Original Article

(Check for updates

Effects of Cinnamon Supplementation on Lipid Profile: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials

Hawal Lateef Fateh 💿,¹ Saman M. Amin 💿 ²

¹Nursing Department, Kalar Technical College, Garmian Polytechnic University, Kalar 46021, Kurdistan Region, Iraq ²Garmian Health Directorate, Ministry of Health, Kalar 46021, Kurdistan Region, Iraq

ABSTRACT

Since the effects of cinnamon supplementation on lipid profiles are still controversial, this study conducted a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials to assess the effect of cinnamon supplementation on lipid profiles. The study was designed and conducted according to the guidelines of the 2020 preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analysis (PRISMA) statements. A systematic and comprehensive search was performed in several databases from inception up to 11 November 2023. The meta-analysis on the impact of Cinnamon on lipid profiles indicates a non-significant overall effect on low-density lipoprotein (weighted mean differences [WMD], -2.48; 95% confidence interval [CI], -9.70, 4.72). However, significant reductions are seen with doses < 500 mg/day (-10.26), and non-significant increases with doses ≥ 500 mg/day (1.18). The overall effect on highdensity lipoprotein is non-significant (WMD, 3.97; 95% CI, -7.877, 15.831), showing varying responses at different doses. Triglycerides exhibit a significant overall reduction (WMD, -6.88; 95% CI, -12.62, -1.15), particularly in the < 500 mg/day group. The overall effect on cholesterol is non-significant (WMD, -4.314; 95% CI, -15.011, 6.384), with diverse responses at different doses. High heterogeneity underlines the importance of standardized study designs and further exploration of dosage-specific effects. Findings from this study suggest that cinnamon supplements might be beneficial to modulate the blood lipid profile.

Keywords: Cinnamon; Lipids; Meta-analysis; Randomized controlled trial

INTRODUCTION

Since cardiovascular diseases are still the primary cause of morbidity and death globally, it is critical to investigate new and practical approaches for controlling cardiovascular risk factors [1]. Among the many possible therapies, the spice known for its long history in traditional medicine—cinnamon—has recently attracted interest due to its potential health benefit [2]. Given the importance of lipids in cardiovascular health, it is imperative to clarify how cinnamon supplementation affects lipid profiles in this era of evidence-based medicine [3].

OPEN ACCESS

Received: Nov 11, 2023 Revised: Jan 15, 2024 Accepted: Jan 18, 2024 Published online: Jan 26, 2024

Correspondence to Hawal Lateef Fateh

Nursing Department, Kalar Technical College, Garmian Polytechnic University, Farmanbaran neighborhood, Kalar 46021, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.

Email: hawallatif@gmail.com

Copyright © 2024. The Korean Society of Clinical Nutrition

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ORCID iDs

Hawal Lateef Fateh ib https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3808-6404 Saman M. Amin ib https://orcid.org/0009-0003-4135-6249

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Data Availability Statement Not applicable.



Supplementation on Lipid Profile



Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Fateh HL; Formal analysis: Fateh HL; Methodology: Fateh HL; Software; Supervision: Fateh HL; Validation: Amin SM; Writing - review & editing: Fateh HL. Cinnamon (*Cinnamomum*) is one of the most commonly used spices in the world and one of the oldest herbal remedies used to treat certain diseases and inflammation [4]. Cinnamon can modulate immune system function via regulation of anti- and proinflammatory gene expression [5,6]. Cinnamaldehyde is the major active ingredient of cinnamon and its anti-inflammatory effects have been observed in several studies [7,8].

Numerous clinical trials and studies exploring the effects of cinnamon on lipid profiles have employed varying doses, contributing to a nuanced understanding of its potential therapeutic range [9,10]. The selection of a daily dose of 500 mg is often grounded in the existing literature, where doses within this range have consistently shown significant effects on lipid parameters and higher doses may pose an increased risk of adverse effects, prompting researchers to establish a dosage within a range deemed safe and well-tolerated. This cautious approach aims to balance the potential therapeutic benefits of cinnamon with the need to mitigate any potential risks associated with elevated intake. By adhering to a 500 mg/day dosage, researchers aim to optimize the likelihood of observing positive effects on lipid parameters while minimizing the possibility of unwanted side effects [11]. This dose has been identified as a potentially efficacious level for achieving positive outcomes in terms of lipid profile modulation. This strategic dose selection not only enhances the reliability and reproducibility of findings but also aids in the formulation of evidence-based recommendations for individuals seeking to leverage cinnamon for lipid management.

Several clinical studies have investigated the potential impact of cinnamon on lipid profiles, shedding light on its role in cardiovascular health. In a randomized, doubleblind trial conducted by Vafa et al., [10] participants with type 2 diabetes who consumed cinnamon experienced notable reductions in total cholesterol (TC), low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C), and triglyceride (TG) levels compared to the placebo group. Similarly, a study by Khan et al. [12] demonstrated significant improvements in lipid parameters among individuals with type 2 diabetes after a 40-day cinnamon supplementation period. Furthermore, the meta-analysis conducted by Maierean et al. [9] amalgamated data from ten randomized controlled trials (RCTs), revealing a consistent trend towards decreased TC and TGs in subjects supplemented with cinnamon. These clinical findings provide compelling evidence for the potential lipid-modulating effects of cinnamon, indicating its promising role in managing cardiovascular risk factors.

Also, some previous studies suggest a potential role of cinnamon and its components in improving insulin sensitivity [13,14], reducing fasting blood glucose [12,15], postprandial blood glucose levels (2-h post break-fast) [16,17], glycosylated haemoglobin [18], TC [12], serum TG [12], LDL-C [12], blood antioxidant levels [19], systolic blood pressure [19] and percent body fat [19].

The aim of this study is to provide guidance for clinical practice and public health efforts, in addition to adding to the expanding body of information on the effects of cinnamon through our systematic review and meta-analysis. We can address possible sources of variability, investigate subgroups, and assess the robustness of reported effects thanks to the synthesis of data from RCTs. In doing so, our research aims to close current gaps, guide future studies, and maybe impact dietary guidelines for those who want to improve their cardiovascular health. In order to tackle this, we conduct a thorough investigation using a systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTs with the goal of distilling a thorough knowledge of how cinnamon supplementation affects lipid profiles.



MATERIALS AND METHODS

Our study was designed, conducted, and reported according to the guidelines of the 2020 preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analysis (PRISMA) statements.

Literature search strategy

A thorough and methodical search of the PubMed, Web of Science, Embase, and Cochrane library databases up until November 10, 2023, produced pertinent material. Only works published in English were included. The keywords were merged using MeSH in the search. The following is the search string: "Cinnamon" or "Cinnamomum verum" or "Ceylon cinnamon" and "lipid" or "intervention study" or "intervention" or "controlled trial" or "randomized" or "random" or "randomly" or "placebo" or "assignment." In order to find any pertinent research that could have been overlooked, the reference lists of each study, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses were also examined.

Criteria for inclusion and exclusion

Original studies that satisfied the following criteria were chosen for inclusion in the metaanalysis: (a) the study design had to be a randomized controlled trial that looked into how cinnamon affected blood lipids; (b) the outcome had to include all changes in TC, LDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C), or TG level; and (c) all data had to be complete and available. The exclusion standards listed below were applied: (a) research that blatantly did not fit the aforementioned requirements; (b) experiments on cells, animals, metaanalyses, reviews, conference papers, case reports, and editorials.

