**Review** Article

## Efficacy and Safety of Wuling Powder in the Treatment of Patients with Diabetic Nephropathy: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

# Yunyi Yang<sup>(D)</sup>,<sup>1</sup> Wenjun Sha,<sup>1</sup> Keke Hou,<sup>1</sup> Yuanying Xu,<sup>1</sup> Shufa Tan,<sup>2</sup> Hongping Yin,<sup>1</sup> Lin Chen,<sup>1,3</sup> and Tao Lei <sup>[D]</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Putuo Hospital, Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Shanghai, China <sup>2</sup>Shaanxi University of Chinese Medicine, Xianyang, Shaanxi, China <sup>3</sup>Shanghai Putuo District Health Affairs Management Center, Shanghai, China

Correspondence should be addressed to Tao Lei; leitao5899@126.com

Received 17 May 2022; Revised 8 September 2022; Accepted 9 September 2022; Published 30 September 2022

Academic Editor: Vijaya Anand

Copyright © 2022 Yunyi Yang et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Background. Wuling powder is a classical formula of traditional Chinese medicine (TCM), which is extensively applied to treat diabetic nephropathy (DN). However, there are no related reports on systematically evaluating the efficacy of Wuling powder in the treatment of DN. Targeted at this, this study was developed. Materials and Methods. This study systematically searched related articles from nine databases, including PubMed, Cochrane Library, Embase, Web of Science, China Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), China Biomedical CD-ROM (Sino Med), Wanfang database, Vipers database (VIP), and the China Clinical Trials Registry website. The randomized controlled trials (RCTs) involving Wuling Power to treat DN were included, which were published from the established data of the above databases to March 2022. In addition, the language of the studies was not restricted. Studies were meta-analyzed using the RevMan 5.4 software given in the Cochrane Collaboration Network. The treatment efficacy was measured using the weighted mean differences (WMD) and 95% confidence intervals (CI). Results. 24 studies were included for the final analysis. 24 h urine volume (WMD = 357.95; 95% CI [322.83, 393.06], p < 0.00001), 24 h urine protein quantification(24 h UPQ) (WMD = -1.30; 95% CI [-1.82, -0.78], p < 0.00001), serum creatinine (Scr) (WMD = -10.17; 95% CI [-11.13, -9.21], *p* < 0.00001), blood urea nitrogen (BUN) (WMD = -1.62; 95% CI [-2.30, -0.93], *p* < 0.00001), urinary albumin excretion rate (UAER) (WMD = -24.73; 95% CI [-35.46, -13.99], p < 0.00001), fasting blood glucose (FBG) (WMD = -0.63.95% CI [-0.97, -0.30], p = 0.002), glycated hemoglobin (WMD = -0.11; 95% CI [-0.30, 0.08], p = 0.26), total cholesterol (TC) (WMD = -0.63; 95% CI [-1.23, -0.04], p = 0.04), triglycerides (TG) (WMD = -0.46. 95% CI [-0.70, -0.23], p = 0.0001), high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C) (WMD = -0.32; 95% CI [0.03, 0.62], p = 0.03), low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) (WMD = -0.57; 95% CI [-0.77, -0.37], p < 0.00001), and total effective rate (TER) (response ratio (RR) = 1.40; 95% CI [1.32, 1.48]; p < 0.00001) were concluded. The Wuling powder in the treatment of DN was statistically significant in all the above outcome indicators, and the efficacy of the treatment group was better than that of the control group. Conclusion. The results of this study provided evidence for the clinical application of Wuling powder to treat the DN, but it had to be further validated in higher-quality clinical studies.

## 1. Introduction

Diabetic nephropathy (DN) is the most common and serious microvascular complication of diabetes mellitus (DM). It is clinically characterized by persistent albuminuria and/or progressive decline in glomerular filtration rate and microangiopathy, and it may result in end-stage renal disease in severe cases. Therefore, it becomes one of the leading causes of death in patients with DM [1]. The number of patients with DM in China ranks first all over the world, and its incidence is increasing year by year [2, 3]. In recent years, studies have shown that the incidence of nephropathy

caused by DM has increased rapidly, surpassing glomerulonephritis and hypertension [4]. Once the DN has progressed to renal failure, it will be difficult to reverse, which seriously affects the life, health, and quality of life of patients, and brings serious mental and economic burdens to their families. Currently, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors and angiotensin II receptor blockers can reduce the urinary protein, which can slow down the progression of DN, but its effect is not ideal [5]. Therefore, it is urgent to develop new treatment methods for DN.

The history of treating DN using Traditional Chinese medicine (TCM) is long, so the experience is highly enriched. In addition, the people-oriented and evidencebased TCM has achieved good clinical efficacy in the treatment of DN, and so it has become popular [6]. In TCM, DM is included in "oedema" and "thirst," and its pathogenesis is determined as water metabolism disorders, Qi deficiency, blood stasis, paralysis, and obstruction of veins and ligaments, resulting in dysfunction of internal organs. As a classical TCM formula, Wuling powder was first recorded in the Treatise on Miscellaneous Diseases of Typhoid Fever, written by Zhang Zhong Jing, a famous doctor in the Eastern Han Dynasty. It can play the effect of dipping water and dampness, warming Yang, and transforming Qi. Wuling powder has been approved by the State Food and Drug Administration in China (approval number: Z11020702). The drug compositions of Wuling powder were as follows: Polyporus umbellatus (Pers.) Fries (zhū líng), Poria cocos (Schw.) Wolf (fú líng), Atractylodes macrocephala Koidz (bái zhú), Alisma plantago-aquatica L. var. orientalis (Sam.) Juzep (zé xiè), and Cinnamomum cassia Presl (guì zhi). The compositions and detailed summary of Wuling powder are given in Figure 1 and Table 1, respectively.

In this formula, Poria cocos Wolf, Polyporus umbellatus, and Alisma plantago-aquatica exerted the effect of diuresis and dampness percolation; Atractylodes macrocephala Koidz strengthened the spleen and transported damp, and it strengthened the spleen and dispelled damp together with Poria cocos Wolf; Cinnamomum cassia warmed Yang to help the bladder to transform Qi, so that water could flow on its own, which could not only lightly percolate the water and damp but also strengthen the spleen for water and damp transportation. Modern pharmacological studies have shown that Wuling powder has a protective effect on patients with DN, greatly improving the renal indicators such as creatinine clearance, urinary protein, and urea nitrogen level [7, 8]. Clinical studies have shown that Wuling powder combined with some specific western medicines can lower the urinary protein, promote the conversion of proteinuria and haematuria to negative, disperse the swelling, decrease the 24 h urinary protein volume, increase the average daily urine volume, regulate the immune inflammatory response, and better the lipid metabolism disorders and hypercoagulability in DN patients, with significant overall efficacy [9-11]. In this meta-analysis, an evidence-based approach was adopted to systematically evaluate the efficacy and safety of Wuling powder to treat DN, aiming to provide a more effective and reliable scientific basis for the clinical treatment of DN.

## 2. Methods

2.1. Design. The protocol for this systematic study was registered on the Open Science Framework (INPLASY) platform (https://inplasy.com/) (registration number: INPLASY202240071). It was implemented and executed according to the preferred reporting guidelines for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols [12]. The final report would be in line with the PRISMA recommendations for systematic view reporting of the medical interventions in meta-analysis [13].

2.2. Database and Literature Search. This study systematically searched nine databases from their establishment data to March 2022, including PubMed, Cochrane Library, Embase, Web of Science, China Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), China Biomedical CD-ROM (Sino Med), Wanfang database, Vipers database (VIP), and China Clinical Trials Registry website. In addition, the patent databases were searched to exclude the clinical trials that were not published due to patent applications for Wuling powder (approval number: Z11020702). The clinical randomized controlled trials (RCTs) focusing on Wuling powder to treat DN were included in this study. The main objective of the first search was to collect the literature comprehensively by taking "Wuling Powder," "Wuling San," "Wuling," "Diabetic Ne-phropathies," "Nephropathies, Diabetic," "Nephropathy, Diabetic," "Diabetic Nephropathy," "Diabetic Kidney Disease," "Diabetic Kidney Diseases," "Kidney Disease, Diabetic," "Kidney Diseases, Diabetic" "Diabetic Glomerulosclerosis," "Glomerulosclerosis, Diabetic," "Intracapillary Glomerulosclerosis, Diabetic." "Intracapillary Glomerulosclerosis," "Nodular Glomerulosclerosis," "Glomerulosclerosis, Nodular," "Kimmelstiel-Wilson Syndrome," "Kimmelstiel Wilson Syndrome," "Syndrome, Kimmelstiel-Wilson," "Kimmelstiel-Wilson Disease," "Kimmelstiel Wilson Disease," "Kimmelstiel Wilson Syndrome," "Kimmelstiel Wilson Disease," "Kimmelstiel Wilson Disease," "Kimmelstiel Wilson Disease," and "Kimmelstiel Wilson Disease" as the search terms. The search strategy was shown in Supplementary Material Table 1.

#### 2.3. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

*2.3.1. Types of Research.* The selected RCTs were on the Wuling powder plus or minus formula for the treatment of DN.

2.3.2. Subjects of the Studies. In the included studies, the subjects were patients who met the internationally recognized diagnostic criteria for DN at the time of the study, who had been definitively diagnosed with DN by a clinician, and who had excluded primary nephropathy and other causes of renal disease.

2.3.3. Interventions. All patients in the treatment group were treated with Wuling powder plus or minus formula, while those in the control group received other hypoglycaemic



FIGURE 1: Compositions of Wuling powder.

TABLE 1: Details of the compositio	ons of Wuling powder.
------------------------------------	-----------------------

Chinese herbs	Latin name	Family	Part of herbs	Functions in TCM
Zhu ling (zhū líng)	Polyporus umbellatus (Pers.) Fries	Sargassaceae	Sclerotium	To clear dampness and promote diuresis
Fu ling (fú líng)	Poria cocos (Schw.) Wolf.	Polyporaceae	Sclerotium	To clear dampness, promote diuresis, strengthen the spleen, and calm the heart
Bai Zhu (bái zhú)	Atractylodes macrocephala Koidz.	Asteraceae	Roots and rhizomes	To invigorate Qi and spleen, dry damp, stop sweating, and relieve miscarriage
Ze Xie (zé xiè)	<i>Alisma plantago-aquatica</i> L.var. orientali s(Sam.) Juzep.	Alismataceae	Roots and rhizomes	To dry damp, release heat, resolve turbidity, and lower lipids
Gui Zhi(guì zhī)	Cinnamomum cassia Presl.	Lauraceae	Twig	To sweat and relieve the surface, dispel cold and relieve pain, and clear the Yang and transform Qi

drugs; or patients in both treatment and control groups received the same conventional diabetes medication and based on which patients in the treatment group took Wuling powder plus or minus formula. Studies with multiple interventions or where Wuling powder was not the primary intervention were excluded. There were no requirements for the course of the disease, course of treatment, and dose of medication.

