META-ANALYSIS

The efficacy of Salvia-ligustrazine and Ligustrazine in treating gestational hypertension: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Ruyi Ji 💿, Qianrong Gan, Xinyao Shu 💿, Ruitong Xu 💿, Xinyu Huang 💿, and Tao Shen 💿*

Pregnancy-induced hypertension syndrome (PIH), a prevalent and critical condition, has garnered increasing attention due to its significant impact on maternal and fetal health outcomes. The conventional treatment approaches rely on magnesium sulfate and various antihypertensive drugs; however, the clinical efficacy of these treatments is limited, highlighting the need to explore alternative avenues for improvement. Recently, a growing number of clinical studies have investigated the use of Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine in combination with conventional therapy. A comprehensive synthesis and critical analysis of these studies is necessary to evaluate the efficacy and safety of Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine in treating PIH. We sought all articles published prior to December 2, 2023, from seven databases to identify randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that involved traditional Chinese medicine Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine in combination with Western medicines for the conventional treatment of PIH, according to predefined inclusion criteria. The studies were assessed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool (ROB2.0), and meta-analyses were conducted using Stata 15.0 statistical software. We analyzed 47 RCTs encompassing 4517 patients. The results demonstrated that combining Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine with Western medications was more efficacious than using Western medications alone. This combination improved the overall response rate, reduced the incidence of adverse pregnancy outcomes for mothers and infants, and decreased the occurrence of side effects associated with PIH treatment. While we evaluated the efficacy of traditional Chinese medicine injections of Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine alongside conventional Western treatments, our conclusions must be considered provisional due to potential bias and the limited availability of RCTs.

Keywords: Pregnancy-induced hypertension syndrome (PIH), Salvia-ligustrazine, Ligustrazine, meta-analysis.

Introduction

Pregnancy-induced hypertension (PIH) is one of the most prevalent obstetric conditions, characterized by high blood pressure, proteinuria, and other clinical signs that can endanger both maternal and infant health. In severe cases, such as eclampsia, PIH can lead to seizures, coma, and even death [1]. The conventional therapy primarily involves magnesium sulfate along with symptomatic treatments such as sedation and antihypertensive drugs. However, this approach has limited efficacy and is associated with side effects. Junxia et al. [2] found that prolonged, high-dose use of magnesium sulfate can inhibit maternal uterine contractions, prolong labor, and increase the risk of postpartum hemorrhage. Additionally, newborns may present with hypotonia and decreased responsiveness. Advancements in hypertension research have revealed that PIH involves organ ischemia due to vasospasm, leading to microcirculatory disturbances and increased blood viscosity [3]. According to traditional Chinese medicine (TCM) theory, the formation of blood stasis hinders the production of new

blood [4]. Therefore, Chinese herbs that stimulate circulation and eliminate congested blood, such as Salvia miltiorrhiza and Rhizoma Ligustici Chuanxiong, are commonly used to treat this condition. Active ingredients extracted from these herbs, such as Salvia-ligustrazine and Ligustrazine (Chuanxiongzine), have been widely used in clinical settings as injections for the treatment of PIH in recent years. These injections promote circulation and reduce congestion [5]. Several clinical studies have demonstrated that the combined treatment with Chuanxiongzine injection significantly alleviates PIH compared to conventional treatments. Benefits include lowering blood pressure, reducing proteinuria, improving maternal and infant pregnancy outcomes, promoting coagulation, and reducing the incidence of drug-induced adverse events. Current meta-analyses on this treatment regimen have only focused on Chuanxiongzine [6], without considering the combination of Salvia-ligustrazine with conventional treatments. Additionally, these analyses often have limited sample sizes and few outcome indicators, making it difficult to confirm the efficacy of the

School of Basic Medical Sciences, Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Chengdu, China.

^{*}Correspondence to Tao Shen: shentaotcm@aliyun.com

DOI: 10.17305/bb.2024.10743

^{© 2024} Ji et al. This article is available under a Creative Commons License (Attribution 4.0 International, as described at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

regimen. Therefore, to provide more robust evidence on the role of Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine in combination with conventional Western drug regimens for PIH, we conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis of relevant articles published in recent years to confirm the efficacy and safety of this treatment approach.

Materials and methods

This report was designed and conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines and is registered on the PROSPERO website for meta-analysis (CRD42024496232).

Literature search strategy

We searched the following databases: PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library, Web of Science, China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), Wanfang Database, and VIP Database. The literature search was limited to studies published up to December 2, 2023, in English and Chinese languages. The search involved a combination of subject terms and free terms, including the following medical subject headings: Hypertension, Pregnancy-Induced, Salvia-ligustrazine, and Ligustrazine. Detailed search strategies are provided in Supplementary Text 1.

Study inclusion and exclusion criteria Inclusion criteria (Table 1)

P (participants): Individuals with hypertensive disorders associated with pregnancy, including gestational hypertension, pre-eclampsia/eclampsia, chronic hypertension, and chronic hypertension with superimposed pre-eclampsia. Subjects were diagnosed based on the Guidelines for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Hypertensive Diseases in Pregnancy (2020 edition) [7].

I (intervention): The treatment group received routine treatment with Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine combined with Western medicines.

C (control): The control group received only conventional Western medicines, including but not limited to magnesium sulfate, nifedipine, labetalol, and other sedative antihypertensive treatments.

O (outcomes): Primary outcome measures: changes in blood pressure (systolic blood pressure, SBP; diastolic blood pressure, DBP), maternal and infant pregnancy outcomes, overall response rate (ORR). Secondary outcome measures: Incidence of adverse effects, urine protein levels, coagulation indicators (Activated partial thromboplastin time, APTT; Prothrombin time, PT).

S (study design): Randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

Exclusion criteria

The exclusion of subjects was as below: 1) Duplicate studies; 2) Noncompliance with the intervention; and 3) Lack of valid data. Specifically, literature lacking outcome indicators distinct from those listed enumerated under "O (outcome)" will not be included.

Two assessors (RYJ and GQR) independently reviewed the literature based on the above criteria, with any inconsistencies

resolved through discussion or by consulting a third reviewer (ZYZ).

Extraction of data and assessment of study quality

Two reviewers (R.Y.J. and G.Q.R.) independently extracted data from the final set of included articles, which included information on the first author, year of publication, country, interventions and controls, treatment duration, basic information about the study population, and outcome measures.

The Cochrane Risk of Bias Assessment Tool (ROB 2.0) was used to evaluate the risk of bias in the selected articles. ROB 2.0 assesses five aspects: bias arising from the random allocation process, bias due to deviations from established procedures, bias arising from missing outcome data, bias related to outcome measures, and bias resulting from selective reporting of results. Each study was independently assessed by two reviewers using ROB 2.0, with any disagreements resolved by a third reviewer (ZYZ). The results are presented as risk of bias plots.

Statistical analysis

The primary outcome indicators were changes in blood pressure, including SBP and DBP, maternal and infant pregnancy outcomes, and ORR, while the secondary outcome indicators were urine protein levels, coagulation indices (APTT; PT), and the occurrence of adverse reactions.

Meta-analysis was performed using Stata15.0. Weighted mean differences (WMD) were calculated for continuous data, with 95% confidence intervals (CI) reported when the same scale was used. For dichotomous variables, meta-analysis was performed using relative risk (RR) to indicate effect size. Heterogeneity between studies was assessed using the Q test for X^2 and I^2 statistic. When heterogeneity across studies was not significant ($I^2 < 50\%$ and P > 0.1), the Mantel-Haenszel model was used for meta-analysis. Conversely, a random-effects model was employed.

To explore the extent and sources of heterogeneity among studies, subgroup analyses and regression analyses of Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine combined with conventional treatment were conducted based on treatment duration. Sensitivity analysis was performed to assess the robustness of the meta-analysis results, and publication bias in the included literature was evaluated using funnel plots, with statistical testing conducted using the Egger or Begg method (for studies with $n \ge 8$). For results showing with significant publication bias, a cut-and-patch approach was used to assess its impact on the findings.

Results

Literature search

The initial database search yielded 318 articles. After removing duplicates and excluding articles that did not meet the inclusion criteria, 63 articles were thoroughly reviewed. Ultimately, 47 studies [5, 8–53] were identified as eligible for meta-analysis. The literature screening process is depicted in Figure 1.





| P (participants) | | Individuals with hypertensive disorders associated with pregnancy |
|------------------|-----------|---|
| l (intervention) | | Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine combined with Western medicines |
| C (control) | | Only conventional western medicines |
| O (outcomes) | Primary | SBP and DBP; pregnancy outcomes; ORR |
| | Secondary | Incidence of adverse effects; urine proteins; APTT, PT |
| S (study design) | | RCTs |

SBP: Systolic blood pressure; DBP: Diastolic blood pressure; ORR: Overall response rate; APTT: Activated partial thromboplastin time; PT: Prothrombin time; RCTs: Randomized controlled trials.

The characteristics of included studies

The 47 included studies were conducted in China and involved a total of 4517 female patients, with an average age ranging from 21 to 42 years. The fundamental attributes of the included studies are presented in Table 1.

Risk of bias of the included studies

Figure 2 shows the results of the risk of bias assessment for the 47 included trials. There was a potential risk in 23 studies [5, 10, 11, 13, 14, 20–22, 25, 27–29, 36, 38, 41–46, 48, 50, 51] due to missing random assignment, missing subgroup concealment, or lack of blinding. The remaining 24 studies [8, 9, 12, 15–19, 23, 24, 26, 30–35, 37, 39, 40, 47, 49, 52, 53] were deemed to have a low risk of bias. All studies showed minimal risk for missing outcome data, missing outcome measures, and selective reporting. Overall, the included literature presented a low risk of bias.

Meta-analysis results

Main outcome indicators Changes in blood pressure: SBP, DBP

There were 12 studies [5, 24, 34, 36, 40, 44, 47, 48, 50–53] and 17 studies [11, 16, 20–23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 33, 35, 37, 39, 42, 46, 49] reported changes in blood pressure with conventional



Figure 2. The risk of bias assessment.

treatment combined with Salvia-ligustrazine or Chuanxiongzine, respectively. Both SBP and DBP changes were analyzed using random-effects meta-analysis ($I^2 = 85.0\%$, P < 0.001); ($I^2 = 83.2.0\%$, P < 0.001). The results indicate that combining Salvia-ligustrazine injection significantly reduced SBP (WMD = -10.73; 95% CI: -13.12 to -8.33; P < 0.001) and DBP (WMD = -8.79; 95% CI: -10.78 to -6.80; P < 0.001) compared to conventional treatment. Treatment with Chuanxiongzine injection also significantly reduced SBP (WMD = -11.73; 95% CI: -14.12 to -9.34; P < 0.001) and DBP (WMD = -8.25; 95% CI: -9.66 to -6.84; P < 0.001) (Figures 3 and 4).

Pregnancy outcome-mother

Six studies [24, 27, 32, 34, 52, 53] reported pregnancy outcomes with Salvia-ligustrazine combined with conventional therapy. The heterogeneity test for Salvia-ligustrazine treatment showed no significant heterogeneity among the included studies ($I^2 = 0.0\%$, P = 0.843), leading to the use of a fixed-effects model. The results showed that the Salvia-ligustrazine combination reduced the risk of several pregnancy outcomes compared with conventional treatment. [Cesarean (RR = 0.64; 95% CI: 0.52–0.77; P < 0.001), Postpartum eclampsia (RR = 0.41; 95% CI: 0.12–1.38; P = 0.151), Placental abruption (RR = 0.50; 95% CI: 0.19–1.30; P = 0.154), Postpartum hemorrhage (RR = 0.25; 95% CI: 0.12-0.53; P < 0.001), Others (RR = 0.63;95% CI: 0.29–1.34; P = 0.229 However, there was no significant difference in the incidence of postpartum eclampsia, placental abruption, or other outcomes when comparing TCM combination therapy with Western medicine alone. The small sample size in the studies involving in Salvia-ligustrazine Combination Therapy, may account for this (Figure 5).

Twenty-one studies [8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17–20, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 33, 35, 37–39, 45, 49] reported pregnancy outcomes with Chuanxiongzine combined with conventional therapy. The heterogeneity test was nonsignificant ($I^2 = 0.0\%$, P = 0.978), so a fixed-effects model was employed to summarize the results. This analysis indicated that the combination of Chuanxiongzine reduced the risk of several maternal pregnancy outcomes compared with conventional Western drug therapy [Cesarean (RR = 0.53; 95% CI: 0.43–0.65; P < 0.001), Postpartum hemorrhage (RR = 0.29; 95% CI: 0.22–0.40; P < 0.001), Placental abruption (RR = 0.28; 95% CI: 0.16–0.50; P < 0.001), Postpartum eclampsia (RR = 0.39; 95% CI: 0.16–0.95; P = 0.038), and Uterine inertia (RR = 0.31; 95% CI: 0.18–0.52; P < 0.001) (Figure 6).

