504–14. doi: 10.1159/000327911
- Geng WY, Liu ZB, Song NN, Geng WY, Zhang GH, Jin WZ, et al. Effects of Electroacupuncture at Zusanli (ST36) on Inflammatory Cytokines in a Rat Model of Smoke-Induced Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. J Integr Med (2013) 11:213–9. doi: 10.3736/jintegrmed2013024
- Zhang XF, Zhu J, Geng WY, Zhao SJ, Jiang CW, Cai SR, et al. Electroacupuncture at Feishu (BL13) and Zusanli (ST36) Down-Regulates the Expression of Orexins and Their Receptors in Rats With Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. J Integr Med (2014) 12:417–24. doi: 10.1016/S2095-4964(14)60040-6
- Li J, Wu S, Tang H, Huang W, Wang L, Zhou H, et al. Long-Term Effects of Acupuncture Treatment on Airway Smooth Muscle in a Rat Model of Smoke-Induced Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. *Acupunct Med* (2016) 34:107–13. doi: 10.1136/acupmed-2014-010674
- Nurwati I, Mudigdo A, Saputra K, Sutrisno T. Reduction of Interleukin-17 Level by Acupuncture at Feishu (BI 13) Is Strengthened by Acupuncture at Zusanli (ST 36) in a Mouse Model of Chronic Asthma: An Experimental Study. *Med Acupunct* (2015) 27:278-82. doi: 10.1089/ acu.2015.1111
- 21. Song XM, Wu XJ, Li JG, Le LL, Liang H, Xu Y, et al. The Effect of Electroacupuncture at ST36 on Severe Thermal Injury-Induced Remote

Acute Lung Injury in Rats. Burns (2015) 41:1449-58. doi: 10.1016/ j.burns.2015.03.004

- 22. Wei Y, Dong M, Zhong L, Liu J, Luo Q, Lv Y, et al. Regulation of Hypothalamic-Pituitary-Adrenal Axis Activity and Immunologic Function Contributed to the Anti-Inflammatory Effect of Acupuncture in the OVA-Induced Murine Asthma Model. *Neurosci Lett* (2017) 636:177–83. doi: 10.1016/j.neulet.2016.11.001
- Wang Z, Hou L, Yang H, Ge J, Wang S, Tian W, et al. Electroacupuncture Pretreatment Attenuates Acute Lung Injury Through Alpha7 Nicotinic Acetylcholine Receptor-Mediated Inhibition of HMGB1 Release in Rats After Cardiopulmonary Bypass. *Shock* (2018) 50:351–9. doi: 10.1097/ SHK.000000000001050
- Dong M, Ma C, Wang WQ, Chen J, Wei Y. Regulation of the IL-33/ST2 Pathway Contributes to the Anti-Inflammatory Effect of Acupuncture in the Ovalbumin-Induced Murine Asthma Model. *Acupunct Med* (2018) 36:319– 26. doi: 10.1136/acupmed-2017-011377
- Dong M, Wang WQ, Chen J, Li MH, Xu F, Cui J, et al. Acupuncture Regulates the Balance of CD4(+) T Cell Subtypes in Experimental Asthma Mice. *Chin J Integr Med* (2019) 25:617–24. doi: 10.1007/s11655-018-3055-6
- Zhang XF, Xiang SY, Geng WY, Cong WJ, Lu J, Jiang CW, et al. Electro-Acupuncture Regulates the Cholinergic Anti-Inflammatory Pathway in a Rat Model of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. J Integr Med (2018) 16:418–26. doi: 10.1016/j.joim.2018.10.003
- Dhar R, Zhang L, Li Y, Rana MN, Hu Z, Li Z, et al. Electroacupuncture Ameliorates Cardiopulmonary Bypass Induced Apoptosis in Lung via ROS/ Nrf2/NLRP3 Inflammasome Pathway. Life Sci (2019) 238:116962. doi: 10.1016/j.lfs.2019.116962
- Huang D, Chen M, Wang Z, Hou L, Yu W. Electroacupuncture Pretreatment Attenuates Inflammatory Lung Injury After Cardiopulmonary Bypass by Suppressing NLRP3 Inflammasome Activation in Rats. *Inflammation* (2019) 42:895–903. doi: 10.1007/s10753-018-0944-y
- Zhou L, Hong J, Wan Z, Lu X, Shao Y. Effects of Electroacupuncture Combined With Interleukin10 on Chronic Sinusitis in Mice. *Mol Med Rep* (2019) 20:1952–8. doi: 10.3892/mmr.2019.10375
- Cui J, Dong M, Yi L, Wei Y, Tang W, Zhu X, et al. Acupuncture Inhibited Airway Inflammation and Group 2 Innate Lymphoid Cells in the Lung in an Ovalbumin-Induced Murine Asthma Model. *Acupunct Med* (2021) 39:217– 25. doi: 10.1177/0964528420924033
- 31. Lou Y, Yu Q, Xu K, Tu Y, Balelang MF, Lu G, et al. Electroacupuncture Preconditioning Protects From Lung Injury Induced by Limb Ischemia/ Reperfusion Through TLR4 and NFkappaB in Rats. *Mol Med Rep* (2020) 22:3225–32. doi: 10.3892/mmr.2020.11429
- 32. Tang W, Dong M, Teng F, Cui J, Zhu X, Wang W, et al. TMT-Based Quantitative Proteomics Reveals Suppression of SLC3A2 and ATP1A3 Expression Contributes to the Inhibitory Role of Acupuncture on Airway Inflammation in an OVA-Induced Mouse Asthma Model.

