

Optical Coherence Tomography Evaluation of Peripapillary and Macular Structure Changes in Pre-perimetric Glaucoma, Early Perimetric Glaucoma, and Ocular Hypertension: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

OPEN ACCESS

rontiers

in Medicine

Edited by:

Michele Lanza, University of Campania Luigi Vanvitelli, Italy

Reviewed by:

Je Hyun Seo, Pusan National University, South Korea Christian Mardin, University of Erlangen Nuremberg, Germany

> *Correspondence: Bing Jiang drjiangb@csu.edu.cn

[†]These authors have contributed equally to this work

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Ophthalmology, a section of the journal Frontiers in Medicine

Received: 15 April 2021 Accepted: 28 May 2021 Published: 01 July 2021

Citation:

Tong Y, Wang T, Zhang X, He Y and Jiang B (2021) Optical Coherence Tomography Evaluation of Peripapillary and Macular Structure Changes in Pre-perimetric Glaucoma, Early Perimetric Glaucoma, and Ocular Hypertension: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Front. Med. 8:696004. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2021.696004 Yuxin Tong^{1,2†}, Tiantian Wang^{3†}, Xinyu Zhang^{1,2}, Yi He⁴ and Bing Jiang^{1,2*}

¹ Department of Ophthalmology, Second Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, China, ² Hunan Clinical Research Center of Ophthalmic Disease, Changsha, China, ³ Department of Ophthalmology, Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, China, ⁴ Department of Neurosurgery, Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, China

Background: This study aimed to assess the differences in the average and sectoral peripapillary retinal nerve fiber layer (pRNFL), macular ganglion cell plus inner plexiform layer (mGCIPL), and macular ganglion cell complex (mGCC) thickness using optical coherence tomography (OCT) in patients with pre-perimetric glaucoma (PPG) compared to those with early perimetric glaucoma (EG) and ocular hypertension (OHT).

Methods: A comprehensive literature search of the PubMed database, the Cochrane Library, and Embase was performed from inception to March 2021. The weighted mean difference (WMD) with the 95% confidence interval (CI) was pooled for continuous outcomes.

Results: Twenty-three cross-sectional studies comprising 2,574 eyes (1,101 PPG eyes, 1,233 EG eyes, and 240 OHT eyes) were included in the systematic review and meta-analysis. The pooled results demonstrated that the average pRNFL (WMD = 8.22, 95% CI = 6.32–10.12, P < 0.00001), mGCIPL (WMD = 4.83, 95% CI = 3.43–6.23, P < 0.00001), and mGCC (WMD = 7.19, 95% CI = 4.52–9.85, P < 0.00001) were significantly thinner in patients with EG than in those with PPG. The sectoral thickness of pRNFL, mGCIPL, and mGCC were also significantly lower in the EG eyes. In addition, the average pRNFL and mGCC were significantly thinner in the PPG eyes than those in the OHT eyes (pRNFL: WMD = -8.57, 95% CI = -9.88 to -7.27, P < 0.00001; mGCC: WMD = -3.23, 95% CI = -6.03 to -0.44, P = 0.02). Similarly, the sectoral pRNFL and mGCC were also significantly those in the OHT eyes.

Conclusion: OCT-based measurements of peripapillary and macular structural alterations can be used to distinguish PPG from EG and OHT, which can help understand the pathophysiology of glaucoma at earlier stages. Studies that employ clock hour classification methods and longitudinal studies are needed to verify our findings.

1

Systematic Review Registration:

https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?RecordID=239798 CRD42021239798

Keywords: pre-perimetric glaucoma, early perimetric glaucoma, ocular hypertension, optical coherence tomography, retinal nerve fiber layer, ganglion cell plus inner plexiform layer, ganglion cell complex

INTRODUCTION

Glaucoma is a group of neurodegenerative diseases that is characterized by the progressive loss of retinal ganglion cells (RGCs) and axons, followed by the irreversible visual field (VF) deterioration (1). Glaucoma is one of the leading causes of blindness, and ~111.8 million people worldwide are expected to suffer from glaucomatous optic neuropathy through 2040. This imposes a huge burden on public health systems (2). Elevated intraocular pressure (IOP) is believed to be one of the major risk factors of glaucoma. Patients that have increased IOP with normal appearance of the optic disc can have about nine times the risk of developing glaucoma and are regarded as ocular hypertension (OHT) individuals or glaucoma suspects (3). Currently, reducing the IOP is the only effective method for glaucoma treatment (4, 5). However, since glaucoma has an insidious onset and obscure symptoms especially at the earlier stages, such as pre-perimetric glaucoma (PPG) and early perimetric glaucoma (EG), patients are usually diagnosed at an advanced stage with severe VF defects (2, 6). Thus, early detection of glaucomatous damage is crucial for hypotensive therapies to slow glaucoma progression and ameliorate the quality of life (7, 8).

Several methods have been utilized for the diagnosis of glaucoma, and of these, standard automated perimetry-based VF examination is the gold standard for evaluating the severity of glaucomatous damage (9). Nevertheless, studies have shown that ganglion cell loss can precede VF defects in glaucoma (10–18) indicating that morphological changes occur earlier than functional damage. Since severe functional damage is closely related to the central region of the VF, it is difficult to solely rely on poor patient performance in standard automated perimetry (19). Moreover, the VF test is occasionally unreliable, which impairs its diagnostic efficacy. Therefore, more objective and reproducible methods are required for assessing the peripapillary and macular structure changes in glaucoma.

Optical coherence tomography (OCT) is a quantitative and non-invasive method of enhanced-depth visualization of the optic nerve head (ONH) and retina with high imaging quality and scanning speed, which enables clinicians to monitor morphological changes of the ONH and retina in glaucoma (20– 24). Several studies using OCT have reported that the attenuation of the peripapillary retinal nerve fiber layer (pRNFL), macular ganglion cell plus inner plexiform layer (GCIPL), and macular ganglion cell complex (mGCC) could be hallmark features of glaucoma (20, 22, 24, 25). Although some investigations have revealed the continuum of glaucoma from mild to advanced stages, studies have shown inconsistencies regarding the diagnostic values of OCT indicators in differentiating PPG from EG (26–44) and in differentiating PPG from OHT (39, 43, 45–48).

Thus, we conducted this systematic review and meta-analysis to facilitate a better understanding of glaucomatous progression form OHT without apparent ONH configuration changes to the pre-perimetric stage with structural deterioration, and from the pre-perimetric to the early perimetric stage with impaired VF in view of the peripapillary and macular structural alterations, and to enable ophthalmologists to discriminate PPG from EG, and PPG from OHT.

METHODS

This systematic review and meta-analysis adhered to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Metaanalysis (PRISMA) statement methodology and the Metaanalysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) guidelines (49, 50). Three investigators (YT, TW, and YH) independently performed the literature search, data extraction, and quality assessment based on the same standard. The study was registered in PROSPERO (CRD42021239798).

Literature Search

We performed a comprehensive literature search of the PubMed database, Embase, and the Cochrane Library from inception to March 2021 using the following strategy with the combination of free text terms and Medical Subject Headings (MeSH): "preperimetric" [All Fields] AND ("glaucoma" [MeSH Terms] OR "glaucoma"[All Fields] OR "glaucomas"[All Fields]) AND ("ocular hypertension" [MeSH Terms] OR ("ocular" [All Fields] AND "hypertension" [All Fields]) OR "ocular hypertension" [All Fields] OR ("suspect" [All Fields] OR "suspected" [All Fields] OR "suspecting" [All Fields] OR "suspects" [All Fields]) OR "early" [All Fields] OR "mild" [All Fields] OR ("hypertense" [All Fields] OR "hypertension" [MeSH Terms] OR "hypertension" [All Fields] OR "hypertension s" [All Fields] OR "hypertensions" [All Fields] OR "hypertensive" [All Fields] OR "hypertensive s" [All Fields] OR "hypertensives" [All Fields])) AND ("tomography, optical coherence" [MeSH Terms] OR ("tomography" [All Fields] AND "optical" [All Fields] AND "coherence" [All Fields]) OR "optical coherence tomography" [All Fields] OR ("optical" [All Fields] AND "coherence" [All Fields] AND "tomography" [All Fields]) OR "OCT" [All Fields]). We modified search strategies according to the different requirements of the different databases. Full-text screening was conducted to include potentially applicable studies.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Eligible studies were included if they fulfilled the following criteria: (1) original article; (2) inclusion of PPG and (EG or

OHT) with the same diagnostic standard: for PPG, patients had to demonstrate characteristic glaucomatous optic nerve damage (i.e., neuroretinal rim thinning, excavation, or notching) without a reproducible VF; for EG, in addition to the typical glaucomatous optic disc changes (i.e., neuroretinal rim thinning, excavation, or notching), the mean deviation (MD) of the VF defect had to exceed -6 dB based on the Hodapp-Anderson-Parrish VF severity grading scale (51); for OHT, patients with an elevated IOP > 21 mmHg but with normal optic disc appearance and VF were included; and (3) inclusion of at least one of the following quantitative indicators measured by OCT – pRNFL, mGCIPL, or mGCC thickness.

The exclusion criteria were: (1) animal experiments, reviews, case reports, and conference abstracts; (2) non-inclusion of PPG, EG and OHT; (3) lack of information regarding pRNFL, mGCIPL, or mGCC thickness; (4) different diagnostic standards; and (5) studies with unextractable data.

Data Extraction

The following details were extracted with regard to the studies: title, first author, publication year, study type, region, source of patients, number of patients and eyes, mean age of patients, female/male ratios, type of spectral domain OCT (SD-OCT) or time domain OCT (TD-OCT) devices, type of glaucoma, diagnostic standards, average and sectoral pRNFL, mGCIPL and mGCC thickness, scan area and protocol of the ONH and macular region, and MD of the VF. Disagreements were resolved through consensus after discussion among all authors.

Quality Assessment

The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) methodology checklist was used to evaluate the quality of the included cross-sectional studies.

Statistical Analyses

All statistical analyses were conducted using Review Manager V5.4.1 (Cochrane Collaboration, London, United Kingdom) and Stata V12.0 (StataCorp LLC, Texas, America). We employed the weighted mean difference (WMD) with the 95% confidence interval (CI) to pool the mean differences of OCT parameters between the PPG and EG groups, and between the PPG and OHT groups. A *P*-value of <0.05 was considered to be statistically significant. Heterogeneity was estimated using Cochrane's Q test and I² statistics. A fixed-effects model was used when I² < 50% (52); otherwise, a random-effects model (Der Simonian-Laird method) was used. We performed subgroup analyses according to the type of glaucoma, type of OCT device, and macular scan area. Subgroups with less than two included studies were excluded to prevent further discrepancy. "Leave-one-out" sensitivity analyses were performed to validate the stability and



TABLE 1 Characteristics of included studies	
---	--

Study	Year	Region	No.	eyes		Mean age	± SD (yrs)			Gender (F/M)	Device (OCT)	Glaucoma types	Main outcome	Sca (mm²	n area or mm³)
			PPG	EG	ОНТ	PPG	EG	ОНТ	PPG	EG	ОНТ				ONH	Macular region
Wang et al. (44)	2020	China	26	22		36.9 ± 11.1	41.4 ± 13.9		6/16	7/12		RTVue	POAG	pRNFL, GCC		6 × 6
Sarigül Sezenöz et al. (43)	2020	Turkey	28	31	18	66.71 ± 11.33	68.20 ± 9.12	66.61 ± 10.44	N/A	N/A	N/A	Heidelberg	Mixed	pRNFL, GCC, total retina thickness, G/T ratio		
Lu et al. (42)	2020	China	44	42		43 ± 11	46 ± 11		17/27	20/22		RTVue	POAG	pRNFL, GCC	4.5 × 4.5	6 × 6
Hou et al. (41)	2019	USA	68	162		68.4 ± 10.8	68.4 ± 8.6		30/25	60/61		RTVue Spectralis	POAG	pRNFL, GCC		3 × 3
Kim et al. (40)	2017	Korea	26	26		52.08 ± 11.77	55.65 ± 13.36		16/10	16/10		Cirrus Spectralis	OAG	mRNFL, GCIPL, GCL IPL	,	6 × 6
Aydogan et al. (39)	2017	Turkey	94	66	77	53.2 ± 11.1	59.4 ± 9.5	52.8 ± 8.2	57/37	36/30	62/15	RTVue	Mixed	pRNFL, GCC, TR, OR	3.45-mm circle	7 × 7
Akil et al. (38)	2017	USA	20	20		63.13 ± 16.43	65.375 ± 5.2		10/10	8/12		Cirrus	POAG	pRNFL	3.4-mm circle	
Kumar et al. (37)	2016	India	28	83		57.04 ± 2.78	61.2 ± 1.34		N/A	N/A		RTVue	Mixed	pRNFL, GCC	3.45-mm circle	6 × 6
Cennamo et al. (36)	2016	Italy	66	41		64.86 ± 7.12	63.78 ± 11.70		30/36	25/16		RTVue	OAG	pRNFL, GCC	3.45-mm circle	7 × 7
Park et al. (35)	2015	Korea	50	106		58.2 ± 13.7	56.0 ± 12.7		26/24	66/40		Cirrus	Mixed	pRNFL, GCIPL, TNN ratio	3.46-mm I circle	$6 \times 6 \times 2$
Kim et al. (34)	2015	Korea	79	83		54.6 ± 11.8	57.5 ± 11.6		40/39	43/40		Cirrus	Mixed	pRNFL, GCIPL	Optic disc Cube 200 > 200	Macular Cube 512 × 128
Hwang et al. (33)	2015	Korea	48	110		51.7 ± 13.8	51.6 ± 12.7		N/A	N/A		Cirrus	Mixed	GCIPL		6 × 6
Yamada et al. (32)	2014	Japan	30	31		56.9 ± 14.7	61.8 ± 11.5		13/17	19/12		Spectralis	Mixed	mRNFL, GCC, GCL, TR		30 × 15 degreed macular area
Sung et al. (31)	2014	Korea	37	70		54.22 ± 12.70	53.97 ± 12.36		20/17	29/41		Cirrus	Mixed	pRNFL, GCIPL	3.46-mm circle	14.13 mm ² elliptical annulus area
Kim et al. (30)	2014	Korea	68	72		53.12 ± 10.69	56.83 ± 12.73		N/A	N/A		3D OCT-2000	OAG	pRNFL, mRNFL, GCIPL, GCC	3.46-mm circle	6 × 6

Tong et al.

(Continued)

OCT Differentiates PPG EG OHT

TABLE 1 | Continued

Study	Year	Region	No.	eyes		Mean age	± SD (yrs)			Gender (F/M)		Device (OCT)	e Glaucoma types	Main outcome	Scar (mm² c	n area or mm³)
			PPG	EG	OHT	PPG	EG	OHT	PPG	EG	ОНТ				ONH	Macular region
Kim et al. (29)	2014	Korea	103	111		57.2 ± 11.8.	56.8 ± 11.4	1	52/51	52/59		Cirrus	OAG	pRNFL, GCIPL	3.46-mm circle	Macular Cube 200 × 200
Holló et al. (48)	2014	Hungary	33		28	56.2 ± 12.1		50.7 ± 15.6	N/A		N/A	RTVue	Mixed	pRNFL, GCC, total retina thickness, G/T ratio	4-mm circle	
Arintawati et al. (28)	2013	Japan	32	81		58.94 ± 12.15	60.16 ± 16.77		18/14	45/36		RTVue	Mixed	pRNFL, GCC, FLV, GLV	3.5-mm circle	7 × 7
Pomorska et al. (47)	2012	Poland	33		27	61.0 ± 9.6		57.8 ± 11.2	17/16		18/9	Sratus	Mixed	pRNFL	3.4-mm circle	
Morooka et al. (27)	2012	Japan	23	24		56.8 ± 9.4	51.9 ± 12.2	2	16/7	13/11		RS3000	Mixed	pRNFL, GCC	3.45-mm circle	9 × 9
Horn et al. (26)	2011	Germany	77	52		59.2 ± 10.0	60.8 ± 10.5	5	41/36	27/25		Sepctralis	OAG	pRNFL	3.4-mm circle	
Garas et al. (46)	2011	Hungary	46		36	57.6 ± 11.8		51.5 ± 16.5	N/A		N/A	RTVue	Mixed	pRNFL, GCC, FLV	4-mm circle	
Taliantzis et al. (45)	2009	Greece	42		54	58.1 ± 11.6		56.7 ± 13.2	20/22		25/29	Stratus	Mixed	pRNFL	3.4-mm circle	

PPG, pre-perimetric glaucoma; EG, early perimetric glaucoma; OHT, ocular hypertension; OAG, open-angle glaucoma; POAG, primary open-angle glaucoma; Mixed, unclassified glaucoma or more than one types of glaucoma; pRNFL, peripapillary retinal nerve fiber layer; mRNFL, macular retinal nerve fiber layer; GCIPL, ganglion cell plus inner plexiform layer; GCL, ganglion cell layer; IPL, inner plexiform layer; GCC, ganglion cell complex; G/T ratio, macular GCC to total retinal thickness; TR, macular total retinal parameters; OR, macular outer retinal parameters; FLV, focal loss volume; GLV, global loss volume; TNM ratio, temporal to nasal macular GCIPL thickness ratio; F/M, female/male; ONH, optic nerve head.

reliability of the results. Publication bias was evaluated by the combination of Begg's funnel plot and Egger's test (53, 54).