Pregnancy outcome-fetus

Six articles [24, 27, 32, 34, 52, 53] reported fetal pregnancy outcomes with Salvia-ligustrazine combined with conventional therapy. The heterogeneity test was nonsignificant (I^2 =0.0%, P = 0.976), leading to the use of a fixed-effects model. The findings indicated that combined Salvia-ligustrazine treatment reduced the risk of several fetal pregnancy outcomes compared with Western medicine alone [Neonatal asphyxia (RR = 0.25; 95% CI: 0.07-0.87; P = 0.030), Fetal distress (RR = 0.29; 95% CI: 0.13-0.65; P = 0.003), Others (RR = 0.45; 95% CI: 0.22-0.93; P = 0.031), and Prematurity (RR = 0.33; 95% CI: 0.11-0.99; P = 0.047)] (Figure 7).

| Study ID | WMD (95% CI) | % Weight |
|--|-------------------------|-------------|
| ligustrazine | | |
| Li et al. (2018) | -9.78 (-12.61, -6.95) | 3.88 |
| Ding N et al. (2019) | -14.55 (-19.41, -9.69) | 3.19 |
| Huang Y F et al. (2017) | -8.34 (-11.67, -5.01) | 3.72 |
| Jia X H (2020) | -6.70 (-8.66, -4.74) | 4.12 |
| Li M L (2018) | -17.60 (-19.92, -15.28) | 4.03 |
| Li Y H et al. (2022) | -10.23 (-12.90, -7.56) | 3.93 |
| Li Z Y (2019) | -17.66 (-22.84, -12.48) | 3.07 |
| Liu Y X (2019) | -8.37 (-13.49, -3.25) | 3.09 |
| Peng W J et al. (2012) | -10.20 (-16.67, -3.73) | 2.64 |
| Quan G H (2015) | -12.30 (-18.79, -5.81) | 2.63 |
| Shi G L et al. (2017) | -16.20 (-17.94, -14.46) | 4.17 |
| Xu H Y (2017) | -11.88 (-16.46, -7.30) | 3.28 |
| Liu S Q (2018) | -17.69 (-19.51, -15.87) | 4.15 |
| Zhou J (2018) | -17.08 (-23.24, -10.92) | 2.73 |
| Zhou X L et al. (2019) | -5.50 (-9.54, -1.46) | 3.48 |
| Zhang X et al. (2018) | -9.23 (-13.29, -5.17) | 3.47 |
| Yu L et al. (2021) | -1.50 (-11.45, 8.45) | 1.71 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 88.6% , p = 0.000) | -11.73 (-14.12, -9.34) | 57.29 |
| Salvia–ligustrazine | | |
| Chen R et al. (2019) | -15.74 (-17.93, -13.55) | 4.06 |
| Guo X L (2023) | -14.68 (-16.32, -13.04) | 4.19 |
| Hao Y Q et al. (2023) | -6.32 (-10.08, -2.56) | 3.57 |
| Huang Y M (2020) | -12.80 (-19.67, -5.93) | 2.51 |
| Xue L et al. (2023) | -8.82 (-12.55, -5.09) | 3.58 |
| Song Y H (2019) | -1.27 (-4.85, 2.31) | 3.63 |
| Wang Q Y et al. (2018) | -11.14 (-15.98, -6.30) | 3.19 |
| Wei M P et al. (2023) | -13.19 (-15.34, -11.04) | 4.07 |
| Xiao P P et al. (2021) | -12.29 (-16.97, -7.61) | 3.25 |
| Qin L etal. (2018) | -10.16 (-14.26, -6.06) | 3.46 |
| Zhang H J (2020) | -7.70 (-12.06, -3.34) | 3.36 |
| Jia A L et al. (2022) | -13.27 (-16.29, -10.25) | 3.82 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 85.0% , p = 0.000) | -10.73 (-13.12, -8.33) | 42.71 |
| . Overall (I-squared = 87.0% , p = 0.000) | -11.31 (-12.98, -9.65) | 100.00 |
| NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis | | |
| -25 1 1 1 -1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | |

Figure 3. Forest plot of SBP. SBP changes in PIH patients treated with Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine injection combined with conventional treatment. SBP: Systolic blood pressure; PIH: Pregnancy-induced hypertension; WMD: Weighted mean differences; CI: Confidence intervals.

Twenty-two articles [9, 11–13, 15, 18–20, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37–39, 45, 46, 49] reported fetal pregnancy outcomes with Chuanxiongzine combined conventional therapy ($I^2 = 0.0\%$, P = 1.000). The results were integrated via a fixed-effects model, revealing that combined Ligustrazine treatment reduced the risk of several fetal pregnancy outcomes compared to conventional Western medicine [Fetal distress (RR = 0.33; 95% CI: 0.22–0.50; P < 0.001), Neonatal asphyxia (RR = 0.30; 95% CI: 0.21–0.42; P < 0.001), Prematurity (RR = 0.28; 95% CI: 0.17–0.46; P < 0.001), Neonatal death (RR = 0.37; 95% CI: 0.21–0.65; P = 0.001), and Others (RR = 0.47; 95% CI: 0.31–0.72; P < 0.001)] (Figure 8).

Overall response rate

Eight studies [5, 27, 34, 36, 40, 47, 50, 53] and 17 studies [8, 9, 11, 14-16, 19, 20, 22, 25, 28, 30, 33, 37, 38, 43, 52] reported the ORR of conventional Western medicine combined with Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine, respectively. The heterogeneity test analysis showed no significance (I^2 =0.0%, P = 0.998). Results indicated that Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine combination treatment significantly increased the overall response rate compared to conventional Western medicine treatment [Salvia, Ligustrazine (RR = 1.21; 95% CI: 0.17-1.25; P < 0.001), Ligustrazine (RR = 1.21; 95% CI: 1.16-1.26; P < 0.001)] (Figure 9).

| Study ID | WMD (95% CI) | % Weight |
|---|-------------------------|-------------|
| | () | |
| | 0.22 (10.01 | 2 70 |
| Li et al. (2018) | -8.32(-10.81, -5.83) | 3.78 |
| Ding N et al. (2017) | -8.44(-11.41, -5.47) | 3.51 |
| Huang Y F et al. (2017) | -8.51(-11.11, -5.91) | 3.72 |
| | -3.57(-5.01, -2.13) | 4.31 |
| | -8.55 (-10.52, -6.58) | 4.06 |
| Li Y H et al. (2022) | -8.17 (-9.79, -6.55) | 4.23 |
| Li Z Y (2019) | -10.82(-15.45, -6.19) | 2.60 |
| $\lim_{t \to \infty} Y X (2019) \qquad \qquad$ | -13.75(-16.88, -10.62) | 3.41 |
| Peng w J et al. (2012) | -8.00(-12.05, -3.95) | 2.90 |
| Quan G H (2015) | -9.50 (-13.34, -5.66) | 3.01 |
| Shi G L et al. (2017) | -10.07(-11.37, -8.77) | 4.37 |
| Xu H Y (2017) | -7.42 (-10.40, -4.44) | 3.50 |
| Lm S Q (2018) | -11.76 (-13.22, -10.30) | 4.30 |
| Zhou J (2018) | -6.15 (-8.31, -3.99) | 3.96 |
| Zhou X L et al. (2019) | -5.10 (-7.62, -2.58) | 3.76 |
| Zhang X et al. (2018) | -7.04 (-9.90, -4.18) | 3.57 |
| Yu L et al. (2021) | -1.80 (-11.27, 7.67) | 1.08 |
| Subtotal (1-squared = 83.4% , p = 0.000) | -8.25 (-9.66, -6.84) | 60.06 |
| Salvia-ligustrazine | | |
| Chen R et al. (2019) | -5.55(-7.39, -3.71) | 4.13 |
| Guo X L (2023) | -10.59 (-11.84, -9.34) | 4.38 |
| Hao Y Q et al. (2023) | -7.00 (-10.06, -3.94) | 3.45 |
| Huang Y M (2020) | -10.40 (-14.78, -6.02) | 2.72 |
| Xue L et al. (2023) | -11.48 (-13.47, -9.49) | 4.05 |
| Song Y H (2019) | -3.55 (-6.38, -0.72) | 3.58 |
| Wang Q Y et al. (2018) | -8.00 (-12.70, -3.30) | 2.57 |
| Wei M P et al. (2023) $\rightarrow \frac{1}{1}$ | -11.02 (-14.21, -7.83) | 3.38 |
| Xiao P P et al. (2021) | -8.37 (-12.62, -4.12) | 2.79 |
| Oin L etal. (2018) | -13.91 (-19.64, -8.18) | 2.11 |
| Zhang H J (2020) | -14.30(-18.11, -10.49) | 3.03 |
| Jia A L et al. (2022) | -3.93(-6.46, -1.40) | 3.75 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 84.1% , p = 0.000) | -8.79 (-10.78, -6.80) | 39.94 |
| | | |
| Overall (1–squared = 83.2% , p = 0.000) | -8.45 (-9.57, -7.32) | 100.00 |
| NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis | | |
| I I I I -20 0 10 | | |

Figure 4. Forest plot of DBP. The diastolic blood pressure changes. WMD: Weighted mean differences; CI: Confidence intervals.

Secondary outcome indicators

Urine protein

Six studies [5, 24, 34, 48, 52, 53] and eight studies [21, 22, 28, 31, 38, 39, 46, 49] reported changes in 24-h urine protein levels with conventional treatment combined with Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine, respectively. A random-effects model ($I^2 = 95.3\%$, P < 0.001) was applied. The meta-analysis revealed that both combined treatments with Salvia-ligustrazine and Ligustrazine significantly reduced patients' 24-h urine protein levels (WMD = -0.30; 95% CI: -0.47 to -0.13; P < 0.001), (WMD = -0.68; 95% CI: -1.00 to -0.37; P < 0.001) (Figure 10).

Coagulation function (APTT, PT)

Changes in APTT and PT values with conventional treatment combined with Chinese medicine injections were reported in eight [28, 30, 31, 35, 39, 41, 47, 53] and nine studies [28, 30, 31, 35, 39, 41, 45, 47, 53], respectively. These changes were meta-analyzed using a random-effects model ($I^2 = 89.8\%$, P < 0.001), ($I^2 = 94.4\%$, P < 0.001). The meta-analysis showed that combined treatment with Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine increased both APTT and PT values in patients' blood (WMD = 3.23; 95% CI: 2.31–4.14; P < 0.001), (WMD = 1.79; 95% CI: -1.10 to 2.48; P < 0.001) (Figures 11 and 12).

| Study | | % |
|--|-------------------|--------|
| ID | RR (95% CI) | Weight |
| cesarean | | |
| Chen R et al. (2019) | 0.68 (0.51, 0.92) | 22.28 |
| Hao Y Q et al. (2023) | 0.72 (0.52, 0.99) | 19.75 |
| Xue L et al. (2023) | 0.50 (0.28, 0.89) | 12.15 |
| Chang M (2019) | 0.55 (0.31, 0.97) | 11.14 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.631) | 0.64 (0.52, 0.77) | 65.32 |
| | | |
| postpartum eclampsia | | |
| Chen R et al. (2019) | 0.50 (0.13, 1.91) | 3.04 |
| Zhao W Q et al. (2018) | 0.20 (0.01, 4.09) | 1.27 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.583) | 0.41 (0.12, 1.38) | 4.30 |
| Placental abruntion | | |
| Chen R et al. (2019) | 0.50 (0.05, 5.37) | 1.01 |
| Oin L etal. (2018) | 0.33(0.04, 3.14) | 1.52 |
| Zhao W O et al. (2018) | 0.57 (0.18, 1.86) | 3 54 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% n = 0.916) | 0.50 (0.19, 1.30) | 6.08 |
| | 0.00 (0.19, 1.50) | 0.00 |
| Others | | |
| Chen R et al. (2019) | 0.33 (0.04, 3.11) | 1.52 |
| Oin L etal. (2018) | 0.25(0.03, 2.19) | 2.03 |
| Chang M (2019) | 0.67 (0.12, 3.81) | 1.52 |
| Zhao W Q et al. (2018) | 1.00 (0.34, 2.94) | 3.04 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.632) | 0.63 (0.29, 1.34) | 8.10 |
| | | |
| postpartum hemorrhage | | |
| Chen R et al. (2019) | 0.14 (0.02, 1.13) | 3.54 |
| Hao Y Q et al. (2023) | 0.13 (0.02, 0.97) | 4.05 |
| Xue L et al. (2023) | 0.50 (0.05, 5.34) | 1.01 |
| Qin L etal. (2018) | 0.50 (0.05, 5.42) | 1.01 |
| Chang M (2019) | 0.25 (0.06, 1.12) | 4.05 |
| Zhao W Q et al. (2018) | 0.40 (0.08, 1.99) | 2.53 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.888) | 0.25 (0.12, 0.53) | 16.20 |
| . Overall (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.843) | 0.55 (0.46, 0.67) | 100.00 |
| | | |
| .001 1 10 | | |

Figure 5. Forest plot of Salvia-ligustrazine on pregnancy outcomes for mothers. RR: Relative risk; CI: Confidence intervals.