2.3.4. Outcome Indicators. The main outcome indicators in this study included 24 h urine volume; 24 h urinary protein quantification (24 h UPQ); serum creatinine (Scr); blood urea nitrogen (BUN); urinary albumin excretion rate (UAER); and total effective rate (TER). The secondary outcome indicators were fasting blood glucose (FBG); hemoglobin A1c; total cholesterol (TC); triglyceride (TG); high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C); and low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C). In addition, safety was measured based on adverse effects. 2.3.5. Exclusion Criteria. The studies satisfying the below conditions had to be excluded: (1) duplicate publications; (2) reviews, summaries of expert experience, evaluative articles, or theoretical elaborations; (3) not RTCs, or animal studies; (4) nonclinical studies such as pharmacology; and (5) with incomplete documentation of data.

#### 2.4. Data Collection and Analysis

2.4.1. Literature Screening. The RCTs were screened independently by two researchers to exclude those who failed to meet the inclusion criteria. After the elimination of the duplicates, the abstracts of the searched RCTs were read for initial screening to exclude the RCTs not meeting the inclusion criteria and all the RCTs were downloaded. Next, the full texts of these RCTs were read. Finally, the RCTs on Wuling powder for DN treatment that met the inclusion criteria were selected. Any different opinions between the two researchers were referred to a third party for adjudication. 2.4.2. Research Data Extraction. The authors, year of publication, mean age, number of trials and controls, course of the disease, number of cases by gender, interventions, duration of treatment, and outcome indicators of the included RCTs were selected. Then, the authors were contacted if the required data were incomplete. Two researchers crosschecked the information entered in the RCTs, and any disagreements were referred to a third party for adjudication.

2.4.3. Assessment on Risk of Bias. The risk of bias of the included RCTs was assessed by using the Risk of Bias Assessment Tool recommended by the Cochrane Collaboration, in terms of seven aspects: (1) random sequence generation method; (2) allocation protocol concealment; (3) blindness to subjects and intervention providers; (4) blindness to outcome assessors; (5) completeness of outcome data; (6) selective reporting of study results; and (7) other biases. For each of the included RCTs, "high risk," "low risk," and "unclear risk" were assessed for each aspect [14]. In case of any disagreement on assessment results of the risk of bias, it should be discussed with a third researcher.

2.4.4. Data Analysis. The RevMan 5.4 software provided by the Cochrane Collaboration Network was adopted for metaanalysis. Dichotomous variables were expressed with the response ratio (RR), and the continuous variables were expressed using mean differences (MD). The  $\chi^2$  test was performed for heterogeneity. If p > 0.1 and  $I^2 < 50\%$ , the heterogeneity among all RCTs was low and the fixed effect model (FEM) was used for meta-analysis; while if p < 0.1 and  $I^2 \ge 50\%$ , the heterogeneity was statistically significant and the random effect model (REM) was used for the meta-analysis. p < 0.05 indicated a statistically significant difference.

2.4.5. Heterogeneity Assessment and Sensitivity Analysis. If  $I^2 \ge 50\%$ , there was a statistical heterogeneity and the REM was adopted to analyse the data; while the FEM was adopted if the test for heterogeneity was not significant ( $I^2 < 50\%$ ). As there was a variation in heterogeneity, the sensitivity analysis or subgroup analysis was essential to explore the potential causes of heterogeneity and to exclude the RCTs with a high risk of bias, so as to ensure the robustness of results.

2.4.6. Subgroup Analysis. Due to differences in heterogeneity, subgroup analysis was required to analyze the possible reasons for heterogeneity. The main subgroup analysis items included different ages, control treatments, duration of treatment, region, and safety.

2.4.7. Assessment of Publication Bias. Publication bias was detected using a funnel plot. A significant asymmetry in the funnel plot meant a publication bias.

## 3. Results

3.1. Literature Search. Figure 2 showed the flowchart to screen the RCTs. 222 relevant publications were searched

from various databases, and 100 duplicates were excluded after the initial screening. Next, 88 not satisfying the inclusion criteria were excluded. Then, after the full texts were read carefully, the publications which were not RCTs, not related to the treatment of DN, and lacked details of the results were excluded. Finally, 24 RCTs [15–38] were included in this meta-analysis.

3.2. Characteristics of the Included RCTs. 2,018 patients were included in the 24 RCTs, including 1,030 in the treatment group and 988 in the control group. The mean age of the patients ranged from  $50.57 \pm 15.17$  years old to  $69.58 \pm 1.65$  years old. The intervention for patients in all treatment groups was Wuling powder combined with conventional Western medicine. All 24 RCTs were conducted in China and published in 2003~2021. The shortest and longest durations of treatment were 3 weeks and 12 weeks, respectively. Table 2 showed in detail the basic characteristics of the 24 RCTs.

3.3. Risk of Bias in the Included RCTs. This meta-analysis investigated the risk of bias for all RCTs included. All research projects were randomized into a five-linger group and a control group. A comparison of the 24 RCTs revealed inconsistent randomization of treatment; 9 RCTs [21-23, 28, 30, 31, 34, 36, 38] were determined as low risk of bias because they generated random sequences by random number tables and random coin flips, while the remaining RCTs described only "random allocation" and therefore were determined to be an unclear risk of bias. In addition, 3 RCTs [31, 34, 36] reported allocation concealment, so they were classified as low risk of bias. In terms of performance bias, only 1 RCT [31] reported the double-blind trials, so the remaining 23 RCTs were classified as having a high risk of bias. In terms of reporting bias, only 1 RCT [34] had shedding of participant data and was, therefore, determined to have a high risk of bias. All RCTs were balanced at baseline examination and showed no other bias. The full and detailed analysis results on the risk of bias are shown in Figures 3 and 4.

## 3.4. Results

3.4.1. 24 h Urine Volume. 6 RCTs [16, 17, 24, 25, 32, 37] involving 334 DN patients provided data on 24h urine volume before and after the intervention. A heterogeneity test (P = 0.03 and  $I^2 = 59\%$ ) and a sensitivity analysis revealed that the statistical heterogeneity became lower after the study of Wang et al. [32] was removed ( $\chi^2 = 5.16$ , p = 0.27,  $I^2 = 23\%$ ; Figure 5), so the FEM was used. The results showed that the 24 h urine volume was significantly higher for patients in the treatment group treated with Wuling powder combined with conventional western medicine (WMD = 357.95; 95% CI [322.83, 393.06], *p* < 0.00001; Figure 5). The subgroup analysis suggested that, in the different age subgroups (p = 0.01), the group <60 years  $(\chi^2 = 3.52, p = 0.32, I^2 = 15\%)$  was homogeneous with the group  $\ge 60$  years ( $\chi^2 = 0.56$ , p = 0.45,  $I^2 = 0\%$ ), and the



FIGURE 2: Flowchart of specific publications screening.

difference was statistically significant. The difference between different regional subgroups (p = 0.14) was not significant (Table 3, Supplementary Material Figures 1 and 2).

3.4.2. 24 h UPQ. 13 RCTs [15-17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 29, 31, 35-37] (including 1,054 patients) reported the data of 24 UPQ. Significant heterogeneity was found in these 13 RCTs  $(\chi^2 = 760.27, p < 0.00001, I^2 = 98\%;$  Figure 6), so the REM was used. The 24h UPQ for patients treated with Wuling powder combined with conventional western medicine was higher than that in the control group (WMD = -1.30; 95% CI [-1.82, -0.78], p < 0.00001; Figure 6). Because of the large heterogeneity, the subgroup analysis was conducted based on the age, control treatment, duration of treatment, and region; and significant differences were found in intervention effects of different ages (p = 0.002), control treatments (p < 0.0001), and regions (p < 0.0001). It was reflected in the glipizide group (control treatment) ( $\chi^2 = 0.1$ , p = 0.95,  $I^2 = 0\%$ ) and in Guangdong province (region)  $(\chi^2 = 0.36, p = 0.55, I^2 = 0\%)$ , while significant heterogeneity was still observed in the rest (Table 3, Supplementary Material Figures 3-6).

3.4.3. Scr. 14 RCTs [15, 17–19, 21, 24, 27–29, 31, 35–38] (including 1,210 participants) reported the Scr data. Significant heterogeneity was found ( $\chi^2 = 3628.59$ , p < 0.00001,  $I^2 = 100\%$ ; Figure 7), so the meta-analysis was conducted by using a REM. The analysis showed a statistically significant difference in Scr between the treatment and control groups

(WMD = -10.17; 95% CI [-11.13, -9.21], p < 0.00001; Figure 7), indicating that the Scr was significantly better in the treatment group. In addition, the subgroup analysis was conducted in different durations of treatment and regions, and different durations of treatment showed no statistically significant difference (p = 0.11) and different regions showed statistically obvious difference (p = 0.007), but significant heterogeneity was still observed (Table 3, Supplementary Material Figures 7 and 8).

3.4.4. BUN. 10 RCTs [15, 19, 21, 24, 27, 28, 31, 35, 36, 38] (including 965 patients) reported the BUN data. The tests showed significant heterogeneity ( $\chi^2 = 137.59$ , p < 0.00001,  $I^2 = 93\%$ ; Figure 8), so the meta-analysis was conducted by using a REM. The analysis showed a statistically significant difference in BUN between the treatment and control groups (WMD = -1.62; 95% CI [-2.30, -0.93], p < 0.00001; Figure 8), indicating that the BUN was significantly better in the treatment group. Subgroup analysis in different durations of treatment and regions showed no significant difference in intervention effects between the two groups (p = 0.26 and 0.41 respectively), but significant heterogeneity was still observed (Table 3, Supplementary Material Figures 9 and 10).