In some articles, the eight-quadrant classification method was used to display sectoral thickness while other studies employed the four-quadrant classification method. Since most of the studies used the four-quadrant classification (only one study used the eight-quadrant classification, which we included for the combined analysis regarding the pRNFL thickness), we transformed the eight-quadrant data to fourquadrant data to reduce heterogeneity using the following formula to combine the means and standard deviations of the two groups:

$$\begin{split} \overline{x}_{12} &= \frac{N_1 \cdot \overline{x}_1 + N_2 \cdot \overline{x}_2}{N_1 + N_2} \\ \sigma_{12} &= \sqrt{\frac{(N_1 - 1) \cdot \sigma_1^2 + (N_2 - 1) \cdot \sigma_2^2 + \frac{N_1 \cdot N_2}{N_1 + N_2} \cdot \left(\overline{x}_1^2 + \overline{x}_2^2 - 2\overline{x}_1 \cdot \overline{x}_2\right)}{N_1 + N_2 - 1}} \end{split}$$

TABLE 2 | Methodological quality of included studies.

 \bar{x}_1 and \bar{x}_2 are the mean pRNFL or mGCIPL or mGCC thickness of the two adjacent sections in the eight-quadrant classification. σ_1 and σ_2 are the standard deviations of the two groups. N_1 and N_2 are number of the eyes in the two sections. \bar{x}_{12} and σ_{12} are the combined mean and standard deviation (i.e., \bar{x}_1 and σ_1 refer to parameters of the temporal superior quadrant, \bar{x}_2 and σ_2 refer to parameters of the temporal inferior quadrant, and \bar{x}_{12} and σ_{12} refer to combined parameters of the temporal superior and inferior quadrants).

RESULTS

Literature Search

A total of 334 studies were retrieved in our screening, of which 85 duplicates were removed and 208 articles were excluded by titles and abstracts. We further excluded 17 studies with unextractable data and 1 study that used a different diagnostic standard. Finally, 23 studies were integrated into the qualitative and quantitative analyses (26–48). The flow diagram of literature search is shown in **Figure 1**.

Study						11-iten	n check li	st recom	nended l	oy AHRC	2		
	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	vii	viii	ix	x	xi	Score	Quality
Wang et al. (44)	*	*	*			*		*		*		6	М
Sarigül Sezenöz et al. (43)	*	*	*			*		*				5	Μ
Lu et al. (42)	*	*	*			*		*		*		6	Μ
Hou et al. (41)	*	*	*			*		*		*		6	Μ
Kim et al. (40)	*	*	*			*		*		*		6	Μ
Aydogan et al. (39)	*	*	*			*		*		*		6	Μ
Akil et al. (38)	*	*	*			*	*	*		*		7	Μ
Kumar et al. (37)	*	*	*			*	*	*		*		7	Μ
Cennamo et al. (36)	*	*	*				*	*		*		6	Μ
Park et al. (35)	*	*	*		*	*	*	*		*		8	Н
Kim et al. (34)	*	*	*			*	*	*		*		7	Μ
Hwang et al. (33)	*	*				*		*		*		5	Μ
Yamada et al. (32)	*	*	*		*	*	*	*		*		8	Н
Sung et al. (31)	*	*	*			*	*	*		*		7	Μ
Kim et al. (30)	*	*	*		*	*	*	*		*		8	Н
Kim et al. (29)	*	*	*			*		*		*		6	М
Holló et al. (48)	*	*	*			*		*		*		6	М
Arintawati et al. (28)	*	*	*					*		*		5	М
Pomorska et al. (47)	*	*	*			*	*			*		6	М
Morooka et al. (27)	*	*	*		*	*		*		*		7	М
Horn et al. (26)	*	*	*			*		*		*		6	М
Garas et al. (46)	*	*	*			*	*	*		*		7	Μ
Taliantzis et al. (45)	*	*	*			*				*		5	М

AHRQ, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; H, high quality; M, moderate quality; L, low quality; high quality (score: 8–11); moderate quality (score: 4–7); low quality (score: 0–3). i, Define the source of information; ii, List inclusion and exclusion criteria for exposed and unexposed subjects (cases and controls) or refer to previous publications; iii, Indicate time period used for identifying patients; iv, Indicate whether or not subjects were consecutive if not population-based; v, Indicate if evaluators of subjective components of study were masked to other aspects of the status of the participants; vi, Describe any assessments undertaken for quality assurance purposes; vii, Explain any patient exclusions from analysis; viii, Describe how confounding was assessed and/or controlled; ix, If applicable, explain how missing data were handled in the analysis; x, Summarize patient response rates and completeness of data collection; xi, Clarify what follow-up, if any, was expected and the percentage of patients for which incomplete data or follow-up was obtained. The study meets the requirements of the corresponding items.