Evaluation of quality

The Cochrane risk of bias tool's seven validity questions were used to evaluate the literature quality of the included studies. The tool evaluated the following biases: incomplete outcome data, selective outcome reporting, blinding of outcome assessment, blinding of personnel, blinding of participants, and random sequence generation. Based on the Cochrane Handbook guidelines, every item was assessed as having a "Low," "High," or "Unclear" risk of bias.

Data analysis

Stata 15.0 was used for all statistical analyses, with p < 0.05 being deemed statistically significant. The average change (final value minus baseline value) was subtracted to determine the mean value of the pertinent indicators. The value of the final endpoint was utilized if there were several endpoints. By contrasting the change from control to baseline and the change from intervention to baseline, we were able to determine the mean difference in effectiveness (MD) for the parallel controlled research. Serum lipid levels were taken at the conclusion of the intervention and control periods, and MD in effect was computed for the crossover test. This formula was used to compute the net change in standard deviation (SD) in cases where the study did not give one. The original literature did not give all of the data consistently, thus we translated the various blood lipid level units to millimoles per liter (1 mg/dL = 0.0258 mmol/L).

Furthermore, we computed the SD as appropriate because some studies only supplied the standard error and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) of the data. In addition, the mean net change was computed by deducting the endpoint mean value from the matching basal line mean value. With a correlation value of R = 0.5, the net change of SD was computed using the following formula: SDchange = (SD2baseline + SD2endpoint – $2R \times SDbaseline \times SDendpoint) \frac{1}{2}$ [20].



The research spanned multiple countries, encompassing four studies conducted in Iran [6-9], two in India [10,11], one in Sweden [12], one in Pakistan [13], one in Germany [14], and one in the United States [15]. This diverse geographical distribution ensured a global perspective and contributed to a comprehensive understanding of the effects of cinnamon supplementation on lipid profiles across different regions.

To evaluate the heterogeneity, χ^2 statistics and I² metrics were applied. The random-effects model was used when the I² > 50% or the p value of the χ^2 test < 0.10, which denotes a significant degree of heterogeneity. Furthermore, subgroup analyses were carried out according to the individuals' backgrounds and the source of MUFA. Egger's regression test and funnel plots were used to look at possible publication bias. Moreover, the impact of a single research on the total outcomes was assessed using the sensitivity analysis.

RESULTS

Literature search and study characteristics

The complete flow diagram of the selected studies is shown in **Figure 1**. Initially, a thorough search of pertinent databases produced 8,901 documents in total. Nevertheless, no entries were found in registers, suggesting that electronic databases served as the main source of research for this systematic study. In order to ensure the dataset's clarity and prevent



Figure 1. The flow diagram of trial selection.

*Consider, if feasible to do so, reporting the number of records identified from each database or register searched (rather than the total number across all databases/registers).

[†]If automation tools were used, indicate how many records were excluded by a human and how many were excluded by automation tools.



redundancy, 4,426 duplicate records were found and eliminated before the screening procedure. After that, the first screening procedure was applied to the 4,475 unique records that were still present. In the first stage of the evaluation, 4,475 records were reviewed in total. In order to establish the titles and abstracts' possible relevance to the study issue, a preliminary assessment of the materials was conducted in this stage. 4,454 of the screened data were rejected on the basis of preset inclusion and exclusion standards. Exclusion criteria included everything from incompatible study designs to irrelevant themes.

Study characteristics

Table 1 provides a more in-depth summary of the key characteristics of the included studies, offering detailed insights into various aspects. The assessment of the risks of bias in these studies is visually represented in **Figures 1-3**. These figures present a comprehensive overview of the methodological rigor and potential biases within the scope of the included studies.

Shishehbor et al. [21] demonstrated a study with low risk of bias, showcasing a robust methodology. Their allocation concealment, indicating selection bias, was appropriately addressed. Furthermore, their approach to handling incomplete outcome data exhibited a low risk of attrition bias, contributing to the overall reliability of their findings [21].

On the other hand, Wickenberg et al. [22] presented a study with an unclear risk of bias in terms of allocation concealment. This uncertainty in selection bias could potentially influence the study's internal validity. It is crucial to acknowledge and consider this uncertainty when interpreting the results.

In the investigations led by Askari et al. [23], Farooq et al. [24], Gupta Jain et al. [25], and Zare et al. [26], a low risk of bias was identified. Contrastingly, Khan et al. [12] exhibited a high risk of bias in blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias), blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias), and selective reporting (reporting bias). These factors introduce potential sources of bias that may impact the study's internal validity and the accuracy of the reported results.

In the case of Ziegenfuss et al., [19] a high risk of bias was identified specifically in the domain of selective reporting (reporting bias).

Studies	Year	Country	Study design	Participant	Sample size and sex	Duration (wk)	Sarr si:	iple ze	Means age, mean CG	Intervention, dose (mg/d)	Control group
							IG	CG			
Khan et al. [12]	2003	Pakistan	SB	Diabetes	30 F, 30 M	6	30	30	52	400 mg	Placebo
Ziegenfuss et al. [19]	2006	US	DB	Metabolic syndrome	11 F, 11 M	12	12	10	46	500 mg	Placebo
Solomon TP et al.[14]	2007	Germany	DB	Diabetes	21 F, 44 M	12	33	32	62	112 mg	Placebo
Wickenberg et al. [22]	2014	Sweden	DB, PC	IGT	10 F, 7 M	12	9	8	72	500 mg	Placebo
Askari et al. [23]	2014	Iran	DB, PC	Fatty liver disease	50 M, F	12	32	22	56	1,500 mg	Placebo
Gupta Jain et al. [25]	2017	India	DB, PC	Metabolic syndrome	52 F, 64 M	16	58	58	45	3,000 mg	Placebo
Hajimonfarednejad et al. [33]	2018	Iran	DB	Polycystic ovary syndrome	80 F	8	33	33	28	1,000 mg	Placebo
Shishehbor et al. [21]	2018	Iran	DB, PC	Rheumatoid arthritis	36 F	8	18	18	46	500 mg	Placebo
Zare et al. [26]	2019	Iran	TB, PC	Diabetes	63 F, 75 M	12	69	69	52	500 mg	Placebo
Farooq et al. [24]	2023	India	SB	Fatty liver disease	29 F, 31 M	8	30	30	44	500 mg	Placebo

Table 1. Characteristic of included studies in meta-analysis

IG, intervention group; CG, control group; DB, double-blinded; PC, placebo-controlled; F, female; IGT, impaired glucose tolerance; M, male; SB, single-blinded; TB, triple-blinded.









■ Low risk of bias ■ Unclear risk of bias ■ High risk of bias

Figure 3. Risk of bias graph for all included studies.

Results of meta-analysis

Figure 4 shows the meta-analysis of ten studies investigating the effect of cinnamon supplementation on lipid profiles unveiled noteworthy findings across key parameters. For LDL, the overall effect did not demonstrate statistical significance (weighted mean differences [WMD], -2.48; 95% CI, -9.70, 4.72; p = 0.499), suggesting that cinnamon did not exert a significant influence on LDL levels. However, a substantial degree of heterogeneity was observed among the studies (I² = 96.0%), indicating considerable variability in the reported outcomes. Conversely, HDL exhibited no significant overall effect as well (WMD, 3.97; 95% CI, -7.877, 15.831; p = 0.511), and a strikingly high level of heterogeneity was noted (I² = 99.5%).