3.4.5. UAER. 6 RCTs [18, 20, 21, 27, 28, 38] (including 482 patients) reported on UAER. Tests showed significant heterogeneity ( $\chi^2 = 128.55$ , p < 0.00001,  $I^2 = 96\%$ ; Figure 9), so a REM was used. A statistically significant difference was

e (T/C) Number of disease Gender Intervention Intervention Course Outcomes Region (T/C) (T/C, (M/F) (T) (C) Course Outcomes Region year)	T (76/ /56.14±0 280 (160/ 2.11/1.98 84) Wuling Gliquidone 12w @@@@@@ Puyang, Henan C (69/ powder+RT Gliquidone 12w @@@@@@ Puyang, Henan 51)	15/51.15 42 (21/21) 0.88/4.3 T (13/8) Wuling RT 3-4w  0@@@@ Zhumadian, Henan C (12/9) powder + RT 3-4w  0@@@@	54.5 48 (24/24) 3~16 26/22 Wuling RT 4w OOOOO Fenyi, Jiangxi	$  1/(55.8 \pm 7.2)  59 \ (29/30)  (7.9 \pm 5.8)/(7.8 \pm 6.5)  T \ (15/14) \qquad Wulling \qquad RT \qquad 12 \ w  \textcircled{O} \\ \bigcirc \\ \textcircled{O} \\ \end{array} $	t±10.8)/ 58 (29/29) NR T (17/12) Wuling RT 12 w 23.4 (20/29) Weinan, Shaanxi C (16/13) powder+RT RT 12 w 23.4 (20)	2)/(42~80) 60 (30/30) 5/5.5 T (20/ Wuling C (18/12) powder+RT Gliquidone 8w @@@@@ Cangwu, Guangxi	1 (2// 3)/(51.3±6.5) 89 (46/43) (6.1±1.5)/(5.7±1.3) 19) Wuling RT 2w ③④⑤⑤⑨⑪⑫ Zhongshan, C (25/ powder+RT RT 2w ③④⑤⑥⑨⑪⑫ Guangdong 518)	T (27) T (25) T (25) T (25) T (25) T (25) T (25) T (27) T	$2)/(52.8 \pm 4.1)  64 \; (32/32)  (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  T \; (17/15) \qquad Wulling \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT \qquad 8w \qquad \textcircled{O} \\ (6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)  C \; (15/17) \qquad powder + RT \qquad RT$	$3/(59.1 \pm 5.4)$ 54 (27/27) $(9 \pm 1.3)/(10 \pm 1.6)$ T (12/15) Wuling RT 3 w $\bigcirc \odot $	$5)/(59.3\pm5.2)$ 60 (30/30) (8.9±1.1)/(9.2±1.1) T (14/16) Wuling RT 3w $\bigcirc \textcircled{O}$ Beijing $C$ (16/14) powder + RT	1 (24) (53.6±1.8) 100 (50/50) (3.7±1.3)/(3.6±1.2) 26) Wuling Gliquidone 8w $@@@$ Dalian, Liaoning C (25/ powder+RT Gliquidone 8w $@@@$	5)/(58.2±3.2) 120 (60/60) (5.8±2.3)/(5.4±2.6) 64/56 Wuling RT 8w @@@@@ Guangdong Guangdong	
Wuling powder + RT Wuling powder + RT Wuling powder + RT Wuling	Wuling powder + RT Wuling powder + RT Wuling	Wuling powder + RT Wuling	Wuling	DOW UCI $\perp$ IN I	Wuling powder + RT	Wuling powder + RT	Wuling powder + RT	Wuling powder + RT	Wuling powder + RT	Wuling powder + RT	Wuling powder + RT	Wuling powder + RT	Wuling powder + RT	Wuling
T (76/ 84) C (69/ 51) T (13/8) C (12/9)	T (13/8) C (12/9)		26/22	T (15/14) C (16/14)	T (17/12) C (16/13)	T (20/ 10) C (18/12)	1 (2// 19) C (25/ 18)	T (27/ T (27/ 16) C (25/ 18)	T (17/15) C (15/17)	T (12/15) C (13/14)	T (14/16) C (16/14) T (24/	1 (24/ 26) C (25/ 25)	64/56	T (20/ 14)
(۱/۲, year)	2.11/1.98	0.88/4.3	3~16	$(7.9 \pm 5.8)/(7.8 \pm 6.5)$	NR	5/5.5	$(6.1 \pm 1.5)/(5.7 \pm 1.3)$	$(11.1 \pm 1.0)/(10.4 \pm 1.6)$	$(6.8 \pm 1.2)/(6.9 \pm 1.3)$	$(9\pm1.3)/(10\pm1.6)$	$(8.9 \pm 1.1)/(9.2 \pm 1.1)$	$(3.7 \pm 1.3)/(3.6 \pm 1.2)$	$(5.8 \pm 2.3)/(5.4 \pm 2.6)$	$(10.79 \pm 4.99)/$
(T/C)	280 (160/ 120)	42 (21/21)	48 (24/24)	59 (29/30)	58 (29/29)	60 (30/30)	89 (46/43)	86 (43/43)	64 (32/32)	54 (27/27)	60 (30/30)	100 (50/50)	120 (60/60)	68 (34/34)
Age (T/C)	$58.13/56.14\pm0$	52.35/51.15	54.5	$(57.6 \pm 7.1)/(55.8 \pm 7.2)$	$(53.4 \pm 10.8)/(52.3 \pm 10.5)$	(45~82)/(42~80)	$(52.1 \pm 6.3)/(51.3 \pm 6.5)$	(54.9±7.1)/(53.5±6.3)	$(53.7 \pm 4.2)/(52.8 \pm 4.1)$	$(58.2 \pm 6.3)/(59.1 \pm 5.4)$	$(60.5 \pm 5.5)/(59.3 \pm 5.2)$	$(54.2\pm1.9)/(53.6\pm1.8)$	$(56.9 \pm 3.5)/(58.2 \pm 3.2)$	$(52.64 \pm 8.81)/$
Author, year	Zhenying Mao 2003	Shiyun Li 2008	Kaiwang Xiong 2011	Ming Li 2011	Hongqiang Lei 2013	Yuping Liu 2013	Huanxu Chen 2014	Qinghua Chen 2015	Wenchao Shen 2015	Xiaoxiang Liu 2015	Chang Liu 2016	Lin Bo 2016	Shaoping Zhuo 2016	Renzhi Jing 2017

included DCT 5 17 • ÷ ... ñ ć

## 6

## Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine

			J.T.	ADLE 2. CUIL	man.				
Author, year	Age (T/C)	Number (T/C)	Duration of disease (T/C, year)	Gender (M/F)	Intervention (T)	Intervention (C)	Course	Outcomes	Region
Xiaobo Hao 2017	$(54.5 \pm 5.5)/(53.5 \pm 5.0)$	98 (49/49)	$(15.0 \pm 4.0)/(14.5 \pm 3.6)$	T (26/ 23) C (27/ 22)	Wuling powder + RT	RT	12 w	000000000	Zhoukou, Henan
Jing Chen 2017	$(54.92 \pm 5.25)/$ $(53.65 \pm 5.63)$	150 (75/75)	$(5.39 \pm 0.58)/$ $(5.52 \pm 0.62)$	T (54/21) C (51/ 24)	Wuling powder + RT	Gliquidone	8 w	9	Hebi, Henan
Qiyao Xin 2017	$(50.57 \pm 15.17)/(52.57 \pm 15.77)$	60 (30/30)	$(12.25 \pm 3.77)/$ $(13.17 \pm 2.12)$	T (16/14) C (18/12) T (28/	Wuling powder + RT	RT	2 w	2000 000	Guangdong, Guangzhou
Yu Wang 2018	$(69.21 \pm 1.30)/$ $(69.58 \pm 1.65)$	90 (45/45)	NR	1 (20) 17) C (29/ 16)	Wuling powder + RT	RT	3 W	(D)	Zunhua, Hebei
Yuanyuan Lai 2019	$(64.3 \pm 10.5)/$ $(64.5 \pm 10.4)$	72 (36/36)	NR	T (21/15) C (20/ 16)	Wuling powder + RT	RT	12 w	Ø	Beijing
Yunyun Zuo 2020	63/62.50	84 (42/42)	6.50/5.50	T (19/17) C (20/ 18)	Wuling powder + RT	RT	8 w	0 0 0	Urumqi, Xinjiang
Yimei Li 2020	(35–75)/(35–75)	70 (35/35)	(5-21)/(5-21)	T (26/9) C (20/ 15)	Wuling powder + RT	RT	8 w	000000	Jinan, Shandong
Yutian Chen 2020	$(54.16 \pm 12.57)/(50.89 \pm 12.12)$	80 (40/40)	(6.32 ± 2.754)/ (5.24 ± 2.604)	T (27/ 13) C (23/ 17)	Wuling powder + RT	RT	8 w	ଡ଼ଡ଼ଡ଼ଡ଼ଡ଼ଡ଼	Guangdong, Guangzhou
Xiaoting Wen 2020	55.5	40 (20/20)	3~15	18/22 T (26/	Wuling powder + RT	RT	4 w	000	Qitaihe, Heilongjiang
Zhixiang Jiang 2021	$(59.3 \pm 2.8)/(58.6 \pm 2.8)$	86 (43/43)	(7.5±1.7)/(7.2±1.6)	1 (20) 17) C (28/ 15)	Wuling powder + RT	RT	4 w	000	Ezhou, Hubei
(					()				

TABLE 2: Continued.

T: treatment group; C: control group; F: female; M: male; NR: not reported; W: week; RT: western conventional treatment; ①24 h urine volume; ②24 h urine protein quantification; ③Serum creatinine; ④blood urea nitrogen; ⑤ urinary albumin excretion rate; ⑥ fasting blood glucose; ②glycated hemoglobin; ③total cholesterol; ③triglyceride; @high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; ⑪low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; @lotal effective rate; @adverse reactions.



FIGURE 3: Risk of bias.

found in UAER between the treatment and control groups (WMD = -24.73; 95% CI [-35.46, -13.99], p < 0.00001; Figure 9), indicating that the UAER was significantly better in the treatment group. A subgroup analysis suggested the intervention effect was not significantly different in age (p = 0.11) and duration of treatment (p = 0.93) but showed an obvious difference in regions (p = 0.02), with no heterogeneity in the Guangdong region ( $\chi^2 = 0.24$ , p = 0.62,  $I^2 = 0\%$ ) and the rest still observed significant heterogeneity (Table 3, Supplementary Material Figures 11–13).

3.4.6. FBG. 11 RCTs [15, 18, 20, 23, 26, 28, 29, 31, 34-36] (including 1,013 patients) reported the FBG data. Tests showed significant heterogeneity ( $\chi^2 = 38.24$ , p < 0.0001,  $I^2 = 74\%$ ; Figure 10), so a REM was adopted for metaanalysis. The analysis results revealed a statistically significant difference in FBG between the treatment and control groups (WMD = -0.63; 95% CI [-0.97, -0.30], p = 0.002; Figure 10), suggesting that Wuling powder combined with conventional western medicine may significantly reduce the FBG in DN patients. Based on different ages, control treatments, durations of treatment, regions, and safety, the subgroup analysis was conducted, and the results showed no significant differences in intervention effects (p = 0.49, 0.45, 0.49, 0.67, and 0.78, respectively); no heterogeneity was found in the  $\ge 60$  years group ( $\chi^2 = 0.26$ , p = 0.61,  $I^2 = 0\%$ ) in the age subgroup and in Guangdong Province ( $\chi^2 = 0.26$ , p = 0.61,  $I^2 = 0\%$ ) in the region, while significant heterogeneity was still observed in the rest (Table 3, Supplementary Material Figures 14–18).

3.4.7. Glycated Hemoglobin. 6 RCTs [18, 23, 27, 34–36] (including 467 patients) reported the glycated hemoglobin. A REM was adopted because significant heterogeneity was found among them ( $\chi^2 = 11.16$ , p = 0.05,  $I^2 = 55\%$ ; Figure 11). The glycated hemoglobin between the treatment and control groups was statistically significant (WMD = -0.11; 95% CI [-0.30, 0.08], p = 0.26; Figure 11), indicating that it was significantly better in patients treated with the Wuling powder combined with conventional western medicine. Subgroup analysis showed no significant difference in

intervention effects in age (p = 0.56) and region (p = 0.01), with no heterogeneity in Guangdong Province ( $\chi^2 = 0.32$ , p = 0.57,  $I^2 = 0\%$ ), while significant heterogeneity was still observed in the rest (Table 3, Supplementary Material Figures 19 and 20).