Study or Subaroup	Mean	PG SD TA	otal Me	EG an '	SD T	otalu	Veight	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Akil 2017	88.8	11.66	20 7	1.9 1	1.5	20	4.0%	8.90 [1.72. 16.08]	
Arintawati 2013	88.13	10.55	32 87	75 13	88	81	6.0%	0.38 [-4.36 5.12]	
Avdogan 2017	102.5	5.8	94 90	94	7.8	66	8.4%	11.56 [9.34. 13.78]	_ _
Cennamo 2016	104.21	17.58	66 97.	33 14	63	41	4.7%	6.88 [0.71, 13.05]	
Horn 2011	81.6	12.1	77	70 13	3.1	52	6.2%	11.60 [7.13, 16.07]	
Hou 2019	83.6	10.95	68 7	.5 1	8.3	162	7.8%	6.10 [3.20, 9.00]	
Kim 2015	88.2	12.7	79 7:	.8 1	1.6	83	6.9%	14.40 [10.65, 18.15]	
Kim KE 2014	87	10.5	103 7	1.2 11	0.4	111	7.9%	7.80 [5.00, 10.60]	
Kim YJ 2014	99.87	11.92	68 89	47 14	03	72	6.4%	10.40 [6.10, 14,70]	
Kumar 2016	92.1	10.39	28 8	.9 6	65	83	6.6%	3.20 (-0.91, 7, 31)	
Lu 2020	92.16	9.2	44 84	31 1	11	42	6.4%	7 85 [3 53 12 17]	
Morooka 2012	87.2	7.8	23	87 1 ⁻	1 4	24	5.2%	0 20 [-5 36 5 76]	
Park 2015	81	9.6	50 73	1.2	g -	106	7.5%	7.80 [4.64, 10.96]	
Sezenoz 2020	88.04	8.47	28 75	77 16	27	31	4.5%	12.27 [5.74, 18.80]	
Suna 2014	86.77	9.41	37 76	99 1	1.1	70	6.7%	9,78 [5,79, 13,77]	
Wang 2020	87	9.1	26 7	.3 1:	2.3	22	4.7%	11.70 [5.48, 17.92]	
Total (95% CI)		:	843		10	066 1	100.0%	8.22 [6.32, 10.12]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 9.84; Chi ²	² = 51.71.	df = 15 (< 0.00)001);	² = 71	%		
Test for overall effec	t: Z = 8.49 (F	P < 0.000	01)		,,				-10 -5 U 5 10
в				_					110 20
Study - Out	PI	PG T	tal	EG		Tate	14/-: .	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD To		ean	SD 1	rotal	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Akil 2017	109.56	18.86	20	94	19.9	20	4.3%	15.56 [3.54, 27.58]	
Arintawati 2013	89.94	10.37	32 8	3.14 1	4.79	81	11.0%	1.80 [-3.03, 6.63]	
Aydogan 2017	124.3	11.2	94 1	10.9	13.4	66	12.2%	13.40 [9.45, 17.35]	
Cennamo 2016	102.7 1	12.93	ъб 9 70	9.08 1	7.11	41	9.4%	3.62 [-2.48, 9.72]	
Kim 2015	107.7	16.3	79	33.2	11.5	83	11.6%	14.50 [10.14, 18.86]	
KIM YJ 2014	116.73	10.96	o8 10	3.78 2	2.89	72	8.7%	12.95 [6.30, 19.60]	
Kumar 2016	113.3	16.46	28 1	J/.6	9.81	83	8.9%	5.70 [-0.75, 12.15]	
Lu 2020	112.88	22.54	44 103	895 2	2.38	42	6.0%	8.98 [-0.51, 18.48]	
Park 2015	101	15.1	50	12.5	14.3	106	10.8%	8.50 [3.51, 13.49]	
Sung 2014	105.73 1	13.62	3/ 9	4.03 1	8.73	70	9.2%	11.70 [5.49, 17.91]	
wang 2020	90.7	10.5	20	18.7	15.1	22	7.8%	12.00 [4.51, 19.49]	
Total (95% CI)		5	44			686	100.0%	9 64 [6 69 12 59]	•
Heterogeneity Tau ²	= 14 48 [.] Chi	² = 26 44	df = 10.0	P = 0.00	13): IZ =	= 62%	100.070	5.64 [0.05, 12.55]	
Test for overall effect	t 7 = 6.41 (P	< 0.0000	1)	- 0.00	55), 1 -	- 02 /0			-20 -10 0 10 20
•			.,						PPG EG
	PI	PG		EG	-			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD Tot	al Me	an s	SD TO	otal V	veight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Aydogan 2017	76.3	8	94 6	.6 !	9.5	66	18.0%	8.70 [5.89, 11.51]	
Kim 2015	71.2	11.5	79 5	.4 !	99	83	17 4%	13 80 [10 49 17 11]	
10	A				0.0	-	4	10.00[10.40,1111]	
Kim YJ 2014	84.83	14.5	68 80.	51 15.	.62	72	15.1%	4.32 [-0.67, 9.31]	
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020	84.83 70.8	14.5 9.5	68 80. 44 69.7	51 15. 35 1:	.62 3.9	72 42	15.1% 15.0%	4.32 [-0.67, 9.31] 1.06 [-3.99, 6.12]	
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015	84.83 70.8 62.8	14.5 9.5 7.6	68 80. 44 69.7 50 6	51 15. 35 1: 1.1 !	.62 3.9 9.2	72 42 106	15.1% 15.0% 18.1%	4.32 [-0.67, 9.31] 1.06 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44]	
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1	14.5 9.5 7.6 0.04	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62.	51 15. 35 1: 0.1 9 59 10.	.62 3.9 9.2 .62	72 42 106 70	15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4%	4.32 [-0.67, 9.31] 1.06 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68]	
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% Ch	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1	14.5 9.5 7.6 0.04	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62.	51 15. 35 1: 1.1 ! 59 10.	.62 3.9 9.2 .62	72 42 106 70	15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4%	4.32 [-0.67, 9.31] 1.06 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68]	
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI)	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1	14.5 9.5 7.6 0.04 3	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62. 72	51 15. 35 13 1.1 9 59 10.	.62 3.9 9.2 .62	72 42 106 70 439 1	15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4%	4.32 [-0.67, 9.31] 1.06 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71]	
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ²	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 = 21.32; Ch	14.5 1 9.5 7.6 9 0.04 3 1 ² = 37.03	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62. 72	51 15. 35 1: 0.1 9 59 10. P < 0.00	.62 3.9 9.2 .62)0001);	72 42 106 70 439 1 I ² = 86	15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4%	4.32 [-0.67, 9.31] 1.06 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71]	
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 = 21.32; Ch ct: Z = 2.78 (f	14.5 9.5 7.6 0.04 31 1 ² = 37.03 P = 0.005)	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62. 72 5, df = 5 (51 15. 35 1: 1.1 ! 59 10. P < 0.00	62 3.9 9.2 62 0001);	72 42 106 70 439 1 I ² = 86	15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4%	4.32 [-0.67, 9.31] 1.06 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 2 = 21.32; Ch ct: Z = 2.78 (F	14.5 1 9.5 7.6 9 0.04 3 i ² = 37.03 P = 0.005) PG	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62. 72 1, df = 5 (51 15. 35 13 0.1 9 59 10. P < 0.00 EG	62 3.9 9.2 62 0001);	72 42 106 70 439 1 I ² = 86	15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4%	4.32 [-0.67, 9.31] 1.06 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 t = 21.32; Ch t: Z = 2.78 (F P Mean	14.5 1 9.5 7.6 9 0.04 3 i ² = 37.03 P = 0.005) PG <u>SD</u> Te	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62. 72 5, df = 5 () 9 9 9	51 15. 35 13 0.1 9 59 10. P < 0.00 P < 0.00 EG ean	62 3.9 9.2 62 0001); SD_T	72 42 106 70 439 1 I ² = 86	15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4% 100.0% %	4.32 [-0.67, 9.31] 1.06 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CL	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 2 = 21.32; Ch t: Z = 2.78 (F <u>P</u> <u>Mean</u> 115.66	14.5 9.5 7.6 $ii^2 = 37.03$ P = 0.005) PG <u>SD To</u> 20.35	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62. 72 5, df = 5 () 9 9 9 9 10 11 10 12 12 10 12 12 10 12 12 10 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	51 15. 35 13 0.1 9 59 10. P < 0.00 EG an 8.5 19	62 3.9 9.2 62 0001); <u>SD T</u>).04	72 42 106 70 439 1 I ² = 86	15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4% 100.0% % Weight 5.4%	4.32 [-0.67, 9.31] 1.06 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 1.7.16 [4.95, 29.37]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 2 = 21.32; Ch ct: Z = 2.78 (F <u>P</u> <u>Mean</u> 115.66 88.22	14.5 1 9.5 7.6 9 0.04 3 i ² = 37.03 P = 0.005) PG <u>SD To</u> 20.35 11.95	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62. 72 4, df = 5 (1) 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	51 15. 35 13 1.1 9 59 10. 2 < 0.00 50 EG 50 19 8.5 19 .25 15	62 3.9 9.2 62 0001); <u>SD T</u> 3.04 5.37	72 42 106 70 439 1 I ² = 86 <u>Fotal</u> 20 81	15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4% 100.0% % Weight 5.4% 10.1%	Mean Difference W. Random, 55% (1.3) 1.06 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% (1.3) 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 0.87 [-4.35, 6.29]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 2 = 21.32; Ch t: Z = 2.78 (F <u>Mean</u> 115.66 115.62 133.1	14.5 1 9.5 7.6 3 0.04 3 i ² = 37.03 P = 0.005) PG <u>SD To</u> 20.35 11.95 13.4	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62. 72 4, df = 5 (1) 9 9 10 20 9 32 87 94 11	51 15. 35 13 1.1 9 59 10. 2 < 0.00 EG 2an 8.5 19 .25 15 7.1 1	62 3.9 9.2 62 0001); <u>SD T</u> 0.04 5.37 4.2	72 42 106 70 439 1 I ² = 86 <u>Fotal</u> 20 81 66	15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4% 100.0% % Weight 5.4% 10.1% 10.8%	 M. G. G. G. F. G. S. G.	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 = 21.32; Ch t:t Z = 2.78 (F <u>Mean</u> 115.66 133.1 101.69	14.5 1 9.5 7.6 9 0.04 3 1 ² = 37.03 P = 0.005) PG <u>SD Tc</u> 20.35 11.95 13.4 14.25	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62. 72 5, df = 5 (1) 5, df = 5 (1) 72 72 72 72 72 72 72 72 72 72 72 72 72	51 15. 35 1: 0.1 9 59 10. 2 < 0.00 EG ean 8.5 19 .25 15 7.1 1 .57 14	62 3.9 9.2 62 0001); <u>SD T</u> 9.04 5.37 4.2 4.84	72 42 106 70 439 1 I ² = 86 <u>Fotal</u> 20 81 66 41	15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4% 10.0% % Weight 5.4% 10.1% 10.8% 9.8%	4.32 [-0.67, 9.31] 1.06 [-3.99, 612] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference V, Random, 95% CI 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 6.12 [0.42, 11.82]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim 2015	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 2 = 21.32; Ch :t: Z = 2.78 (f <u>P</u> <u>P</u> <u>P</u> <u>P</u> <u>115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7</u>	$\begin{array}{cccc} 14.5 & 1 \\ 9.5 & \\ 7.6 & \\ 0.04 & \\ 11^2 = 37.03 \\ P = 0.005 \\ PG & \\ PG & \\ 11.95 \\ 13.4 \\ 14.25 \\ 13.9 \\ \end{array}$	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62. 72 5, df = 5 () 94 11 94 11 66 95 79 8	51 15. 35 1: 35 1: 59 10. 2 < 0.00 EG ean 8.5 19 .25 15 7.1 1 .57 14 5.3 1	62 3.9 9.2 62 0001); <u>SD T</u> 9.04 5.37 4.2 4.84 1.5	72 42 106 70 439 1 I ² = 86 <u>Fotal</u> 20 81 66 41 83	15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4% 10.0% % Weight 5.4% 10.1% 10.8% 9.8% 11.2%	Mean Difference W. Random, 95% Cl 17.16 (4.95, 9.31) 2.70 (-0.04, 5.44) 2.60 (-1.48, 6.68) 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference W. Random, 95% Cl 17.16 (4.95, 29.37) 0.87 (-4.35, 6.29) 16.00 (11.63, 20.37) 14.40 [10.46, 18.34]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim YJ 2014	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 2 = 21.32; Ch t: Z = 2.78 (f <u>P</u> <u>115.66</u> 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73	14.5 1 9.5 7.6 9 0.04 3 1 ² = 37.03 P = 0.005) PG 5D Te 20.35 11.95 13.4 14.25 13.9 13.9 17.18	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62. 72 72 94 61 66 95 79 8 79 8 79 8 68 102	51 15. 35 1: 35 1: 59 10. 2 < 0.00 EG 20.00	500 62 500 500 500 500 500 500 500 50	72 42 106 70 439 1 I ² = 86 Fotal 20 81 66 41 83 72	15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4% 10.0% % Weight 5.4% 10.1% 10.8% 9.8% 11.2% 9.4%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 1.16 [4.98, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 6.12 [0.42, 11.82] 14.40 [10.46, 18.34] 18.68 [12.51, 24.85]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 ⁴ = 21.32; Ch tt Z = 2.78 (F <u>P</u> <u>Mean</u> 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.5	14.5 1 9.5 7.6 9 0.04 3 1 ² = 37.03 P = 0.005) PG 50 Tc 20.35 11.95 13.4 14.25 13.9 17.18 14.94	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62. 72 50 61 50 61 51 62. 72 51 62. 73 74 75 62. 75 62. 75 62. 75 62. 75 7 79 4 11 66 7 68 70 22 79 8 68 70 22 79 8 68 70 22 79 8 68 70 22 79 8 79 8 70	$51 15. \\ 35 13. \\ 1.1 9 \\ 59 10. \\ \hline 9 \\ 63 \\ 10. \\ 57 14. \\ 10. \\ 5.3 10. \\ 5.3 10. \\ 5.3 10. \\ 5.3 10. \\ 5.3 10. \\ 5.4 10. \\ 6.4 10. \\ \hline 9 \\ 10. \\ 10$	50 62 3.9 9.2 62 0001); 50 1,004 5.37 4.2 1.84 1.5 0.05 0.16	72 42 106 70 439 1 I [≈] = 86 I [≈] = 86 20 81 66 41 83 72 83	Weight 15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4% 100.0% % Weight 5.4% 10.1% 10.8% 9.8% 11.2% 9.4% 9.6%	Mail 10.64, 10.67, 9.31] 1.06 [-3.99, 61.2] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 6.12 [0.42, 11.82] 14.40 [10.46, 18.34] 18.68 [12.51, 24.85] 7.10 [1.15, 13.05] 7.10 [1.15, 13.05]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim 2015 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 2 = 21.32; Ch tt Z = 2.78 (f P Mean 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 110.16	14.5 1 9.5 7.6 $(0.04)^{-1}$ $r^{-1} = 37.03$ $r^{-1} = 37.03$ $r^{-1} = 0.005$ r^{-1} $r^{-1} = 37.03$ $r^{-1} = 37.03$	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62. 72 . , df = 5 (() 94 11 66 95 794 11 66 95 79 8 68 102 28 10 24 94	51 15. 35 1: 35 1: 59 10. 2 < 0.00 EG 20 6.57 14 5.3 1 .57 14 5.3 1 .57 14 5.3 20 6.4 10 .12 24	5.5 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.2 5.2	72 42 106 70 439 1 I [≈] = 86 1 [№] = 86 20 81 66 41 83 72 83 42	Weight 15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4% 10.0% % 5.4% 10.1% 10.8% 9.8% 11.2% 9.8% 11.2% 9.6% 6.5%	Mean Difference W. Random, 95% Cl 17.16 (4.95, 9.31) 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference W. Random, 95% Cl 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 0.37 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 6.12 [0.42, 11.82] 14.40 [10.46, 18.34] 18.68 [12.51, 24.85] 7.10 [1.15, 13.05] 15.04 [4.92, 25.16]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 2 = 21.32; Ch 2 = 2.78 (f <u>P</u> <u>Mean</u> 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7 113.5 110.16 999	$\begin{array}{c cccccc} 14.5 & & 0.5 \\ 9.5 & & 7.6 \\ 7.6 & & 0.04 \\ \hline & & 3.5 \\ 14^{2} = 37.03 \\ P = 0.005 \\ PG \\ \hline & & 5D & Tc \\ $	88 80. 44 69.7 50 61 51 62. 72 72 20 9 32 87 94 11 66 96 79 8 68 102 28 10 28 10 28 10 29 8 64 96 50 8	51 15. 35 1: 35 1: 59 10. 2 < 0.00 EG ean 8.5 19 .25 15 7.1 1 .57 14 5.3 1 .05 20 6.4 10 .12 24 1.2 1	62 3.9 9.2 62 00001); 5D T 0.04 1.5 0.05 0.16 0.97 7.9	72 42 106 70 439 1 I ² = 86 70 81 66 41 83 72 83 42 106	Weight 15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4% 100.0% % 5.4% 10.8% 9.8% 11.2% 9.8% 9.6% 9.6%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 1.16 [4.39, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 6.12 [0.42, 11.82] 14.40 [10.46, 18.34] 18.68 [12.51, 24.85] 7.10 [11.51, 30.65] 15.04 [4.92, 25.16] 15.80 [4.93, 23.77]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 = 21.32; Ch t: Z = 2.78 (f <u>P</u> <u>Mean</u> 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.6 110.16 99.7	14.5 1 9.5 7.6 3 7.6 3 0.04 3 i ^a = 37.03 P = 0.005) PG 5D Tc 20.35 11.95 13.4 14.25 13.9 17.18 14.94 22.79 17.78 17.79 17.69	Main Main 00 0 00 0 00 0 00 0 00 0 00 0 00 0 00 0 00 0 01 0 02 0 03 0 04 0 05 0 05 0 06 9 06 0 07 0 08 10 28 10 28 10 28 10 28 10 28 10 28 10 29 8 30 8 30 8	51 15. 35 13. 35 13. 59 10. 2 < 0.00 2 <	62 3.9 9.2 62 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0	72 42 106 70 439 1 ² = 86 20 81 66 41 83 72 83 72 83 42 106 70	Weight 15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4% 100.0% % 5.4% 10.1% 10.8% 9.8% 11.2% 9.6% 6.5% 9.6% 8.1%	Mean Difference Wean Difference W.Random, 95% CI 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 0.06 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference W.Random, 95% CI 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 0.07 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [1.63, 20.37] 6.12 [0.42, 11.82] 14.40 [10.46, 18.34] 18.68 [12.51, 24.85] 7.10 [1.15, 13.05] 15.04 [4.92, 25.16] 17.80 [1.83, 23.77] 20.11 [12.22, 28.00]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 2 = 21.32; Ch tt Z = 2.78 (f P Mean 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.15 110.16 99.9 109.92 83.3	14.5 1 9.5 7.6 9 7.6 9 0.04 3 7 9 = 37.03 P = 0.005) PG 5D To 20.35 11.95 13.4 14.25 13.9 17.18 14.94 22.79 17.7 14.94 22.79 17.79 9.1	88 80 44 69.7 50 61 37 62 72 72 72 9 32 87 32 87 32 87 32 87 68 102 50 6 50 6 37 89 36 37 89 26	51 15. 55 11: 55 10: 55 10: 56 10: 57 40: 57 10: 57 14 5.3 1 57 14 5.3 1 50 20 6.4 10: 1.2 24 1.2 1 8.1 2 72 1	62 3.9 9.2 62 50001); 5001 500	72 42 106 70 439 1 20 81 66 41 83 72 83 42 106 70 22	Weight 15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4% 10.0% % Weight 5.4% 10.1% 10.8% 9.8% 11.2% 9.6% 8.5% 9.6% 8.5% 9.5%	Mean Difference V. Random, 95% Cl 10.6 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference V. Random, 95% Cl 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 0.87 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 6.12 [0.42, 11.82] 14.40 [10.46, 18.34] 18.66 [12.51, 24.86] 7.10 [1.15, 13.06] 15.04 [4.92, 25.16] 17.80 [11.83, 23.77] 20.11 [12.22, 28.17] 11.30 [51.51, 74.65]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim 2015 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 2 = 21.32; Ch tt Z = 2.78 (f <u>Penne</u> 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.16 99.7 99.0 99.0 99.3 109.92 83.3	14.5 1 9.5 7.6 3 0.04 3 1 [#] = 37.03 P = 0.005) PG 20.35 13.4 14.25 13.4 14.25 13.9 17.18 14.94 22.79 17.7 17.69 9.1	88 80 44 69.7 50 61 37 62 72 72 72 9 32 87 94 11 66 95 79 8 68 102 28 102 28 102 28 102 28 102 28 102 28 102 29 82 50 8 37 88 26 26	51 15. 35 11: 59 10. E66 ean 8.5 19 .25 15 .7.1 1 .57 14 .53 1 .05 20 6.4 10 .12 24 .12 1 .81 2 .72 1	500 500 500 500 500 500 500 500	72 42 106 70 439 1 20 81 66 41 83 72 83 42 106 70 22	Weight 15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4% 10.0% % 10.0% 9.8% 11.2% 9.8% 11.2% 9.6% 8.5% 9.6% 8.1% 9.5%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 2.70 [-0.4, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 0.37 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 6.12 [0.42, 11.82] 14.40 [10.46, 18.34] 18.68 [12.51, 24.85] 7.10 [1.15, 13.05] 7.10 [1.15, 13.05] 17.80 [11.83, 23.77] 20.11 [12.22, 28.00] 11.30 [5.15, 17.45]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Total (95% Cl)	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 = 21.32; Ch t: Z = 2.78 (F <u>P</u> <u>Mean</u> 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.6 110.16 99.7 120.73 110.16 83.3	14.5 1 9.5 7.6 3 0.04 3 1 ² = 37.03 P = 0.005) PG <u>SD Tc</u> 20.35 11.95 13.9 13.4 14.25 13.9 13.4 14.25 13.9 17.18 14.94 22.79 17.69 9.1 5	SE 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62. 72 72 x, df = 5 () 9 32 87 94 11 66 95 79 8 68 102 24 95 50 83 37 89 36 37 36 37 37 89 544 56	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	5.5 62 3.9 9.2 62 50001); 5 <u>SD 1</u> 0.04 5.37 4.2 8.84 1.5 0.05 0.16 9.7 7.9 2.3 3.2 1	72 42 106 70 439 1 1 [≠] = 86 1 [≠] = 86 81 66 41 83 72 83 42 106 70 22 686	Weight 15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4% 10.0% % Weight 10.1% 10.1% 9.8% 11.2% 9.8% 11.2% 9.8% 11.2% 9.8% 11.2% 9.8% 11.2% 9.8% 11.2% 9.8% 11.2	Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CI 17.16 (4.95, 29.37) 1.06 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CI 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 0.07 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [1.63, 20.37] 6.12 [0.42, 11.82] 14.40 [10.46, 18.34] 18.68 [12.51, 24.85] 7.10 [1.15, 13.05] 15.04 [4.92, 25.16] 17.80 [11.83, 23.77] 20.11 [12.22, 28.00] 11.30 [5.15, 17.45] 12.79 [9.08, 16.50]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ²	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 = 21.32; Ch t: Z = 2.78 (f P <u>Mean</u> 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.16 99.9 109.92 83.3 = 27.99; Ch	14.5 9.5 7.6 3 0.04 3 1 ² = 37.03 P = 0.005) PG 5D Tc 20.35 11.95 13.4 14.25 13.9 17.18 14.94 22.79 17.7 17.69 9.1 9.1 € 5 1 ² = 40.75	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62. 72 72 20 9 32 87 94 11 66 95 79 8 68 102 28 102 28 102 37 89 26 544 644 95 544 95	51 15. 35 1: 59 10. 59 10. 59 10. 50 10. 50 10. 50 10. 50 10. 51 10. 53 10. 53 10. 53 10. 53 10. 53 10. 54 10. 54 10. 57 14. 53 10. 54 10. 55 10. 57 10.	62 3.9 9.2 62 0001); 5004 5.37 4.2 84 1.5 0.05 1.97 7.9 3.3 2.1 001); 1 001); 1	72 42 106 70 439 1 ¹ ² = 86 ¹ ²	Weight 15.1% 15.1% 15.1% 16.4% 10.4% 00.0% % Weight 5.4% 10.1% 10.8% 9.8% 9.8% 9.4% 9.6% 8.1% 9.5% 100.0%	Mean Difference V. Random, 95% C1 1.6 (-3.99, 6.12) 2.70 (-0.04, 5.44) 2.60 (-1.48, 6.68) 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference W. Random, 95% C1 17.16 (4.95, 29.37) 0.97 (-4.35, 6.29) 16.00 (11.63, 20.37) 17.10 (1.15, 13.05) 15.04 (4.92, 25.16) 17.80 (11.83, 23.77) 20.11 (1.22, 28.00) 11.30 (5.15, 17.45) 12.79 [9.08, 16.50]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference M. Random. 95% Cl
kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawal 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2018 Kim 2015 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 *= 21.32; Ch tt Z = 2.78 (f P Mean 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 109.92 83.3 = 27.99; Ch tt Z = 6.76 (f	14.5 1 9.5 7.6 3 0.04 3 1 ³ = 37.03 P = 0.005) PG 20.35 13.4 14.25 13.9 17.18 14.95 13.9 17.18 14.95 13.9 17.18 14.95 17.69 9.1 5 ⁵ ² = 40.75 ⁵ ² < 0.0000	88 80. 44 69.7. 50 61. 37 62. 72 72 20 § 32 87 94 11 20 § 32 87 94 11 50 66 50 8 50 8 26 50 26 26 544 96 10 10	51 15. 35 1: 59 10. 59 10. 59 10. 59 10. 50 10. 50 10. 50 10. 50 10. 51 10. 53 1 53 1 53 1 53 1 53 1 53 1 53 1 53 1 53 1 54 10. 59 10. 50 10. 5	62 3.9 9.2 62 62 5.2 1.0 0.001); i 5.2 1.5 0.05 1.6 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.07 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.07 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.07 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.07 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.07 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.07 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.07 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.07 1.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0	72 42 106 70 439 1 ² = 86 (otal 1) 20 81 66 83 72 83 42 83 72 83 42 106 70 22 686 [² = 75 ⁴	11.5.1% 15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 10.0% 10.1% 5.4% 10.1% 10.8% 9.8% 9.8% 9.8% 9.8% 9.8% 9.5% 100.0% %	Mean Difference 17.16 (4.95, 9.31) 1.06 (-3.99, 6.12) 2.70 (-0.04, 5.44) 2.60 (-1.48, 6.68) 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 17.16 (4.95, 29.37) 1.6.72 (0.42, 11.82) 16.00 (11.63, 20.37) 6.12 (0.42, 11.82) 15.04 [4.92, 25.16] 15.04 [4.92, 25.16] 15.04 [4.92, 25.16] 17.80 [1.183, 23.77] 20.11 [1.22, 28.00] 11.30 [5.15, 17.45] 12.79 [9.08, 16.50]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity. Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawali 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity. Tau ² Test for overall effec	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 = 21.32; Ch t: Z = 2.78 (f P Mean 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.6 101.61 99.9 109.92 83.3 = 27.99; Ch t: Z = 6.76 (f	14.5 9.5 7.6 3 0.04 3 $i^2 = 37.03$ P = 0.005 PG 5D Tc 20.35 11.95 13.4 14.25 13.9 17.18 14.25 13.9 17.18 14.94 22.79 17.78 9.1 2.79 17.69 9.1 $i^2 = 40.75$ P = 40.75 P < 0.0000	88 80. 44 69.7 50 61. 73 62. 77 2 72	$ \begin{array}{c} 51 & 15. \\ 35 & 1. \\ 59 & 10. \\ \hline \\ 59 & 10. \\ \hline \\ 8.5 & 19 \\ 8.5 & 19 \\ 8.5 & 19 \\ 8.5 & 19 \\ 8.5 & 19 \\ 7.1 & 1 \\ 5.7 & 14 \\ 5.3 & 1 \\ 1.25 & 15 \\ 7.1 & 1 \\ 1.57 & 14 \\ 1.57 & 14 \\ 1.57 & 14 \\ 1.2 & 24 \\ 1.2 & 24 \\ 1.2 & 1 \\ 1.2 & 24 \\ 1.2 & 1 \\ 1.2 & 24 \\ 1.2 & 1 \\ 1.2 & 24 \\ 1.2 & 1 \\ 1.2 & 24 \\ 1.2 & 1 \\ 1.2 & 24 \\ 1.2 & 1 \\ 1.2 & $	62 3.9 9.2 62 62 62 62 62 62 62 62 62 6	72 42 106 70 439 1 ² = 86 66 41 83 81 666 41 83 42 106 70 22 888 686 ² = 75 ⁴	11.5.1% 15.0% 15.0% 16.4% 10.0% % Weight 5.4% 10.1% 10.8% 9.6% 8.1% 9.6% 8.1% 9.6% 8.1% 9.6% 8.1% 9.6%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 1.16 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 1.7.16 [4.95, 29.37] 6.12 [0.42, 11.82] 14.00 [1.63, 20.37] 6.12 [0.42, 11.83] 18.88 [12.51, 24.85] 7.10 [1.15, 13.05] 15.04 [4.92, 25.16] 17.80 [1.83, 23.77] 20.11 [12.22, 28.00] 11.30 [5.15, 17.45] 12.79 [9.08, 16.50]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kim YJ 2014 Kim YJ 2014 Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec E	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 *= 21.32; Ch t: Z = 2.78 (f P Mean 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.55 110.16 99.7 109.92 83.3 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	14.5 9.5 7.6 9.5 0.04 3 1 ² = 37.03 P = 0.005 PG 5D Tc 20.35 11.95 13.4 14.25 13.4 14.25 13.4 14.25 13.4 14.25 13.4 14.25 13.4 14.25 17.69 9.1 ² = 40.75 ² < 0.0000 PG	68 80. 44 69.7 50 61 37 62. 72 72 72 72 737 62. 79 11 79 12 66 92 66 92 50 68 50 68 50 87 50 87 50 86 50 85 50 86 50 86 50 86 50 86 50 86 50 87 50 87 544 96 544 91 544 91 54 91 54 92	51 15. 35 11: 59 10. 2 < 0.00 EG6 ean 2.5 19: 7.1 14. 5.3 10. 5.3 10. 5.3 11. 5.3 12. 7.2 12. 7.2 1 P < 0.0 EG 60. EG 60. EG 70. 2.5 10. 2.5 10.	62 3.9 9.2 62 0001); 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	72 42 106 70 439 1 1 ² = 86 41 83 42 106 70 22 686 F = 75 ⁴	11.5.1% 15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 10.0% % Weight 5.4% 9.8% 9.8% 9.8% 6.5% 9.6% 9.6% 9.5% 10.0.0% %	Mean Difference W. Random, 95% Cl 16, 43, 26, 16, 7, 9, 31] 2, 70 [-0, 4, 5, 44] 2, 60 [-1, 48, 6, 68] 5, 69 [1, 67, 9, 71] Mean Difference W. Random, 95% Cl 17, 16 [4, 95, 29, 37] 0, 37 [-4, 35, 6, 29] 16, 00 [11, 63, 20, 37] 0, 37 [-4, 35, 6, 29] 16, 00 [11, 63, 20, 37] 16, 12 [0, 42, 11, 82] 14, 40 [10, 46, 18, 34] 18, 86 [12, 51, 24, 85] 7, 10 [11, 51, 30, 51] 17, 80 [11, 83, 23, 77] 20, 11 [12, 22, 280] 11, 30 [5, 15, 17, 45] 12, 79 [9, 08, 16, 50] Mean Difference	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Akil 2017 Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec E Study or Subgroup	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 2 = 21.32; Ch tt Z = 2.78 (f P <u>Mean</u> 115.66 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.169 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.169 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.169 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.169 99.7 120.92 83.3 29.9; Ch tt Z = 6.76 (f P Mean	14.5 9.5 7.6 9.7.6 9.7.6 9.7.6 9.7.6 9.7.03 P = 0.005) PG 50.75 13.4 14.25 13.9 17.18 14.25 13.4 14.25 13.9 17.7 17.69 9.1 7.69 9.1 7.69 9.1 7.69 9.1 7.69 9.1 7.69 9.1 7.69 9.1 7.69 9.1 7.69 9.1 7.69 9.1 7.69 7.79 7.79 7.79 7.79 7.79 7.79	88 80. 88 80. 44 69.7 37 62. 72 72 xtal M. 20 § 32 87 94 111 66 96 50 61 50 62 63 79 64 92 50 6 50 6 50 6 50 6 51 26 544 94 544 94 544 94 544 95 544 91 544 92 544 93 544 94 54 93 54 94 54 94 55 5 54 94 54 94 54 94 54	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	50 62 3.9 9.2 62 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	72 42 106 70 439 1 1 ² = 86 (otal 1 ² = 86 41 83 72 83 42 106 70 22 686 1 ² = 75 ⁴ 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	11.5.1% 15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 16.4% 100.0% % Weight 5.4% 10.1% 9.8% 10.8% 9.8% 11.2% 9.8% 6.5% 9.6% 9.5% 9.5% 100.0% %	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec E Study or Subgroup Aydogan 2017	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 = 21.32; Ch t: Z = 2.78 (f P Mean 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.16 99.7 120.73 110.16 99.9 99.9 109.92 83.3 = 27.99; Ch t: Z = 6.76 (f P Mean 75.96	14.5 9.5 7.6 9.5 7.6 3 9.5 7.6 3 7.6 3 7.6 3 7.6 3 7.6 3 7.0 7.0 9 7.0 5 7 7.0 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 8 7 7 8 7 7 8 7 7 8 7 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 8 7 8 8 7 8 8 7 8 8 7 8 8 7 8 8 7 8 8 7 8 8 7 8 8 8 7 8 8 8 8 8 7 8	88 80. 