Untoward reaction

Ten articles [14, 17, 18, 21, 24, 29, 30, 37, 42, 53] reported adverse events associated with conventional treatment combined with Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine. The adverse events included headache, dizziness, chest tightness, and impaired liver and kidney function ($I^2 = 14.5\%$, P = 0.310). The findings indicated that, compared with conventional treatment alone, combined Chinese medicine injections reduced the number of adverse reactions in patients (WMD = 0.64; 95% CI: 0.46–0.89; P = 0.008) (Figure 13).

Subgroup analysis

For each major outcome measure (SBP, DBP, ORR), we conducted subgroup analyses based on the duration of the treatment (up to seven days; over 14 days; 7–14 days) (Figures 14–16). The results showed that all three treatment durations had a significant effect on improving the indices as long as they were treated with the program (P < 0.01). Furthermore, our regression analysis indicated that changes in SBP might be influenced by different treatment durations (P = 0.042 < 0.05).

| Study | | % |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------|
| ID | RR (95% CI) | Weight |
| cesarean | | |
| Li et al. (2018) | 0.61 (0.36, 1.02) | 5.15 |
| Chen su ving (2002) | 0.61(0.26, 1.02) 0.46(0.24, 0.88) | 5.02 |
| Ding Natal (2012) | 0.54 (0.22, 0.80) | 5.82 |
| L 7 X (2010) | 0.32 (0.16, 0.71) | J.85 |
| Zhang X at al. (2018) | 0.55 (0.16, 0.71) | 4.71 |
| Zhang X et al. (2018) | 0.55 (0.31, 0.96) | 4.48 |
| Guo Z Y (2019) | 0.63 (0.42, 0.93) | 7.17 |
| Zhang P (2014) | 0.52 (0.25, 1.07) | 3.41 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.857) | 0.53 (0.43, 0.65) | 35.77 |
| postpartum hemorrhage | | |
| Li et al. (2018) | 0.22 (0.05, 0.97) | 2.02 |
| Cheng J M (2015) | 0.25 (0.03, 2.14) | 0.90 |
| Ding N et al. (2019) | 0.25 (0.10, 0.61) | 4.48 |
| | 0.25 (0.03, 2.14) | 0.90 |
| Li X H et al. (2022) | 0.20 (0.01, 4.05) | 0.56 |
| Li 7 V (2010) | 0.20 (0.05, 0.87) | 2.24 |
| Li 2 1 (2019) | 0.20 (0.05, 0.87) | 2.24 |
| | 0.20 (0.05, 0.85) | 2.24 |
| Shi G L et al. (2017) | 0.40 (0.08, 1.96) | 1.12 |
| Shi L et al. (2015) | 0.20 (0.02, 1.60) | 1.13 |
| Liu S Q (2018) | 0.14 (0.01, 2.68) | 0.78 |
| Zhou J (2018) | 0.25 (0.07, 0.84) | 2.69 |
| Zhou X L et al. (2019) | 0.60 (0.23, 1.55) | 2.24 |
| Zhang X et al. (2018) | 0.55 (0.23, 1.31) | 2.47 |
| Guo Z Y (2019) | 0.27 (0.08, 0.92) | 2.47 |
| Liao Y T et al. (2004) | 0.36 (0.16, 0.81) | 4.16 |
| in X F (2015) | 0.25(0.03, 2.12) | 0.90 |
| Wang L Y (2013) | 0.17 (0.05, 0.52) | 4 03 |
| $(u \in D(2014))$ | 0.25 (0.03, 2.18) | 0.90 |
| (d F D (2014) | - 0.40 (0.10, 2.40) | 0.90 |
| | - 0.49 (0.10, 2.49) | 0.91 |
| Subtotal (1-squared - 0.0%, p - 0.988) | 0.29 (0.22, 0.40) | 37.14 |
| Placental abruntion | | |
| Listal (2018) | 0.36 (0.12, 1.05) | 2 47 |
| Li M.L (2018) | - 0.15 (0.01, 2.75) | 0.78 |
| Li W L (2018) | | 0.78 |
| Li Y K (2010) | - 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) | 0.67 |
| Liu Y X (2019) | 0.17 (0.02, 1.32) | 1.34 |
| Shi G L et al. (2017) | 0.11 (0.01, 2.01) | 1.01 |
| Shi L et al. (2015) | 0.42 (0.12, 1.51) | 1.59 |
| Liu S Q (2018) | 0.33 (0.07, 1.56) | 1.34 |
| Ding Z P et al. (2020) | 0.24 (0.05, 1.05) | 1.85 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.981) | 0.28 (0.16, 0.50) | 11.05 |
| postpartum eclampsia | | |
| Cheng J M (2015) | 0.40 (0.08, 1.95) | 1.12 |
| Shi L et al. (2015) | 0.20 (0.01, 3.05) | 0.57 |
| in X E (2015) | 0.22 (0.01, 3.35) | 0.67 |
| Su E D (2014) | | 1.24 |
| Subtotal (L-squared = 0.0% n = 0.050) | 0.30 (0.13, 1.91) | 1.34 |
| Subtotal (1 squared = 0.07%, p = 0.950) | 0.59 (0.10, 0.95) | 5.70 |
| iterine inertia | | |
| Ding N et al. (2019) | 0.27 (0.10, 0.74) | 3.36 |
| Li M L (2018) | 0.20 (0.02, 1.60) | 1.13 |
| Li Y H et al. (2022) | 0.50 (0.10, 2.59) | 0.90 |
| Liu Y X (2019) | 0.25 (0.06, 1.10) | 1.79 |
| Shi G L et al. (2017) | 0.17 (0.02, 1.33) | 1.34 |
| Liu S O (2018) | 0.25 (0.03, 2.15) | 0.90 |
| Zhou X L et al. (2019) | 0.46 (0.10, 1, 14) | 2 91 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.937) | 0.31 (0.18, 0.52) | 12.34 |
| | | 100.00 |
| Overall $(1-squared = 0.0\%, p = 0.978)$ | 0.38 (0.33, 0.45) | 100.00 |
| I | 1 | |
| .00615 1 | 163 | |
| | | |



| Study | | % |
|---|-------------------|--------|
| ID | RR (95% CI) | Weight |
| Neonatal asphyxia | | |
| Chen R et al. (2019) | 0.33 (0.04, 3.11) | 4.20 |
| Hao Y Q et al. (2023) | 0.50 (0.05, 5.36) | 2.80 |
| Xue L et al. (2023) | 0.20 (0.01, 4.06) | 3.50 |
| Chang M (2019) | 0.11 (0.01, 2.01) | 6.29 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.870) | 0.25 (0.07, 0.87) | 16.78 |
| | | |
| Fetal distress | | |
| Chen R et al. (2019) | 0.20 (0.02, 1.66) | 6.99 |
| Hao Y Q et al. (2023) | 0.25 (0.03, 2.17) | 5.59 |
| Xue L et al. (2023) | 1.00 (0.15, 6.82) | 2.80 |
| Qin L etal. (2018) | 0.20 (0.02, 1.68) | 6.99 |
| Chang M (2019) | 0.33 (0.07, 1.57) | 8.39 |
| Zhao W Q et al. (2018) | 0.14 (0.01, 2.71) | 4.90 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.836) | 0.29 (0.13, 0.65) | 35.66 |
| | | |
| others | | |
| Chen R et al. (2019) | 0.33 (0.07, 1.59) | 8.39 |
| Hao Y Q et al. (2023) | 0.25 (0.06, 1.13) | 11.19 |
| Zhao W Q et al. (2018) $$ | 0.75 (0.28, 2.04) | 11.19 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.423) | 0.45 (0.22, 0.93) | 30.77 |
| | | |
| prematurity | | |
| Xue L et al. (2023) | 0.50 (0.05, 5.34) | 2.80 |
| Chang M (2019) | 0.30 (0.09, 1.02) | 13.99 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.707) | 0.33 (0.11, 0.99) | 16.78 |
| | | |
| Overall (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.976) | 0.34 (0.22, 0.54) | 100.00 |
| | | |
| | | |
| .00615 1 | 163 | |



Sensitivity analysis

Sensitivity analyses of the key outcome indicators indicated that the findings were fundamentally reliable (Figures S1–S9).

Publication bias

Primary outcome measures were tested for publication bias using funnel plots, Egger's test, or Begg's test. The data indicated that publication biases in blood pressure changes and pregnancy outcome indicators in mothers and infants treated with combined Salvia-ligustrazine were not significant (P > 0.05). However, there was a notable publication bias (P < 0.01) for total efficiency, and our conclusions did not change after we supplemented the analysis with the eight publications using the cut-and-patch method. Additionally, there was publication bias in the maternal and infant pregnancy outcome indicators of combined Chuanxiongzine treatment (P < 0.05), and the conclusions remained unchanged after applying the cut-andpatch method, further validating our findings.

Discussion

PIH represents a considerable threat to the health of both mothers and infants. In severe cases, it can precipitate placental abruption, eclampsia, cardiovascular and cerebrovascular accidents, as well as other adverse pregnancy outcomes [54]. The conventional therapeutic agents employed in such cases included magnesium sulfate and sedative antihypertensive drugs. However, the results are often unsatisfactory and accompanied by a variety of adverse effects, underscoring the urgent need for improved treatment options. Salvia-ligustrazine and ligustrazine may be suitable pharmacological options for the management of PIH. Clinical applications have shown favorable outcomes, facilitating more efficacious treatment regimens for patients diagnosed with PIH.

Based on meta-analysis, evidence suggests that the combination of Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine injections with conventional treatment is superior to the use of Labetalol, Nifedipine, and similar drugs alone in terms of reducing blood