TG showed a significant reduction with cinnamon supplementation (WMD, -6.88; 95% CI, -12.62, -1.15; p = 0.019), accompanied by notable heterogeneity (I² = 97.4%). TC did not register a statistically significant overall effect (WMD, -4.314; 95% CI, -15.011, 6.384; p = 0.429), with a substantial degree of heterogeneity (I² = 97.6%). These results underscore the complexity of cinnamon's impact on lipid profiles, highlighting the need for further exploration and consideration of contextual factors contributing to the observed heterogeneity.

CHOL				
Author	Effect (95% CI)	% Weight	Duration	Dose
Shiebabhar at al	4 80 (-8 00 17 70)	0.01	Rwook	500 mg
Vickenbern et al	-4.02 (-7.26 -0.78)	11 45	12 week	500 mg
Faezeh Askari et al	65.30 (32.79.97.81)	5.59	12 week	1500 mg
Fouzia Faroog et al	-4.00 (-16.07, 8.07)	10.08	8 week	500 mg
ALAM KHAN et .al	-31.50 (-33.49, -29.51)	11.52	6 week	400 mg
B. Mang et al	-0.18 (-4.72, 4.36)	11.33	12 week	112mg
Mahdie Haii et.al	-15.25 (-25.69, -4.81)	10.42	8 week	1000 mg
Sonal Gupta Jain	-10.62 (-14.00, -7.24)	11.44	16 week	3000 mg
Boohaveh Zare et al	-13.00 (-20.38, -5.62)	10.96	12week	500mg
	4 00 (-20 08 28 08)	7 29	12 week	500mg
Overall, DL (l ² = 97.6%, p < 0.000)	-4.31 (-15.01, 6.38)	100.00	12 WOOK	ocomy
-100 0	 100			
TO				
IG	Effect	%		
Author	(95% CI)	Weight	Duration	Dose
Shishehbor et.al	9.55 (-16.11, 35.21)	3.93	8 week	500 mg
Wickenberg et.al	1.80 (-0.03, 3.63)	18.16	12 week	500 mg
Faezeh Askari et.al	-41.80 (-72.90, -10.70)	2.87	12 week	1500 mg
Fouzia Farooq et.al	3.60 (-27.61, 34.81)	2.85	8 week	500 mg
ALAM KHAN et.al	-13.14 (-15.65, -10.63)	17.87	6 week	400 mg
B. Mang et .al	-3.96 (-10.91, 2.99)	14.55	12 week	112mg
Mahdie Haji et.al	-12.11 (-25.63, 1.41)	9.12	8 week	1000 mg
Sonal Gupta Jain	-6.12 (-7.98, -4.26)	18.15	16 week	3000 mg
Roghayeh Zare et.al	-9.70 (-19.63, 0.23)	11.90	12week	500mg
Tim N. Ziegenfuss et.al	-34.00 (-107.60, 39.60)	0.59	12 week	500mg
Overall, DL (l ² = 91.3%, p < 0.000)	-6.89 (-12.62, -1.16)	100.00		
	l 100			
HDL				
HDL	Effect	%		
HDL Author	Effect (95% Cl)	% Weight	Duration	Dose
HDL Author Shishehbor et al	Effect (95% Cl) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91)	% Weight 11.65	Duration 8 week	Dose
HDL Author Visikehbor et.al	Effect (95% Cl) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52)	% Weight 11.65 9.02	Duration 8 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al	Effect (95% Cl) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Vickenberg et.al Faezeh Askari et.al	Effect (95% CI) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.99)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 500 mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Faezeh Askari et.al Fauzia Faroq et.al Mang et.al	Effect (95% Cf) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.99) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80 11.88	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 500 mg 112mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Faezeh Askari et.al B. Mang et.al Mande Haji et.al	Effect (95% Cl) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.99) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.28 (-19.18, 23.20)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80 11.88 8.58	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 8 week 8 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 112mg 1000 mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Faszeh Askari et.al Fouzia Farocq et.al B. Mang et.al Mahdle Haji et.al Sonal Gupta Jain	Effect (95% Cf) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.99) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.26 (0.47, 2.05)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80 11.88 8.58 11.92	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 8 week 8 week 16 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 112mg 1000 mg 3000 mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Fazeh Askari et.al Drouzia Fazoog et.al B. Mang et.al Mahdie Haji et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Roghayeh Zure et.al	Effect (95% Cl) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.45 (-10.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.28 (0.47, 2.05) 3.51 (63.58, 86.72)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80 11.88 8.58 11.92 11.90	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 8 week 16 week 12week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 112mg 1000 mg 3000 mg 500mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Faezeh Askari et.al B. Mang et.al Mahdie Haji et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Roghayeh Zare et.al Tim N. Zegonuss et.al	Effect (95% Cf) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.99) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.26 (0.47, 2.05) -35.15 (33.58, 36.72) 0.00 (-7.59, 7.59)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80 11.88 8.58 11.92 11.90 11.37	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 16 week 12 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 112mg 1000 mg 3000 mg 500mg 500mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Faozeh Askari et.al Mandie Haji et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Roghayeh Zare et.al Tim N. Ziogentuss et.al Overall, DL (* 99,5%, p < 0.000)	Effect (95% Cf) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.99) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.26 (0.47, 2.05) 3.51 f (33.58, 36.72) 0.00 (-7.59, 7.59) 3.96 (-7.88, 15.53)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80 11.88 8.58 11.92 11.90 11.37 100.00	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 16 week 12 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 1100 mg 1000 mg 500mg 500mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Faezeh Askari et.al B. Mang et.al Mahdie Haji et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Roghayeh Zare et.al Overall, DL (I [®] = 99.5%, p < 0.000)	Effect (95% Cf) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, 5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.99) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.26 (0.47, 2.05) 35.15 (33.58, 36.72) 0.00 (-7.59, 7.59) 3.96 (-7.88, 15.83)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80 11.88 8.58 11.92 11.90 11.37 100.00	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 8 week 16 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 112mg 1000 mg 3000 mg 500mg 500mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Vickenberg et.al Paceh Askari et.al B. Mang et.al Mandie Haij et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Roghayeh Zare et.al Tim N. Ziegenfuss et.al Overall, DL (I ^a = 99.5%, p < 0.000)	Effect (95% CI) 2.81 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.90) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.26 (0.47, 2.65) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.26 (0.47, 2.65) 2.55 (-19.8, 15.63) 1.90 (-7.59, 7.59) 3.98 (-7.88, 15.63)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80 11.88 8.58 11.92 11.90 11.37 100.00	Duration 8 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 16 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 500 mg 112mg 1000 mg 500mg 500mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Fazeh Askari et.al Mandie Haji et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Roghayeh Zare et.al Overall, DL (I [®] = 99.5%, p < 0.000)	Effect (95% CI) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, 5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.99) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.26 (0.47, 2.05) 35.15 (33.58, 36.72) 0.00 (-7.59, 7.59) 3.98 (-7.88, 15.83)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80 11.88 8.58 11.92 11.90 11.37 100.00	Duration 8 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 112mg 1000 mg 3000 mg 500mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Facech Askari et.al Foucia Farocoq et.al B. Mang et.al Mahdie Haji et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Roghayeh Zare et.al Tim N. Ziegenfuss et.al Overall, DL (I [®] = 99.5%, p < 0.000) 	Effect (95% CI) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.99) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.26 (0.47, 2.05) 35.15 (33.58, 36.72) 0.00 (-7.59, 7.59) 3.98 (-7.88, 15.83) 50 Effect (95% CI)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80 11.88 8.58 11.92 11.90 11.37 100.00	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 12 week 12 week 12 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 112mg 1000 mg 3000 mg 500mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Faceh Askari et.al B. Mang et.al B. Mang et.al Mahdie Haiji et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Tim N. Zegenfuss et.al Tim N. Zegenfuss et.al Cverall, DL (i ^a = 99.5%, p < 0.000) 1-50 CDL Author Shishehbor et.al	Effect (95% CI) 2.81 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.26 (0.47, 2.05) 3.51 5 (33.59, 36.72) 0.00 (-7.59, 7.59) 3.96 (-7.88, 15.63) Effect (95% CI) Effect	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80 11.88 8.58 11.92 11.90 11.37 100.00	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 13 week 14 week 14 week 14 week 14 week 15 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 1000 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Faezeh Askari et.al Bu Mang et.al Mahdie Haji et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Roghayeh Zare et.al Tim N. Zegentus et.al Overall, DL (I ^e 99.5%, p < 0.000) -50 DDL Author Shishehbor et.al	Effect (95% Cl) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.82, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, 5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.99) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.26 (0.47, 2.05) 35.15 (33.59, 36.72) 0.00 (-7.59, 7.59) 3.98 (-7.88, 15.83) 50 Effect (95% Cl) -2.70 (-4.55, 11.46) -3.70 (-4.53, 2.13)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80 11.88 8.58 11.92 11.90 11.37 100.00 % Weight 9.36 11.11	Duration 8 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 12 week 12 week 12 week 12 week 12 week 12 week 12 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 1000 mg 3000 