88 80. 44 69.7 500 61 71 72 72 72 72 72 73 82. 74 95. 79 8 86 102 28 10 44 95. 37 85. 26 37 85 26 144 94. 44 94. 144 94. 144 94. 144 94. 144 94. 144 94. 144 94. 144 94. 144 94. 144 94. 145. 94.	51 15. 35 11. 59 10. 2 < 0.00 EG 8.5 19 2.5 15 7.1 1 8.5 19 2.5 15 7.1 1 5.3 1 0.5 20 1.2 24 1.2 1 P < 0.0 EG n S 8 11	62 3.9 9.2 62 62 62 62 62 62 62 62 62 6	72 42 42 106 70 439 1 439 1 1 20 81 6 68 70 22 686 70 22 6886 72 22 6886 75 75 00 22 66 01 75 75 02 75 75 03 75 75	11.5.1% 115.1% 115.1% 115.1% 116.4% 100.0% % Weight 10.8% 9.8% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.4% 9.5% 10.2% 10.0% %	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 1.06 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 1.7.16 [4.95, 29.37] 6.12 [0.42, 11.82] 14.40 [10.46, 18.34] 18.68 [12.51, 24.85] 7.10 [1.16, 3.037] 15.7.20 [1.83, 23.77] 20.11 [12.22, 28.00] 11.30 [5.15, 17.45] 12.79 [9.08, 16.50] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 7.86 [4.59, 11.33]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -20 -10 0 10 20 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec E Study or Subgroup Aydogan 2017	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 1 2 = 21.32; Ch t: Z = 2.78 (f P Mean 115.66 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.93 109.93 83.2 99 109.93 83.2 99 109.93 83.2 99 109.93 83.2 99 109.93 83.2 99 109.93 83.2 99 109.93 83.2 99 109.93 83.2 99 109.93 83.2 99 109.93 83.2 99 109.65 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.	14.5 9.5 7.6 9.5 0.04 3 1 ² = 37.03 P = 0.005 PG 5D Tc 20.35 11.95 13.4 14.25 13.4 14.25 13.4 14.25 13.4 14.25 13.4 14.25 13.4 14.25 13.4 14.95 17.76 9.1 ² ² = 40.75 ² < 0.0000 PG <u>SD Tc</u> 10.9 10.1 10.9 10.9 10.9 10.9 10.9 ³ ³ ³ ⁴ ⁴ ⁵ ⁴ ⁵ ⁵ ⁵ ⁵ ⁵ ⁵ ⁵ ⁵	88 80. 80 80. 80 80. 80 80. 81 80. 93 762. 72 72 94 191. 94 92. 97 82. 87 94. 11 66. 92.0 87. 94. 11. 66. 92. 50. 86. 50. 86. 50. 85. 50. 86. 50. 86. 50. 86. 50. 86. 50. 86. 50. 86. 50. 86. 50. 86. 50. 86. 51. 87. 52. 54. 54. 54. 55. 87. 56. 79. 57. 79. 57. <td< td=""><td>51 15. 53 10. 53 10. 54 10. 54 10. 55 10.</td><td>62 3.9 9.2 62 9.2 62 9.001); 1.5 9.04 5.37 4.2 8.84 1.5 9.7 7.9 1.3 001); 1.5 001); 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0</td><td>72 42 42 106 70 439 1 439 1 1* = 86 106 41 83 72 83 72 83 72 686 70 22 686 6* 70 22 686 6* 7 5* 75* 5* 75* 5* 686 1* 75* 5* 75* 5* 686 1* 8* 75* 5* 75*</td><td>115.1% 15.0% 15.0% 10.00.0% % Weightt 10.1% 10.1% 10.1% 9.8% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 9.5% 100.0% %</td><td>Mean Difference W. Random, 95% C1 1.30 [1.5.7, 1.4] Wean Difference W. Random, 95% C1 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 17.80 [11.83, 23.77] 0.11 [12.22, 28.00] 11.30 [5.15, 17.45] 12.79 [9.08, 16.50] Mean Difference W. Random, 95% C1 7.96 [4.59, 11.33] 1.30 [10.77, 17.03]</td><td>-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference M. Random, 95% Cl</td></td<>	51 15. 53 10. 53 10. 54 10. 54 10. 55 10.	62 3.9 9.2 62 9.2 62 9.001); 1.5 9.04 5.37 4.2 8.84 1.5 9.7 7.9 1.3 001); 1.5 001); 1.5 0.05 1.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0	72 42 42 106 70 439 1 439 1 1* = 86 106 41 83 72 83 72 83 72 686 70 22 686 6* 70 22 686 6* 7 5* 75* 5* 75* 5* 686 1* 75* 5* 75* 5* 686 1* 8* 75* 5* 75*	115.1% 15.0% 15.0% 10.00.0% % Weightt 10.1% 10.1% 10.1% 9.8% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 9.5% 100.0% %	Mean Difference W. Random, 95% C1 1.30 [1.5.7, 1.4] Wean Difference W. Random, 95% C1 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 17.80 [11.83, 23.77] 0.11 [12.22, 28.00] 11.30 [5.15, 17.45] 12.79 [9.08, 16.50] Mean Difference W. Random, 95% C1 7.96 [4.59, 11.33] 1.30 [10.77, 17.03]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference M. Random, 95% Cl
kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Akil 2017 Akil 2017 Akil 2017 Akil 2017 Akil 2017 Akil 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Kim 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec E Study or Subgroup Aydogan 2017 Kim XJ 2015 Kim XJ 2014	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	14.5 9.5 7.6 9.7.6 9.7.6 9.0.4 3.7.03 P = 0.005) PG 50.35 13.4 14.25 13.9 17.18 14.25 13.9 17.69 9.1 7.69 7.69 7.6 7.69 7.6 7.69 7.6 7.69 7.6 7.69 7.69 7.7 7.7 7.7 7.7 7.7 7.7 7.7 7.	88 80. 88 80. 44 69.7 60 61 37 62. 72 72 1 10 20 5 32 87 94 111 66 96 68 102 28 10 28 10 44 94 40 45 50 68 101 11) tal Mez 44 94 67 90 68 102 28 10 101 11 tal Mez 404 6 77 60 30 76	51 15. 35 11. 59 10. 59 10. EG 8.5 19 8.5 19 7.1 1 1.57 14 8.5 20 6.4 10 1.2 24 1.2 1 P < 0.0 EG n S 8 11 2 9 1 2	62 3.9 9.2 62 62 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	72 42 429 1 70 439 1 70 81 1 20 81 1 66 70 20 81 83 72 83 42 106 70 22 686 686 67 70 22 686 1 683 41 1 439 1 1	115.1% 15.0% 15.0% 16.4% 100.0% % Weight 10.1% 10.8% 9.8% 8.1% 9.6% 8.1% 9.5% 100.0% % Veight 15.5%	Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CI V. Cli (1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1) V. Cli (1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2) V. Random, 95% CI V. Random, 95	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -20 -10 0 10 20 PPG EG Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
kim VJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Arintawati 2013 Kim VJ 2014 Kim VJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec E Study or Subgroup Aydogan 2017 Kim 2015 Kim KE 2014	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 = 21.32; Ch t: Z = 2.78 (f <u>P</u> <u>Mean</u> 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.6 101.69 99.7 120.73 110.16 99.9 109.92 100.92 100.9	14.5 9.5 7.6 9.5 7.6 9.5 7.6 9.5 7.6 9.5 7.0 9.7 9.7 9.7 13.4 14.25 13.9 17.18 14.25 13.9 17.18 14.25 13.9 17.69 9.1 9.1 9.1 9.1 9.1 9.1 9.1 9.	88 90. 88 90. 84 69.7 837 62. 72 72 72 72 10 94 91 11 92 87 93 94 94 16 97 96 66 92 79 12 79 80 92 12 44 92 92 12 11 10 12 10 14 92 150 82 164 94 17 94 17 94 18 94 19 94 10 37 10 37 10 37 11 10 12 10 13 10 14 10 15	51 15. 55 10. 55 10. 55 10. 55 10. 55 10. 55 10. 55 10. 55 10. 55 10. 55 10. 57 14. 5.3 1. 5.7 14. 5.3 1. 5.7 14. 5.3 1. 5.7 14. 5.3 1. 5.7 14. 5.3 1. 5.7 14. 5.3 1. 5.7 14. 5.3 10. 5.7 14. 5.3 10. 5.7 14. 5.7	62 3.9 9.2 62 62 52 1 0.001); 52 1 0.04 5.37 7.9 2.1 0.01); 1 52 1 52 1 52 1 53 53 53 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54	72 42 429 1 70 439 439 1 1 70 20 81 66 41 83 42 83 42 666 70 22 686 6 6 70 22 686 6 83 42 866 6 106 10 666 1 833 11 111 1	115.1% 15.0% 15.0% 16.4% 000.0% % Weightt 10.8% 5.4% 10.1% 10.8% 6.5% 9.8% 9.8% 9.8% 9.5% 100.0% % Veight 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.2%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 1.30 [-1.38, 3.77] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 1.16 [-3.98, 6.12] 1.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 1.7.16 [4.95, 29.37] 6.12 [0.42, 11.82] 14.40 [10.46, 18.34] 18.68 [12.51, 24.85] 7.10 [1.16, 3.20.37] 6.12 [0.42, 11.82] 15.04 [4.92, 25.16] 15.04 [4.92, 25.16] 17.80 [1.18, 32.77] 20.11 [12.22, 28.00] 11.30 [5.15, 17.45] 12.79 [9.08, 16.50] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 7.36 [4.59, 11.33] 13.90 [10.77, 17.03] 10.10 [6.41, 13.79] 7.68 [2.66, 12.50]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -20 -10 0 10 20 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Avintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec E Study or Subgroup Aydogan 2017 Kim XE 2014 Kim X2 2014 Kim X2 2014	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 = 21.32; Ch t: Z = 2.78 (f P Mean 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99 109.92 83.3 = 27.99; Ch t: Z = 6.76 (F P Mean 75.96 74.1 87 74.57 14.57 15.57 1	14.5 9.5 7.6 33 $= 37.03$ $P = 0.005$ PG SD Tc 20.35 11.95 13.9 17.18 14.25 13.9 17.7 17.69 9.1 $P = 5$ < 0.0000 PG PG $P = 40.75$ < 0.0000 PG SD To 10.1 10.9 14.4 14.72 18.3	88 80. 80 80. 44 69.7 637 62. 72 72 72 72 737 62. 741 M. 752 87 79 111 66 102. 79 28 616 102. 79 26 644 94 617 79 618 102. 79 60. 703 76 614 44 94 6 618 70.2 79 60. 703 76. 618 70.2 76 60. 70.3 76. 614 68. 70. 60. 70. 60. 70. 60. 70. 60. 70. 60. 70. 60. <td>51 15. 55 10. 55 10. 55 10. EG an EG 88.5 19 2.25 15 7.1 1 1.57 14 5.3 1 0.5 20 6.4 10 1.2 24 P < 0.0 EG n S 8 11 P < 0.0 EG 9 4 0.0 1.2 24 9 9 14. 3 158 1.5 15 1.2 24 1.2 24 1.5 15 1.5 15 1.</td> <td>62 3.9 9.2 62 62 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50</td> <td>72 42 429 1 70 439 1 439 1 1 12 83 1 83 42 1 686 1 22 686 70 22 686 1 23 686 1 3 111 1 72 121 1 1</td> <td>115.1% 15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 10.00.0% % Weightt 10.1% 10.1% 9.8% 9.8% 9.6% 9.8% 9.6% 9.5% 10.0% 15.5% 15.8% 15.8% 15.8% 15.8% 15.8% 11.5%</td> <td>Mean Difference Wean Difference W. Random, 95% (C1) 11, 16 (-3.9, 9, 612) 2.70 (-0.04, 5.44) 2.60 (-1.48, 6.68) 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference W. Random, 95% (C1) 17.16 (4.95, 29.37) 0.37 (-4.35, 6.29) 16.00 (11.63, 20.37) 0.37 (-4.35, 6.29) 16.00 (14.63, 20.37) 0.37 (-4.35, 6.29) 16.00 (14.63, 20.37) 0.17 (1.16, 20.37) 0.17 (1.49, 2.25.16) 17.80 (11.83, 23.77) 20.11 (12.22, 28.00) 11.30 (5.15, 17.45) 12.79 (9.08, 16.50) Mean Difference W. Random, 95% (C1) 7.96 (4.59, 11.33) 13.09 (10.77, 17.03) 10.10 (6.41, 13.79) 7.63 (2.86, 12.50)</td> <td>-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference M. Random, 95% Cl -20 -10 0 10 20 PPG EG Mean Difference N. Random, 95% Cl</td>	51 15. 55 10. 55 10. 55 10. EG an EG 88.5 19 2.25 15 7.1 1 1.57 14 5.3 1 0.5 20 6.4 10 1.2 24 P < 0.0 EG n S 8 11 P < 0.0 EG 9 4 0.0 1.2 24 9 9 14. 3 158 1.5 15 1.2 24 1.2 24 1.5 15 1.5 15 1.	62 3.9 9.2 62 62 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	72 42 429 1 70 439 1 439 1 1 12 83 1 83 42 1 686 1 22 686 70 22 686 1 23 686 1 3 111 1 72 121 1 1	115.1% 15.1% 15.0% 18.1% 10.00.0% % Weightt 10.1% 10.1% 9.8% 9.8% 9.6% 9.8% 9.6% 9.5% 10.0% 15.5% 15.8% 15.8% 15.8% 15.8% 15.8% 11.5%	Mean Difference Wean Difference W. Random, 95% (C1) 11, 16 (-3.9, 9, 612) 2.70 (-0.04, 5.44) 2.60 (-1.48, 6.68) 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference W. Random, 95% (C1) 17.16 (4.95, 29.37) 0.37 (-4.35, 6.29) 16.00 (11.63, 20.37) 0.37 (-4.35, 6.29) 16.00 (14.63, 20.37) 0.37 (-4.35, 6.29) 16.00 (14.63, 20.37) 0.17 (1.16, 20.37) 0.17 (1.49, 2.25.16) 17.80 (11.83, 23.77) 20.11 (12.22, 28.00) 11.30 (5.15, 17.45) 12.79 (9.08, 16.50) Mean Difference W. Random, 95% (C1) 7.96 (4.59, 11.33) 13.09 (10.77, 17.03) 10.10 (6.41, 13.79) 7.63 (2.86, 12.50)	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference M. Random, 95% Cl -20 -10 0 10 20 PPG EG Mean Difference N. Random, 95% Cl
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim 2015 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec E Study or Subgroup Aydogan 2017 Kim X015 Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 2 = 21.32; Ch tt Z = 2.78 (f P Mean 115.66 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.169 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 100.92 83.3 227.99; Ch tt Z = 6.76 (f P Mean 75.96 74.1 87 78.57 1 74.57 1 75.57 1 7	14.5 9.5 7.6 9.7.6 9.7.6 9.7.6 9.7.03 P = 0.005; PG 20.35 13.4 14.25 13.9 17.18 14.25 13.9 17.69 9.1 7.69 7.6 7.69 7.6 7.69 7.6 7.69	88 80. 88 80. 44 89.7 60 61 37 62. 72 72 10 50 10 20 20 52 94 111 106 95 668 102 28 10 28 10 29.1 14 44 92 44 94 61 10 11) 11 tal Mez 603 76 644 66. 79 6 634 6 73 60 644 64.4 644 66.0 70.5 50	51 15. 35 11. 59 10. 59 10. EG 8.5 19 8.5 19 8.5 19 7.1 1 1.57 14 8.5 20 6.4 10 1.2 24 1.2 1 1.2 24 1.2 1 P < 0.0 EG n S 8 11 2 9 1 2 9 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1	62 3.9 9.2 62 62 50 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	72 42 429 1 70 439 439 1 70 20 83 1 83 72 83 42 106 70 22 686 686 11 683 1 111 72 72 1 06 1 111 1 72 1 06 1 07 22	115.1% 15.1% 15.0% 16.4% 100.0% % Weight 10.1% 10.1% 10.1% 9.8% 9.8% 8.1% 9.6% 8.1% 9.5% 10.0% % Veight 15.5% 15.0% 15.0% 13.2% 11.51%	Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI 7,96 (4, 59, 11, 30) 11,06 (-3, 99, 6, 12) 2,070 (-0, 04, 5, 44) 2,60 (-1, 48, 6, 68) 5,69 [1,67, 9, 71] Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI 17,16 (4, 95, 29, 37) 16, 12 (0, 42, 11, 82) 16, 00 (11, 63, 20, 37) 6, 12 (0, 42, 11, 82) 16, 04 (19, 22, 51, 6) 17,80 (11, 83, 23, 77) 20, 11 (12, 22, 28, 10) 11, 30 (5, 15, 17, 45) 12,79 [9,08, 16, 50] Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI 7,96 (4, 59, 11, 33) 13,90 (10, 77, 17, 30) 11, 30 (6, 14, 13, 79) 7,86 (2, 86, 12, 50) 6, 34 (0, 41, 12, 27) 7,86 (2, 86, 12, 50) 6, 34 (0, 41, 12, 27)	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -20 -10 0 10 20 PPG EG Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec E Study or Subgroup Aydogan 2017 Kim 2015 Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Study or Subgroup Aydogan 2017 Kim 2015 Kim KE 2014 Kim YJ 2014	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 = 21.32; Ch t: Z = 2.78 (f <u>P</u> <u>Mean</u> 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.16 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.16 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.16 99.7 120.73 113.5 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 101.69 99.7 120.73 110.66 99.7 120.73 110.66 99.7 120.73 110.66 99.7 120.73 110.66 99.7 120.73 110.66 99.7 120.73 110.66 83.3 100.99 100.99 7 100.97 7 100.73 110.66 83.3 100.99 7 100.75 100.76 7 100.75 10	14.5 9.5 7.6 9.5 7.6 9.5 7.6 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0 9.0	88 90.0 88 90.0 80 90.0 37 62. 72 72 72 72 73 62. 74 11. 94 11. 79 8. 66 92. 79 8. 66 92. 79 8. 228 10. 44 92. 50 8. 24 11. 11 11. 12 10.0 13 10.0 14 10.0 15 10.0 16 10.0 17 10.0 18 10.0 19.0 10.0 11.0 10.0 11.0 10.0 12.0 10.0 13.0 10.0 14.0 10.0 15.0 10.0 10.0	51 15. 55 10. 55 10. EG an EG 85 19 25 15 1.25 15 7.1 1 5.3 1 1.05 20 1.2 24 1.2 1 P < 0.0 EG 8 11 2 9 9 14. 3 15.8 1 10.8 2 9 9 14.3 3 15.8 1 10.8 2 9 9 14.3 3 15.8 1 10.8 1 10	62 3.9 9.2 62 62 62 62 50 10 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 1 50 50 1 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	72 42 42 106 70 439 1 106 70 1 20 81 6 81 66 1 42 106 70 20 83 42 106 70 22 686 1 70 21 666 1 00 111 1 42 1 1 101 1 1 42 1 1 111 1 1 42 1 1 111 1 1 42 1 1 111 1 1 42 1 1 106 1 1	115.1% 15.0% 15.0% 10.00.0% % Weightt 10.8% 5.4% 10.1% 10.8% 11.2% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% 9.5% 100.0% % Veight 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.2% 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.5% 15.2%	Mean Difference V. A. 21 (-0.67, 9.31) 1.06 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CL 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.71 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.01 [1.63, 20.37] 0.71 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.02 [1.63, 20.37] 0.71 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.02 [1.63, 20.37] 0.71 [1.63, 20.37] 0.71 [1.63, 20.37] 0.11 [1.62, 22, 80.0] 11.30 [51.5, 17.45] 12.79 [9.08, 16.50] Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CL 7.86 [4.59, 11.33] 13.90 [10.77, 17.03] 10.01 [6.41, 13.79] 7.68 [2.68, [2.50] 6.34 [0.41, 12.27] 2.00 [-1.57, 5.57]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI -20 -10 0 10 20 PPG EG Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec E Study or Subgroup Aydogan 2017 Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Kim KE 2014 Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 15.65.19 1 15.65.19 1 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.16 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.16 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.16 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.16 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.16 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.16 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.16 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.92 99.7 110.92 83.3 110.92 99.7 110.92 83.3 110.92 99.7 110.92 83.3 110.92 99.7 110.92 83.3 110.92 83.5 110.92 85.5 110.92 85.5 110.92 85.5 110.92 85.5 110.92 85.5 110.92 85.5 110.92 85.5 110.92 85.5 110.92 85.5 110.95	14.5 9.5 9.5 7.6 33 $= 37.03$ $P = 0.005$ PG SD Tc 20.35 11.95 13.9 17.18 14.25 13.9 17.7 17.69 9.1 $P = 5$ < 0.0000 PG SD To 10.1 10.9 14.44 4.72 10.9 14.44 14.73 10.8 9.52	88 80. 88 80. 44 69.7 637 62. 72 72 72 72 737 62. 741 M. 752 87 94 111 66 810.2 28 102 50 86 50 86 50 86 50 86 50 86 50 86 51 86 52 87 64 94 68 70.2 779 60 779 60 779 60 779 60 703 76 68 70.5 79 60 703 76 64 62 59 37 61.5 59 37 61.5	51 15. 55 10. 55 10. EG an EG an EG 8.5 19 9.25 15 7.1 1 1.57 14 1.57 14 1.57 14 1.57 14 1.57 14 1.2 24 P < 0.0 EG n S 8 11 P < 0.0 EG 1.2 24 P < 0.0 EG 1.2 24 1.2 2 9 9 1.3 1.2 24 1.2 3 1.2 3 1.2 4 1.2 4	62 3.9 9.2 62 62 62 62 62 62 62 62 62 6	72 42 42 106 70 439 439 1 70 83 72 83 72 83 72 83 70 111 72 83 70 1006 71 70	115.1% 15.1% 15.1% 10.0% % Weightt 10.1% 10.1% 10.1% 9.8% 9.8% 9.6% 8.1% 9.6% 8.1% 9.6% 8.1% 9.5% 10.0% 15.5% 15.8% 15.8% 15.8% 15.8% 15.4%	Mean Difference Wean Difference W. Random, 95% C1 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 0.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference W. Random, 95% C1 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 0.37 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.37 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [14.63, 20.37] 0.37 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.01 [1.63, 20.37] 0.37 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.01 [1.63, 20.37] 0.37 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.04 [4.92, 25.16] 7.10 [1.15, 13.05] 15.04 [4.92, 25.16] 17.80 [11.83, 23.77] 20.11 [12.22, 28.00] 11.30 [5.15, 17.45] 12.79 [9.08, 16.50] Mean Difference W. Random, 95% C1 7.96 [4.59, 11.33] 13.09 [10.77, 17.03] 10.10 [6.41, 13.79] 7.63 [2.86, 12.50] 0.34 [0.41, 12.27] 2.00 [-1.57, 5.57] 4.70 [0.40, 9.00]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference N. Random, 95% Cl -20 -10 0 10 20 PPG EG Mean Difference N. Random, 95% Cl -20 -10 0 0 10 20 PPG EG
Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 Kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec E Study or Subgroup Aydogan 2017 Kim XJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Study or Subgroup Aydogan 2017 Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI)	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 1 15.66 115.66 88.22 133.1 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.16 110.169 99.7 120.73 113.16 110.169 99.7 120.73 113.16 110.169 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.169 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.169 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.169 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.169 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.169 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.169 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.169 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.169 99.7 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.169 99.7 120.73 110.165 10.99 10.99.7 120.73 110.165 10.75 110.165 10.75 10.75 110.165 10.75 10.	14.5 9.5 7.6 9.7.6 9.7.6 9.7.6 9.7.6 9.7.03 P = 0.005) PG 50 To 9.1 11.95 13.4 14.25 13.9 17.18 14.25 13.9 17.78 17.69 9.1 17.69 9.1 17.7 17.69 9.1 17.7 17.69 9.1 17.7 17.69 9.1 10.9 10.9 10.9 14.4 10.9 10.9 14.4 10.9 10.9 14.4 10.9 10.9 14.4 10.9 10.8	88 80. 88 80. 44 89.7 60 61 37 62. 72 72 72 1 20 § 337 85 32 87 94 11. 66 96 61 102 28 10 20 2 61 102 28 10 29 10 50 28 614 94 50 26 614 110 111 11 112 11 113 12 114 12 115 10 116 10 117 10 118 10 119 10 110 10 111 10 112 10	51 15. 35 11. 59 10. EG ean 10. 59 10. EG ean 10. 50 10. 50 10. EG ean 10. 50 10. 50 10.	62 3.9 9.2 62 0001); 50 I 0.04 1.04 1.5 1.6 1.5 1.7 001); 1.5 1.7 001); 1.5 1.5 1.7 001); 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3	72 42 439 1 70 439 439 1 70 1 20 1 81 66 41 83 72 83 106 70 686 11 683 1 72 1 683 1 72 1 72 1 72 1 72 1 72 1 72 1 72 1 72 1 72 1 72 1 72 1 70 1 106 7 1 106 7 1	115.1% 15.1% 15.0% 16.4% 100.0% % Weight 10.1% 10.8% 9.8% 9.8% 8.1% 9.6% 8.1% 9.5% 100.0% %	Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CI 7.80 (4.59, 11.30) 1.00 (1.63, 9.9.612) 2.00 (-1.48, 6.68) 5.69 (1.67, 9.71) Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CI 7.10 (1.45, 29.37) 1.30 (5.15, 12.48) 1.60 (11.63, 20.37) 6.12 (0.42, 11.82) 1.60 (11.63, 20.37) 6.12 (0.42, 21.18) 1.60 (4.18, 13.44) 1.868 (12.51, 24.85) 7.10 (1.15, 13.05) 1.50 (4 (49.2, 25.16) 1.7.80 (11.83, 23.77) 20.11 (12.22, 28.00) 11.30 (5.15, 17.45) 12.79 (9.08, 16.50) Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CI 7.96 (4.59, 11.33) 13.90 (10.77, 17.03) 13.00 (10.74, 17.03) 13.00 (10.77, 17.03) 13.00 (10.77, 17.03) 10.10 (5.44, 13.79) 7.68 (2.86, 12.50) 6.34 (0.41, 12.27) 4.70 (0.40, 9.00) 7.64 (4.39, 10.89)	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl -20 -10 0 10 20 PPG EG Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
kim VJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Arintawati 2013 Kim VJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Wang 2020 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec E Study or Subgroup Aydogan 2017 Kim VJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 = 21.32; Ch t: Z = 2.78 (f P Mean 115.66 115.66 101.69 99.7 120.73 113.5 110.16 99.7 109.92 109.92 109.92 109.92 109.92 113.5 110.16 99.7 109.92 109.	14.5 9.5 9.5 7.6 33 7.6 9.5 0.04 33 $P = 37.03$ $P = 0.005$ PG SD 13.9 13.9 17.18 14.25 13.9 17.69 9.1 7.69 9.1 5^{2} 6^{2} SD FO SD SD FO SD FO SD FO SD SD	88 90. 84 69.7 84 69.7 937 62. 72 72 72 72 94 11.7 932 87 94 92 94 12. 94 14.4 95 66. 92 87.7 932 87.7 94 11. 101 14.4 95 66. 92 61. 11) 14. 97.9 60. 97.9 60. 97.9 60. 97.9 60. 97.9 60. 97.9 60. 97.9 60. 97.9 60. 97.9 60. 97.9 60. 97.9 60. 97.9 60. 97.9 60. 97.0 61. 97. <td>51 15. 55 10. 55 10. 55 10. 55 10. 55 10. 56 10. 57 14. 5.3 1 1.5 20. 72 1 P < 0.0 EG R 5. 8 11 2 9 9 14. 3 15.8 1 100 2 9 9 14. 3 15.8 1 100 2 9 9 14. 3 15.8 1 100 2 9 1 100 2 100 1 100 1</td> <td>50000000000000000000000000000000000000</td> <td>72 42 439 1 106 70 439 1 18 80 20 81 66 43 42 106 70 70 686 66 83 111 42 1 686 70 70 1 72 1 650 10</td> <td>115.1% 15.1% 15.0% 10.00.0% % Weightt 10.8% 10.1% 10.8% 11.2% 9.8% 9.8% 9.8% 9.6% 9.5% 10.0.0% % Veight 15.5% 15.5% 15.2% 15.5% 15.2%</td> <td>Mean Difference V. A.32 [-0.67, 9.31] 1.06 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CL 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.71 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.01 [1.63, 20.37] 0.71 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.02 [1.63, 20.37] 0.71 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.02 [1.63, 20.37] 0.71 [-1.52, 29.37] 0.71 [-1.52, 22.800] 11.30 [51.5, 17.45] 12.79 [9.08, 16.50] Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CL 7.86 [4.59, 11.33] 13.90 [10.77, 17.03] 10.01 [6.41, 13.79] 7.68 [2.68, [2.50] 6.34 [0.41, 12.27] 2.00 [-1.57, 5.57] 4.70 [0.40, 9.00] 7.64 [4.39, 10.89]</td> <td>-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference W. Random, 95% CI -20 -10 0 10 20 PPG EG Mean Difference W. Random, 95% CI</td>	51 15. 55 10. 55 10. 55 10. 55 10. 55 10. 56 10. 57 14. 5.3 1 1.5 20. 72 1 P < 0.0 EG R 5. 8 11 2 9 9 14. 3 15.8 1 100 2 9 9 14. 3 15.8 1 100 2 9 9 14. 3 15.8 1 100 2 9 1 100 2 100 1	50000000000000000000000000000000000000	72 42 439 1 106 70 439 1 18 80 20 81 66 43 42 106 70 70 686 66 83 111 42 1 686 70 70 1 72 1 650 10	115.1% 15.1% 15.0% 10.00.0% % Weightt 10.8% 10.1% 10.8% 11.2% 9.8% 9.8% 9.8% 9.6% 9.5% 10.0.0% % Veight 15.5% 15.5% 15.2% 15.5% 15.2%	Mean Difference V. A.32 [-0.67, 9.31] 1.06 [-3.99, 6.12] 2.70 [-0.04, 5.44] 2.60 [-1.48, 6.68] 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CL 17.16 [4.95, 29.37] 0.97 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 0.71 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.01 [1.63, 20.37] 0.71 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.02 [1.63, 20.37] 0.71 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.02 [1.63, 20.37] 0.71 [-1.52, 29.37] 0.71 [-1.52, 22.800] 11.30 [51.5, 17.45] 12.79 [9.08, 16.50] Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CL 7.86 [4.59, 11.33] 13.90 [10.77, 17.03] 10.01 [6.41, 13.79] 7.68 [2.68, [2.50] 6.34 [0.41, 12.27] 2.00 [-1.57, 5.57] 4.70 [0.40, 9.00] 7.64 [4.39, 10.89]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference W. Random, 95% CI -20 -10 0 10 20 PPG EG Mean Difference W. Random, 95% CI
kim YJ 2014 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec D Study or Subgroup Akil 2017 Arintawati 2013 Aydogan 2017 Cennamo 2016 kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 kim YJ 2014 Kumar 2016 Lu 2020 Park 2015 Sung 2014 Vang 2020 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effec Sung 2015 Kim KE 2014 Kim YJ 2014 Kim YJ 2014 Kim YJ 2014 Kim YJ 2015 Kim KE 2014 Kim YJ 2014 Sung 2017 Sung 2014 Total (95% CI)	84.83 70.8 62.8 65.19 1 = 21.32; Ch t: Z = 2.78 (f P Mean 115.66 99.7 120.73 113.55 110.169 99.7 120.73 113.55 110.169 99.7 120.73 113.55	14.5 9.5 9.5 7.6 33 $P = 0.005$ PG SD Tc 20.35 11.95 13.9 17.18 14.25 17.7 17.69 9.1 PG SD To 9.1 $P = 50$ PG SD To 10.1 10.9 14.44 14.73 10.8 9.52 4 9.52 4 9.72	88 80. 84 69.7 837 62. 72 72 72 72 737 62. 74 11.7 86 92. 79 14.1 86 92. 87 94.1 86.8 102.28 87.9 66.8 92.6 26. 144 94.5 44.1 94.6 17.9 60.0 00.3 7.6 50.37 85.3 50.47.6 59.9 37.7 61.5 57.5 5.41.6 60.1) 10.1	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	62 3.9 9.2 52 52 52 54 54 54 54 54 54 55 55 55 55	72 42 42 106 70 18 439 1 106 1 20 81 66 41 83 72 83 72 686 70 62 686 107 683 111 1 72 42 1006 1 70 1 550 111	115.1% 15.1% 15.1% 10.00.0% % Weightt 10.1% 10.1% 10.1% 9.8% 9.6% 9.5% 100.0% % Veight 15.5%	Mean Difference Wean Difference M. (1.48, 6.68) 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference M. (1.48, 6.68) 5.69 [1.67, 9.71] Mean Difference M. (1.48, 6.68) 0.37 [-4.35, 6.29] 10.01 [1.63, 20.37] 0.37 [-4.35, 6.29] 16.00 [11.63, 20.37] 1.01 [1.5, 12] 1.4.40 [10.46, 18.34] 18.68 [12.51, 24.85] 7.10 [1.5, 13.05] 15.04 [4.92, 25.16] 17.80 [11.83, 23.77] 20.11 [12.22, 28.00] 11.30 [5.15, 17.45] 12.79 [9.08, 16.50] Mean Difference M. Random, 95% C1 7.96 [4.59, 11.33] 13.09 [10.77, 17.03] 10.10 [6.41, 13.79] 7.68 [2.86, 12.50] 6.34 [0.41, 12.27] 2.00 [-1.57, 5.57] 4.70 [0.40, 9.00] 7.64 [4.39, 10.89]	-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG Mean Difference M. Random, 95% Cl -20 -10 0 10 20 PPG EG Mean Difference M. Random, 95% Cl -20 -10 0 5 10