| Fetal distress 0.40 (0.08, 1.95) 1.37 Li et al. (2013) 0.40 (0.08, 1.95) 1.37 Shi L et al. (2015) 0.20 (0.01, 1.93) 0.20 (0.01, 1.93) Ding Z r et al. (2020) 0.21 (0.05, 0.22) 2.54 Li et al. (2015) 0.20 (0.06, 0.25) 0.21 (0.05, 0.22) Ving Z r (2013) 0.40 (0.19, 0.81) 0.21 (0.05, 0.22) Subtotal (-squared - 0.0%, p - 0.900) 0.33 (0.04, 1.98) 0.33 (0.04, 1.98) Nonntial asplyxia 0.43 (0.12, 1.55) 1.92 Li et al. (2018) 0.43 (0.12, 1.55) 1.92 Number of (1.00) 0.33 (0.04, 1.98) 0.33 (0.04, 1.98) Li et al. (2018) 0.43 (0.12, 1.55) 1.92 Li et al. (2019) 0.33 (0.04, 1.98) 0.33 (0.04, 1.98) Li et al. (2017) 0.23 (0.02, 1.93) 0.33 (0.04, 1.98) Li et al. (2018) 0.33 (0.04, 1.98) 0.22 (0.05, 0.08) Li et al. (2019) 0.33 (0.04, 1.98) 0.22 (0.05, 0.08) Li et al. (2018) 0.23 (0.02, 1.93) 1.10 Chow X et al. (2018) 0.23 (0.01, 0.28) 1.10 Li et al. (2019) 0.23 (0.01, 0.28) 1.10 Chow X et al. (2018) 0.24 (0.01, 0.28) 1.10 Gua Z Y (2014) 0.23 (0.01, 0.28) 1.10 <t< th=""><th>Study ID</th><th>% RR (95% CI)</th><th>6 Veight</th></t<> | Study ID | % RR (95% CI) | 6 Veight |
|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|
| Li cui (2013) Li uy X (2019) Shi L cui (2015) Chun X L cui (2019) Chun X Cui (2018) Chun X L cui (2019) Chun X Cui (2018) Chun X Cui (201 | Fetal distress | | |
| Lin Y X (2015) 0.69 Shi L et al. (2015) 0.69 Zhang X et al. (2019) 0.55 (02.1.10) 1.92 Lin Y T (2015) 0.23 (0.06, 1.09) 2.19 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.23 (0.06, 0.29) 2.54 Lin X Y (2013) 0.59 (0.02, 1.25) 0.50 (0.05, 5.22) 0.55 Subtoal (-squared - 0.0%, p - 0.300) 0.33 (0.04, 1.08) 0.22 (0.05, 0.63) 4.11 Ding N et al. (2019) 0.23 (0.04, 1.08) 0.33 (0.04, 1.08) 0.82 Li H et al. (2012) 0.33 (0.04, 1.08) 0.82 0.16 (0.83) 3.84 Li H (2018) 0.43 (0.12, 1.55) 1.92 0.33 (0.04, 1.08) 0.82 Li Y H et al. (2017) 0.33 (0.04, 1.08) 0.82 0.16 (0.83) 3.84 Li Y H et al. (2019) 0.23 (0.03, 2.15) 1.10 0.25 (0.03, 2.15) 1.10 Ding Z Y et al. (2019) 0.50 (0.14, 0.28) 0.21 (0.06, 0.39) 2.47 Zhang Y (2013) 0.43 (0.12, 4.92) 0.43 (0.12, 4.92) 1.44 Vu L et al. (2017) 0.50 (0.10, 2.60) 0.43 (0.12, 0.42) 3.44 Lin X F (2015) 0.20 (0.01, 4.02) 0.44 (0.19, 0.48) <td>Li et al. (2018)</td> <td>0.40 (0.08, 1.95) 1</td> <td>37</td> | Li et al. (2018) | 0.40 (0.08, 1.95) 1 | 37 |
| SNL ct al. (2015) 0.669 Zhoux X, tct al. (2019) 0.55 (0.21, 1.38) 3.02 Ding Z, Y et al. (2020) 0.21 (0.05, 0.22) 0.21 (0.05, 0.22) Liax Y (2013) 0.40 (0.19, 0.48) 5.37 Zhang P (2014) 0.96, p = 0.900) 0.33 (0.22, 0.50) 2.316 Neonatial asphysia 0.43 (0.12, 1.55) 1.92 Lia V (2013) 0.43 (0.12, 1.55) 1.92 Din W tc (2) (2010) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 3.84 Di W tc (2) (2010) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 3.84 Di W tc (2) (2010) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 3.84 Lia V (2019) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 3.84 Shi G L tal. (2017) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 3.84 Lia V (2019) 0.31 (0.11, 0.88) 3.56 Lia V (2019) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 0.82 Lia V (2019) 0.13 (0.01, 0.88) 3.56 Lia V (2015) 0.25 (0.03, 2.16) 1.10 Dia D 2 et al. (2020) 0.31 (0.11, 0.88) 3.56 Lia V Y t et al. (2019) 0.25 (0.03, 2.16) 1.10 Zhang P (2014) 0.99(1.138) 0.247 Lia V Y t et al. (2021) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 3.29 Zhang P (2014) 0.99(1.10, 0.20) 0.43 (0.05, 0.08, 3.3) Subtotal (-squar | Lin Y X (2019) | 0.14(0.02, 1.00) 1 | 92 |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | Shi L et al. (2015) | 0.20(0.01, 3.95) | 69 |
| Zhang X et al. (2018) 0.25 (006, 1.09) 2.19 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.21 (0.05, 0.92) 2.54 Liax Y F (2013) 0.20 (0.06, 0.63) 4.11 Zhang P (2014) 0.28 (0.05, 2.55) 0.20 (0.06, 0.63) Subtoal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.900) 0.33 (0.12, 1.55) 1.92 Ding N et al. (2019) 0.33 (0.22, 0.50) 2.316 Li X T (2018) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 0.82 Li Y (2019) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 0.82 Lia Y (2019) 0.33 (0.01, 0.80) 3.84 Lia Y (2019) 0.33 (0.02, 1.05) 1.10 Zhong X et al. (2019) 0.33 (0.01, 0.80) 3.84 Lia Y (2014) 0.25 (0.03, 2.15) 1.10 Zhon X et al. (2020) 0.31 (0.01, 0.80) 3.84 Lia Y (2013) 0.21 (0.02, 0.32) 1.30 Zhang Y (2014) 0.25 (0.018, 1.38) 2.74 Zhang Y (2014) 0.25 (0.018, 1.38) 2.74 Ding X et al. (2019) 0.21 (0.64, 98) 3.29 Zhang Y (2014) 0.26 (0.03, 1.43 | Zhou X L et al. (2019) | 0.20(0.01, 0.00) | 02 |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | Zhou X \in et al. (2018) | 0.25(0.06, 1.09) 2 | 19 |
| Link Y T et al. (2000) Link Y T et al. (2013) Link Y (2013) Subtonal (1=squared = 0.0%, p = 0.900) Normal applysia Li et al. (2019) Li et al. (2019) | Ding 7 P et al. (2020) | 0.25(0.00, 1.09) 2 | 54 |
| Lin X F (2015) Wang L Y (2015) Wang L Y (2015) Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.900) Li Y H et al. (2019) Zhang Y (2019) Li Y H et al. (2019) Zhang Y (2018) Li Y H et al. (2019) Zhang Y (2019) Li S Q (2018) Zhang Y (2019) Li X (2019) Li X L et al. (2019) Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.996) Pernaturity Ding N et al. (2019) Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.996) Li Z Y (2019) Li Z Y (2019) Li X (2019) Li X (2019) Li X (2019) Li X (2019) Ding Y et al. (2019) Li X (2010) Li X (2010) Li X (2010) Li X (2010) Li X (2 | Liao V T et al. (2004) | 0.21(0.05, 0.92) 2. | 37 |
| Wing L Y (2013) Zhang P (2014) 0.201 (0.042, 0.633) 201 (0.14, 0.042) 0.201 (0.042, 0.633) 0.201 (0.042, 0.633) 0.201 0.201 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.02, 0.02, 0.14) 0.301 (0.02, 0.02, 0.14) 0.301 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.02, 0.02, 0.14) 0.301 (0.01, 0.02, 0.123) 0.431 (0.02, 0.02, 0.14) 0.301 (0.01, 0.02) 0.431 (0.02, 0.02) 0.431 (0.02, 0.02) 0.431 (0.02, 0.02) 0.431 (0.02 | Liao 1 1 ct al. (2004) | | 55 |
| Wing L (12015) 0.256 (0.5, 2.56) 1.39 Subtotal (L-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.900) 0.33 (0.22, 0.50) 2.16 Neonatal asphyxia 0.43 (0.12, 1.55) 1.92 Li et al. (2019) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 0.82 Li Y (2019) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 0.82 Li Y (2019) 0.31 (0.01, 0.88) 3.56 Li Y (2019) 0.31 (0.01, 0.88) 3.56 Lin Y Y (2019) 0.31 (0.01, 0.88) 3.56 Lin Y X (2019) 0.31 (0.01, 0.88) 3.56 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.21 (0.03, 2.15) 1.10 Case Z Y (2019) 0.23 (0.01, 0.28) 2.74 Ding Z P et al. (2021) 0.23 (0.01, 0.20) 0.23 (0.03, 2.15) 1.10 Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) 0.13 (0.03, 0.09) 4.24 Li Y Y (2019) 0.22 (0.01, 0.42) 0.43 (0.12, 0.42) 0.43 (0.12, 0.42) Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) 0.13 (0.02, 0.20) 1.10 0.29 (0.01, 0.31) 3.44 Ding Y et al. (2012) 0.44 (0.01, 0.42) 0.46 (0.19, 1.14) 3.56 Li Y Y (2019) 0.22 (0.01, 0.31) 3.44 0.39 (0.01, 1.55) 1.34 | Wang L V (2013) | | 11 |
| Ling T (2019) 0.33 (0.22, 0.50) 23.16 Neonatal asphyxia 0.43 (0.12, 1.52) 1.92 Li et al. (2018) 0.29 (0.10, 0.80) 3.84 Li Y H et al. (2012) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 0.82 Li Y L (2018) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 0.82 Li X (2019) 0.31 (0.02, 1.05) 1.10 Zhang X et al. (2019) 0.25 (0.03, 2.15) 1.10 Zhang X et al. (2018) 0.22 (0.01, 0.80) 3.84 Uin X F (2018) 0.25 (0.03, 2.15) 1.10 Guo Z Y (2019) 0.25 (0.03, 2.15) 1.10 Cabor Z Y (2019) 0.22 (0.05, 0.80) 2.47 Lin X F (2015) 0.20 (0.01, 4.02) 0.69 Wang L Y (2013) 0.43 (0.12, 0.42) 1.11 Yu L et al. (2021) 0.13 (0.02, 0.05) 1.30 Ding X et al. (2019) 0.25 (0.08, 0.91) 3.02 Zhang P (2014) 0.30 (0.21, 0.42) 3.461 Yu L et al. (2013) 0.13 (0.02, 0.96) 2.19 Li J Q (2013) 0.13 (0.02, 0.96) 2.19 Jand P (2014) 0.33 (0.09, 1.13) 3.02 Yu L et al. (2015) 0.96 </td <td>Thong P (2014)</td> <td>- 0.20 (0.00, 0.05) 4</td> <td>20</td> | Thong P (2014) | - 0.20 (0.00, 0.05) 4 | 20 |
| Subtoolal (r-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.900) Neonatal asphysia Li et al. (2013) Ding N et al. (2019) Li Y (2019) Chang Z et al. (2020) Li Y (2019) Guo Z Y (2019) Li Y (2013) Zhang P (2014) Yu L et al. (2017) Ding N et al. (2017) Ding Z P et al. (2020) Corrall (L-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.966) Ding Z P et al. (2020) Ding Z P | $\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i ^2 = 0.00(1 + 10.000)$ | | .39 |
| Normatal asphysia 1 0.43 (0.12, 1.55) 1.92 Ding N et al. (2019) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 0.82 Li Y H et al. (2021) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 0.82 Li Y Y (2019) 0.31 (0.04, 3.08) 0.82 Lin X Y (2019) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 0.82 Zhang X et al. (2017) 0.25 (0.03, 2.15) 1.10 Zhou X L et al. (2019) 0.25 (0.03, 2.15) 1.10 Zhang X et al. (2018) 0.25 (0.03, 2.15) 1.10 Guo Z Y (2019) 0.21 (0.05, 0.98) 2.47 Lian X F (2015) 0.23 (0.04, 0.29) 1.11 Yu L et al. (2020) 0.33 (0.04, 0.29) 4.44 Lian X F (2013) 0.43 (0.12, 2.49) 1.11 Yu L et al. (2019) 0.23 (0.05, 0.98) 2.47 Lian X F (2013) 0.43 (0.12, 2.49) 1.11 Yu L et al. (2019) 0.23 (0.01, 0.26) 1.46 Li Y (2019) 0.25 (0.08, 0.81) 3.34 Zhang P (2014) 0.25 (0.08, 0.81) 3.32 Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) 0.33 (0.21, 0.42) 3.46 Normatal death 0.37 (0.21, 0.79) 0.28 (0.17, 0.46) | Subtotal $(1-squared = 0.0\%, p = 0.900)$ | 0.55 (0.22, 0.50) 2. | 5.10 |
| Li et al. (2018) Ding N et al. (2019) Li Y H et al. (2019) Li Y (2019) Li S Q (2019) Li S Q (2019) Li S Q (2018) Guo Z Y (2019) Li av Y (2019) Li av Y (2019) Chang Y et al. (2020) Guo Z Y (2019) Li av Y (2013) Chang P (2014) Yu L et al. (2019) Ding X et al. (2019) Li av Y (2013) Chang P (2014) Yu L et al. (2019) Ding X et al. (2019) Li z Y (2019) Li av Y (2013) Chang P (2014) Yu L et al. (2019) Li z Y (2019) Li z Y (2019) Li z Y (2019) Li z Y (2019) Li av T et al. (2020) Chang P (2014) Yu L et al. (2019) Li z Y (2019) Chang P (2014) Yu L et al. (2019) Chang P (2014) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) Li z Y (2019) Chang P (2014) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) Li z Y (2019) Chang P (2014) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) | Neonatal asphyxia | 0.42 (0.12, 1.55) 1 | 02 |
| Ding N et al. (2019) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 0.82 Li Y H et al. (2022) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 0.82 Li Y Y (2019) 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 0.82 Li Y (2019) 0.17 (0.02, 1.32) 1.64 Shi G L et al. (2017) 0.25 (0.03, 2.15) 1.10 Lin S Q (2018) 0.25 (0.03, 2.15) 1.10 Zhou X L et al. (2019) 0.50 (0.18, 1.38) 2.74 Zhang X et al. (2020) 0.13 (0.02, 1.05) 1.98 Guo Z Y (2019) 0.22 (0.05, 0.98) 2.47 Lin N F (2015) 0.23 (0.04, 3.08) 0.42 Wang L Y (2013) 0.13 (0.02, 1.05) 1.98 Subtotal (L-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.996) 0.13 (0.02, 0.06) 1.10 Var L 2 (2019) 0.23 (0.04, 1.042) 3.66 Zhang Y (2014) 0.27 (0.08, 0.91) 3.02 Zhang Y (2014) 0.27 (0.08, 0.91) 3.02 Subtotal (L-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) 0.23 (0.02, 1.67) 1.39 Subtotal (L-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) 0.23 (0.02, 0.06) 2.19 Zhang Y (2014) 0.25 (0.08, 0.83) 3.29 Zhang Y (2014) 0.28 (0.17, 0.46) 16.74 | Li et al. (2018) | 0.43(0.12, 1.55) 1. | .92 |
| Li M L (2018) Li Y H et al. (2022) Li Y (2019) Li X Y (2019) Li X SQ (2018) Shi G L et al. (2017) Zhang X et al. (2018) Guo Z Y (2019) Li a V (2019) Chao Y (2019) Li a V (2019) Chao Y (2019) Li A Y (2013) Chao Y (2019) Li X Y (2013) Chao Y (2019) Li Z Y (2019) Chao Z F (2018) Chao Z F (2019) Chao Z F (2018) Chao Z F (2018) Chao Z F (2018) Chao Z F (2019) Chao Z F (2019 | Ding N et al. (2019) | 0.29(0.10, 0.80) 3. | .84 |
| Li Y H et al. (202) Li Z Y (2019) Shi G L et al. (2017) Li S Q (2018) Zhang X et al. (2017) Li S Q (2018) Zhang X et al. (2019) Mang L Y (2013) Li X F (2015) Mang L Y (2013) Li X F (2014) Pirematurity Ding N et al. (2029) Li Z Y (2019) Li Z Y (2019) Zhang P (2014) Mang X et al. (2018) Neonatal death Dong Y et al. (2015) Mong Y et al. (2015) Mang Y (2014) Li Z Y (2019) Li Z Y (2 | Li M L (2018) | | .82 |
| Li Z Y (2019) Li Y X (2019) Li S Q (2018) Shi G L et al. (2017) Li S Q (2018) C 25 (0.03, 2.15) Li 0 Ding Z P et al. (2019) Guo Z Y (2019) Liao Y T et al. (2019) Guo Z Y (2019) Liao Y T et al. (2020) Guo Z Y (2019) Liao Y T et al. (2020) Man L Y (2013) Ding Z P et al. (2021) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.996) Neonatal death Dong Y et al. (2019) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) Neonatal death Dong Y et al. (2012) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) Neonatal death Dong Y et al. (2013) Li Z Y (2013) Li Z Y (2013) C Hores Zhou J (2018) C | Li Y H et al. (2022) | - 0.33 (0.04, 3.08) 0. | .82 |
| Lu Y X (2019) Shi G L et al. (2017) Lu S Q (2018) Zhou X L et al. (2019) Close X et al. (2019) Close X et al. (2019) Close X et al. (2019) Close X (2019) Close X et al. (2020) Close X (2019) Close X (2019) Clos | Li Z Y (2019) | $0.31\ (0.11,\ 0.88)$ 3 | .56 |
| Shi G L et al. (2017) Liu S Q (2018) Zhang X et al. (2019) Guo Z Y (2013) Lia Y T et al. (2004) Liu X F (2013) Zhang P (2014) Yu L et al. (2021) Ding Z P et al. (2020) Guo Z Y (2013) Liz Y (2013) Ding Z P et al. (2020) Control (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.996) Control (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) Control (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) Control (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.806) Control (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.8 | Liu Y X (2019) | 0.17 (0.02, 1.32) 1 | .64 |
| Liu S Q (2018) Zhou X L et al. (2019) Ding Z P et al. (2020) Guo Z Y (2019) Lia V T et al. (2024) Lia V T et al. (2024) Lia V T (2015) Wang L Y (2013) Va L et al. (2021) Ding Z P et al. (2020) Control L C S (0.10, 2.60) Liz Y (2013) Liz Y (2013) Liz Y (2014) Va L et al. (2021) Ding X et al. (2021) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.996) Liz Y (2019) Control L C S (0.10, 2.60) Liz Y (2019) Liz Y (2019) Liz Y (2019) Control L C S (0.10, 2.60) Liz J Q (2019) Control L C S (0.10, 2.60) Liz J Q (2019) Control L C S (0.10, 2.60) Control L C S (0.10, 2.70) Control L C S (0.10, 1.65) Control L C S (0.10, 1.78) Control L C S (0.10, | Shi G L et al. (2017) | • 0.25 (0.03, 2.16) 1 | .10 |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | Liu S Q (2018) | • 0.25 (0.03, 2.15) 1. | .10 |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Zhou X L et al. (2019) | 0.50 (0.18, 1.38) 2. | .74 |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | Zhang X et al. (2018) | 0.25 (0.03, 2.12) | .10 |
| Guo Z Y (2019) 0.22 (20.5, 0.98) 2.47 Liao Y T et al. (2004) 0.38 (0.16, 0.90) 4.24 Liu X F (2013) 0.38 (0.16, 0.90) 4.24 Zhang P (2014) 0.40 (0.10, 2.49) 1.11 Yu L et al. (2021) 0.49 (0.10, 2.49) 1.10 Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.996) 0.50 (0.10, 2.60) 1.10 Jing N et al. (2019) 0.25 (0.08, 0.83) 3.29 Zhou J (2018) 0.29 (0.10, 0.81) 3.84 Zhang P (2014) 0.36 (0.13, 1.03) 3.02 Jai JQ (2019) 0.32 (0.08, 0.81) 3.84 Zhang P (2014) 0.39 (0.10, 8.187) 1.39 Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) 0.57 (0.18, 1.79) 1.92 Lai JQ (2019) 0.33 (0.09, 1.12) 2.50 Guo Z Y (2019) 0.33 (0.09, 1.12) 2.50 Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) 0.37 (0.18, 1.79) 1.92 Lai JQ (2018) 0.37 (0.21, 0.65) 1.070 0.27 (0.28, 0.41) Out J (2018) 0.37 (0.21, 0.65) 1.070 0.37 (0.21, 0.65) 1.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.34 (0.28, 1.40) 3.39 0.34 (0.13, 0.86 | Ding Z P et al. (2020) | 0.13 (0.02, 1.05) 1 | .98 |