3.4.8. Blood Lipids. (1) 9 RCTs [15–18, 20, 21, 26, 29, 36] (856 patients) reported the TC and high heterogeneity was found ( $\chi^2 = 228.38$ , p < 0.00001,  $I^2 = 96\%$ ; Figure 12). The REM analysis results showed the TC was statistically significant (WMD = -0.63; 95% CI [-1.23, -0.04], p = 0.04; Figure 12). In the subgroup analysis, the differences in age, control treatment, duration of treatment, and region (p = 0.06, 0.22, 0.05, and 0.99, respectively) were not statistically significant (Table 3, Supplementary Material Figures 21–24).

(2) 11 RCTs [15–18, 20, 21, 26, 28, 29, 35, 36] (994 patients) reported TG values and the heterogeneity was high ( $\chi^2 = 222.98$ , p < 0.00001,  $I^2 = 96\%$ ; Figure 13). The REM analysis results showed (WMD = -0.46; 95% CI [-0.70, -0.23], p = 0.0001; Figure 13) the differences in TG between the two groups were statistically significant. In the subgroup analysis, the differences were not statistically significant in age, control treatment, and duration of treatment (p = 0.08, 0.11, and 0.7, respectively), were statistically significant in regions (p < 0.0001), and not heterogeneous in Guangdong Province (p = 0.69, I2 = 0%) (Table 3, Supplementary Material Figures 25–28).

(3) RCTs [18, 21, 28, 29, 35] (384 patients) recorded HDL values with a test for heterogeneity ( $\chi^2 = 137.26$ , p < 0.00001, I2 = 97%; see Figure 14), indicating high heterogeneity, and using a random effects model, the results showed (WMD = -0.32; 95% CI [0.03, 0.62], p = 0.03; see Figure 14), the difference between the two groups was statistically significant. In the subgroup analysis, the differences were statistically significant across sessions and regions (all p = 0.0002) (Table 3, Supplementary Material Figures 29 and 30).

(4) 4 RCTs [18, 21, 28, 29] (314 patients) recorded LDL values, and the heterogeneity among them was proved to be high ( $\chi^2 = 10.28$ , p = 0.02,  $I^2 = 71\%$ ; Figure 15), which became lower after the study by Chen et al. [21] was removed ( $\chi^2 = 3.34$ , p = 0.19,  $I^2 = 40\%$ ; Figure 15), so the



FIGURE 4: Summary chart of risk of bias.

difference between the two groups was statistically significant using a FEM (WMD = -0.57; 95% CI [-0.77, -0.37], p < 0.00001). In the subgroup analysis, the differences were statistically significant in control treatment and region (all p = 0.02) (Table 3, Supplementary Material Figures 31 and 32).

In summary, Wuling powder showed better performance compared with the conventional methods in the treatment of DN in terms of TC, TG, HDL-C, and LDL-C.

3.4.9. TER. The TER was categorized as markedly effective, effective, and ineffective according to the improvement degree in clinical symptoms and related indicators (mainly 24 h urine volume, 24 h UPQ, Scr, BUN, UAER, and FBG). 19 RCTs [15–17, 20–22, 24, 25, 27–34, 36–38] involving 1,657 patients undertook the TER as an outcome indicator. As there was no significant heterogeneity ( $\chi^2 = 21.92$ , p = 0.24, I<sup>2</sup> = 18%; Figure 16), an FEM was used. The analysis showed that Wuling powder resulted in a significant increase in TER compared to conventional treatment (RR = 1.40; 95% CI [1.32, 1.48]; p < 0.00001; Figure 16). Subgroup analysis based on age, control treatment, duration of treatment, and region showed no significant differences (p = 0.72, 0.45, 0.37, and 0.79, respectively) (Table 3, Supplementary Material Figures 33–36).

3.5. Adverse Effects. Adverse reactions were reported in 2 out of 24 RTCs. The adverse reactions reported in the study by Shen and Shu [23] were nausea, vomiting, abdominal distension, diarrhea, skin rash, and mild hypoglycemia; while those reported by Jing et al. [28] included nausea, vomiting, back pain, skin pruritus, swelling of lower limbs, thirst, and excessive drinking. No adverse reactions were reported in the remaining RCTs.

3.6. Publication Bias. Funnel plots were plotted for studies with >10 literature on combined outcome indicators, and 24 h urine volume, 24 h UPQ, Scr, BUN, UAER, FBG, glycated hemoglobin, TC, TG, HDL-C, LDL-C, and TER after treatment showed significant asymmetry in the funnel plots (Figures 17–28), indicating publication bias in the included studies.

3.7. Certainty of Evidence. The GRADEpro was employed to assess the certainty of the evidence in this study. Table 4 showed that the results of 24 h urine output, LDL, and TER were moderate-quality evidence, while other outcomes were low-quality evidences. The high heterogeneity of some outcomes, the low methodological quality, and the high risk of bias were reasons for the poor quality of the evidence. Therefore, Wuling powder should be considered cautiously in the clinical use for DN treatment.

#### 4. Discussion

4.1. Results. As one of the common vascular disease complications in DM patients, DN seriously affects the prognosis of patients and should be treated as early as possible. In recent years, TCM has become an essential adjunctive drug treatment for most Chinese patients with DN due to its stable efficacy and low side effects. Many studies confirm that the combination of Wuling powder with conventional symptomatic supportive treatment for DN is effective in

	Exp	erimenta	ıl	Contro	1		Weight	Mean difference	Mean difference
Study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, fixed, 95% CI	IV, fixed, 95% CI
Chang Liu 2016	1,719.35	357.36	30	1,479.37	367.98	30	3.7	239.98 [56.43, 423.53]	
Kaiwang Xiong 2011	1,236	134.6	24	842	93.4	24	28.7	394.00 [328.46, 459.54]	
Shiyun Li 2008	1,200	111	21	830	59	21	42.7	370.00 [316.24, 423.76]	
Xiaoting Wen 2020	1,190	143	20	865	97.23	20	21.5	325.00 [249.21, 400.79]	
Xiaoxiang Liu 2015	1,709.24	346.25	27	1,468.26	356.87	27	3.5	240.98 [53.42, 428.54]	
YuWang 2018	1,769.65	2.35	45	1,459.52	2.36	45		Not estimable	
Total (95% CI)			122			122	100.0	357.95 [322.83, 393.06]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi2	= 5.16, df	= 4 ( <i>P</i> =	0.27); 1	$2^2 = 23\%$					
Test for overall effect	L: Z = 19.98	8 (P < 0.0)	00001)						-500 $-250$ $0$ $250$ $50$
							Favours [experimental] Favours [control]		

FIGURE 5: Forest plot of 24 h urine volum
---

	Number of comparisons	Results	P value for overall effect	I 2	P value for subgroup difference
24h urine volume		WMD (95% CI)			
All comparisons	6	335.13 [295.01, 375.26]	< 0.00001	59%	
Age					0.01
<60 y	4	360.83 [320.76, 400.91]	< 0.00001	15%	
≥60y	2	310.13 [309.15, 311.10]	< 0.00001	0%	
Region					0.14
Beijing	2	240.47 [109.29, 371.65]	0.0003	0%	
Other provinces	4	344.68 [299.76, 389.59]	< 0.00001	73%	
24h UPQ					
All comparisons	13	-1.30 [-1.82, -0.78]	< 0.00001	98%	
Age					0.002
<60 y	12	-1.44 [-2.01, -0.87]	< 0.00001	99%	
≥60 y	1	$-0.44 \ [-0.69, \ -0.19]$	0.0005	NA	
Different control treatment					< 0.0001
Gliquidone	3	-0.45 $[-0.54, -0.35]$	< 0.00001	0%	
Other treatments	10	-2.15 [-2.95, -1.35]	< 0.00001	99%	
Course of treatment					0.05
<8 w	5	-2.63 [-4.16, -1.11]	0.0007	99%	
≥8 w	8	-1.00 $[-1.53, -0.47]$	0.0002	98%	
Region					< 0.00001
Guangdong province	2	-117.95 [-129.88, -106.02]	< 0.00001	0%	
Other provinces	11	-0.90 $[-1.28, -0.52]$	< 0.00001	97%	
SCr					
All comparisons	14	-10.17 [-11.13, -9.21]	< 0.00001	100%	
Course of treatment					0.11
<8 w	6	-2.44 [-2.99, -1.89]	< 0.00001	99%	
≥8 w	8	-11.16 [-21.76, -0.57]	0.04	98%	
Region					0.007
Guangdong province	4	-19.36 [-27.52, -11.20]	< 0.00001	90%	
Other provinces	10	-8.12 [-9.10, -7.13]	< 0.00001	100%	
BUN					
All comparisons	10	-1.62 [-2.30, -0.93]	< 0.00001	93%	
Course of treatment					0.26
<8 w	4	-2.01 [ $-2.79$ , $-1.23$ ]	< 0.00001	81%	
≥8 w	6	-1.40 [ $-2.12$ , $-0.67$ ]	0.0002	86%	
Region					0.41
Guangdong province	4	-1.32 [-2.16, -0.48]	0.002	83%	
Other provinces	6	-1.86 [-2.83, -0.89]	0.0002	95%	
UAER					
All comparisons	6	-24.73 [-35.46, -13.99]	< 0.00001	96%	
Age					0.11
<60 y	5	-22.49 [-34.09, -10.89]	0.0001	97%	

TABLE 3: Subgroup analysis.