Α	1	PPG			EG			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Hwang 2015	72.5	6.9	48	70.2	7.7	110	14.4%	2.30 [-0.13, 4.73]	
Kim 2015	78.9	5.5	79	72.9	6.5	83	17.5%	6.00 [4.15, 7.85]	_ _
Kim 2017	75.75	7.45	26	65.09	8.82	26	7.2%	10.66 [6.22, 15.10]	
Kim KE 2014	77.3	6.6	103	73.5	6.9	111	17.7%	3.80 [1.99, 5.61]	_ _
Kim YJ 2014	66.49	5.36	68	62.36	6.55	72	16.8%	4.13 [2.15, 6.11]	_ _ _
Park 2015	76	7.2	50	71.9	7.2	106	14.4%	4.10 [1.68, 6.52]	
Sung 2014	78.24	6.55	37	72.21	8.42	70	12.2%	6.03 [3.14, 8.92]	
Total (95% CI)			411			578	100.0%	4.83 [3.43, 6.23]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	2.05: C	hi ² = 1	4.88. d	f=6(P:	= 0.02)	: I ² = 60)%		<u> </u>
Test for overall effect:	Z= 6.74	I (P < (0.0000	1)	,				-10 -5 0 5 10 PPG EG
В		DDG			FG			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	Mean Directence	W Random 95% Cl
Hwang 2015	75.7	71	48	75.5	7.2	110	16.9%	0.20 62 22 2 621	
Kim 2015	87.8	7.2	70	76	6.4	83	18.0%	6 90 [4 70 9 90]	
kim k/E 2014	78.5	7.2	103	75.4	7.0	111	18.3%	3 10 [1 10 5 10]	
Kim X.L 2014	67.74	, A	88	64.96	7.67	72	17.4%	2 78 [0 51 5 05]	_
Park 2015	79	77	50	7/ 0	r.or a	106	15.9%	2.10 [0.31, 5.03]	_
Sung 2014	79.35	6.63	37	72.64	11.17	70	13.7%	6.71 [3.33, 10.09]	
Total (95% CI)			385			552	100.0%	371[171 572]	
Heterogeneity: Tou ² -	1 69. 01	hi≊ – 2i	161 4	(- 6 (P -	- 0 001	0)-12-	76%	5.7 [[], 5.72]	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.63	(P = 0	0.0003)	- 5 (r -	- 0.001	0),1 =	7070		-10 -5 0 5 1 PPG EG
с	1	PPG			EG			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Hwang 2015	68.8	10.1	48	64.4	10.9	110	12.4%	4.40 [0.89, 7.91]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Kim 2015	76.5	7.9	79	67.3	7.1	83	19.1%	9.20 [6.88, 11.52]	_ _
Kim KE 2014	76.3	7.3	103	71.7	8.6	111	20.4%	4.60 [2.47, 6.73]	_
Kim YJ 2014	65.24	5.46	68	59.88	6.8	72	21.1%	5.36 [3.32, 7.40]	_
Park 2015	73	9.2	50	65.9	9.5	106	14.3%	7.10 [3.97, 10.23]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Sung 2014	75.35	7.67	37	69.11	10.29	70	12.7%	6.24 [2.79, 9.69]	
Total (95% CI)			385			552	100.0%	6.18 [4.61, 7.75]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	1.98; CI	hi ^z = 1	0.58, df	f = 5 (P =	= 0.06);	I² = 53	%		
									-10 -5 0 5 10