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Fazeh Askari et.al Mandie Haji et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Roghayeh Zare et.al Overall, DL (f = 99.5%, p < 0.000) LDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al	Effect (95% CI) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, 5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.90) 0.45 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-1.77, 2.85) 3.51 5 (33.56, 85.72) 0.00 (-7.59, 7.59) 3.98 (-7.88, 15.63) 50 Effect (95% CI) 0.44 (-10.58, 11.46) -3.70 (4.53, 2.13) -4.01 (-13.48)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80 8.58 11.92 11.90 11.37 100.00 % Weight 9.36 11.1 822	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 3000 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al B. Mang et.al Mandie Haji et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Roghayeh Zane et.al Tim N. Ziegenfuss et.al Overall, DL (I ⁴ = 99.5%, p < 0.000) 	Effect (95% CI) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.99) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.28 (0.47, 2.05) 3.51 5 (33.54, 36.73) 0.00 (-7.59, 7.59) 3.98 (-7.88, 15.83) 50 Effect (95% CI) 0.44 (-10.58, 11.46) -3.70 (+3.53, 2.13) -4.04 (-18.46, 8.69) 1.70 (-4.85, 2.13)	% Weight 11.85 9.02 11.87 11.80 11.87 11.80 11.88 8.58 8.58 11.82 11.80 11.37 100.00 % Weight 9.64 9.64	Duration 8 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 8 week 12 wek 12 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 112mg 1000 mg 500mg 500mg 500mg 500mg 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 500 mg 50
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al B. Mang et.al B. Mang et.al Mahdie Haji et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Roghayeh Zare et.al The X. Zegenius et.al Overall, DL (I ² = 99.5%, p < 0.000) -50 UDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Faezeh Askari et.al Faezeh A	Effect (95% CI) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.26 (0.47, 2.05) 3.51 5 (33.59, 36.72) 0.00 (-7.59, 7.59) 3.98 (-7.88, 15.83) 50 Effect (95% CI) 0.44 (-10.58, 11.46) -3.70 (-4.53, 2.13) -4.40 (-18.49, 9.69) 1.70 (-4.85, 2.21) -4.40 (-18.49, 9.69) 1.70 (-4.85, 2.21)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80 11.88 8.85 11.92 11.80 11.90 11.37 100.00	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 13 week 14 week 14 week 15 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 1000 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 100 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 1200 mg 1000
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Mahdie Haji et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Roghayeh Zare et.al Overall, DL (I ⁶ = 99.5%, p < 0.000) -50 CDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Author	Effect (95% CI) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, 5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.99) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.26 (0.47, 2.05) 3.51 5 (3.58, 36.72) 0.00 (-7.59, 7.59) 3.98 (-7.88, 15.83) 50 Effect (95% CI) 0.44 (-10.55, 11.40) -3.70 (+3.5, 12.50) 0.54 (-1.73, 4.50) 1.70 (+3.65, 12.55) -16.20 (-17.36, 15.64) 0.55 (-12.34, -15.64)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80 11.88 8.58 11.92 11.90 11.97 100.00 8.68 11.11 9.86 11.11 9.86 11.11 9.86 11.11 9.75 9.86 11.11 9.75 9.75 11.12	Duration 8 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 8 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 1000 mg 3000 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 1000 mg 10
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Bomg et.al Bomg et.al Author Corrall, DL (f = 99.5%, p < 0.000)	Effect (95% CI) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 309) 0.45 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-1.77, 2.85) 3.51 5 (33.68, 68.72) 0.00 (-7.59, 7.59) 3.98 (-7.88, 15.63) 50 Effect (95% CI) 6.44 (-10.58, 11.46) -3.70 (4.53, 2.13) -4.40 (-18.49, 860) 1.70 (4.85, 12.29) -16.20 (-17.36, -15.04) 0.54 (-3.44, 42) 1.50 (4.34, 4.42)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.88 8.55 11.82 11.80 11.92 11.97 10.00 9.38 11.11 8.22 9.38 11.11 8.22 9.38 11.11 8.22 9.38 11.11 9.38	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week 13 week 14 week 14 week 15 week 15 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 1000 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 1500
HDL Author Shishehbor et al Wickenberg et al Paceh Askari et al B. Mang et al Coverall, DL (I ^a = 99.5%, p < 0.000) LDL Author Shishehbor et al Wickenberg et al Faceh Askari et al Mande Haji et al	Effect (95% CI) 2.81 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.26 (0.47, 20.5) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.26 (0.47, 20.5) 3.96 (-7.88, 15.63) Effect (95% CI) Effect (95% CI) 0.44 (-10.58, 11.44) -3.70 (-8.53, 2.13) -4.40 (-18.49, 0.69) 1.70 (-8.53, 2.13) -4.40 (-13.4, 4.22) -16.84 (-17.38, -15.04) 0.54 (-3.34, 4.42) -16.44 (-44.74, 0.71)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.88 8.85 11.92 11.80 11.80 11.90 11.37 100.00	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 112mg 1000 mg 500mg 500mg 500mg 500mg 500mg 112mg 1000 mg 100
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Faezeh Askari et.al Overall, DL (i ² = 99.5%, p < 0.000) -50 CDL Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Faezeh Askari et.al Faezeh Askari et.al Faezeh Askari et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Author Shishehbor et.al Mandei Haij et.al Sonal Gupta Jain	Effect (95% CI) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, 5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.99) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.26 (0.47, 2.05) 3.515 (3.58, 36.72) 0.00 (-7.59, 7.59) 3.98 (-7.88, 15.83) 50 Effect (95% CI) -4.04 (-10.58, 11.46) -3.70 (-4.53, 2.13) -4.04 (-18.49, 9.69) 1.70 (-4.85, 12.29) -16.29 (-17.36, -15.04) 0.54 (-3.34, 4.42) -16.49 (24.97, -8.01) -8.82 (+11.44, -9.29)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.80 11.88 8.88 11.92 11.80 11.80 11.87 100.00 % % Weight 8.22 9.36 9.36 9.36 9.36 9.36 9.36 9.36 9.36	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 1000 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 1500 mg 1500 mg 1000 mg 1000 mg 1000 mg 1000 mg 1000 mg 1000 mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et al Wickenberg et al Fazeh Askari et al Bonarg et al Mahdie Haji et al Sonal Gupta Jain Roghayeh Zare et al Mishehbor et al M	Effect (96%, CI) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.99) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.26 (0.47, 2.05) 3.51 5 (3.58, 38.72) 0.00 (-7.59, 7.59) 3.39 (-7.88, 15.83) 3.39 (-7.88, 15.83) 50 Effect (95% CI) 0.44 (-10.55, 11.46) -3.70 (-8.55, 12.51) -4.40 (-5.8, 15.64) 0.54 (-3.34, 4.42) -16.40 (-2.47, -6.01) -8.42 (-11.44, -4.20) -18.40 (-2.47, -6.01) -8.42 (-11.44, -4.20) -18.40 (-2.47, -6.01) -8.42 (-11.44, -4.20) -18.40 (-2.47, -6.01) -8.42 (-11.44, -4.20) -19.70 (13.44, 24.77, -6.01) -19.70 (13.44, 24.77, -6.01) -19.70 (13.45, 27.61)	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.88 8.59 11.82 11.90 11.97 100.00 9.96 11.97 10.00 9.96 11.91 10.92 9.94 11.94 11.94 11.94 11.94 11.94 11.94 11.94 11.94 11.94 11.94 11.94 11.94 11.94 11.94 11.95	Duration 8 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 8 week 12 week 13 week 12 week 13 week 14 week 14 week 15 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 1500 mg 112mg 1000 mg 112mg 1000 mg 500 mg
HDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Paceh Askari et.al B. Mang et.al Mahdie Haji et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Roghayeh Zare et.al Tim N. Ziegenfuss et.al Overall, DL (1 ⁴ = 99.5%, p < 0.000) LDL Author Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Faceh Askari et.al Faceh Askari et.al Faceh Askari et.al Faceh Askari et.al Faceh Askari et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Roghayeh Zare et.al Shishehbor et.al Wickenberg et.al Faceh Askari et.al Faceh Askari et.al Faceh Askari et.al Sonal Gupta Jain Roghayeh Zare et.al Tim N. Ziegenfuss et.al	Effect (95% CI) 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.45 (-3.09, 3.99) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.28 (0.47, 2.05) 3.51 5 (33.56, 36.72) 0.00 (-7.59, 7.59) 3.98 (-7.88, 15.63) 50 Effect (95% CI) 0.01 (-15.9, 7.59) 3.98 (-7.88, 15.63) Effect (95% CI) 0.02 (-15.8, 15.64) 0.70 (+8.49, 8.09) 1.70 (+8.45, 21.23) -16.40 (-14.4, -8.07) -8.82 (+14.4, -8	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.88 8.85 11.82 11.89 11.89 11.90 11.37 100.00 % % Weight 10.90 11.11 8.22 9.54 11.91 11.92 11.90 1.90	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week 13 week 14 week 12 week 12 week 12 week 12 week 12 week 12 week 12 week 12 week 12	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 1500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 100 mg 1000 mg 500 mg 1000 mg 1000 mg 1000 mg 500 mg 500 mg 500 mg 1000 mg 500
HDL Author Shishehbor et al Wickenberg et al Paceh Askari et al B. Mang et al B. Mang et al B. Mang et al B. Mang et al Coreral, DL (I ² = 99.5%, p < 0.000) LDL Author Shishehbor et al Wickenberg et al Faceh Askari et al Paceh Askari et al Paceh Askari et al Paceh Askari et al Paceh Askari et al Mande Haji et al Sonal Gupta Jain House Haji et al Shishehbor et al Mande Haji et al Shishehbor et al Mande Haji et al Sonal Gupta Jain Paceh Askari et al Paceh	Effect (95% CI) 2.81 (-2.69, 7.91) 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 2.28 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.28 (047, 20.51) 2.28 (-19.18, 23.70) 1.28 (047, 20.51) 3.98 (-7.88, 15.63) Effect (95% CI) Effect (95% CI) 0.44 (-10.58, 11.44) -3.70 (-4.53, 2.13) -4.40 (-18.49, 0.69) 1.70 (-4.85, 2.23) -15.0 (-17.38, -15.04) 0.54 (-3.37, 4.42) -16.44 (-4.97, -8.01) -8.82 (-11.44, -0.20) -18.82 (-11.44, -0.20) -18.82 (-11.44, -0.20) -18.82 (-11.44, -0.20) -18.82 (-11.43, -0.21) -8.82 (-11.43, -	% Weight 11.65 9.02 11.87 11.88 8.88 11.92 11.80 11.90 11.37 100.00	Duration 8 week 12 week 12 week 8 week 12 week	Dose 500 mg 500 mg 1500 mg 1000 mg 500mg 500mg 500mg 500mg 500mg 1500 mg 1500 mg 1500 mg 1000 mg 112mg 1000 ng 3000 mg 500 mg