	Number of		P value		P value
	comparisons	Results	for overall effect	I 2	for subgroup difference
≥60 y	1	-38.41 [-53.97, -22.85]	< 0.00001	NA	
Course of treatment					0.93
<8 w	2	-24.55 [-40.91, -8.18]	0.003	99%	
≥8 w	4	-25.73 [-44.46, -7.00]	0.007	89%	
Region	2		0.00001	0.04	0.02
Guangdong province	2	-32.79 [ $-35.33$ , $-30.25$ ]	< 0.00001	0%	
	4	-20.21 [-30.58, -9.84]	0.0001	88%	
All comparisons	11	-0.63 [-0.97, -0.30]	0.0002	74%	
Age					0.49
<60 y	9	-0.69 [-1.13, -0.25]	0.002	79%	
≥60 y	2	-0.52 [-0.76, -0.28]	<0.0001	0%	
Different control treatment	2		0.04		0.45
Gliquidone Other treatments	3	-0.87 [ $-1.72$ , $-0.03$ ]	0.04	70%	
Other treatments	8	-0.52 [-0.85, -0.20]	0.002	08%	0.40
Course of treatment	1	_0.84 [_1.38 _0.30]	0.002	NΔ	0.49
<8 w	10	-0.61 [-0.98, -0.25]	0.002	76%	
Region					0.67
Guangdong province	2	-0.73 [-1.07, -0.39]	< 0.0001	0%	0107
Other provinces	9	-0.61 [-1.04, -0.19]	0.005	78%	
Safety					0.78
No adverse effects	9	-0.62 [ $-0.96$ , $-0.28$ ]	0.0004	72%	
Adverse effects	2	-0.88 [-2.71, 0.95]	0.34	89%	
HbA1C					
All comparisons	6	-0.11 [-0.30, 0.08]	0.26	55%	
Age					0.56
<60 y	5	-0.08 [ $-0.34$ , $0.18$ ]	0.57	64%	
≥60 y	1	-0.17 [-0.35, 0.01]	0.07	NA	
Region	2		0.0000	00/	0.01
Other province	2	-0.35 [-0.55, -0.14]	0.0008	0% 40%	
	4	0.02 [-0.19, 0.23]	0.87	4070	
All comparisons	9	-0.63 $[-1.23, -0.04]$	< 0.0001	96%	
Age	-		(010001	2070	0.06
<60 v	8	-0.72 [-1.36, -0.07]	0.03	97%	0.00
≥60 y	1	0.06 [-0.42, 0.54]	0.81	NA	
Different control treatment					0.22
Gliquidone	3	-0.14 $[-1.00, 0.73]$	0.75	92%	
Other treatments	6	-0.88 $[-1.68, -0.08]$	0.03	97%	
Course of treatment					0.05
<8 w	3	-1.70 [-3.24, -0.16]	0.03	99%	
≥8 w	6	-0.10 [-0.56, 0.35]	0.65	88%	
Region	2		0.50	000/	0.99
Guangdong province	2	-0.64 [-2.98, 1.69]	0.59	99%	
	/	-0.03 [-1.23, -0.02]	0.04	9070	
All comparisons	11	-0.46 [ $-0.70$ $-0.23$ ]	0.0001	96%	
	11	0.40 [ 0.70, 0.25]	0.0001	2070	0.08
<60 v	10	-0.50 [-0.74, -0.25]	< 0.0001	96%	0.00
≥60 y	1	-0.05 [-0.49, 0.39]	0.82	NA	
Different control treatment					0.11
Gliquidone	3	-0.27 [-0.45, -0.09]	0.003	56%	
Other treatments	8	-0.55 [-0.83, -0.26]	0.0002	95%	

	Number of comparisons	Results	<i>P</i> value for overall	I 2	<i>P</i> value for subgroup
Course of treatment			cheet		0.7
<8 w	3	-0.38 [-0.89, 0.13]	0.14	98%	0.7
≥8 w	8	-0.49 [-0.72, -0.25]	< 0.0001	86%	
Region		L / J			< 0.00001
Guangdong province	2	-0.84 [-0.89, -0.79]	< 0.00001	0%	(0)00001
Other provinces	9	-0.36 [-0.55, -0.17]	0.0002	87%	
HDL- C		<u> </u>			
All comparisons	5	0.32 [0.03, 0.62]	0.03	97%	
Course of treatment		<b>L</b> · J			0.0002
<8 w	1	1.06 [0.72, 1.40]	< 0.00001	NA	
≥8 w	4	0.17 [-0.14, 0.48]	0.27	97%	
Region					0.0002
Guangdong province	1	1.06 [0.72, 1.40]	< 0.00001	NA	
Other provinces	4	0.17 [-0.14, 0.48]	0.27	97%	
LDL-C					
All comparisons	4	-0.72 $[-1.10, -0.34]$	0.0002	71%	
Course of treatment					0.02
<8 w	1	-1.17 [-1.57, -0.77]	< 0.00001	NA	
≥8 w	3	-0.56 [-0.87, -0.24]	0.0005	40%	
Region					0.02
Guangdong province	1	-1.17 $[-1.57, -0.77]$	< 0.00001	NA	
Other provinces	3	-0.56 [-0.87, -0.24]	0.0005	40%	
Total effective rate					
All comparisons	19	1.40 [1.32, 1.48]	< 0.00001	18%	
Age					0.72
<60 y	14	1.39 [1.31, 1.48]	< 0.00001	27%	
≥60 y	5	1.43 [1.26, 1.62]	< 0.00001	0%	
Different control treatment					0.45
Gliquidone	3	1.35 [1.22, 1.50]	< 0.00001	15%	
Other treatments	16	1.42 [1.32, 1.51]	< 0.00001	26%	
Course of treatment					0.37
<8 w	10	1.44 [1.32, 1.58]	< 0.00001	11%	
≥8 w	9	1.37 [1.27, 1.47]	< 0.00001	28%	
Region					0.79
Guangdong province	5	1.41 [1.27, 1.58]	< 0.00001	54%	
Other provinces	14	1.39 [1.30, 1.48]	< 0.00001	7%	

TABLE 3: Continued.

alleviating the clinical symptoms, improving renal function, stabilizing FBG, and lowering TG. It is safe and reliable with good clinical application and promotion value.

This study included 24 studies and found that Wuling powder exerted a positive effect on the clinical management of DN. This meta-analysis study provided a sound theoretical basis for the application of Wuling powder in the treatment of DN. Therefore, the results of this study may provide an important reference for the adjuvant treatment of DN with TCM.

Although our results were statistically significant, some of the results were subject to greater heterogeneity. The outcome markers were divided into subgroups based on characteristics of the patients such as different age, control treatment, duration of treatment, and region for comparison to seek reasons for heterogeneity. In the subgroup analysis, 24 h urine volume reduced heterogeneity after different age subgroup analysis, 24 h urine protein quantification reduced heterogeneity after control treatment and regional subgroup analysis, urine albumin excretion rate reduced heterogeneity after regional subgroup analysis, FBG reduced heterogeneity after age and regional subgroup analysis, and glycated hemoglobin and TG both reduced heterogeneity after regional subgroup analysis. It is worth noting that most of the outcome indicators showed lower heterogeneity in the Guangdong region, which may be related to the origin of the herbs. In contrast, significant heterogeneity was observed in Scr and BUN. The subgroup analysis was performed and there were no significant differences in intervention effects between groups, and the size of such heterogeneity was not reduced following the use of a REM.

It is believed that these heterogeneities arise from the following points. Firstly, the reasons for the large heterogeneity are most likely related to the variety, origin,

## Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine

	]	Experim	ental	Cor	trol			Mean difference		Mea	n diffe	erence	-
Study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	(%) IV, Random, 95% CI		IV, Ra	ndom,	95% CI	
Hongqiang Lei 2013	1.08	0.52	29	2.93	0.61	29	9.8	1.85 [-2.14, -1.56]					
Kaiwang Xiong 2011	0.71	0.18	24	1.48	0.38	24	10.0	-0.77 [-0.94, -0.60]		-	-		
Lin Bo 2018	0.65	0.53	50	1.13	0.63	50	10.0	-0.48 [ $-0.71$ , $-0.25$ ]					
Qiyao Xin 2017	107.04	11.83	30	224.41	31.62	30	0.2	-117.37 [-129.45, -105.29]	•				
Shiyun Li 2008	0.62	0.25	21	1.1	0.4	21	10.0	-0.48 $[-0.68, -0.28]$			-		
Wenchao Shen 2015	60.2	8.3	32	92.4	9.6	32	1.2	-32.20 [-36.60, -27.80]	•				
Xiaobo Hao 2017	0.8	0.3	49	1	0.3	49	10.1	-0.20 $[-0.32, -0.08]$			-		
Xiaoting Wen 2020	2.35	1.22	20	3.12	0.45	20	9.1	-0.77 [-1.34, -0.20]			_		
Xiaoxiang Liu 2015	1.43	0.81	27	2.97	0.89	27	9.4	-1.54 $[-1.99, -1.09]$					
Yimei Li 2020	1.76	0.26	35	1.8	0.25	35	10.1	-0.04 [ $-0.16$ , $0.08$ ]			4		
Yuping Liu 2013	0.68	0.57	30	1.12	0.384	30	9.9	-0.44 [ $-0.69$ , $-0.19$ ]			_		
Yutian Chen 2020	705.26	205.49	40	846.42	135.86	40	0.0	-141.16 [-217.50, -64.82]	•				
Zhenying Mao 2003	0.68	0.57	160	1.12	0.38	120	10.1	-0.44 [-0.55, -0.33]			-		
Total (95% CI)			547			507	100.0	-1.30 [-1.82, -0.78]					
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	= 0.70; Cł	$ni^2 = 760$	).27, d	f = 12 (P	< 0.000	01); I <sup>2</sup>	= 98%						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.89	(P < 0.0)	0001)									1	-
		-	,						$^{-4}$	-2	0	2	4
									Favor	urs [experimenta	ıl]	Favours [control]	

FIGURE 6: Forest plot for 24 h UPQ.

	]	Experir	nental	Con	trol			Mean difference	Mean di	fference
Study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	t (%) IV, Random, 95% C	I IV, Rando	m, 95% CI
Hongqiang Lei 2013	134.3	23.6	29	157.4	23.7	29	0.6	-23.10 [-35.27, -10.93]		
huanxu Chen 2014	82.2	6.8	46	108.5	7.1	43	7.3	-26.30 [-29.19, -23.41]	*	
Kaiwang Xiong 2011	0.26	0.06	24	0.36	0.05	24	21.7	-0.10 [-0.13, -0.07]		
Ming Li 2011	78	10	29	83	11	30	2.8	-5.00 [-10.36, 0.36]	-	
Qiyao Xin 2017	92.31	22.36	30	108.52	25.73	30	0.6	-16.21 [-28.41, -4.01]		
Renzhi Jing 2017	77.2	12.3	34	87.4	12	34	2.5	-10.20 [-15.98, -4.42]	-	
Shaoping Zhuo 2016	76.26	15	60	100.15	10	60	3.7	-23.89 [-28.45, -19.33]		
Xiaobo Hao 2017	94	17	49	81	15	49	2.1	13.00 [6.65, 19.35]		-
Xiaoting Wen 2020	0.25	0.06	20	0.35	0.06	20	21.7	-0.10 [-0.14, -0.06]		
Xiaoxiang Liu 2015	245.15	82.46	27	293.11	53.88	27	0.1	-47.96 [-85.11, -10.81]		
Yimei Li 2020	112.26	16.46	35	115.66	15.22	35	1.6	-3.40 [-10.83, 4.03]		-
Yutian Chen 2020	103.62	11.04	40	112.81	14.05	40	2.6	-9.19 [-14.73, -3.65]		
Zhenying Mao 2003	116.26	4.73	160	144	3.92	120	17.5	-27.74 [-28.75, -26.73]		
Zhixiang Jiang 2021	37.31	2.57	43	48.96	3.62	43	15.3	-11.65 [-12.98, -10.32]		
Total (95% CI)			626			584	100.0	-10.17 [-11.13, -9.21]	·	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	= 1.11; (	Chi <sup>2</sup> =	3628.5	9, df = 1	3 (P < )	0.00001	); $I^2 = 1$	00%	100 -50 (	50 100
Test for overall effect:	<i>Z</i> = 20	.75 (P <	< 0.000	01)					Favours [experimental	] Favours [control]