| Liao Y T et al. (2004) Liu X F (2015) Wang L Y (2013) Zhang P (2014) Yu L et al. (2021) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.996) rematurity Ding N et al. (2019) Li Z Y (2019) Zhang Y et al. (2019) Clu Z Y (2019 | Guo Z Y (2019) | 0.22 (0.05, 0.98) 2 | .47 |
| Liu X F (2015) Wang L Y (2013) Zhang P (2014) Yu L et al. (2021) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.996) Li Z Y (2019) Zhou J (2018) Club Z Y (2019) Zhang X et al. (2018) Guo Z Y (2019) Li Z Y (2019) Club Z Y (2019) Li Z Y (2019) Li Z Y (2019) Club Z Y (2019) Li Z Y (2019) Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) Li Z Y (2019) Club Z Y (2019) Club Z Y (2019) Li Z Y (2019) Club Z Y (2018) Club Z Y (201 | Liao Y T et al. (2004) | 0.38 (0.16, 0.90) 4 | .24 |
| $ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Wang L Y (2013)} \\ \mbox{Zhang P (2014)} \\ \mbox{Zhang P (2014)} \\ \mbox{Zhang P (2014)} \\ \mbox{Zhang P (2014)} \\ \mbox{Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0\%, p = 0.996)} \\ \mbox{.} \\ \mbox{Jermaturity} \\ \mbox{Dig N et al. (2019)} \\ \mbox{Li Z Y (2019)} \\ \mbox{Zhang X et al. (2018)} \\ \mbox{Zhang X et al. (2018)} \\ \mbox{Zhang P (2014)} \\ \mbox{Zhang P (2014)} \\ \mbox{Zhang X et al. (2018)} \\ \mbox{Zhang P (2014)} \\ \mbox{Local A (2012)} \\ \mbox{Li Z Y (2019)} \\ \mbox{Li Z J A (2012)} \\ \mbox{Li Z J A (2014)} \\ \mbox{Li Z J A (2014)} \\ \mbox{Li Z J A (2015)} \\ \mbox{Li Z J A (2012)} \\ \mbox{Li Z J A (2014)} \\ \mbox{Li J A (2012)} \\ \mbox{Li J A (2014)} \\ \mbox{Li J A (2014)} \\ \mbox{L J A (2014)} \\ \mbox{L J A (2014)} \\ \mbox{L J A (2015)} \\ \mbox{L A (2015)} \\ \mbox{L J A (2014)} \\ \mbox{L J A (2014)} \\ \mbox{L J A (2014)} \\ \mbox{L J A (2015)} \\ \mbox{L J A (2014)} \\ \mbox{L J A (2015)} \\ \mbox{L J A (2014)} \\ \mbox{L J A (2015)} \\ \mbox{L J A (2015)} \\ \mbox{L J A (2015)} \\ \mbox{L J A (2016)} \\ L J A (20$ | Liu X F (2015) | 0.20 (0.01, 4.02) 0. | .69 |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Wang L Y (2013) | 0.13 (0.03, 0.50) 4 | .39 |
| Yu L et al. (2021) 0.50 (0.10, 2.60) 1.10 Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.996) 0.30 (0.21, 0.42) 34.61 . . 0.27 (0.08, 0.91) 3.02 Li Z Y (2019) 0.25 (0.08, 0.83) 3.29 Zhou J (2018) 0.36 (0.13, 1.03) 3.02 Guo Z Y (2019) 0.36 (0.13, 1.03) 3.02 Zhang X et al. (2018) 0.36 (0.13, 1.03) 3.02 Guo Z Y (2019) 0.39 (0.08, 1.87) 1.39 Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) 0.38 (0.17, 0.46) 16.74 Neonatal death 0.26 (0.10, 1.14) 3.56 Dong Y et al. (2012) 0.46 (0.19, 1.14) 3.56 Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) 0.33 (0.09, 1.12) 2.50 Guo Z Y (2019) 0.46 (0.19, 1.14) 3.56 Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) 0.37 (0.21, 0.65) 10.70 . 0.48 (0.25, 0.91) 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.44 (0.12, 1.78) 1.69 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.34 (0.13, 0.86) 3.95 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.34 (0.13, 0.86) 3.95 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.34 (0.2 | Zhang P (2014) | - 0.49 (0.10, 2.49) 1 | .11 |
| Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.996) i prematurity Ding N et al. (2019) Li Z Y (2019) Zhou J (2018) Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) i Neonatal death Dong Y et al. (2013) Lai J Q (2019) Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) i Neonatal death Dong Y et al. (2013) Lai J Q (2019) Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) i others Zhou J (2018) Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) i others Zhou J (2018) Ding Z P et al. (2020) Ding Z P | Yu L et al. (2021) | - 0.50 (0.10, 2.60) 1 | .10 |
| $\begin{array}{c} & \\ \mbox{implementativity} \\ \mbox{Ding N et al. (2019)} \\ \mbox{Li Z Y (2019)} \\ \mbox{Zhou J (2018)} \\ \mbox{Zhang X et al. (2018)} \\ \mbox{Quot Z Y (2019)} \\ \mbox{Subtotal (l-squared = 0.0\%, p = 0.958)} \\ \mbox{Implementative} \\ \mbox$ | Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.996) | 0.30 (0.21, 0.42) 34 | 4.61 |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | prematurity | | |
| Li Z Y (2019) Zhou J (2018) Guo Z Y (2019) Zhang X et al. (2018) Guo Z Y (2019) Zhang P (2014) Subtotal (1–squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) Neonatal death Dong Y et al. (2012) Lai J Q (2019) Zhang P (2014) Subtotal (1–squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) | Ding N et al. (2019) | 0.27 (0.08, 0.91) 3 | .02 |
| $\begin{array}{c} \label{eq:constraint} \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | $\operatorname{Li} Z Y (2019)$ | 0.25(0.08, 0.83) 3 | 29 |
| $\begin{array}{c} \begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ | Zhou I (2018) | 0.29(0.10, 0.81) 3 | 84 |
| Linking Y (2019) 0.30 (0.12, 10.9) 0.32 Sub Z Y (2019) 0.33 (0.02, 0.96) 2.19 Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) 0.28 (0.17, 0.46) 16.74 . 0.57 (0.18, 1.79) 1.92 Lai J Q (2019) 0.46 (0.19, 1.14) 3.56 Peng W J et al. (2012) 0.09 (0.01, 1.65) 1.34 Shi L et al. (2015) 0.09 (0.01, 1.65) 1.34 Guo Z Y (2019) 0.20 (0.01, 4.07) 0.69 Zhang P (2014) 0.37 (0.21, 0.65) 10.70 . 0.37 (0.21, 0.65) 10.70 . 0.48 (0.25, 0.91) 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.46 (0.13, 0.86) 3.95 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.47 (0.12, 1.78) 1.69 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.34 (0.13, 0.86) 3.95 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.806) 0.34 (0.28, 0.41) 100.00 . 0.34 (0.28, 0.41) 100.00 | Zhang X et al. (2018) | 0.29(0.10, 0.01) 3 | 02 |
| Chang P (2014) 0.13 (0.02, 0.30) 2.13 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) 0.39 (0.08, 1.87) 1.39 . Neonatal death 0.57 (0.18, 1.79) 1.92 Lai J Q (2019) 0.46 (0.19, 1.14) 3.56 Peng W J et al. (2015) 0.33 (0.09, 1.12) 2.50 Guo Z Y (2019) 0.20 (0.01, 4.07) 0.69 Zhang P (2014) 0.33 (0.09, 1.12) 2.50 Guo Z Y (2019) 0.20 (0.01, 4.07) 0.69 Zhang P (2014) 0.37 (0.21, 0.65) 10.70 . 0.48 (0.25, 0.91) 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.44 (0.13, 0.86) 3.95 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.806) 0.43 (0.28, 1.40) 3.39 Owerall (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 1.000) 0.34 (0.28, 0.41) 100.00 | Guo Z X (2019) | 0.30(0.02, 0.96) 2 | 19 |
| 2.1mg r (2017) 0.55 (0.30, 1.67) 1.57 Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.958) 0.28 (0.17, 0.46) 16.74 Neonatal death 0.28 (0.17, 0.46) 16.74 Dong Y et al. (2013) 0.57 (0.18, 1.79) 1.92 Lai J Q (2019) 0.46 (0.19, 1.14) 3.56 Peng W J et al. (2012) 0.33 (0.09, 1.12) 2.50 Guo Z Y (2019) 0.33 (0.09, 1.12) 2.50 Zhang P (2014) 0.37 (0.21, 0.65) 10.70 Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) 0.46 (0.19, 1.14) 3.56 Outo Z Y (2019) 0.37 (0.21, 0.65) 10.70 . 0.19 (0.01, 3.91) 0.69 Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) 0.48 (0.25, 0.91) 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.47 (0.12, 1.78) 1.69 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.34 (0.13, 0.86) 3.95 Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.806) 0.47 (0.31, 0.72) 14.79 . 0.34 (0.28, 0.41) 100.00 0.34 (0.28, 0.41) 100.00 | Zhang P (2014) | 0.13(0.02, 0.90) 2. | 30 |
| Neonatal death 0.57 (0.18, 1.79) 1.92 Dong Y et al. (2013) 0.46 (0.19, 1.14) 3.56 Peng W J et al. (2015) 0.09 (0.01, 1.65) 1.34 Shi L et al. (2015) 0.20 (0.01, 4.07) 0.69 Guo Z Y (2019) 0.20 (0.01, 4.07) 0.69 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) 0.37 (0.21, 0.65) 10.70 . 0.48 (0.25, 0.91) 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.44 (0.13, 0.86) 3.95 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.806) 0.34 (0.28, 0.41) 100.00 . 0.34 (0.28, 0.41) 100.00 | Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% n = 0.958) | 0.39(0.00, 1.07) | 6 74 |
| Neonatal death 0.57 (0.18, 1.79) 1.92 Lai J Q (2019) 0.46 (0.19, 1.14) 3.56 Peng W J et al. (2012) 0.90 (0.01, 1.65) 1.34 Shi L et al. (2015) 0.33 (0.09, 1.12) 2.50 Guo Z Y (2019) 0.20 (0.01, 4.07) 0.69 Zhang P (2014) 0.19 (0.01, 3.91) 0.69 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) 0.37 (0.21, 0.65) 10.70 . 0.48 (0.25, 0.91) 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.48 (0.25, 0.91) 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.47 (0.12, 1.78) 1.69 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.34 (0.13, 0.86) 3.95 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.806) 0.34 (0.28, 0.41) 100.00 . 0.34 (0.28, 0.41) 100.00 | | 0.28 (0.17, 0.40) | 0.74 |
| $\begin{array}{c} \text{Lai J Q (2019)} \\ \text{Peng W J et al. (2012)} \\ \text{Shi L et al. (2015)} \\ \text{Guo Z Y (2019)} \\ \text{Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0\%, p = 0.842)} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{others} \\ \text{Zhou J (2018)} \\ \text{Ding Z P et al. (2020)} \\ \text{Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0\%, p = 0.806)} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{Overall (I-squared = 0.0\%, p = 1.000)} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{Overall (I-squared = 0.0\%, p = 1.000)} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{Overall (I-squared = 0.0\%, p = 1.000)} \\ \text{.} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{.} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{.} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{.} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{.} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{.} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{.} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \text{.} \\ \begin{array}{c}$ | Neonatal death | 0.57 (0.19, 1.70) 1 | 02 |
| Lai J Q (2017) 0.40 (0.19, 1.14) 3.56 Peng W J et al. (2012) 0.09 (0.01, 1.65) 1.34 Shi L et al. (2015) 0.33 (0.09, 1.12) 2.50 Guo Z Y (2019) 0.20 (0.01, 4.07) 0.69 Zhang P (2014) 0.19 (0.01, 3.91) 0.69 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) 0.37 (0.21, 0.65) 10.70 . 0.48 (0.25, 0.91) 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.43 (0.12, 1.78) 1.69 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.33 (0.28, 1.40) 3.39 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.806) 0.34 (0.13, 0.86) 3.95 . 0.34 (0.28, 0.41) 100.00 | $L_{\text{old}} = L_{\text{old}} (2010)$ | 0.5/(0.18, 1.79) 1. | .72 56 |
| Peng W J et al. (2012) $0.09 (0.01, 1.65)$ 1.34 Shi L et al. (2015) $0.33 (0.09, 1.12)$ 2.50 Guo Z Y (2019) $0.20 (0.01, 4.07)$ 0.69 Zhang P (2014) $0.19 (0.01, 3.91)$ 0.69 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) $0.37 (0.21, 0.65)$ 10.70 . . $0.48 (0.25, 0.91)$ 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.48 (0.25, 0.91)$ 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.63 (0.28, 1.40)$ 3.39 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.34 (0.13, 0.86)$ 3.95 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.806) $0.34 (0.28, 0.41)$ 100.00 | Lai J Q (2019) | 0.46(0.19, 1.14) 3. | .50 |
| Shi L et al. (2015) $0.33 (0.09, 1.12)$ 2.50 Guo Z Y (2019) $0.20 (0.01, 4.07)$ 0.69 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) $0.19 (0.01, 3.91)$ 0.69 . $0.37 (0.21, 0.65)$ 10.70 . . $0.48 (0.25, 0.91)$ 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.48 (0.25, 0.91)$ 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.63 (0.28, 1.40)$ 3.39 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.34 (0.13, 0.86)$ 3.95 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.806) $0.34 (0.28, 0.41)$ 100.00 . . . $0.34 (0.28, 0.41)$ 100.00 | Peng w J et al. (2012) | 0.09(0.01, 1.65) 1. | .34 |
| Guo Z Y (2019) $0.20 (0.01, 4.07)$ 0.69 Zhang P (2014) $0.19 (0.01, 3.91)$ 0.69 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) $0.37 (0.21, 0.65)$ 10.70 . . $0.48 (0.25, 0.91)$ 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.47 (0.12, 1.78)$ 1.69 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.63 (0.28, 1.40)$ 3.39 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.34 (0.13, 0.86)$ 3.95 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.806) $0.34 (0.28, 0.41)$ 100.00 . . . $0.34 (0.28, 0.41)$ 100.00 | Shi L et al. (2015) | 0.33(0.09, 1.12) 2. | .50 |
| Zhang P (2014) $0.19 (0.01, 3.91)$ 0.69 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842) $0.37 (0.21, 0.65)$ 10.70 . $0.48 (0.25, 0.91)$ 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.47 (0.12, 1.78)$ 1.69 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.63 (0.28, 1.40)$ 3.39 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.34 (0.13, 0.86)$ 3.95 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.806) $0.34 (0.28, 0.41)$ 100.00 . $0.34 (0.28, 0.41)$ 100.00 | Guo Z Y (2019) | | .69 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.842) 0.37 (0.21, 0.65) 10.70 . others 0.48 (0.25, 0.91) 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.47 (0.12, 1.78) 1.69 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.63 (0.28, 1.40) 3.39 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.34 (0.13, 0.86) 3.95 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.806) 0.47 (0.31, 0.72) 14.79 . 0.34 (0.28, 0.41) 100.00 | Zhang P (2014) | | .69 |
| others 0.48 (0.25, 0.91) 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.47 (0.12, 1.78) 1.69 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.63 (0.28, 1.40) 3.39 Ding Z P et al. (2020) 0.34 (0.13, 0.86) 3.95 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.806) 0.47 (0.31, 0.72) 14.79 Overall (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 1.000) 0.34 (0.28, 0.41) 100.00 | Subtotal (1-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.842) | 0.37 (0.21, 0.65) | 0.70 |
| Zhou J (2018) $0.48 (0.25, 0.91)$ 5.76 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.47 (0.12, 1.78)$ 1.69 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.63 (0.28, 1.40)$ 3.39 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.34 (0.13, 0.86)$ 3.95 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.806) $0.47 (0.31, 0.72)$ 14.79 Overall (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 1.000) $0.34 (0.28, 0.41)$ 100.00 | others | | |
| Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.47 (0.12, 1.78)$ 1.69 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.63 (0.28, 1.40)$ 3.39 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.34 (0.13, 0.86)$ 3.95 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.806) $0.47 (0.31, 0.72)$ 14.79 Overall (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 1.000) $0.34 (0.28, 0.41)$ 100.00 | Zhou J (2018) | 0.48 (0.25, 0.91) 5. | .76 |
| Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.63 (0.28, 1.40)$ 3.39 Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.34 (0.13, 0.86)$ 3.95 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.806) $0.47 (0.31, 0.72)$ 14.79 Overall (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 1.000) $0.34 (0.28, 0.41)$ 100.00 Image: the squared = 0.0526 1 190 | Ding Z P et al. (2020) | 0.47 (0.12, 1.78) 1 | .69 |
| Ding Z P et al. (2020) $0.34 (0.13, 0.86)$ 3.95 Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.806) $0.47 (0.31, 0.72)$ 14.79 Overall (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 1.000) $0.34 (0.28, 0.41)$ 100.00 I I 100.00 | Ding Z P et al. (2020) | 0.63 (0.28, 1.40) 3. | .39 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.806) $0.47 (0.31, 0.72)$ 14.79 Overall (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 1.000) $0.34 (0.28, 0.41)$ 100.00 I I 100.00 I 190 190 | Ding Z P et al. (2020) | 0.34 (0.13, 0.86) 3 | .95 |
| \cdot | Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.806) | 0.47 (0.31, 0.72) | 4.79 |
| .00526 1 190 | Overall (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 1.000) | 0.34 (0.28, 0.41) | 00.00 |
| .00526 1 190 | ¦ | | |
| | .00526 | 1 190 | |