Characteristics of Included Studies

According to our eligibility criteria, 23 cross-sectional studies comprising 2,574 eyes (1,101 PPG eyes, 1,233 EG eyes, and 240 OHT eyes) were included in the systematic review and the meta-analysis. Detailed characteristics of the included studies are summarized in **Table 1**. The AHRQ checklist scores of all the included cross-sectional studies were not <5, demonstrating that the studies were of good quality. Details are presented in **Table 2**.

PPG vs. EG

Peripapillary RNFL Thickness

Sixteen studies evaluating pRNFL thickness showed significant heterogeneity ($I^2 > 50\%$); thus, the random-effects model was used. The pooled results demonstrated a significant decrease in the average and quadrant pRNFL thickness in the EG eyes compared with the PPG eyes (average: WMD = 8.22, 95% CI = 6.32–10.12, *P* < 0.00001, **Figure 2A**; superior: WMD = 9.64, 95% CI = 6.69–12.59, *P* < 0.00001, **Figure 2B**; nasal: WMD = 5.69, 95% CI = 1.67–9.71, *P* = 0.005, **Figure 2C**; inferior: WMD =

12.79, 95% CI = 9.08–16.50, *P* < 0.00001, **Figure 2D**; temporal: WMD = 7.64, 95% CI = 4.39–10.89, *P* < 0.00001, **Figure 2E**).

Macular GCIPL Thickness

Seven of the included studies assessed the average mGCIPL thickness and six studies assessed superior and inferior mGCIPL thickness with significant heterogeneity ($I^2 > 50\%$). The pooled results indicated the average mGCIPL thickness was significantly less in the EG eyes than in the PPG eyes (WMD = 4.83, 95% CI = 3.43–6.23, *P* < 0.00001, **Figure 3A**). Likewise, the superior and inferior mGCIPL were also significantly thinner in patients with EG than in those with PPG (superior: WMD = 3.71, 95% CI = 1.71–5.72, *P* = 0.0003, **Figure 3B**; inferior: WMD = 6.18, 95% CI = 4.61–7.75, *P* < 0.00001, **Figure 3C**).

Macular GCC Thickness

Ten studies measured the average mGCC thickness and seven studies assessed quadrant mGCC thickness with $\rm I^2>50\%.$ All the pooled mGCC thickness values were significantly



reduced in the EG eyes compared to the PPG eyes (average: WMD = 7.19, 95% CI = 4.52–9.85, P < 0.00001, **Figure 4A**; superior: WMD = 4.42, 95% CI = 2.53–6.30, P < 0.00001, **Figure 4B**; inferior: WMD = 7.26, 95% CI = 4.23–10.30, P < 0.00001, **Figure 4C**).

Subgroup Analyses

The stratified subgroup analysis according to the type of glaucoma (**Table 3**) showed a similar decreased trend of pRNFL and mGCIPL thickness in EG compared with PPG except for the superior quadrant of pRNFL in the open-angle glaucoma subgroup (WMD = 8.19, 95% CI = -0.95 to 17.33, P = 0.08). However, unlike the combined pooled data, in the subgroup of the open-angle glaucoma in terms of the average and inferior mGCC thickness, there was no difference between the EG and

PPG eyes (average: WMD = 5.86, 95% CI = -0.98 to 12.70, P = 0.09; inferior: WMD = 7.85, 95% CI = -3.17 to 18.86, P = 0.16).

In addition, considering the different types of OCT (**Table 4**), the average and quadrant pRNFL thickness were significantly lower in the EG eyes than in the PPG eyes regardless of the kind of OCT that was used except for the nasal quadrant of pRNFL in the Cirrus SD-OCT subgroup (WMD = 6.38, 95% CI = -1.02 to 13.78, P = 0.09).

The subgroup analysis regarding the scan area of the macular region (**Table 5**) revealed that the average and sectoral mGCC thickness were significantly lower in patients with EG than in those with PPG in the 6×6 mm subgroup, whereas no difference was found in 7×7 mm subgroup (average: WMD = 5.36, 95% CI = -3.27 to 13.99, P = 0.22; superior: WMD = 3.54, 95% CI =

TABLE 3 Subgroup analysis of average and sectoral pRNF	, mGCIPL and mGCC thickness according to the type	e of glaucoma in patients with PPG and EG.
	-,	

Subgroup	No.	Hete	erogeneity	WMD (95% CI)	Ove	rall effect
		I ²	Р		Z	Р
1. pRNFL						
POAG						
Average	4	0%	0.42	7.45 (5.30, 9.59)	6.81	< 0.00001
Superior	3	0%	0.70	11.75 (6.47, 17.04)	4.36	< 0.0001
Inferior	3	0%	0.64	13.07 (8.24, 17.89)	5.31	< 0.00001
OAG						
Average	4	0%	0.41	8.99 (7.02, 10.96)	8.94	< 0.00001
Superior	2	76%	0.04	8.19 (-0.95, 17.33)	1.76	0.08
Inferior	2	88%	0.003	12.34 (0.03, 24.65)	1.97	0.05
Mixed						
Average	8	84%	<0.00001	7.60 (4.13, 11.07)	4.29	< 0.0001
Superior	6	75%	0.001	9.41 (5.29, 13.53)	4.48	< 0.00001
Inferior	6	83%	<0.0001	12.47 (6.41, 18.52)	4.03	< 0.0001
2. mGCIPL						
OAG						
Average	3	75%	0.02	5.44 (2.57, 8.31)	3.72	0.0002
Superior	2	0%	0.84	2.96 (1.46, 4.46)	3.87	0.0001
Inferior	2	0%	0.61	5.00 (3.52, 6.47)	6.65	< 0.00001
Mixed						
Average	4	55%	0.08	4.63 (2.87, 6.40)	5.14	< 0.00001
Superior	4	84%	0.0003	4.16 (0.87, 7.45)	2.48	0.01
Inferior	4	46%	0.13	7.32 (5.84, 8.80)	9.66	< 0.00001
3. mGCC						
POAG						
Average	3	58%	0.09	7.38 (4.09, 10.67)	4.40	< 0.0001
Superior	2	68%	0.08	5.81 (0.29, 11.33)	2.06	0.04
Inferior	2	74%	0.05	10.05 (3.51, 16.59)	3.01	0.003
OAG						
Average	2	86%	0.007	5.86 (-0.98, 12.70)	1.68	0.09
Superior	2	0%	0.39	3.79 (1.27, 6.32)	2.95	0.003
Inferior	2	92%	0.0004	7.85 (-3.17, 18.86)	1.40	0.16
Mixed						
Average	5	89%	<0.00001	7.37 (2.64, 12.11)	3.05	0.002
Superior	3	78%	0.01	3.96 (0.12, 7.80)	2.02	0.04
Inferior	3	78%	0.01	5.23 (1.14, 9.32)	2.51	0.01

PPG, pre-perimetric glaucoma; EG, early perimetric glaucoma; POAG, primary open-angle glaucoma; OAG, open-angle glaucoma; Mixed, unclassified glaucoma or more than one types of glaucoma; pRNFL, peripapillary retinal nerve fiber layer; mGCIPL, macular ganglion cell plus inner plexiform layer; mGCC, macular ganglion cell complex; WMD, weighted mean difference; CI, confidence interval; I², I-square heterogeneity statistic; Z, Z-statistic. The bold values refer to the studies with a P value > 0.05.

-0.64 to 7.72, P = 0.10; inferior: WMD = 3.35, 95% CI = -1.08 to 7.79, P = 0.14).

-9.88 to -7.27, P < 0.00001, **Figure 5A**; superior: WMD = -12.43, 95% CI = -15.00 to -9.86, P < 0.00001, **Figure 5B**; inferior: WMD = -11.02, 95% CI = -13.81 to -8.23, P < 0.00001, **Figure 5C**).

PPG vs. OHT

Peripapillary RNFL Thickness

Six studies evaluated average pRNFL thickness in patients with PPG and OHT with $I^2 < 50\%$; thus, fixed-effects model was used. The pooled results demonstrated that the average and quadrant pRNFL thickness were significantly lower in patients with PPG than in those with OHT (average: WMD = -8.57, 95% CI =

Macular GCC Thickness

Four studies measured average mGCC thickness with $\rm I^2 > 50\%,$ and three studies assessed sectoral mGCC thickness with $\rm I^2 < 50\%.$ The average and sectoral mGCC were significantly thinner in the PPG eyes than those in the OHT eyes (average: WMD

Subgroup	No.	Hete	erogeneity	WMD (95% CI)	Overall effect		
		l ²	Р		Z	Р	
RTVue SD-OCT							
Average	6	81%	<0.0001	6.96 (2.96, 10.95)	3.42	0.0006	
Superior	6	71%	0.004	7.51 (2.98, 12.04)	3.25	0.001	
Nasal	2	0%	1.00	8.70 (6.72, 10.68)	8.60	< 0.00001	
Inferior	6	77%	0.0006	9.18 (4.13, 14.22)	3.56	0.0004	
Temporal	2	0%	0.64	7.56 (4.64, 10.49)	5.06	< 0.00001	
Cirrus SD-OCT							
Average	5	56%	0.06	9.67 (7.09, 12.25)	7.35	< 0.00001	
Superior	4	14%	0.32	12.04 (8.91, 15.17)	7.53	< 0.00001	
Nasal	3	93%	0.00001	6.38 (-1.02, 13.78)	1.69	0.09	
Inferior	4	0%	0.56	16.18 (13.24, 19.13)	10.77	< 0.00001	
Temporal	4	89%	<0.00001	7.74 (2.20, 13.29)	2.74	0.006	

TABLE 4 | Subgroup analysis of average and sectoral pRNFL thickness according to the type of OCT in patients with PPG and EG.

PPG, pre-perimetric glaucoma; EG, early perimetric glaucoma; pRNFL, peripapillary retinal nerve fiber layer; OCT, optical coherence tomography; SD-OCT, spectral domain OCT; WMD, weighted mean difference; CI, confidence interval; I², I-square heterogeneity statistic; Z, Z-statistic. The bold value refers to the study with a P value > 0.05.

TABLE 5 | Subgroup analysis of average and sectoral mGCC thickness according to the macular scan area (mm²) in patients with PPG and EG.

Subgroup	No.	Hete	erogeneity	WMD (95% CI)	Overall effect		
		l ²	Р		Z	Р	
6 × 6							
Average	4	25%	0.26	8.09 (5.91, 10.27)	7.27	< 0.00001	
Superior	3	18%	0.29	5.28 (2.69, 7.86)	4.00	< 0.0001	
Inferior	3	61%	0.08	11.44 (7.38, 15.50)	5.53	< 0.00001	
7 × 7							
Average	3	95%	<0.00001	5.36 (-3.27, 13.99)	1.22	0.22	
Superior	3	80%	0.006	3.54 (-0.64, 7.72)	1.66	0.10	
Inferior	3	76%	0.01	3.35 (-1.08, 7.79)	1.48	0.14	

PPG, pre-perimetric glaucoma; EG, early perimetric glaucoma; mGCC, macular ganglion cell complex; WMD, weighted mean difference; CI, confidence interval; I², I-square heterogeneity statistic; Z, Z-statistic. The bold values refer to the studies with a P value > 0.05.

= -3.23, 95% CI = -6.03 to -0.44, P = 0.02, Figure 6A; superior: WMD = -5.78, 95% CI = -7.25 to -4.31, P < 0.00001, Figure 6B; inferior: WMD = -6.14, 95% CI = -7.54 to -4.73, P < 0.00001, Figure 6C).

Subgroup Analysis

The subgroup analysis demonstrated that the average pRNFL thickness was significantly lower in patients with PPG than in those with OHT, regardless of the type of OCT (SD-OCT: WMD = -9.04, 95% CI = -10.62 to -7.46, P < 0.00001; TD-OCT: WMD = -7.56, 95% CI = -9.88 to -5.24, P < 0.00001, **Supplementary Figure 1**).