Figure 4. Effect of cinnamon on CHOL, TG, HDL and LDL.

CHOL, cholesterol; TG, triglycrid; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; LDL, low-density lipoprotein.



Subgroup analysis and sensitivity analysis

Table 2 and **Figure 5** presents a detailed exploration of the impact of cinnamon supplementation on lipid profiles, stratified by intervention dosage, specifically focusing on TC, TG, HDL, and LDL. The findings reveal intriguing insights into the differential effects based on the administered dosage. For LDL, an intervention dose of less than 500 mg/day demonstrated a significant reduction (WMD, -10.26; 95% CI, -15.62, -4.90; p = 0.001), with a modest level of heterogeneity (I² = 40.4%). In contrast, higher doses (\geq 500 mg/ day) exhibited a non-significant increase in LDL levels (WMD, 1.18; 95% CI, -10.28, 12.65; p = 0.840), accompanied by pronounced heterogeneity (I² = 97.2%). HDL levels displayed a non-significant reduction for both lower (WMD, -2.72; 95% CI, -11.294, 5.841; p = 0.533) and higher (WMD, 6.01; 95% CI, -9.562, 21.599; p = 0.449) intervention doses, with considerable heterogeneity observed (I² = 96.1% and 99.4%, respectively). In terms of TG, lower doses

Table 2. The effect of Cinnamon on LDL, HDL, TG and Chol

Variables	No.	WMD (95% CI)	p value	Heterogeneity		
			_	p heterogeneity	²	
LDL						
Overall effect Intervention dose (mg/day)	10	-2.48 (-9.70, 4.72)	0.499	0.001	96.0%	
< 500	3	-10.26 (-15.62, -4.90)	0.001	0.187	40.4%	
≥ 500	7	1.18 (-10.28, 12.65)	0.840	0.001	97.2%	
HDL						
Overall effect Intervention dose (mg/day)	10	3.97 (-7.877, 15.831)	0.511	0.001	99.5%	
< 500	3	-2.72 (-11.294, 5.841)	0.533	0.001	96.1%	
≥ 500	7	6.01 (-9.562, 21.599)	0.449	0.001	99.4%	
TG						
Overall effect Intervention dose (mg/day)	10	-6.88 (-12.62, -1.15)	0.019	0.001	97.4%	
< 500	3	-12.65 (-25.29, -0.008)	0.050	0.057	65.2%	
≥ 500	7	-4.66 (-13.52, 4.20)	0.303	0.001	93.5%	
Chol						
Overall effect	10	-4.314 (-15.011, 6.384)	0.429	0.001	97.6%	
Intervention dose (mg/day)						
< 500	3	3.566 (-17.58, 24.71)	0.741	0.001	90.8%	
≥ 500	7	-6.969 (-20.97, 7.03)	0.329	0.001	98.1%	

LDL, low-density lipoprotein; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; TG, triglycrid; Chol, cholesterol; WMD, weighted mean differences; CI, confidence interval.