| Study | | % |
|---|---------------------|--------|
| ID | RR (95% CI) | Weight |
| | | |
| ligustrazine | | 2.52 |
| Li et al. (2018) | 1.17 (1.00, 1.37) | 3.72 |
| Chen su xing (2002) | 1.18 (1.05, 1.32) | 6.57 |
| Cheng H J (2019) | 1.21 (1.02, 1.44) | 4.04 |
| Ding N et al. (2019) | 1.24 (1.02, 1.50) | 3.61 |
| Huang Y F et al. (2017) \bullet | 1.18 (1.01, 1.38) | 4.14 |
| Li M L (2018) | 1.22 (1.01, 1.47) | 3.40 |
| Liu Y X (2019) | 1.38 (1.14, 1.66) | 3.40 |
| Xue L et al. (2023) | 1.33 (1.11, 1.60) | 3.83 |
| Peng W J et al. (2012) | 1.10 (0.94, 1.29) | 2.55 |
| Quan G H (2015) | 1.13 (0.96, 1.33) | 2.64 |
| Shi G L et al. (2017) | 1.22 (1.03, 1.44) | 3.93 |
| Guo Z Y (2019) | 1.17 (1.01, 1.36) | 4.36 |
| Liao Y T et al. (2004) | 1.18 (1.04, 1.34) | 5.48 |
| Liu X F (2015) | 1.23 (1.00, 1.51) | 2.76 |
| Wang X F et al. (2020) | 1.21 (1.01, 1.46) | 3.55 |
| Xu F D (2014) | 1.23 (1.04, 1.46) | 4.99 |
| Zhang P (2014) | - 1.23 (0.99, 1.54) | 2.80 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.988) | 1.21 (1.16, 1.26) | 65.78 |
| | | |
| Salvia-ligustrazine | | |
| Chen R et al. (2019) | 1.14 (1.00, 1.29) | 5.31 |
| Hao Y Q et al. (2023) | 1.15 (1.00, 1.31) | 4.99 |
| Song Y H (2019) | 1.17 (1.02, 1.36) | 4.25 |
| Wang Q Y et al. (2018) | 1.27 (1.00, 1.60) | 3.19 |
| Wei M P et al. (2023) | 1.21 (1.02, 1.43) | 3.61 |
| Xiao P P et al. (2021) | 1.21 (1.01, 1.44) | 3.61 |
| Zhang H J (2020) | 1.26 (1.08, 1.47) | 4.46 |
| Zhao W Q et al. (2018) | - 1.31 (1.10, 1.56) | 4.78 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.900) | 1.21 (1.14, 1.28) | 34.22 |
| | | 0 |
| Overall (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.998) | 1.21 (1.17, 1.25) | 100.00 |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | 0 |
| | | |
| I I 601 1 | 1 66 | |
| .001 1 | 1.00 | |