Publication Bias

No significant publication bias was shown according to the results of Egger's and Begg's tests (P > 0.05, **Table 6**), and no obvious asymmetry or correlation between study and effect size was observed in the funnel plot in terms of

pRNFL and mGCC thickness (**Supplementary Figures 2–5**). However, slight asymmetry was noted in the funnel plot of average mGCIPL thickness (**Supplementary Figure 6A**), but not in those of superior and inferior mGCIPL thickness (**Supplementary Figures 6B,C**).

Sensitivity Analyses

There was no obvious change in the results after "leave-oneout" sensitivity analyses, indicating the reproducibility and stability of our results (**Supplementary Figures 7–11**). However, the sensitivity analysis of average mGCIPL thickness in patients with PPG and EG indicated that the study by Kim et al. (40) contributed mostly to the heterogeneity (**Table 7**). After excluding this study, heterogeneity was largely reduced ($I^2 =$ 34%, **Supplementary Figure 12**) and the funnel plot became symmetrical (**Table 6** and **Supplementary Figure 13**, *P*-value of Egger's test increased from 0.195 to 0.745). In addition, the sensitivity analysis of average mGCC thickness in PPG



eyes and EG eyes demonstrated that the study by Aydogan et al. (39) was the major source of the heterogeneity (**Table 8**). After excluding this study, the I² decreased from 83% to 64% (**Supplementary Figure 14**). In the sensitivity analysis of average mGCC thickness in the PPG eyes and OHT eyes, the study by Aydogan et al. (39) was also shown to introduce the heterogeneity mostly (**Table 9**). After excluding this study, no heterogeneity was noted (I² = 0%, **Supplementary Figure 15**).

DISCUSSION

In the present study, we first pooled the average and sectoral pRNFL, mGCIPL, and mGCC thickness in patients with PPG and EG. Our results demonstrated that the average and sectoral pRNFL, mGCIPL, and mGCC were significantly thinner in the EG eyes than in the PPG eyes. These findings were consistent across several studies (26, 29, 34, 38–41, 43, 44), whereas the results of eight studies were not significantly different in terms of the average or sectoral pRNFL thickness (27, 28, 30, 31, 35–37, 42); two studies reported there was no significant difference in the EG eyes compared to the PPG eyes concerning mGCC thickness (28, 36), and one study did not demonstrate a significant reduction in the EG eyes regarding the average and superior mGCIPL thickness (33). Currently,

the exact biomechanisms of glaucomatous neurodegeneration remain poorly understood (1, 55). Nevertheless, continuous and progressive glaucomatous damage may lead to configuration changes in retinal ganglion cell dendrites, soma, and axons (56, 57), causing the attenuation of thickness in corresponding residing sites, inner plexiform layer, ganglion cell layer and RNFL (20). Our pooled results of pRNFL, mGCIPL, and mGCC thickness suggested that more serious structural damage occurred in EG than in PPG.

To explore the source of heterogeneity across the included studies, we performed subgroup analyses according to the different types of glaucoma. Our findings did not show a significant decrease in the superior quadrant of pRNFL (P = 0.08), and the average, as well as the inferior mGCC thickness in the EG eyes when patients with open-angle glaucoma were enrolled (average: P = 0.09; inferior quadrant: P = 0.16). This was probably mainly due to the relatively small sample size in the subgroup of OAG regarding the pRNFL and the mGCC thickness (N = 2), because of which heterogeneity could not be excluded. Another reason was that no quality assurance step was taken in the study of Cennamo et al. (36). Since only a single OCT examination was performed to evaluate each parameter by one experienced ophthalmologist, ensuring the reproducibility and reliability of the examination results was difficult.



Based on the anatomy of retina, \sim 30–50% RGCs are centered within the 4.5-mm-circle region of the fovea (44, 58-60); thus, using a relatively small scan area of $3 \times 3 \text{ mm}$ may not allow the differentiation of EG from PPG or suspected glaucoma (41, 61). For this reason, we also performed a subgroup analysis of the macular scan area. Interestingly, our pooled data showed that when the 6 \times 6 mm scan protocol was used, there was a significant decrease in mGCC thickness in the EG eyes compared with the PPG eyes, whereas there was no difference when the 7 \times 7 mm scan protocol was used. One reason for the different diagnostic performances between these two scan protocols may be the decreased signal-to-noise ratio. Although the enlarged scan area could cover the region with the most abundant RGCs, the concomitant decrease in signal-to-noise ratio and increase in test-retest variability (62) may have undervalued the assessment of GCC thickness measured by SD-OCT. Another explanation was the strict inclusion criteria by Arintawati et al. (28). In this study, investigators only accepted subjects with all the typical glaucomatous changes observed in fundus photographs to avoid false-positive cases. Consequently, patients with higher severity may have been enrolled; thus, showing a minimal difference between the PPG and EG groups. Unfortunately, because of the small sample size (N = 3), we were unable to include other scan areas and protocols, introducing difficulties in the overall evaluation of the diagnostic values regarding different macular scan protocols. In addition, sensitivity analysis demonstrated that the study of Aydogan et al. (39) contributed mostly to the heterogeneity of average mGCC thickness. The main reason was that the age was not well-matched among PPG and EG groups (P < 0.001), which may induce potential bias since glaucoma is an age-related optic neuropathy (55). However, after excluding this study, the heterogeneity decreased (I² decreased from 83 to 64%).

Recently, in addition to OCT, several studies have focused on the macular microvasculature changes in PPG and EG via OCT angiography, revealing the progression patterns of glaucoma with respect to microvascular dysregulation (41, 42, 44, 63, 64). Although macular vessel density (VD) was reported to significantly decrease both in PPG and EG, one study demonstrated that mGCC thickness, unlike macular VD, could serve as a tool to discriminate PPG from EG (41). The study also showed that the percentage loss of mGCC thickness was significantly higher than that of macular VD both in PG and EG. Another study reported that both inferotemporal and superotemporal pRNFL thickness were significantly decreased in EG eyes compared to PPG eyes whereas only the inferotemporal sector of the radial peripapillary capillary VD experienced a significant decrease (42). Considering previous OCT studies that suggest that structural deterioration usually occurs before functional loss (10-18), these findings consolidate the results of our study, which indicate that the OCT

TABLE 6 | Begg's and Egger's tests results for the evaluation of publication bias.

Outcome indicators	No.	Begg	g's test	Egge	r's test
		z	Pr > z	t	P > t
1. PPG vs. EG					
pRNFL					
Average	16	0.23	0.822	-0.55	0.589
Superior	11	0.62	0.533	-0.53	0.606
Nasal	6	0.00	1.000	-1.21	0.292
Inferior	11	1.71	0.087	-0.76	0.465
Temporal	7	0.30	0.764	-0.60	0.573
mGCC					
Average	10	1.07	0.283	0.20	0.849
Superior	7	0.00	1.000	0.04	0.973
Inferior	7	0.00	1.000	-0.11	0.920
mGCIPL					
Average	7	1.20	0.230	1.50	0.195
Superior	6	0.38	0.707	0.26	0.806
Inferior	6	0.00	1.000	0.36	0.735
2. PPG vs. OHT					
pRNFL					
Average	6	1.13	0.260	2.71	0.053
Superior	4	-0.34	1.000	0.85	0.487
Inferior	4	0.34	0.734	3.32	0.08
mGCC					
Average	4	0.34	0.734	-1.84	0.206
Superior	3	0.00	1.000	0.51	0.700
Inferior	3	0.00	1.000	1.10	0.471

PPG, pre-perimetric glaucoma; EG, early perimetric glaucoma; OHT, ocular hypertension; pRNFL, peripapillary retinal nerve fiber layer; mGCC, macular ganglion cell complex; mGCIPL, macular ganglion cell plus inner plexiform layer.

TABLE 7 | Sensitivity analysis of average mGCIPL thickness in patients with PPG and EG.

Study excluded	Fixed-effects	model	Random-effec	Heterogeneity	
	WMD (95% CI)	Р	WMD (95% CI)	Р	l ²
Kim et al. (40)	4.40 (3.53, 5.27)	<0.00001	4.39 (3.30, 5.47)	<0.00001	34%
Park et al. (35)	4.71 (3.80, 5.63)	<0.00001	5.00 (3.35, 6.65)	<0.00001	66%
Kim et al. (34)	4.26 (3.30, 5.23)	<0.00001	4.60 (3.02, 6.18)	<0.00001	59%
Hwang et al. (33)	4.97 (4.05, 5.88)	<0.00001	5.21 (3.80, 6.62)	<0.00001	54%
Sung et al. (31)	4.50 (3.60, 5.40)	<0.00001	4.68 (3.12, 6.24)	<0.00001	64%
Kim et al. (30)	4.75 (3.80, 5.70)	<0.00001	5.03 (3.32, 6.73)	<0.00001	66%
Kim et al. (29)	4.87 (3.90, 5.85)	<0.00001	5.10 (3.41, 6.78)	<0.00001	64%

PPG, pre-perimetric glaucoma; EG, early perimetric glaucoma; mGCIPL, macular ganglion cell plus inner plexiform layer; WMD, weighted mean difference; CI, confidence interval; l², I-square heterogeneity statistic. The bold values refer to the study that has contributed mostly to the heterogeneity.

evaluation of macular structure changes could help to clarify the pathophysiological mechanisms of glaucoma and differentiate PPG from EG.

In a subgroup analysis of pRNFL thickness according to the type of SD-OCT, the pooled results were generally consistent with the combined pooled data except for the nasal quadrant in the Cirrus SD-OCT subgroup. The main reason was that Kim et al. (34) utilized the optic disc Cube 200×200 scanning

protocol, whereas the other two studies focused on a 3.46-mmdiameter circle region of the ONH (31, 35). Although all types of SD-OCT could detect characteristic glaucomatous damage patterns of pRNFL thickness, different algorithms, software, and parameters may have induced subtle differences in diagnostic performance (65). However, our pooled results demonstrate the important diagnostic value of SD-OCT in evaluating the severity of the glaucomatous damage of the ONH. TABLE 8 | Sensitivity analysis of average mGCC thickness in patients with PPG and EG.

Study excluded	Fixed-effects model		Random-effects model		Heterogeneity
	WMD (95% CI)	Р	WMD (95% CI)	Р	l ²
Wang et al. (44)	7.51 (6.46, 8.56)	<0.00001	6.78 (3.98, 9.58)	<0.00001	85%
Sarigül Sezenöz et al. (43)	7.56 (6.52, 8.61)	<0.00001	6.85 (4.06, 9.65)	<0.00001	85%
Lu et al. (42)	7.69 (6.61, 8.76)	<0.00001	7.17 (4.23, 10.11)	<0.00001	85%
Hou et al. (41)	8.27 (7.11, 9.43)	<0.00001	7.44 (4.43, 10.45)	<0.00001	84%
Aydogan et al. (39)	5.98 (4.80, 7.17)	<0.00001	6.28 (4.20, 8.37)	<0.00001	64%
Kumar et al. (37)	7.86 (6.77, 8.95)	<0.00001	7.33 (4.36, 10.31)	<0.00001	85%
Cennamo et al. (36)	8.09 (7.02, 9.16)	<0.00001	7.73 (5.00, 10.45)	<0.00001	83%
Yamada et al. (32)	7.78 (6.70, 8.85)	<0.00001	7.29 (4.35, 10.23)	<0.00001	85%
Kim et al. (30)	7.49 (6.40, 8.57)	<0.00001	6.95 (3.98, 9.91)	<0.00001	85%
Arintawati et al. (28)	8.17 (7.10, 9.24)	<0.00001	7.90 (5.34, 10.46)	<0.00001	80%

PPG, pre-perimetric glaucoma; EG, early perimetric glaucoma; mGCC, macular ganglion cell complex; WMD, weighted mean difference; CI, confidence interval; I², I-square heterogeneity statistic. The bold values refer to the study that has contributed mostly to the heterogeneity.

TABLE 9 | Sensitivity analysis of average mGCC thickness in patients with PPG and OHT.

Study excluded	Fixed-effects model		Random-effects model		Heterogeneity
	WMD (95% CI)	Р	WMD (95% CI)	Р	l ²
Sarigül Sezenöz et al. (43)	-2.16 (-3.53,-0.79)	0.002	-3.28 (-6.75, 0.19)	0.06	80%
Aydogan et al. (39)	-4.54 (-6.57, -2.51)	<0.0001	-4.54 (-6.57, -2.51)	<0.0001	0%
Holo et al. (48)	-1.49 (-2.92, -0.06)	0.04	-1.93 (-4.05, 0.19)	0.08	39%
Garas et al. (46)	-1.96 (-3.42, -0.51)	0.008	-3.52 (-7.20, 0.69)	0.11	79%

PPG, pre-perimetric glaucoma; OHT, ocular hypertension; mGCC, macular ganglion cell complex; WMD, weighted mean difference; Cl, confidence interval; l², I-square heterogeneity statistic. The bold values refer to the study that has contributed mostly to the heterogeneity.

Apart from this, studies have shown that individuals with OHT are at higher risk of developing glaucoma than others (3, 4, 66); however, there is no optimal IOP cut-off that possesses both reasonable sensitivity and specificity (3), which may delay the early diagnosis until patients are found to have apparent optic disc structural deterioration. Although the widely used cut-off of 21 mmHg has high sensitivity, it can decrease the specificity to 44% (67). In addition, spectrum bias usually occurs when studies inappropriately include the control groups without any suspicious symptoms of the disease, which can impair the diagnostic efficacy when clinically non-relevant individuals are enrolled (68–70). Thus, we also pooled the average and sectoral pRNFL and mGCC thickness in patients with PPG and OHT.

The pooled results revealed that the pRNFL and mGCC were significantly thinner in the PPG eyes than those in the OHT eyes, which were consistent with several investigations (45, 47, 48). However, two studies reported that there was no difference in patients with PPG and OHT in terms of the average mGCC thickness (39, 43); one study demonstrated that the average pRNFL thickness could not serve as a valued indicator for differential diagnosis (43), and another study showed that no difference was noted in the PPG eyes and OHT eyes regarding the superior mGCC thickness (46).

Similar to the investigation of exploring the heterogeneity across different OCT parameters for the differential diagnosis of

PPG and EG, we also performed subgroup analysis of average pRNFL thickness according to the type of OCT. However, no difference was noted in the pooled results with either SD-OCT or TD-OCT. Compared to the traditional TD-OCT, SD-OCT is the latest generation of OCT with ultra-high scanning speed and retinal image resolutions, and is reported to have higher diagnostic abilities in terms of sectoral pRNFL and macular thickness. However, both SD-OCT and TD-OCT showed comparable reproducibility regarding the mean pRNFL (71). This was consistent with our finding. In the sensitivity analysis, the study of Aydogan et al. (39) also contributed mostly to the heterogeneity of mGCC thickness in patients with PPG and OHT. This may be due to usage of the different macular scanning protocol.

Despite the strengths of our study, some of its limitations should be considered. First, mild asymmetry was shown in the funnel plot of average mGCIPL thickness (**Supplementary Figure 6A**), suggesting potential publication bias. To elucidate the source of the bias, we performed a "leave-one-out" sensitivity analysis (**Table 7**). The results showed that the study by Kim et al. (40) contributed mostly to the heterogeneity in average mGCIPL thickness, wherein some problems of automated segmentation software occurred, although measures were taken to minimize the consequence of the segmentation error. Therefore, after excluding this study, low heterogeneity ($I^2 = 34\%$) was noted (**Supplementary Figure 12**), and the funnel plot became symmetrical (**Supplementary Figure 13**). Second, regarding the subgroup analysis of the macular scan area, due to the relatively small sample size, we did not include other scan protocols apart from the 6×6 mm and 7×7 mm scan protocols. Further, the small sample size may have also introduced heterogeneity in the analysis of mGCC thickness, although sensitivity analyses proved the reliability of our results. Further studies should be included to comprehensively evaluate the influence of scan area and protocols on the assessment of macular structure changes in PPG, EG, and OHT. Moreover, the heterogeneity was high regarding many of our findings, indicating that the results should be cautiously interpreted.

CONCLUSION

The OCT-based assessment of peripapillary and macular structural changes could be potentially utilized to discriminate PPG from EG and OHT. This facilitates a better understanding of the pathophysiology of glaucoma and provides references for ophthalmologists to manage individuals suspected to have glaucoma and glaucoma patients according to the extent of severity in a non-invasive way. Further studies that employ clock hour classification methods that can monitor the configuration alterations in a narrower range and longitudinal studies are needed to verify our findings.