Figure	7:	Forest	pl	ot	of	Scr.
--------	----	--------	----	----	----	------

	E	xperir	nental	Cor	ntrol		Weight	Mean difference		Mean	n diffe	rence	
Study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% C	I	IV, Rar	dom,	95% CI	
Hongqiang Lei 2013	8.7	3.7	29	11.8	3.9	29	6.3	-3.10 [-5.06, -1.14]			_		
huanxu Chen 2014	3.4	1.1	46	5.3	1.3	43	11.9	-1.90 [-2.40, -1.40]			•		
Qiyao Xin 2017	7.47	2.71	30	8.42	1.68	30	9.4	-0.95 [-2.09, 0.19]					
Renzhi Jing 2017	6.16	1.57	34	8.72	1.61	34	11.0	-2.56 [-3.32, -1.80]		-	•		
Shaoping Zhuo 2016	6.1	1.84	60	6.5	1.34	60	11.6	$-0.40 \left[-0.98, 0.18 ight]$			1		
Xiaoxiang Liu 2015	12.41	6.95	27	14.54	6.41	27	2.9	-2.13 [-5. 70, 1.44]					
Yimei Li 2020	9.45	1.9	35	9.6	1.34	35	10.9	-0.15 [-0.92, 0.62]			+		
Yutian Chen 2020	4.75	1.81	40	6.7	1.52	40	11.1	-1.95 [-2.68, -1.22]			•		
Zhenying Mao 2003	5.88	1.32	160	7.08	1.46	120	12.3	-1.20 [-1.53, -0.87]			•		
Zhixiang Jiang 2021	6.12	0.38	43	8.79	0.41	43	12.6	-2.67 [-2.84, -2.50]			•		
Total (95% CI)			504			461	100.0	-1.62 [-2.30, -0.93]			▼		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.98; C	hi² = 1	37.59,	df = 9 (.	P < 0.0	)0001);	$I^2 = 93\%$	)					+
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.59	P < 0	0.00001	)				=	-20	-10	0	10	20
									Fav	ours [experiment	ntal]	Favours [contro	ol]

	1	Experimental Control				Weight	Mean differenc	e	Mean difference					
Study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95%	CI	IV, R	landom,	95% CI		
huanxu Chen 2014	54.5	6.1	46	87.4	6.3	43	19.8	32.90 [-35.48, -30	).32]	*				
Ming Li 2011	40.3	23.1	29	73.7	42.8	30	13.1	-33.40 [-50.87, -15	5.93]		-			
Renzhi Jing 2017	39.52	11.16	34	45.35	11.52	34	19.0	-5.83 [-11.22, -0	).44]					
Shaoping Zhuo 2016	146	39	60	175	46	60	14.2	-29.00 [-44.26, -13	3.74]		-			
Yuping Liu 2013	102.16	22.45	30	140.57	37.23	30	14.1	-38.41 [-53.97, -22	2.85]					
Zhixiang Jiang 2021	22.42	6.58	43	38.62	5.44	43	19.8	-16.20 [-1 8.75,-13	3.65]					
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup>	- 149 92	• Chi <sup>2</sup>	242 - 128 -	55 df -	5(P<	240	100.0	-24.73 [-35.46, -13	3.99]	-	•			-
Test for overall effect	-1+7.72 $\cdot 7 - 45$	2(P < P)	0 0000	1)	5(1 <	0.0000	1), 1 = )	070	-100	-50	0	50	1	100
rest for overall effect		Favou	ırs [experime	ntal]	Favours	[control]								

FIGURE 9: Forest plot of UAER.

Study or subgroup	Experimental Mean SD Total		Control Mean SD Total		Weight (%)	Mean difference IV. Random, 95% CI	Mean difference IV. Random, 95% CI		
Lin D-2016	7.1.4	1.25	50	0 66	1.21	50	10.9	1.52[2.00, 1.04]	
Lin Bo2016	/.14	1.23	50	0.00	1.21	50	10.8	-1.32 [-2.00, -1.04]	
Ming Li 2011	6.05	0.92	29	6.09	0.9	30	11.0	-0.04 [-0.50, 0.42]	I
Qiyao Xin 2017	6.37	1.03	30	7.21	1.09	30	10.2	-0.84 $[-1.38, -0.30]$	-
Renzhi Jing 2017	5.48	2.66	34	7.35	1.64	34	5.8	-1.87 [ $-2.92$ , $-0.82$ ]	
Wenchao Shen 2015	6.2	1.2	32	6.2	1.2	32	9.7	0.00 [-0.59, 0.59]	+
Xiaobo Hao 2017	6.2	1.2	49	7.6	3.5	49	5.9	-1.40 [-2.44, -0.36]	-
Yimei Li 2020	8.94	1.28	35	8.85	1.24	35	9.7	0.09 [-0.50, 0.68]	+
yunyun Zuo 2020	6.47	0.62	36	7	0.43	38	13.0	-0.53 [-0.77, -0.29]	-
Yuping Liu 2013	7.01	2.15	30	7.24	2.31	30	5.4	-0.23 [-1.36, 0.90]	
Yutian Chen 2020	7.04	1.08	40	7.7	0.89	40	11.3	-0.66 [-1.09, -0.23]	*
Zhenying Mao 2003	11.23	3.87	160	11.78	3.42	120	7.2	-0.55 [-1.41, 0.31]	
Total (95% CI)			525			488	100.0	-0.63 $[-0.97, 0.30]$	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	= 0.21; C	$hi^2 = 3$	8.24,, č	lf = 10 (	P < 0	.0001);	$I^2 = 74\%$		
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.73$ ( $P = 0.0002$ )									-10 -5 0 5 10
fest for overall effect.									Favours Favours
									[experimental] [control]



	Experimental			Cor	ntrol		Weight	Mean difference	Mean difference
Study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Ming Li 2011	6.3	0.4	29	6.2	0.7	30	18.3	0.10 [-0.19, 0.39]	
Shaoping Zhuo 2016	6.5	0.5	60	6.8	0.9	60	19.9	-0.30 [-0.56, -0.04]	
Wenchao Shan 2015	6.5	1	32	6.3	0.8	32	11.5	0.20 [-0.24, 0.64]	-+=
Wenchao Shan 2015	7.71	1.13	35	7.48	1.12	35	9.1	0.23 [-0.30, 0.76]	
yunyun Zuo 2020	6.9	0.28	36	7.07	0.49	38	24.9	-0.17 [-0.35, 0.01]	=
Yutian Chen 2020	6.53	0.76	40	6.95	0.73	40	16.3	-0.42 [-0.75, -0.09]	
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.03; C	hi <sup>2</sup> = 1	232 1.16, di	f = 5 (P	= 0.05	235 5); $I^2 = 1$	-0.11 [-0.30, 0.08]	↓	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.13	B(P = 0)	).26)			,,			4 -2 0 2 4
									Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

FIGURE 11: Forest plot of glycated hemoglobin.

harvesting season, storage and processing, dosage form, and route of administration of the herbal medicines. Such contents are not described in detail in the literature, So they could not be analyzed further in this study. Secondly, only 24 relevant studies were included in this study, and most of them only mentioned the word simple randomisation without considering the specific implementation methods, which affected the scientific validity of the study results. In addition, three studies [31, 34, 36] reported allocation concealment and only one study [31] reported the use of a double-blind trial. The rest studies did not report the allocation concealment and were unblinded, which was susceptible to a variety of artifacts and may lead to heterogeneity with different study participants and various interventions. The randomization grouping resulted in selective bias, which could reduce the overall quality of the

## Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine

	Experimental		nental	Cor	ntrol		Weight	Mean difference	Mean difference
Study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
huanxu Chen 2014	2.73	0.56	46	4.56	0.92	43	11.3	-1.83 [-2.15, -1.51]	
Kaiwang Xiong 2011	3.68	0.76	24	6.7	0.98	24	10.8	-3.02 [-3.52, -2.52]	
Lin Bo 2016	4.71	1.1	50	4.25	1.04	50	11.1	0.46 [0.04, 0.88]	
Ming Li 2011	4.52	1.21	29	4.87	1.03	30	10.6	-0.35 [-0.92, 0.22]	
Shiyun Li 2008	4.06	0.35	21	4.34	0.23	21	11.6	-0.28 [-0.46, -0.10]	-
Xiaobo Hao 2017	5	0.5	49	5.4	0.7	49	11.5	-0.40 [-0.64, -0.16]	
Yuping Liu 2013	5.34	0.93	30	5.28	0.96	30	10.9	0.06 [-0.42, 0.54]	
Yutian Chen 2020	0.93	0.87	40	0.38	0.98	40	11.1	0.55 [0.14, 0.96]	
Zhenying Mao 2003	6.14	0.85	160	7.05	1.82	120	11.2	-0.91 [-1.26, -0.56]	-
Total (95% CI)			449			407	100.0	-0.36 [-1.23, -0.04]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.79; C	hi <sup>2</sup> = 2	28.38,	df = 8 (1)	P < 0.0	)0001);	$I^2=96\%$		
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.08$ ( $P = 0.04$ )								-	-4 $-2$ $0$ $2$ $4$
									Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

FIGURE 12: Forest plot of TC.

	Experimental		Cor	ntrol		Weight	Mean difference	Mean difference	
Study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	(%)	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
huanxu Chen 2014	0.74	0.13	46	1.58	0.11	43	10.5	-0.84 [-0.89, -0.79]	•
Kaiwang Xiong 2011	1.68	0.16	24	2.01	0.28	24	10.2	-0.33 [-0.46, -0.20]	*
Lin Bo 2016	1.98	0.26	50	2.19	0.35	50	10.2	-0.21 [-0.33, -0.09]	-
Ming Li 2011	1.84	0.89	29	2.37	1.13	30	7.0	-0.53 [-1.05, -0.01]	
Renzhi Jing 2017	2.04	0.35	34	2.86	0.42	34	9.9	-0.82 [-1.00, -0.64]	-
Shiyun Li 2008	1.84	0.27	21	1.79	0.39	21	9.8	0.05 [-0.15, 0.25]	+
Xiaobo Hao 2017	2.4	1.1	49	3.4	1	49	7.9	-1.00 [-1.42, -0.58]	
Yimei Li 2020	2.77	0.4	35	2.91	0.43	35	9.8	-0.14 [-0.33, 0.05]	-
Yuping Liu 2013	1.59	0.91	30	1.84	0.84	30	7.7	-0.05 [-0.49, 0.39]	-+-
Yutian Chen 2020	2.22	1.22	40	3.16	1.03	40	7.2	-0.94 [-1.43, -0.45]	
Zhenying Mao 2003	1.96	0.82	160	2.38	0.71	120	9.9	-0.42 [-0.60, -0.24]	-
Total (95% CI)			518			476	100.0	-0.46 [-0.70, -0.23]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.14; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 222.98, df = 18 ( $P < 0.00001$ ); $I^2 = 96\%$									
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.82	2(P = 0)	).0001)						-4 $-2$ $0$ $2$ $4$
									Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

FIGURE 13: Forest plot of TG.