Figure 9. Forest plot of overall response rate. RR: Relative risk; CI: Confidence intervals.

pressure, improving coagulation function, enhancing clinical efficacy, and improving maternal and infant pregnancy outcomes. Pharmacological studies have shown that Salvia miltiorrhiza acts against myocardial ischemia, atherosclerosis and thrombosis [55]. Ligustrazine is an alkaloid, and the main active substance extracted from the rhizome of Artemisia *Ligusttcum chuanxiong Hort*, family Umbelliferae, which is widely used clinically for a variety of diseases. Pharmacological reviews have established that Chuanxiongzine has antithrombotic, Anti-ischemia-reperfusion injury, and cardiovascular and cerebrovascular protective effects. Ligustrazine may exert vasodilatory effects through the activation of the adenylate cyclase (AC)/PKA cascade and inhibition of voltage-dependent L-type Ca²⁺ channels [56]. Xu et al. [57] found that Ligustrazine may improve vascular endothelial cell dysfunction by increasing in mitochondrial biosynthesis.

The results showed that treatment with Ligustrazine injections combined with antispasmodic drugs, such as magnesium sulfate or diazepam substantially reduced the number of eclamptic episodes and the severity of eclampsia. Pharmacological studies suggest that Ligustrazine protects the brain and nerves through antioxidant and anti-apoptotic pathways. Xiaoqin [58] found that Ligustrazine inhibited the production of glutamate (Glu) in the brain and promoted the production of gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA), thus reducing neuronal excitability and inhibiting epilepsy. However, Salvia-ligustrazine did not improve eclampsia.

| Study | | % |
|--|----------------------|--------|
| ID | WMD (95% CI) | Weight |
| igustrazine | | |
| Li et al. (2018) | -0.52 (-0.68, -0.36) | 8.18 |
| Huang Y F et al. (2017) | -0.95 (-1.10, -0.80) | 8.25 |
| Lai J Q (2019) | -2.24 (-3.22, -1.26) | 2.77 |
| Li Y H et al. (2022) | -0.91 (-1.02, -0.80) | 8.40 |
| Li Z Y (2019) | -0.55 (-0.71, -0.39) | 8.15 |
| Ku H Y (2017) | 0.08 (-0.07, 0.23) | 8.23 |
| Guo Z Y (2019) | -1.05 (-1.45, -0.65) | 6.35 |
| Yu L et al. (2021) | -0.20 (-0.60, 0.20) | 6.35 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 95.4%, $p = 0.000$) | -0.68 (-1.00, -0.37) | 56.69 |
| | | |
| Salvia-ligustrazine | | |
| Chen R et al. (2019) | -0.08 (-0.17, 0.01) | 8.47 |
| Hao Y Q et al. (2023) | -0.38 (-0.70, -0.06) | 7.07 |
| Kue L et al. (2023) | -0.58 (-0.71, -0.45) | 8.30 |
| Wang Q Y et al. (2018) | -0.57 (-1.51, 0.37) | 2.94 |
| Qin L etal. (2018) | -0.27 (-0.34, -0.20) | 8.55 |
| ia A L et al. (2022) | -0.18 (-0.37, 0.01) | 7.98 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 86.9% , p = 0.000) | -0.30 (-0.47, -0.13) | 43.31 |
| | | |
| Dverall (I-squared = 95.3%, p = 0.000) | -0.51 (-0.71, -0.31) | 100.00 |
| OTE: Weights are from random effects analysis | | |
| -3.22 0 | 3 22 | |

Figure 10. Forest plot of urine protein. WMD: Weighted mean differences; CI: Confidence intervals.

| Study | | | % |
|--|------------|---------------------|--------|
| ID | | WMD (95% CI) | Weight |
| | 1 | | |
| ligustrazine | | | |
| Li et al. (2018) | | 2.88 (2.23, 3.53) | 14.68 |
| Cheng H J (2019) | | 5.11 (3.87, 6.35) | 12.31 |
| Lai J Q (2019) | • | -0.28 (-2.23, 1.67) | 9.25 |
| Li Z Y (2019) | | 4.03 (3.06, 5.00) | 13.46 |
| Zhou X L et al. (2019) | | 1.85 (1.30, 2.40) | 14.98 |
| Yu H R et al. (2020) | | - 4.44 (2.23, 6.65) | 8.25 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 88.2%, p = 0.000) | \diamond | 3.03 (1.84, 4.22) | 72.94 |
| | | | |
| Salvia-ligustrazine | | | |
| Hao Y Q et al. (2023) | | 4.00 (3.67, 4.33) | 15.54 |
| Xiao P P et al. (2021) | | 3.41 (2.00, 4.82) | 11.53 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.425) | \diamond | 3.97 (3.65, 4.29) | 27.06 |
| | | | |
| Overall (I-squared = 89.8%, p = 0.000) | | 3.23 (2.31, 4.14) | 100.00 |
| NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis | | 1 | |
| -6.65 | 0 6 | 6.65 | |



| Study | | | % |
|--|-------------------|----------------------------|--------|
| ID | | WMD (95% CI) | Weight |
| | | | |
| ligustrazine | | | |
| Li et al. (2018) | | 1.73 (1.24, 2.22) | 11.60 |
| Cheng H J (2019) | | 2.33 (1.52, 3.14) | 10.52 |
| Lai J Q (2019) | * | 0.28 (-0.57, 1.13) | 10.37 |
| Li Z Y (2019) | | 2.00 (1.48, 2.52) | 11.52 |
| Zhou X L et al. (2019) | * | 0.37 (0.16, 0.58) | 12.19 |
| Ding Z P et al. (2020) | | - 4.66 (3.72, 5.60) | 10.04 |
| Yu H R et al. (2020) | | 2.35 (1.54, 3.16) | 10.53 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 95.7%, p = 0.000) | $\langle \rangle$ | 1.93 (0.93, 2.92) | 76.77 |
| | | | |
| Salvia-ligustrazine | | | |
| Hao Y Q et al. (2023) | * | 1.18 (0.87, 1.49) | 12.03 |
| Xiao P P et al. (2021) | . | 1.65 (1.03, 2.27) | 11.20 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 43.2%, p = 0.185) | \diamond | 1.33 (0.90, 1.77) | 23.23 |
| | | | |
| Overall (I-squared = 94.4%, p = 0.000) | | 1.79 (1.10, 2.48) | 100.00 |
| NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis | | | |
| -5.6 | 0 5 | 5.6 | |

Figure 12. Forest plot of prothrombin time. WMD: Weighted mean differences; CI: Confidence intervals.

| Study | | % |
|---|-------------------|--------|
| ID | RR (95% CI) | Weight |
| | | |
| ligustrazine | | |
| Cheng H J (2019) | 1.29 (0.52, 3.18) | 9.54 |
| Cheng J M (2015) | 0.20 (0.02, 1.64) | 6.81 |
| Jia X H (2020) | 0.20 (0.05, 0.87) | 13.63 |
| Liu Y X (2019) | 0.75 (0.18, 3.16) | 5.45 |
| Shi L et al. (2015) | 0.46 (0.22, 0.95) | 23.44 |
| Xu H Y (2017) | 0.54 (0.17, 1.72) | 9.77 |
| Zhang X et al. (2018) | 1.00 (0.55, 1.83) | 17.71 |
| Xu F D (2014) | 0.25 (0.03, 2.18) | 5.45 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 28.9%, p = 0.198) | 0.61 (0.43, 0.86) | 91.80 |
| | | |
| Salvia-ligustrazine | | |
| Hao Y Q et al. (2023) | 1.48 (0.26, 8.51) | 2.75 |
| Qin L etal. (2018) | 0.75 (0.17, 3.26) | 5.45 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0% , p = 0.562) | 0.99 (0.33, 3.01) | 8.20 |
| | | |
| Overall (1-squared = 14.5%, p = 0.310) | 0.64 (0.46, 0.89) | 100.00 |
| | | |
| I | | |
| .02 1 10 | | |

Figure 13. Forest plot of untoward reaction. RR: Relative risk; CI: Confidence intervals.

| Study ID W | MD (95% CI) | % Weight |
|--|---|-------------|
| > 14days | 70 (40 04 0 05) | 4.00 |
| Li et al. (2018) -9 | ./8 (-12.61, -6.95) | 4.09 |
| Chen R et al. (2019) -1 | 5.74(-17.93, -13.55) | 4.28 |
| Cip L atal. (2019) -1 | 7.00(-22.04, -12.40) | 3.20 |
| Zhou L (2018) | 0.10(-14.20, -0.00) | 2.00 |
| Yul et al. (2021) | 7.00 (-23.24, -10.92) 50 (-11 45 8 45) | 2.90 |
| | 3 27 (-16 29 -10 25) | 4.03 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 73.4%, p = 0.001) | 2.92 (-15.78, -10.05) | 24.02 |
| 7-14days | | |
| Ding N et al. (2019) -1 | 4.55 (-19.41, -9.69) | 3.37 |
| Guo X L (2023) -1 | 4.68 (-16.32, -13.04) | 4.41 |
| Huang Y M (2020) -1 | 2.80 (-19.67, -5.93) | 2.66 |
| Huang Y F et al. (2017) -8 | .34 (-11.67, -5.01) | 3.92 |
| Li M L (2018) -1 | 7.60 (-19.92, -15.28) | 4.24 |
| Li Y H et al. (2022) -1 | 0.23 (-12.90, -7.56) | 4.14 |
| Liu Y X (2019) -8 | .37 (-13.49, -3.25) | 3.27 |
| Xue L et al. (2023) -8 | .82 (-12.55, -5.09) | 3.78 |
| Shi G L et al. (2017) -1 | 6.20 (-17.94, -14.46) | 4.39 |
| Wang Q Y et al. (2018) -1 | 1.14 (-15.98, -6.30) | 3.38 |
| Wei M P et al. (2023) -1 | 3.19 (-15.34, -11.04) | 4.29 |
| Liu S Q (2018) -1 | 7.69 (-19.51, -15.87) | 4.37 |
| Xiao P P et al. (2021) -1 | 2.29 (-16.97, -7.61) | 3.44 |
| 2hou X L et al. (2019) -5 | .50 (-9.54, -1.46) | 3.67 |
| 2hang X et al. (2018) -9 | .23 (-13.29, -5.17) | 3.67 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 84.0%, p = 0.000) | 2.33 (-14.23, -10.43) | 57.01 |
| ≤7days Hao Y Q et al. (2023) -6 | .32 (-10.082.56) | 3.77 |
| Jia X H (2020) -6 | .70 (-8.66, -4.74) | 4.34 |
| Song Y H (2019) -1 | .27 (-4.85, 2.31) | 3.84 |
| Xu H Y (2017) -1 | 1.88 (-16.46, -7.30) | 3.47 |
| Zhang H J (2020) -7 | .70 (-12.06, -3.34) | 3.55 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 71.0%, p = 0.008) -6 | .58 (-9.46, -3.69) | 18.97 |
| Overall (I-squared = 87.9%, p = 0.000) | 1.31 (-13.04, -9.58) | 100.00 |
| NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis | | |
| -24 0 10 | | |

Figure 14. Forest plot of treatment duration subgroup analysis of SBP. SBP: Systolic blood pressure; WMD: Weighted mean differences; CI: Confidence intervals.