CHOL						
			Effect	%		
Dose_Cat and Author			(95% CI)	Weight	Duration	Dose
>500 mg						
Faezeh Askari et.al	1		 65.30 (32.79, 97.81)	5.59	12 week	1500 mg
Mahdie Haji et.al			-15.25 (-25.69, -4.81)	10.42	8 week	1000 mg
Sonal Gupta Jain	+		-10.62 (-14.00, -7.24)	11.44	16 week	3000 mg
Subgroup, DL (l ² = 90.8%, p < 0.000)	V	>	3.57 (-17.58, 24.71)	27.45		
≤500 mg	1					
Shishehbor et.al	÷	+	4.89 (-8.00, 17.78)	9.91	8 week	500 mg
Wickenberg et.al	÷		-4.02 (-7.26, -0.78)	11.45	12 week	500 mg
Fouzia Farooq et.al		-	-4.00 (-16.07, 8.07)	10.08	8 week	500 mg
ALAM KHAN et .al	•		-31.50 (-33.49, -29.51)	11.52	6 week	400 mg
B. Mang et .al	H	-	-0.18 (-4.72, 4.36)	11.33	12 week	112mg
Roghayeh Zare et.al	- -		-13.00 (-20.38, -5.62)	10.96	12week	500mg
Tim N. Ziegenfuss et.al		•	4.00 (-20.08, 28.08)	7.29	12 week	500mg
Subgroup, DL (l ² = 98.1%, p < 0.000)	$\langle $	>	-6.97 (-20.97, 7.04)	72.55		
Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.416						
Overall, DL (l² = 97.6%, p < 0.000)	$\langle \rangle$	>	-4.31 (-15.01, 6.38)	100.00		
-100			100			

Figure 5. Effect of cinnamon by dosage on CHOL, TG, HDL and LDL.

CHOL, cholesterol; TG, triglycrid; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; LDL, low-density lipoprotein.

(continued to the next page)



ΤG Effect Dose_Cat and Author (95% CI) Weight Dose Dur >500 mg Faezeh Askari et.a -41.80 (-72.90, -10.70) 2.87 12 weel 1500 mg Mahdie Haji et.al -12.11 (-25.63, 1.41) 9.12 1000 mg 3000 mg Sonal Gupta Jain -6.12 (-7.98, -4.26) 18.15 16 weel Subgroup, DL (I² = 65.2%, p = 0.057) -12.65 (-25.29, -0.01) 30.14 ≤500 mg Shishehbor et.al 9.55 (-16.11, 35.21) 3.93 8 week 500 mg Wickenberg et.al 1.80 (-0.03, 3.63) 18.16 500 mg 12 week Fouzia Farooq et.al 3.60 (-27.61, 34.81) 2.85 500 mg 8 week ALAM KHAN et .al -13.14 (-15.65, -10.63) 17.87 6 weel 400 mg 112mg B. Mang et .al -3.96 (-10.91, 2.99) 14.55 12 week Roghayeh Zare et.al -9.70 (-19.63, 0.23) 11.90 12week 500mg Tim N. Ziegenfuss et al. -34.00 (-107.60, 39.60) 0.59 12 week 500m/ Subgroup, DL (I² = 93.5%, p < 0.000) -4.66 (-13.53, 4.20) 69.86 Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.311 Overall, DL (I² = 91.3%, p < 0.000) \diamond -6.89 (-12.62, -1.16) 100.00 HDL Effect % Dose_Cat and Author (95% CI) Duration Dose Weight >500 mg Faezeh Askari et.al -8.20 (-10.67, -5.73) 10.66 1500 mg 12 week Mahdie Haji et.al 2.26 (-19.18, 23.70) 7.51 1000 mg 8 week Sonal Gupta Jain 1.26 (0.47, 2.05) 10.71 3000 mg 16 week Subgroup, DL (I² = 96.1%, p < 0.000) -2.73 (-11.29, 5.84) 28.88 ≤500 ma 2.61 (-2.69, 7.91) Shishehbor et.al 10.45 500 mg 8 weel Wickenberg et.al 0.00 (-19.52, 19.52) 500 mg 7.92 12 week 500 mg Fouzia Farooq et.al 0.45 (-3.09, 3.99) 10.60 8 week 400 mg ALAM KHAN et .al 1.94 (-1.28, 5.16) 10.62 6 week B. Mang et .al 0.54 (-1.77, 2.85) 10.67 12 week 112mg Roghayeh Zare et.al 35.15 (33.58, 36.72) 10.69 12weel 500mg 500mg Tim N. Ziegenfuss et.al 0.00 (-7.59, 7.59) 10.18 12 week Subgroup, DL (I² = 99.4%, p < 0.000) 6.02 (-9.56, 21.60) 71.12 Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.335 Overall, DL (l² = 99.4%, p < 0.000) 3.77 (-6.97, 14.52) 100.00 LDL Effect (95% CI) Dose_Cat and Autho Weight Dose >500 mg Faezeh Askari et a -4 40 (-18 49, 9 69) 8 22 12 week 1500 mg Mahdie Haji et.al -16.49 (-24.97, -8.01) 10.28 8 week 1000 mg Sonal Gupta Jain -8.82 (-11.44, -6.20) 11.80 16 week 3000 ma Subgroup, DL (I² = 40.4%, p = 0.187) -10.27 (-15.63, -4.91) 30.30 ≤500 mg Shishehbor et.al 0.44 (-10.58, 11.46) 9.36 500 mg 8 week Wickenberg et.al -3.70 (-9.53, 2.13) 11.11 12 week 500 mg Fouzia Farooq et.al 1.70 (-8.85, 12.25) 9.54 8 week 500 mg ALAM KHAN et .al -16.20 (-17.36, -15.04) 11.94 6 week 400 mg B. Mang et .al 0.54 (-3.34, 4.42) 11.58 12 week 112mg Roghayeh Zare et.al 19.70 (13.64, 25.76) 11.05 12week 500mg Tim N. Ziegenfuss et.al 10.00 (-14.13, 34.13) 5.12 12 week 500mg Subgroup, DL (I² = 97.2%, p < 0.000) 1.18 (-10.28, 12.65) 69.70 Heterogeneity between groups: p = 0.076 Overall, DL (I² = 96.0%, p < 0.000) -2.49 (-9.70, 4.72) 100.00

Figure 5. (Continued) Effect of cinnamon by dosage on CHOL, TG, HDL and LDL. CHOL, cholesterol; TG, triglycrid; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; LDL, low-density lipoprotein.

exhibited a significant reduction (WMD, -12.65; 95% CI, -25.29, -0.008; p = 0.050), with moderate heterogeneity (I² = 65.2%). Higher doses, however, showed a non-significant decrease in TG levels (WMD, -4.66; 95% CI, -13.52, 4.20; p = 0.303), accompanied by



notable heterogeneity (I² = 93.5%). Lastly, cholesterol levels demonstrated a non-significant increase for lower doses (WMD, 3.566; 95% CI, –17.58, 24.71; p = 0.741) and a non-significant decrease for higher doses (WMD, –6.969; 95% CI, –20.97, 7.03; p = 0.329), with substantial heterogeneity observed in both strata (I² = 90.8% and 98.1%, respectively). These nuanced findings underscore the dosage-dependent nature of cinnamon's effects on lipid profiles, necessitating further investigation and consideration in clinical applications.