BioMed Pharmacother (2021) 134:111001. doi: 10.1016/j.biopha. 2020.111001

- 33. Zhang XF, Xiang SY, Lu J, Li Y, Zhao SJ, Jiang CW, et al. Electroacupuncture Inhibits IL-17/IL-17R and Post-Receptor MAPK Signaling Pathways in a Rat Model of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. *Acupunct Med* (2021) 39:663–72. doi: 10.1177/0964528421996720
- Garth J, Barnes JW, Krick S. Targeting Cytokines as Evolving Treatment Strategies in Chronic Inflammatory Airway Diseases. Int J Mol Sci (2018) 19:3402. doi: 10.3390/ijms19113402
- Barnes PJ. Cellular and Molecular Mechanisms of Asthma and COPD. Clin Sci (Lond) (2017) 131:1541–58. doi: 10.1042/CS20160487
- Rosloniec EF, Latham K, Guedez YB. Paradoxical Roles of IFN-Gamma in Models of Th1-Mediated Autoimmunity. *Arthritis Res* (2002) 4:333–6. doi: 10.1186/ar432
- Muhl H, Pfeilschifter J. Anti-Inflammatory Properties of Pro-Inflammatory Interferon-Gamma. Int Immunopharmacol (2003) 3:1247–55. doi: 10.1016/ S1567-5769(03)00131-0
- Finkelman FD, Hogan SP, Hershey GK, Rothenberg ME, Wills-Karp M. Importance of Cytokines in Murine Allergic Airway Disease and Human Asthma. J Immunol (2010) 184:1663–74. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.0902185
- 39. Kudo M, Melton AC, Chen C, Engler MB, Huang KE, Ren X, et al. IL-17A Produced by Alphabeta T Cells Drives Airway Hyper-Responsiveness in Mice and Enhances Mouse and Human Airway Smooth Muscle Contraction. *Nat Med* (2012) 18:547–54. doi: 10.1038/nm.2684
- Barnes PJ. Inflammatory Mechanisms in Patients With Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. J Allergy Clin Immunol (2016) 138:16–27. doi: 10.1016/ j.jaci.2016.05.011
- Kim SK, Bae H. Acupuncture and Immune Modulation. Auton Neurosci (2010) 157:38–41. doi: 10.1016/j.autneu.2010.03.010

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

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Copyright © 2022 Lee and Kim. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.