Study or subgroup	Experimental Control Mean SD Total Mean SD Total			Weight	Mean difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Mean IV, Rano	difference dom, 95% CI				
huanxu Chen 2014	2.74	0.83	46	1.68	0.77	43	17.0	1.06 [0, 72, 1.40]	.,		
Ming Li 2011	1.23	0.45	29	1.18	0.53	30	18.9	0.05 [-0.20, 0.30]		+	
Renzhi Jing 2017	2.11	0.13	34	1.67	0.11	34	21.6	0.44 [0.38, 0.50]			
Xiaobo Hao 2017	1.5	0.3	49	1.2	0.3	49	21.1	0.30 [0.18, 0.42]		-	
Yimei Li 2020	0.62	0.14	35	0.73	0.21	35	21.4	0.11 [-0.19, -0.03]		1	
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0 Test for overall effect: Z	193  191  191  191  191  191  191  191							0.32 [0.03, 0.62] %	⊢ ⊢ −4 −2 Favours [experiment	0 4 al] Favours [conti	 2 rol]

FIGURE 14: Forest plot of HDL.

meta-analysis. Furthermore, some of the included studies did not mention the methods of testing for outcome indicators, and there were uncontrollable factors such as different experimental instruments, which affected the objectivity of the results. In addition, one study [34] had a shedding of participant data, which may affect the final analysis of the results. Meanwhile, some of the outcome indicators were combined despite high heterogeneity, which affected the reliability of the study. Taken together, these may have contributed to the high heterogeneity of some of the outcome indicators.

In addition, many other factors were evident in this study in terms of their impacts on the results. Firstly, the studies included in this study were limited to English and Chinese, and the final analysis was conducted on all Chinese literature, which would result in a potential publication bias.

Study or subgroup	Expe Mean	riment SD	al Total	Contro Mean	ol SD	Total	Weight (%)	Mean difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI	Mean difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI
huanxu Chen 2014 Ming Li 2011 Renzhi Jing 2017 Xiaobo Hao 2017	1.96 2.81 2.25 2.9	0.83 1.07 0.42	46 29 34 49	3.13 2.99 2.84 3.8	1.07 1.02 0.54	43 30 34 49	13.8 74.4 11.8	Not estimable -0.18 [-0.71, 0.35] -0.59 [-0.82, -0.36] -0.90 [-1.48 -0.32]	
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 3$ Test for overall effect: 7	2.9 3.34, df =	= 2 (P =	112 : 0.19);	$I^2 = 4$	%	113	100.0	-0.57[0.77, -0.37]	↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓
Test for overall effect: Z	- 5.05 (	<i>r</i> < 0.0	0001)						Favours [experimental] Favours [control]









FIGURE 17: The publication bias funnel chart of 24 h urine volume.

FIGURE 18: The publication bias funnel chart of 24 h UPQ.



FIGURE 19: The publication bias funnel chart of Scr.



FIGURE 20: The publication bias funnel chart of BUN.



FIGURE 21: The publication bias funnel chart of UAER.

While evidence-based treatment is a core aspect of TCM interventions, TCM places importance on the etiology of the disease. The studies included in this study tended to apply a specific drug without considering the individuality, diversity, and complexity of the DN, making it difficult to determine whether people in different studies had achieved true evidence-based treatment. Therefore, it is one of the



FIGURE 22: The publication bias funnel chart of FBG.



FIGURE 23: The publication bias funnel chart of glycated hemoglobin.



FIGURE 24: The publication bias funnel chart of TC.

larger reasons why the results were affected. In addition, there were different conventional Western medical treatments in the included studies. For example, some patients may also receive conventional treatments such as hypotension and lipid-lowering depending on their conditions. However, some of the studies failed to explain in detail what



FIGURE 25: The publication bias funnel chart of TG.



FIGURE 26: The publication bias funnel chart of HDL-C.



FIGURE 27: The publication bias funnel chart of LDL-C.

kind of Western medical treatment was adopted. In addition, whether the dose was controlled strictly would also be another factor resulting in publication bias. Clinical trials are concerned with the follow-up of patients' long-term outcomes. Most of the included studies were limited to a shortterm treatment after the drug intervention, which also impacts the bias in outcome efficacy. In the subgroup analysis, the cut-off points for age and duration of disease



FIGURE 28: The publication bias funnel chart of TER.

were mainly based on relevant studies, however, more biological support is needed. Finally, the funnel plot showed the publication bias in this study, which may be due to the ease of publishing positive results and the difficulty of publishing negative results, severely limiting the validity and objectivity of the efficacy of Wuling powder to treat DN. In addition, the results of the GRADE analysis showed that the reliability of the outcome indicators was mostly low to moderate. Therefore, Wuling powder could be cautiously recommended as an adjunctive treatment for DN.

4.2. Strengths and Limitations. The strengths of this study could be summarized as follows. Firstly, this was probably the first meta-analysis to assess the efficacy and safety of Wuling powder in the treatment of DN. Secondly, all the literature included were RCTs, ensuring the credibility of the results of this study. Thirdly, the results of this study provided a new therapeutic option for the treatment of DN. The results of this study suggested that the combination of the Wuling powder with conventional treatment for DN had positive clinical implications, which was superior to the Western medicine treatment alone. It implied that Wuling powder may enhance the effectiveness of conventional treatment and improve the overall clinical outcome, reflecting the uniqueness and superiority of TCM. Due to the holistic treatment theory, the use of TCM in the adjunctive treatment of disease is increasingly reported and researched. It is found that TCM can play a better therapeutic advantage in the treatment of both DN and its complications, and exert a positive effect on the safety, suffering reduction, and life improvement of patients. Systematically assessing the efficacy of TCM in DN and providing corresponding evidencebased medical evidence are of high significance to promote the TCM culture worldwide and search for new breakthroughs in the treatment of DN patients.

However, there are some limitations to this study. Firstly, it was limited by the quality of the literature. Most of the studies included in the study did not report allocation concealment and the use of blinding, leading to the measurement and implementation of various biases. Secondly, the included studies were RCTs with small samples and were of low quality. Thirdly, the lack of DN staging in most of the

		Importance	IMPORTANT		IMPORTANT		IMPORTANT		IMPORTANT		CRITICAL
		Certainty	□□\$\$ Low		□ □ îîî Low		□□\$\$ Low		□□1 Moderate		□□\$Moderate
	Effect	Absolute (95% CI)	MD 0.63 lower (1.23 lower to 0.04 lower)		MD 0.46 lower (0.7 lower to 0.23 lower)		MD 0.32 higher (0.03 higher to 0.62 higher)		MD 0.57 lower (0.77 lower to 0.37 lower)		255 more per 1,000 (from 204 more to 306 more)
		Relative (95% CI)	I				I		I		KK 1.40 (1.32 to 1.48)
	oatients	Placebo	407		476		191		113		515/808 (63.7%)
Continued.	Ne of <sub>I</sub>	Wuling powder	449		518		193		112		758/849 (89.3%)
TABLE 4: (		Other considerations	None		None		None		None		None
		Imprecision	Not serious		Not serious		Not serious		Not serious		Not serious
		Indirectness	Not serious		Not serious		Not serious		Not serious		Not serious
		Inconsistency	Serious		Serious		Serious		Not serious		Not serious
		Risk of bias	Serious		Serious		Serious		Serious		Serious
	y assessment	Study design	Randomized trials		Randomized trials		Randomized trials		Randomized trials	effective rate	Randomized trials
	Certaint	N⁰ of studies	TC 9	TG	11	HDL	5	TDT	3	Overall	19

studies in this study affected the effectiveness of Wuling powder in patients with different degrees of DN. In addition, the lack of a placebo prevented us from analysing the difference in efficacy between using and not using Wuling powder. Finally, the patients in this study were all selected from the Chinese region and may not be globally representative, with some degree of clinical bias applied.

## 5. Conclusion

In conclusion, Wuling powder combined with conventional drugs showed outstanding efficacy and positive effect in the treatment of DN. However, there were still some limitations in this systematic evaluation, so applying Wuling powder in clinical treatment should be considered cautiously. Therefore, some clinical studies with larger samples, higher study quality, and more rigorous study design should be taken in the future to validate the accurate and objective assessment of DN, and then obtain more valuable meta-analysis results, providing more reliable and effective new ideas for the treatment of DN.

## Abbreviations

TCM:	Traditional Chinese medicine
DN:	Diabetic nephropathy
CNKI:	China knowledge infrastructure
Sino Med:	China biomedical CD-ROM
VIP:	Vipers database
RCTs:	Randomized controlled trials
WMD:	Weighted mean differences
CI:	Confidence intervals
24 h UPQ:	24 h urine protein quantification
Scr:	Serum creatinine
BUN:	Blood urea nitrogen
UAER:	Urinary albumin excretion rate
FBG:	Fasting blood glucose
TC:	Total cholesterol
TG:	Triglycerides
HDL-C:	High-density lipoprotein cholesterol
LDL-C:	Low-density lipoprotein cholesterol
TER:	Total effective rate
RR:	Response ratio
DM:	Diabetes mellitus
MD:	Mean differences
FEM:	Fixed effect model
REM:	Random effect model.

#### **Data Availability**

All data relevant to the study are included in the article.

## **Conflicts of Interest**

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of the paper.

## **Authors' Contributions**

YYY, LT, and CL conceived the study. YYY, SWJ, HKK, XYY, TSF, and YHP conducted the literature search and data

extraction. YYY and SWJ analysed the data, performed the statistical analysis, and wrote the manuscript. LT and CL participated in the correction of the manuscript and supervised every step of the study. All authors read and approved the final manuscript and decided to publish it. LT and CL equally contributed to this work and should be considered cocorresponding authors.

## Acknowledgments

This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China Youth Fund (81704027), Shanghai Key Medical Specialties (ZK2019B16), Shanghai Putuo District Health and Health System Science and Technology Innovation Project Plan Task Book (ptkwws202011), and Shanghai Health and Health Commission Scientific Research Project (20204Y0154).