The sensitivity analysis, a crucial component of our study, involved a meticulous examination of the influence of individual studies on the overall effect sizes for key lipid parameters, including LDL, HDL, TG, and TC. Notably, the study by Shishehbor et al. [21] significantly impacted the overall effect of LDL, revealing a value of -2.78 (-10.38, 4.80). This finding suggests that the exclusion or inclusion of this particular study may substantially influence the overall conclusion regarding the effect of cinnamon on LDL levels. Similarly, the study by Askari et al. [23] played a pivotal role in the sensitivity analysis for HDL, demonstrating a value of 5.18 (-6.59, 16.96). Additionally, the study by Wickenberg et al. [22] significantly influenced the sensitivity analysis for TG, indicating a value of -8.74 (-13.47, -4.01). Lastly, for TC, the study by Askari et al. [23] exhibited a substantial impact with a value of -8.47 (-19.15, 2.20). These sensitivity analyses underscore the importance of individual studies in shaping the overall conclusions of our meta-analysis and emphasize the need for careful consideration of their respective contributions to the synthesized evidence.

Publication bias

Figure 6 employs funnel plots to assess the potential presence of publication bias in studies examining the effect of cinnamon supplementation on lipid profiles, specifically focusing on LDL, HDL, TG, and TC. For LDL, Egger's test yielded a p value of 0.030, suggesting a potential presence of publication bias. HDL, TG, and cholesterol, however, exhibited p values of 0.400, 0.254, and 0.002, respectively. While HDL and TG did not show significant evidence of publication bias, the significant p value for cholesterol suggests the need for cautious interpretation due to the potential influence of bias in the reported findings.

DISCUSSION

The meta-analysis on the impact of Cinnamon on lipid profiles indicates a non-significant overall effect on LDL. However, significant reductions are seen with doses < 500 mg/day, and non-significant increases with doses \geq 500 mg/day. TG exhibit a significant overall reduction, particularly in the < 500 mg/day group. High heterogeneity underlines the importance of standardized study designs and further exploration of dosage-specific effects.

This research provides a comprehensive overview of diverse clinical studies investigating the effects of cinnamon on various health conditions. In Iran, Shishehbor et al. [21] focused on rheumatoid arthritis with a dosage of 500 mg/day, while Askari et al. [23] examined fatty liver disease using a higher dosage of 1,500 mg/day. Similarly, in Sweden, Wickenberg et al. [22] explored impaired glucose tolerance (IGT) with a common dosage of 500 mg/day. In India, Farooq et al. [24] investigated fatty liver disease with a dosage of 500 mg/day, and Gupta Jain et al. [25] targeted metabolic syndrome, utilizing a higher dosage of 3,000 mg/day. The studies exhibit variations in participant demographics, intervention duration, and conditions studied, contributing to a rich understanding of cinnamon's potential effects across different contexts.

Supplementation on Lipid Profile





Figure 6. Funnel plots to evaluate publication bias, and the effect of cinnamon for CHOL, TG, HDL and LDL Egger's test. CHOL, cholesterol; TG, triglycrid; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; LDL, low-density lipoprotein.

Furthermore, the studies also highlight the importance of considering the safety and efficacy of different cinnamon dosages. For instance, Khan et al. [12] in Pakistan explored diabetes with a dosage of 400 mg/day, and Solomon TP et al. [14] in Germany studied diabetes with a relatively lower dosage of 112 mg/day. These variations in dosage underscore the need for a nuanced approach to cinnamon supplementation, considering both therapeutic benefits and potential adverse effects. Overall, the diverse range of conditions, dosages, and participant demographics in these studies contributes valuable insights to the ongoing exploration of cinnamon's role in promoting health.

Lipid metabolism is intricately linked to cardiovascular health, with lipid profiles serving as crucial indicators [21]. These profiles encompass measurements of lipoproteins, TG, and cholesterol, providing valuable insights into an individual's cardiovascular status. Dysregulation in these lipid markers, commonly referred to as dyslipidemia, holds a significant position in the pathophysiology of atherosclerosis and the occurrence of cardiovascular events [23]. To elaborate, abnormalities in lipid metabolism can lead to an imbalance in lipoprotein levels, increased TG concentrations, and alterations in cholesterol distribution. These disruptions contribute to the formation of atherosclerotic plaques,



initiating a cascade of events that may culminate in cardiovascular events such as heart attacks or strokes [22].

Comparing these findings with existing literature, several studies have reported conflicting results regarding the influence of cinnamon on LDL levels. Some studies align with the current findings, suggesting a potential LDL-lowering effect, especially at lower doses [24]. However, there are studies that report no significant impact or even an increase in LDL levels with cinnamon supplementation. The observed heterogeneity in the current meta-analysis, as indicated by the high I² value (96.0%), underscores the variability in study designs, participant characteristics, and possibly cinnamon formulations, which may contribute to the inconsistent results.

The effect of Cinnamon on HDL, the overall effect is non-significant (WMD, 3.97; 95% CI, -7.877, 15.831). However, when examining different intervention doses, both groups show non-significant changes, with a slight reduction in HDL for those receiving less than 500 mg/day and a slight increase for those receiving 500 mg/day or more. In comparison to the existing literature, the current study's findings on HDL align with the mixed results reported in previous research [9]. Some studies indicate positive effects on HDL levels with cinnamon supplementation [3,25,27], while others do not find any significant changes [10,28,29,30]. The high level of heterogeneity in this analysis (I² = 99.5%) emphasizes the need for further investigation into the factors contributing to the variability in HDL outcomes across studies.

The results of the current study, demonstrate a significant overall reduction in TG with cinnamon supplementation (WMD, -6.88; 95% CI, -12.62, -1.15). Stratification by intervention dose reveals a more substantial reduction for doses less than 500 mg/day compared to 500 mg/day or more. Comparing these findings with existing literature, there is some agreement with studies reporting a TG-lowering effect of cinnamon [9,31,32]. However, the dose-specific response observed in this meta-analysis adds a valuable layer to the understanding of cinnamon's impact on TG levels. The significant heterogeneity (I² = 97.4%) prompts further exploration of potential influencing factors.

Finally, the effect of Cinnamon on cholesterol. The overall effect is non-significant (WMD, -4.314; 95% CI, -15.011, 6.384), and when stratified by intervention dose, both groups show non-significant changes, with a slight reduction for doses less than 500 mg/day and a slight increase for doses 500 mg/day or more. Comparing these results with existing literature, the non-significant overall effect is consistent with the mixed findings reported in previous studies. The heterogeneity observed in this analysis (I² = 97.6%) raises questions about the diverse responses to cinnamon across different studies.

the current meta-analysis sheds light on the nuanced effects of cinnamon on lipid profiles, particularly LDL, HDL, TG, and cholesterol. The observed variations highlight the importance of considering intervention dosage and underscore the need for further well-controlled studies to elucidate the potential benefits and mechanisms of cinnamon supplementation on lipid parameters.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to reviewers for their valuable comments on this manuscript.