REFERENCES

- 1. Weinreb RN, Aung T, Medeiros FA. The pathophysiology and treatment of glaucoma: a review. *JAMA*. (2014) 311:1901–11. doi: 10.1001/jama.2014. 3192
- Tham YC, Li X, Wong TY, Quigley HA, Aung T, Cheng CY. Global prevalence of glaucoma and projections of glaucoma burden through 2040: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ophthalmology*. (2014) 21:2081– 90. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2014.05.013
- San Laureano J. When is glaucoma really glaucoma? Clin Exp Optom. (2007) 90:376–85. doi: 10.1111/j.1444-0938.2007.00175.x
- Kass MA, Heuer DK, Higginbotham EJ, Johnson CA, Keltner JL, Miller JP, et al. The ocular hypertension treatment study: a randomized trial determines that topical ocular hypotensive medication delays or prevents the onset of primary open-angle glaucoma. *Arch Ophthalmol.* (2002) 120:701–13. Discussion 829-30. doi: 10.1001/archopht.120.6.701
- Boland MV, Ervin AM, Friedman DS, Jampel HD, Hawkins BS, Vollenweider D, et al. Comparative effectiveness of treatments for open-angle glaucoma: a systematic review for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. *Ann Intern Med.* (2013) 158:271–9. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-158-4-201302190-00008
- Heijl A, Bengtsson B, Oskarsdottir SE. Prevalence and severity of undetected manifest glaucoma: results from the early manifest glaucoma trial screening. *Ophthalmology*. (2013) 120:1541–5. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2013.01.043
- Quigley HA. Number of people with glaucoma worldwide. Br J Ophthalmol. (1996) 80:389–93. doi: 10.1136/bjo.80.5.389
- Shiga Y, Aizawa N, Tsuda S, Yokoyama Y, Omodaka K, Kunikata H, et al. Preperimetric glaucoma prospective study (PPGPS): predicting visual field progression with basal optic nerve head blood flow in normotensive PPG eyes. *Transl Vis Technol.* (2018) 7:11. doi: 10.1167/tvst.7.1.11
- 9. Camp AS, Weinreb RN. Will perimetry be performed to monitor glaucoma in 2025? *Ophthalmology*. (2017) 124:S71–5. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2017.04.009

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/**Supplementary Material**, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author/s.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

YT, TW, XZ, and BJ: conceptualization and design. YT, TW, and YH: literature search, data extraction, quality assessment, and data analysis. YT, TW, XZ, YH, and BJ: manuscript writing and editing. BJ: supervision. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

FUNDING

This study was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC 82070967 and 81770930 to BJ), Natural Science Foundation of Hunan Province Grant (2020jj4788 to BJ), China Hunan Provincial Science and Technology Department (No. 2020SK2086). The sponsors did not participate in the design or implementation of this study.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmed. 2021.696004/full#supplementary-material

- Quigley HA, Miller NR, George T. Clinical evaluation of nerve fiber layer atrophy as an indicator of glaucomatous optic nerve damage. Arch Ophthalmol. (1980) 98:1564–71. doi: 10.1001/archopht.1980.01020040416003
- Airaksinen PJ, Drance SM, Douglas GR, Mawson DK, Nieminen H. Diffuse and localized nerve fiber loss in glaucoma. Am J Ophthalmol. (1984) 98:566– 71. doi: 10.1016/0002-9394(84)90242-3
- Sommer A, Katz J, Quigley HA, Miller NR, Robin AL, Richter RC, et al. Clinically detectable nerve fiber atrophy precedes the onset of glaucomatous field loss. *Arch Ophthalmol.* (1991) 109:77–83. doi: 10.1001/archopht.1991.01080010079037
- Quigley HA, Katz J, Derick RJ, Gilbert D, Sommer A. An evaluation of optic disc and nerve fiber layer examinations in monitoring progression of early glaucoma damage. *Ophthalmology*. (1992) 99:19–28. doi: 10.1016/S0161-6420(92)32018-4
- Harwerth RS, Carter-Dawson L, Shen F, Smith EL 3rd, Crawford ML. Ganglion cell losses underlying visual field defects from experimental glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (1999) 40:2242–50.
- Asrani S, Challa P, Herndon L, Lee P, Stinnett S, Allingham RR. Correlation among retinal thickness, optic disc, and visual field in glaucoma patients and suspects: a pilot study. J Glaucoma. (2003) 12:119– 28. doi: 10.1097/00061198-200304000-00006
- Ajtony C, Balla Z, Somoskeoy S, Kovacs B. Relationship between visual field sensitivity and retinal nerve fiber layer thickness as measured by optical coherence tomography. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2007) 48:258– 63. doi: 10.1167/iovs.06-0410
- Cho JW, Sung KR, Lee S, Yun SC, Kang SY, Choi J, et al. Relationship between visual field sensitivity and macular ganglion cell complex thickness as measured by spectral-domain optical coherence tomography. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2010) 51:6401–7. doi: 10.1167/iovs.09-5035
- 18. Cvenkel B, Sustar M, Perovšek D. Ganglion cell loss in early glaucoma, as assessed by photopic negative response, pattern electroretinogram, and

spectral-domain optical coherence tomography. *Doc Ophthalmol.* (2017) 135:17–28. doi: 10.1007/s10633-017-9595-9

- Blumenthal EZ, Sapir-Pichhadze R. Misleading statistical calculations in faradvanced glaucomatous visual field loss. *Ophthalmology*. (2003) 110:196– 200. doi: 10.1016/S0161-6420(02)01297-6
- Tan O, Chopra V, Lu AT, Schuman JS, Ishikawa H, Wollstein G, et al. Detection of macular ganglion cell loss in glaucoma by Fourier-domain optical coherence tomography. *Ophthalmology*. (2009) 116:2305–14.e1-2. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2009.05.025
- Savini G, Carbonelli M, Barboni P. Spectral-domain optical coherence tomography for the diagnosis and follow-up of glaucoma. *Curr Opin Ophthalmol.* (2011) 22:115–23. doi: 10.1097/ICU.0b013e3283437222
- 22. Hood DC, Raza AS, de Moraes CG, Johnson CA, Liebmann JM, Ritch R. The nature of macular damage in glaucoma as revealed by averaging optical coherence tomography data. *Transl Vis Technol.* (2012) 1:3. doi: 10.1167/tvst.1.1.3
- Eladawi N, Elmogy MM, Ghazal M, Helmy O, Aboelfetouh A, Riad A, et al. Classification of retinal diseases based on OCT Images. *Front Biosci.* (2018) 23:247–64. doi: 10.2741/4589
- Hood DC, Raza AS. On improving the use of OCT imaging for detecting glaucomatous damage. *Br J Ophthalmol.* (2014) 98 (Suppl. 2):ii1– 9. doi: 10.1136/bjophthalmol-2014-305156
- Kim MJ, Jeoung JW, Park KH, Choi YJ, Kim DM. Topographic profiles of retinal nerve fiber layer defects affect the diagnostic performance of macular scans in preperimetric glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2014) 55:2079– 87. doi: 10.1167/iovs.13-13506
- Horn FK, Mardin CY, Bendschneider D, Jünemann AG, Adler W, Tornow RP. Frequency doubling technique perimetry and spectral domain optical coherence tomography in patients with early glaucoma. *Eye.* (2011) 25:17– 29. doi: 10.1038/eye.2010.155
- Morooka S, Hangai M, Nukada M, Nakano N, Takayama K, Kimura Y, et al. Wide 3-dimensional macular ganglion cell complex imaging with spectraldomain optical coherence tomography in glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2012) 53:4805–12. doi: 10.1167/iovs.12-9870
- Arintawati P, Sone T, Akita T, Tanaka J, Kiuchi Y. The applicability of ganglion cell complex parameters determined from SD-OCT images to detect glaucomatous eyes. J Glaucoma. (2013) 22:713–8. doi: 10.1097/IJG.0b013e318259b2e1
- Kim KE, Park KH, Jeoung JW, Kim SH, Kim DM. Severity-dependent association between ganglion cell inner plexiform layer thickness and macular mean sensitivity in open-angle glaucoma. *Acta Ophthalmol.* (2014) 92:e650– 6. doi: 10.1111/aos.12438
- 30. Kim YJ, Kang MH, Cho HY, Lim HW, Seong M. Comparative study of macular ganglion cell complex thickness measured by spectral-domain optical coherence tomography in healthy eyes, eyes with preperimetric glaucoma, and eyes with early glaucoma. *Jpn J Ophthalmol.* (2014) 58:244– 51. doi: 10.1007/s10384-014-0315-7
- Sung MS, Yoon JH, Park SW. Diagnostic validity of macular ganglion cellinner plexiform layer thickness deviation map algorithm using cirrus HD-OCT in preperimetric and early glaucoma. J Glaucoma. (2014) 23:e144– 51. doi: 10.1097/IJG.00000000000028
- Yamada H, Hangai M, Nakano N, Takayama K, Kimura Y, Miyake M, et al. Asymmetry analysis of macular inner retinal layers for glaucoma diagnosis. *Am J Ophthalmol.* (2014) 158:1318–29.e3. doi: 10.1016/j.ajo.2014.08.040
- Hwang YH, Ahn SI, Ko SJ. Diagnostic ability of macular ganglion cell asymmetry for glaucoma. *Clin Exp Ophthalmol.* (2015) 43:720– 6. doi: 10.1111/ceo.12545
- HC, 34. Kim YK. Yoo BW, Kim Park KH. Automated detection of hemifield difference across horizontal raphe ganglion cell-inner plexiform layer thickness on map. Ophthalmology. (2015)122:2252-60. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2015. 07.013
- Park JW, Jung HH, Heo H, Park SW. Validity of the temporal-tonasal macular ganglion cell-inner plexiform layer thickness ratio as a diagnostic parameter in early glaucoma. *Acta Ophthalmol.* (2015) 93:e356– 65. doi: 10.1111/aos.12666
- Cennamo G, Montorio D, Romano MR, Cardone DM, Minervino C, Reibaldi M, et al. Structure-functional parameters in differentiating between

patients with different degrees of glaucoma. J Glaucoma. (2016) 25:e884-8. doi: 10.1097/IJG.00000000000491

- 37. Kumar RS, Anegondi N, Chandapura RS, Sudhakaran S, Kadambi SV, Rao HL, et al. Discriminant function of optical coherence tomography angiography to determine disease severity in glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2016) 57:6079–88. doi: 10.1167/iovs.16-19984
- Akil H, Huang AS, Francis BA, Sadda SR, Chopra V. Retinal vessel density from optical coherence tomography angiography to differentiate early glaucoma, pre-perimetric glaucoma and normal eyes. *PLoS ONE.* (2017) 12:e0170476. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0170476
- Aydogan T, Akçay BI S, Kardeş E, Ergin A. Evaluation of spectral domain optical coherence tomography parameters in ocular hypertension, preperimetric, and early glaucoma. *Indian J Ophthalmol.* (2017) 65:1143– 50. doi: 10.4103/ijo.IJO_157_17
- Kim EK, Park HL, Park CK. Segmented inner plexiform layer thickness as a potential biomarker to evaluate open-angle glaucoma: dendritic degeneration of retinal ganglion cell. *PLoS ONE*. (2017) 12:e0182404. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0182404
- Hou H, Moghimi S, Zangwill LM, Shoji T, Ghahari E, Penteado RC, et al. Macula vessel density and thickness in early primary open-angle glaucoma. *Am J Ophthalmol.* (2019) 199:120–32. doi: 10.1016/j.ajo.2018.11.012
- 42. Lu P, Xiao H, Liang C, Xu Y, Ye D, Huang J. Quantitative analysis of microvasculature in macular and peripapillary regions in early primary open-angle glaucoma. *Curr Eye Res.* (2020) 45:629–35. doi: 10.1080/02713683.2019.1676912
- 43. Sarigül Sezenöz A, Gür Güngör S, Akman A, Öztürk C, Cezairlioglu S, Aksoy M, et al. The diagnostic ability of ganglion cell complex thickness-tototal retinal thickness ratio in glaucoma in a Caucasian population. *Turk J Ophthalomol.* (2020) 50:26–30. doi: 10.4274/tjo.galenos.2019.19577
- 44. Wang Y, Xin C, Li M, Swain DL, Cao K, Wang H, et al. Macular vessel density versus ganglion cell complex thickness for detection of early primary open-angle glaucoma. *BMC Ophthalmol.* (2020) 20:17. doi: 10.1186/s12886-020-1304-x
- 45. Taliantzis S, Papaconstantinou D, Koutsandrea C, Moschos M, Apostolopoulos M, Georgopoulos G. Comparative studies of RNFL thickness measured by OCT with global index of visual fields in patients with ocular hypertension and early open angle glaucoma. *Clin Ophthalmol.* (2009) 3:373–9. doi: 10.2147/OPTH.S6150
- 46. Garas A, Vargha P, Holló G. Diagnostic accuracy of nerve fibre layer, macular thickness and optic disc measurements made with the RTVue-100 optical coherence tomograph to detect glaucoma. *Eye.* (2011) 25:57– 65. doi: 10.1038/eye.2010.139
- Pomorska M, Krzyzanowska-Berkowska P, Misiuk-Hojło M, Zajac-Pytrus H, Grzybowski A. Application of optical coherence tomography in glaucoma suspect eyes. *Clin Exp Optom.* (2012) 95:78–88. doi: 10.1111/j.1444-0938.2011.00654.x
- Holló G, Naghizadeh F, Vargha P. Accuracy of macular ganglion-cell complex thickness to total retina thickness ratio to detect glaucoma in white Europeans. *J Glaucoma*. (2014) 23:e132–7. doi: 10.1097/IJG.000000000000030
- Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, Olkin I, Williamson GD, Rennie D, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology (MOOSE) group. JAMA. (2000) 283:2008–12. doi: 10.1001/jama.283.15.2008
- Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JP, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. J Clin Epidemiol. (2009) 62:e1–34. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.06.006
- Parrish RK, 2nd, Gedde SJ, Scott IU, Feuer WJ, Schiffman JC, Mangione CM, et al. Visual function and quality of life among patients with glaucoma. *Arch Ophthalmol.* (1997) 115:1447– 55. doi: 10.1001/archopht.1997.01100160617016
- Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*. (2003) 327:557–60. doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557
- Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. *Biometrics*. (1994) 50:1088–101. doi: 10.2307/2533446
- Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in metaanalysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ.* (1997) 315:629– 34. doi: 10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629

- Weinreb RN, Khaw PT. Primary open-angle glaucoma. Lancet. (2004) 363:1711–20. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(04)16257-0
- Frankfort BJ, Khan AK, Tse DY, Chung I, Pang JJ, Yang Z, et al. Elevated intraocular pressure causes inner retinal dysfunction before cell loss in a mouse model of experimental glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2013) 54:762–70. doi: 10.1167/iovs.12-10581
- El-Danaf RN, Huberman AD. Characteristic patterns of dendritic remodeling in early-stage glaucoma: evidence from genetically identified retinal ganglion cell types. *J Neurosci.* (2015) 35:2329– 43. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1419-14.2015
- Quigley HA, Dunkelberger GR, Green WR. Retinal ganglion cell atrophy correlated with automated perimetry in human eyes with glaucoma. Am J Ophthalmol. (1989) 107:453–64. doi: 10.1016/0002-9394(89)90488-1
- Curcio CA, Allen KA. Topography of ganglion cells in human retina. J Comp Neurol. (1990) 300:5–25. doi: 10.1002/cne.903000103
- Kerrigan-Baumrind LA, Quigley HA, Pease ME, Kerrigan DF, Mitchell RS. Number of ganglion cells in glaucoma eyes compared with threshold visual field tests in the same persons. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2000) 41:741–8.
- Triolo G, Rabiolo A, Shemonski ND, et al. Optical coherence tomography angiography macular and peripapillary vessel perfusion density in healthy subjects, glaucoma suspects, and glaucoma patients. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2017) 58:5713–22. doi: 10.1167/iovs.17-22865
- Wan KH, Lam AKN, Leung CK. Optical coherence tomography angiography compared with optical coherence tomography macular measurements for detection of glaucoma. *JAMA Ophthalmol.* (2018) 136:866–74.42. doi: 10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2018.1627
- Poli M, Cornut PL, Nguyen AM, De Bats F, Denis P. Accuracy of peripapillary versus macular vessel density in diagnosis of early to advanced primary open angle glaucoma. J Fr Ophtalmol. (2018) 41:619– 29. doi: 10.1016/j.jfo.2018.02.004
- Rolle T, Dallorto L, Tavassoli M, Nuzzi R. Diagnostic ability and discriminant values of OCT-angiography parameters in early glaucoma diagnosis. *Ophthalmic Res.* (2019) 61:143–52. doi: 10.1159/000489457
- 65. Chen TC, Hoguet A, Junk AK, Nouri-Mahdavi K, Radhakrishnan S, Takusagawa HL, et al. Spectral-domain OCT: helping the clinician

diagnose glaucoma: a report by the American Academy of Ophthalmology. *Ophthalmology*. (2018) 125:1817–27. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2018.05.008

- 66. Jayanetti V, Sandhu S, Lusthaus JA. The latest drugs in development that reduce intraocular pressure in ocular hypertension and glaucoma. J Exp Pharmacol. (2020) 12:539–48. doi: 10.2147/JEP.S281187
- Tielsch JM, Katz J, Singh K, Quigley HA, Gottsch JD, Javitt J, et al. A population-based evaluation of glaucoma screening: the Baltimore Eye Survey. *Am J Epidemiol.* (1991) 134:1102– 10. doi: 10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a116013
- Rao HL, Kumbar T, Addepalli UK, Bharti N, Senthil S, Choudhari NS, et al. Effect of spectrum bias on the diagnostic accuracy of spectral-domain optical coherence tomography in glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2012) 53:1058–65. doi: 10.1167/iovs.11-8463
- Rao HL, Addepalli UK, Chaudhary S, Kumbar T, Senthil S, Choudhari NS, et al. Ability of different scanning protocols of spectral domain optical coherence tomography to diagnose preperimetric glaucoma. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* (2013) 54:7252–7. doi: 10.1167/iovs.13-12731
- Willis BH. Spectrum bias-why clinicians need to be cautious when applying diagnostic test studies. *Fam Pract.* (2008) 25:390–6. doi: 10.1093/fampra/cmn051
- Schuman JS. Spectral domain optical coherence tomography for glaucoma (an AOS thesis). *Trans Am Ophthalmol Soc.* (2008) 106:426–58.

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

Copyright © 2021 Tong, Wang, Zhang, He and Jiang. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.