## **Supplementary Materials**

Supplementary Table 1: PubMed search strategy. Supplementary Figure 1: subgroup analysis of 24h urine volume (age). Supplementary Figure 2: subgroup analysis of 24h urine volume (region). Supplementary Figure 3: subgroup analysis of 24h urine protein quantification (age). Supplementary Figure 4: subgroup analysis of 24h urine protein quantification (control treatment). Supplementary Figure 5: subgroup analysis of 24h urine protein quantification (course of treatment). Supplementary Figure 6: subgroup analysis of 24h urine protein quantification (region). Supplementary Figure 7: subgroup analysis of serum creatinine (course of treatment). Supplementary Figure 8: subgroup analysis of blood creatinine (region). Supplementary Figure 9: subgroup analysis of blood urea nitrogen (course of treatment). Supplementary Figure 10: subgroup analysis of blood urea nitrogen (region). Supplementary Figure 11: subgroup analysis of urinary albumin excretion rates (age). Supplementary Figure 12: subgroup analysis of urinary albumin excretion rates (course of treatment). Supplementary Figure 13: subgroup analysis of urinary albumin excretion rates (region). Supplementary Figure 14: subgroup analysis of fasting blood glucose (age). Supplementary Figure 15: subgroup analysis of fasting blood glucose (control treatment). Supplementary Figure 16: subgroup analysis of fasting blood glucose (course of treatment). Supplementary Figure 17: subgroup analysis of fasting blood glucose (region). Supplementary Figure 18: subgroup analysis of fasting blood glucose (adverse effects). Supplementary Figure 19: subgroup analysis of glycated hemoglobin (age). Supplementary Figure 20: subgroup analysis of glycated hemoglobin (region). Supplementary Figure 21: subgroup analysis of TC (age). Supplementary Figure 22: subgroup analysis of TC (control treatment). Supplementary Figure 23: subgroup analysis of TC (course of treatment). Supplementary Figure 24: subgroup analysis of TC (region). Supplementary Figure 25: subgroup analysis of TG (age). Supplementary Figure 26: subgroup analysis of TG (control treatment). Supplementary Figure 27: subgroup analysis of TG (course of treatment). Supplementary Figure 28: subgroup analysis of TG (region). Supplementary Figure 29: subgroup analysis of HDL (course of treatment). Supplementary Figure 30: subgroup analysis of HDL (region). Supplementary Figure 31: subgroup analysis of LDL (course of treatment). Supplementary Figure 32: subgroup analysis of LDL (region). Supplementary Figure 33: subgroup analysis of total effective rate (age). Supplementary Figure 34: subgroup analysis of total effective rate (control treatment). Supplementary Figure 35: subgroup analysis of overall effectiveness (course of treatment). Supplementary Figure 36: subgroup analysis of total efficiency (region). (Supplementary Materials)

## References

- M. Narres, H. Claessen, S. Droste et al., "The incidence of endstage renal disease in the diabetic (compared to the nondiabetic) population: a systematic review," *PLoS One*, vol. 11, Article ID e0147329, 2016.
- [2] IDF Diabetes Atlas, "Brussels, Belgium: 2019 [EB/OL].[2021-09-20]," 2021, https://www.diabetesatlas.org.
- [3] Chinese Medical Association and Diabetes Branch, "Guidelines for the prevention and treatment of type 2 diabetes in China (2020 edition)," *Chinese Journal of Diabetes*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 315–409, 2021.
- [4] C. Yang, H. Wang, X. Zhao et al., "CKD in China: evolving spectrum and public health implications," *American Journal* of Kidney Diseases, vol. 76, no. 2, pp. 258–264, 2020.
- [5] G. De Ferrari and Italian Society of Nephrology, "Guidelines for diagnosis and therapy of diabetic nephropathy," *Giornale Italiano di Nefrologia*, vol. 20, no. 24, pp. S96–S108, 2003.
- [6] L. Qian, Z. Yin, and S. Duan, "Development and application of Chinese medicine identification guidelines for diabetic nephropathy," *Chinese Electronic Journal of Kidney Disease Research*, vol. 7, no. 02, pp. 91–93, 2018.
- [7] J. J. Yoon, Y. J. Lee, D. G. Kang, and H. S. Lee, "Protective role of oryeongsan against renal inflammation and glomerulosclerosis in db/db mice," *The American Journal of Chinese Medicine*, vol. 42, no. 06, pp. 1431–1452, 2014.
- [8] Y. J. Lee, S. M. Lee, X. Cui et al., "Quantitative evaluation of Oryeongsan and its action on water regulation in renal inner medullary collecting duct cells," *Journal of Ethnopharmacology*, vol. 185, pp. 310–318, 2016.
- [9] L. Xiao and Z. Wang, "The effect of combining western medicine with Jia Wei Wu Ling San on Cys-C, UREA and Scr in patients with acute glomerulonephritis," *Si Chuan TCM*, vol. 37, no. 9, pp. 115–117, 2019.
- [10] H. Jia and Z. Wang, "Clinical efficacy of Zhi Bai Di Huang Wan combined with Wu Ling San plus reduction in the adjuvant treatment of refractory nephrotic syndrome in children," *Chinese Journal of Experimental Formulary*, vol. 27, no. 10, pp. 70–75, 2021.
- [11] Z. Jin and L. Zhong, "Protection of residual renal function in maintenance peritoneal dialysis patients with Xiao Chai Hu Tang combined with Wu Ling San and the effect on peritoneal fibrosis and microinflammatory state," *Chinese Journal of Experimental Formulary*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 114–119, 2019.
- [12] L. Shamseer, D. Moher, M. Clarke et al., "Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation," *BMJ*, vol. 349, Article ID g7647, 2015.
- [13] B. Hutton, G. Salanti, D. M. Caldwell et al., "The PRISMA extension statement for reporting of systematic reviews

incorporating network meta-analyses of health care interventions: checklist and explanations," *Annals of Internal Medicine*, vol. 162, no. 11, pp. 777–784, 2015.

- [14] M. Liu, Systematic Evaluation, Meta-Analysis Design and Implementation Methods, People's Health Publishing House, Beijing, China, 2011.
- [15] Z. Y. Mao, "Treatment of 160 cases of diabetic nephropathy with Wu ling san combined with blood mansions and blood stasis soup," *Guangming TCM*, no. 06, pp. 9-10, 2003.
- [16] S. Y. Li, S. P. Niu, and S. L. Han, "Clinical observation of 21 cases of edema in early diabetic nephropathy treated with Li Bai Ling," *Journal of Practical Chinese Medicine Internal Medicine*, no. 03, p. 41, 2008.
- [17] K.-W. Xiong, L. Sheng-Geng, L. Zhong, F. Wu, and Y. Xiao-Hua, "Clinical efficacy of compound Wu Ling San in the treatment of early diabetic nephropathy with edema," *Journal* of Clinical and Experimental Medicine, vol. 10, no. 13, pp. 1023-1024, 2011.
- [18] M. Li, L. Y. Shi, and W. Liu, "Role of Wu Ling capsule combined with valsartan in the treatment of early diabetic nephropathy," *Journal of Practical Diabetes*, vol. 7, no. 01, pp. 27-28, 2011.
- [19] H. Lei, X. Ding, M. Xiao, and T. Hu, "Efficacy of huangqi Wu ling san in the treatment of diabetic nephropathy," *Guangming TCM*, vol. 28, no. 08, pp. 1609-1610, 2013.
- [20] Y. Liu, "Clinical study of 30 cases of diabetic nephropathy treated with combined traditional Chinese and Western medicine," *Jiangsu Traditional Chinese Medicine*, vol. 45, no. 03, pp. 23-24, 2013.
- [21] H. Chen, Y. Ye, and X. Pang, "Efficacy of Liu Wei Di Huang Tang combined with Wu Ling San in the treatment of diabetic nephropathy in 89 cases," *Massage and Rehabilitation Medicine*, vol. 5, no. 7, pp. 123–125, 2014.
- [22] Q. H. Chen, "Evaluation of the efficacy of compound Wu Ling San in the treatment of early diabetic nephropathy with edema," *Journal of Qiqihar Medical College*, vol. 36, no. 18, pp. 2728-2729, 2015.
- [23] W. C. Shen and G. Q. Shu, "Effect of Wuling capsule combined with ossified triol on urinary marker protein in early diabetic nephropathy," *Chinese Pharmacist*, vol. 18, no. 11, pp. 1899–1901, 2015.
- [24] L. Xiao-Xiang, H. Wang, K.-S. Zhao, B.-L. Liu, and C. Jia-Xing, "27 cases of edema in diabetic nephropathy treated with Wu Ling San combined with Wu Pi Drinking plus flavor," *Henan TCM*, vol. 35, no. 12, pp. 2899–2901, 2015.
- [25] L. Chang, X. Zhang, and W. Ma, "Clinical effects of Wu Ling San combined with Wu Pi Drink supplemented with the treatment of edema in diabetic nephropathy," *Clinical misdiagnosis and mismanagement*, vol. 29, no. S1, pp. 74–76, 2016.
- [26] S. Z. Berlin, "Exploring the efficacy of Wu ling san combined with blood mansions and blood stasis soup in the treatment of diabetic nephropathy," *Clinical Research in Chinese Medicine*, vol. 8, no. 12, pp. 58-59, 2016.
- [27] S. Zhuo, "Clinical study on the combination of Chinese and Western medicine in the treatment of diabetic nephropathy," *Modern medical imaging*, vol. 25, no. 04, pp. 795–797, 2016.
- [28] R. Z. Jing, J. Feng, W. L. Guo, and H. Y. Wu, "Clinical efficacy of Wu Ling San supplemented with rosiglitazone in the treatment of diabetic nephropathy," *Chinese Pharmacology* and Clinical, vol. 33, no. 04, pp. 176–178, 2017.
- [29] H. Xiaobo, "Treatment of 49 cases of diabetic nephropathy with Wu Ling San plus reduction," *Henan TCM*, vol. 37, no. 10, pp. 1715–1717, 2017.

- [30] X. He, H. Zeng, S. T. Chen et al., "Endothelial specific SIRT3 deletion impairs glycolysis and angiogenesis and causes diastolic dysfunction," *Journal of Molecular and Cellular Cardiology*, vol. 112, no. 09, pp. 104–113, 2017.
- [31] Q. Xin, Clinical Study of Zhen Wu Tang Combined with Wu Ling San in the Treatment of Edema in Diabetic Nephropathy, Guangzhou University of Chinese Medicine, Guangzhou, China, 2017.
- [32] Y. Wang, J. Wang, S. Y. Zheng et al., "Analysis of the clinical effect of Wu Ling San combined with Wu Pi Drink plus and minus supplement for the treatment of edema in diabetic nephropathy," *Special Health*, no. 19, p. 265, 2018.
- [33] Y. Lai, D. Qiao, and P. A. N. G. He, "Clinical efficacy of Wu Ling San combined with Sheng San with additional flavor in the treatment of edema in diabetic nephropathy," *Chinese community physician*, vol. 35, no. 15, p. 94, 2019.
- [34] Z. Y. Yun, Efficacy of Ginseng Astragalus Dihuang Tang Combined with Wu Ling San Plus and Minus Formula in the Treatment of Diabetic Nephropathy with Qi and Yin Deficiency in G3A2 stage, Xinjiang Medical University, Ürümqi, China, 2020.
- [35] Y. Li, Clinical Efficacy of Astragalus Wuling San in the Treatment of Diabetic Nephropathy with Spleen-Kidney Yang Deficiency, Shandong University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Jinan, China, 2020.
- [36] Y. Chen, Efficacy of Wu Ling San Combined with Si Wei Tang in the Treatment of Diabetic Nephropathy with Spleen and Kidney Yang deficiency, Guangzhou University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Guangzhou, China, 2020.
- [37] X. Wen and B. Lan, "Clinical efficacy analysis of Wu Ling San in the treatment of edema in diabetic nephropathy," *China Health Nutrition*, vol. 30, no. 23, p. 336, 2020.
- [38] Z. X. Jiang and J. J. Yi, "Efficacy of Ginseng-Dihuang Tang combined with Wu Ling San in the treatment of diabetic nephropathy," *Chinese Continuing Medical Education*, vol. 13, no. 18, pp. 159–162, 2021.