REFERENCES

- 1. Roth GA, Mensah GA, Johnson CO, et al. Global burden of cardiovascular diseases and risk factors, 1990–2019: update from the GBD 2019 study. J Am Coll Cardiol 2020;76:2982-3021. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Ribeiro-Santos R, Andrade M, Madella D, Martinazzo AP, de Aquino Garcia Moura L, de Melo NR, Sanches-Silva A. Revisiting an ancient spice with medicinal purposes: Cinnamon. Trends Food Sci Technol 2017;62:154-69. CROSSREF
- Jamali N, Kazemi A, Saffari-Chaleshtori J, Samare-Najaf M, Mohammadi V, Clark CC. The effect of cinnamon supplementation on lipid profiles in patients with type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of clinical trials. Complement Ther Med 2020;55:102571. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 4. Kirtikar KR, Basu BB. Indian medicinal plants. Dehra Dun: Bishen Singh Mahendra Pal Singh; 1975.
- Cao H, Urban JF Jr, Anderson RA. Cinnamon polyphenol extract affects immune responses by regulating anti- and proinflammatory and glucose transporter gene expression in mouse macrophages. J Nutr 2008;138:833-40. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 6. Vijayan KK. ATR. Pharmacology and toxicology of cinnamon and cassia. In: Ravindran PN, Nirmal-Babu K, Shylaja M, editors. Cinnamon and cassia: the genus Cinnamomum. Boca Raton (FL): CRC Press; 2005.
- Redd AM, Seo JH, Ryu SY, Kim YS, Kim YS, Min KR, Kim Y. Cinnamaldehyde and 2-methoxycinnamaldehyde as NF-kappaB inhibitors from Cinnamomum cassia. Planta Med 2004;70:823-7.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Wu SJ, Ng LT, Lin CC. Cinnamaldehyde-induced apoptosis in human PLC/PRF/5 cells through activation of the proapoptotic Bcl-2 family proteins and MAPK pathway. Life Sci 2005;77:938-51. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Maierean SM, Serban MC, Sahebkar A, Ursoniu S, Serban A, Penson P, Banach M; Lipid and Blood Pressure Meta-analysis Collaboration (LBPMC) Group. The effects of cinnamon supplementation on blood lipid concentrations: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Clin Lipidol 2017;11:1393-406.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 10. Vafa M, Mohammadi F, Shidfar F, Sormaghi MS, Heidari I, Golestan B, Amiri F. Effects of cinnamon consumption on glycemic status, lipid profile and body composition in type 2 diabetic patients. Int J Prev Med 2012;3:531-6. PUBMED
- 11. Wu T, Huang W, He M, Yue R. Effects of cinnamon supplementation on lipid profiles among patients with metabolic syndrome and related disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Complement Ther Clin Pract 2022;49:101625. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 12. Khan A, Safdar M, Ali Khan MM, Khattak KN, Anderson RA. Cinnamon improves glucose and lipids of people with type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Care 2003;26:3215-8. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 13. Anderson RA, Broadhurst CL, Polansky MM, Schmidt WF, Khan A, Flanagan VP, Schoene NW, Graves DJ. Isolation and characterization of polyphenol type-A polymers from cinnamon with insulin-like biological activity. J Agric Food Chem 2004;52:65-70. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 14. Solomon TP, Blannin AK. Effects of short-term cinnamon ingestion on in vivo glucose tolerance. Diabetes Obes Metab 2007;9:895-901. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Wang JG, Anderson RA, Graham GM 3rd, Chu MC, Sauer MV, Guarnaccia MM, Lobo RA. The effect of cinnamon extract on insulin resistance parameters in polycystic ovary syndrome: a pilot study. Fertil Steril 2007;88:240-3. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Anderson RA, Zhan Z, Luo R, Guo X, Guo Q, Zhou J, Kong J, Davis PA, Stoecker BJ. Cinnamon extract lowers glucose, insulin and cholesterol in people with elevated serum glucose. J Tradit Complement Med 2015;6:332-6. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Hlebowicz J, Darwiche G, Björgell O, Almér LO. Effect of cinnamon on postprandial blood glucose, gastric emptying, and satiety in healthy subjects. Am J Clin Nutr 2007;85:1552-6. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Crawford P. Effectiveness of cinnamon for lowering hemoglobin A1C in patients with type 2 diabetes: a randomized, controlled trial. J Am Board Fam Med 2009;22:507-12. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Ziegenfuss TN, Hofheins JE, Mendel RW, Landis J, Anderson RA. Effects of a water-soluble cinnamon extract on body composition and features of the metabolic syndrome in pre-diabetic men and women. J Int Soc Sports Nutr 2006;3:45-53. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 20. Higgins JP, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 6.3 (updated February 2022). Hoboken (NJ): John Wiley & Sons; 2022.
- Shishehbor F, Rezaeyan Safar M, Rajaei E, Haghighizadeh MH. Cinnamon consumption improves clinical symptoms and inflammatory markers in women with rheumatoid arthritis. J Am Coll Nutr 2018;37:1-6.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF



- 22. Wickenberg J, Lindstedt S, Nilsson J, Hlebowicz J. Cassia cinnamon does not change the insulin sensitivity or the liver enzymes in subjects with impaired glucose tolerance. Nutr J 2014;13:96. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 23. Askari F, Rashidkhani B, Hekmatdoost A. Cinnamon may have therapeutic benefits on lipid profile, liver enzymes, insulin resistance, and high-sensitivity C-reactive protein in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease patients. Nutr Res 2014;34:143-8. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 24. Farooq F, Hussain Z, Hanief MI, Fida Z. Safety and efficacy of cinnamomum zeylanicum Blume in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: a single-blind randomized standard controlled trial. World J Pharm Res 2023;12:540-56.
- 25. Gupta Jain S, Puri S, Misra A, Gulati S, Mani K. Effect of oral cinnamon intervention on metabolic profile and body composition of Asian Indians with metabolic syndrome: a randomized double -blind control trial. Lipids Health Dis 2017;16:113. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 26. Zare R, Nadjarzadeh A, Zarshenas MM, Shams M, Heydari M. Efficacy of cinnamon in patients with type II diabetes mellitus: a randomized controlled clinical trial. Clin Nutr 2019;38:549-56. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 27. Fateh HL, Muhammad SS, Kamari N. Associations between adherence to MIND diet and general obesity and lipid profile: a cross-sectional study. Front Nutr 2023;10:1078961. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Gaggini M, Gorini F, Vassalle C. Lipids in atherosclerosis: pathophysiology and the role of calculated lipid indices in assessing cardiovascular risk in patients with hyperlipidemia. Int J Mol Sci 2022;24:75.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Qin B, Panickar KS, Anderson RA. Cinnamon: potential role in the prevention of insulin resistance, metabolic syndrome, and type 2 diabetes. J Diabetes Sci Technol 2010;4:685-93. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Sarmadi B, Musazadeh V, Dehghan P, Karimi E. The effect of cinnamon consumption on lipid profile, oxidative stress, and inflammation biomarkers in adults: An umbrella meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis 2023;33:1821-35. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 31. Allen RW, Schwartzman E, Baker WL, Coleman CI, Phung OJ. Cinnamon use in type 2 diabetes: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. Ann Fam Med 2013;11:452-9. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 32. Miah MA, Himel MH, Sujan KM, Mustari A, Haque MI. Protective effects of cinnamon powder against hyperlipidemia and hepatotoxicity in butter fed female albino mice. Saudi J Biol Sci 2022;29:3069-74. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 33. Hajimonfarednejad M, Nimrouzi M, Heydari M, Zarshenas MM, Raee MJ, Jahromi BN. Insulin resistance improvement by cinnamon powder in polycystic ovary syndrome: a randomized double-blind placebo controlled clinical trial. Phytother Res 2018;32:276-83. PUBMED | CROSSREF