It was found that the injection of Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine in combination with conventional Western medicine treatment reduced side effects, such as dizziness, nausea, and liver and kidney dysfunction. Ligustrazine has been found to have biological activities, such as protecting liver and kidney function, detoxification, antipyretic effects, and immune enhancement. Cui et al. [59] found that Ligustrazine reduced cochlear ototoxicity by decreasing hearing threshold changes and reducing the expression of heat shock protein 70 and caspase-3 proteins. Ligustrazine also enhanced the phagocytosis of murine peritoneal macrophages, promoted T-lymphocyte esterase positivity, and increased serum hemolysin content, according to Daohong et al. [60].

In summary, the combination of traditional therapy with Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine injections represents a

viable strategy for enhancing efficacy while minimizing adverse effects in patients diagnosed with PIH. This aligns with findings from pharmacological studies on Salvia and Chuanxiong species. Firstly, evidence indicates that the therapy is more effective in lowering blood pressure. Secondly, this therapy diminishes the likelihood of adverse pregnancy outcomes, including eclampsia, placental abruption, postpartum hemorrhage, and other complications. Furthermore, it has fewer adverse effects. The regression analysis demonstrated that both herbal injections exhibited favorable therapeutic effects after approximately one to two weeks of continuous treatment, with no significant difference between them. Prolonged treatment duration did not lead to a statistically significant enhancement of clinical outcomes. In our regression analyses, we found that SBP values appear to be affected by the

| Study ID | WMD (95% CI) | % Weight |
|--|-------------------------|-------------|
| > 14days | | |
| Li et al. (2018) | -8.32 (-10.81, -5.83) | 4.01 |
| | -5.55 (-7.39, -3.71) | 4.37 |
| | -10.82 (-15.45, -6.19) | 2.79 |
| Zhau L (2018) | -13.91 (-19.64, -6.16) | 2.27 |
| | -6.15 (-8.31, -3.99) | 4.20 |
| | -1.80 (-11.27, 7.87) | 1.17 |
| | -3.93 (-0.46, -1.40) | 3.99 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 66.3% , p = 0.007) | -7.01 (-9.06, -4.97) | 22.19 |
| 7-14days | | |
| | -8 44 (-11 41 -5 47) | 3 73 |
| | -10 59 (-11 84 -9 34) | 4 63 |
| Huang Y M (2020) | -10.40 (-14.78, -6.02) | 2.92 |
| Huang Y F et al. (2017) | -8.51 (-11.11, -5.91) | 3.95 |
| Li M L (2018) | -8.55 (-10.52, -6.58) | 4.30 |
| Li Y H et al. (2022) | -8.17 (-9.79, -6.55) | 4.47 |
| Liu Y X (2019) | -13.75 (-16.88, -10.62) | 3.63 |
| Xue L et al. (2023) | -11.48 (-13.47, -9.49) | 4.29 |
| Shi G L et al. (2017) | -10.07 (-11.37, -8.77) | 4.61 |
| Wang Q Y et al. (2018) | -8.00 (-12.70, -3.30) | 2.75 |
| Wei M P et al. (2023) | -11.02 (-14.21, -7.83) | 3.60 |
| Liu S Q (2018) | -11.76 (-13.22, -10.30) | 4.55 |
| Xiao P P et al. (2021) | -8.37 (-12.62, -4.12) | 2.99 |
| Zhou X L et al. (2019) | -5.10 (-7.62, -2.58) | 3.99 |
| Zhang X et al. (2018) | -7.04 (-9.90, -4.18) | 3.79 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 67.6%, p = 0.000) | -9.52 (-10.55, -8.49) | 58.21 |
| | | |
| ≤7days | | |
| Hao Y Q et al. (2023) | -7.00 (-10.06, -3.94) | 3.67 |
| Jia X H (2020) | -3.57 (-5.01, -2.13) | 4.56 |
| Song Y H (2019) | -3.55 (-6.38, -0.72) | 3.81 |
| Xu H Y (2017) | -7.42 (-10.40, -4.44) | 3.73 |
| Zhang H J (2020) | -14.30 (-18.11, -10.49) | 3.24 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 87.3%, p = 0.000) | -6.93 (-10.26, -3.60) | 19.00 |
| Overall (I-squared = 84.4%, p = 0.000) | -8.43 (-9.61, -7.25) | 100.00 |
| NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis | | |
| | 1 | |
| -20 0 | 10 | |

Figure 15. Forest plot of treatment duration subgroup analysis of DBP. DBP: Diastolic blood pressure; WMD: Weighted mean differences; CI: Confidence intervals.

duration of treatment. Specifically, our findings suggest that treatment lasting more than seven days may be more efficacious than treatment lasting up to seven days.

However, it should be noted that the study has certain limitations. While the overall heterogeneity of the articles was relatively low, the heterogeneity of ORR and pregnancy outcomes among the outcome indicators was considerable. Despite performing a thorough heterogeneity analysis, we were unable to identify the source of this heterogeneity. We speculate that the unclear randomization process in the majority of the included studies may have resulted in the omission of crucial information regarding blinding, case shedding, and other factors. This may have contributed to the observed heterogeneity in the present study. RCTs are rare, and the study was geographically limited,

for our findings.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the available evidence supports the hypothesis that the combination of Chinese herbal injections, specifically Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine, is more effective in treating PIH than Western medicine alone. This combination is associated with a higher overall response rate and fewer adverse pregnancy outcomes. Additionally, Salvia-ligustrazine or Ligustrazine injection therapy demonstrates superior safety characteristics and offers longer-term benefits. However,

being almost entirely from China. This underscores the need for

additional high-quality trials to provide supporting evidence

| Study | | % |
|--|-------------------|--------|
| ID | RR (95% CI) | Weight |
| >14days | | |
| Li et al. (2018) | 1.17 (1.00, 1.37) | 4.55 |
| Chen R et al. (2019) | 1.14 (1.00, 1.29) | 6.50 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.792) | 1.15 (1.04, 1.27) | 11.04 |
| ≤7days | | |
| Chen su xing (2002) | 1.18 (1.05, 1.32) | 8.04 |
| Cheng H J (2019) | 1.21 (1.02, 1.44) | 4.94 |
| Hao Y Q et al. (2023) | 1.15 (1.00, 1.31) | 6.11 |
| Song Y H (2019) | 1.17 (1.02, 1.36) | 5.20 |
| Zhang H J (2020) | 1.26 (1.08, 1.47) | 5.46 |
| Guo Z Y (2019) | 1.17 (1.01, 1.36) | 5.33 |
| Zhang P (2014) | 1.23 (0.99, 1.54) | 3.43 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.983) | 1.19 (1.13, 1.26) | 38.49 |
| 7-14days | | |
| Ding N et al. (2019) | 1.24 (1.02, 1.50) | 4.42 |
| Huang Y F et al. (2017) | 1.18 (1.01, 1.38) | 5.07 |
| Li M L (2018) | 1.22 (1.01, 1.47) | 4.16 |
| Liu Y X (2019) | 1.38 (1.14, 1.66) | 4.16 |
| Xue L et al. (2023) | 1.33 (1.11, 1.60) | 4.68 |
| Shi G L et al. (2017) | 1.22 (1.03, 1.44) | 4.81 |
| Wang Q Y et al. (2018) | 1.27 (1.00, 1.60) | 3.90 |
| Wei M P et al. (2023) | 1.21 (1.02, 1.43) | 4.42 |
| Xiao P P et al. (2021) | 1.21 (1.01, 1.44) | 4.42 |
| Wang X F et al. (2020) | 1.21 (1.01, 1.46) | 4.34 |
| Xu F D (2014) | 1.23 (1.04, 1.46) | 6.11 |
| Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.991) | 1.24 (1.18, 1.31) | 50.46 |
| Overall (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.999) | 1.21 (1.17, 1.26) | 100.00 |
| I | | |
| .601 | 1 1.66 | |

Figure 16. Forest plot of treatment duration subgroup analysis of overall response rate. RR: Relative risk; CI: Confidence intervals.

further well-designed studies are needed to substantiate these findings.

Acknowledgments

The authors extend their gratitude to all those who contributed to their study, including the researchers and the study participants. This work was supported by the Key R&D Plan Project of Sichuan Provincial Department of Science and Technology (No. 22ZDYF0905).

Conflicts of interest: Authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding: This work was supported by Key R&D Plan Project of Sichuan Provincial Department of Science and Technology (No. 22ZDYF0905).

Data availability: All data generated during the study are presented in the article/Supplementary Material. Submitted: 22 May 2024 Accepted: 02 August 2024 Published online: 07 August 2024

References

- Sun Y, Guo Y, Xu H, Zhao J, Wu D, Hu J, et al. The relationship between arginine vasopressin gene polymorphisms and plasma copeptin and hypertensive disorders of pregnancy: a nested case-control study. J Hypertens 2023;41(4):608–17. https://doi.org/10.1097/hjh. 0000000000003376.
- [2] Junxia S, Jianfen L, Jinli Y, Huifang Z, Na W, Hui G, et al. Tetromethylpyrazine combined with magnesium sulfate in treatment of hypertension during pregnancy. Jilin J Tradit Chin Med 2015;2015(6):593-4,5. https://doi.org/10.13463/j.cnki.jlzyy.2015. 06.019.
- Bingmei S. Efficacy and safety of the Yiqi Yangyin decoction plus western medicine on pregnancy induced hypertension. Clin J Chin Med 2018;10(35):94–6. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1674-7860.2018. 35.039.

- [4] Guangren S. Basic theory of Chinese medicine. Beijing: China Trad Chin Med Press; 2022.
- [5] Qianya W, Zhongxian H, Canyin W, Yi C. Efficacy of Salvia ligustrazine injection in the treatment of hypertension in pregnancy and its effect on the expression of LIF and Apelin. J Yunnan Univ Tradit Chin Med 2018;41(2):55-7+60. https://doi.org/10.19288/j.cnki.issn.1000-2723.2018.02.015.
- [6] Xiaohong D. Meta-analysis of the efficacy of ligustrazine in the treatment of Hyperemesis Gravidarum. China Eugen 2014;20(3):158-60. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1007-3434.2014.03.011.
- [7] Association HDiPGotOaGSotCM. Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of hypertensive disorders in pregnancy (2020). Chin J Obstet Gynecol 2020;55(4):227-38. https://doi.org/10.3760/cma.j. cn112141-20200114-00039.
- [8] Suqing C. Clinical observation of ligustrazine injection with western medicine in the treatment of hypertensive syndrome of pregnancy. Fujian J Tradit Chin Med 2002(05):11-2. https://doi.org/10.3969/j. issn.1000-338X.2002.05.007.
- [9] Yantao L, Xueqin W, Ji P. The efficacy of ligustrazine in 65 patients with hypertensive syndrome of pregnancy. J Qiqihar Med College 2004;25(4):379-80. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1002-1256.2004. 04.012.
- [10] Xuelan L, Liu D, Qinglian Z, Wenli G. Study on treatment of early onset of severe pre-eclampsia by salviae injection and ligustazine injection in combining with western medicine. Chin J Integr Med [Internet] 2010;30(3):252-4. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20535920/.
- [11] Wujiang P, Jin R, Biling L. Clinical observation on the treatment of 55 cases of hypertensive disorders in pregnancy with magnesium sulfate combined with ligustrazine hydrochloride injection. J Clin Mil Med 2012;40(6):1545-6. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1671-3826. 2012.06.111.
- [12] Liying W. Effect of two drugs combination therapy for hypertensive syndrome of pregnancy on coagulation function and mother and baby. Lab Med Clin 2013;10(18):2470+97. https://doi.org/10.3969/j. issn.1672-9455.2013.18.067.
- [13] Ying D, Bangyu L. Clinical study of ligustrazine injection combined with magnesium sulfate in the treatment of premature severe preeclampsia. Chin Dis Med 2013;21(6):170–1. https://doi.org/10.3969/ j.issn.1673-6567.2013.06.130.
- [14] Fei-Ding X. Analysis of the effect and adverse reactions for ligustrazine combined magnesium sulphate in the treatment of pregnancy-induced hypertension syndrome. Med Innov China 2014;11(8):116-7. https:// doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1674-4985.2014.08.050.
- [15] Ping Z. Observations on the clinical effects of magnesium sulfate and chuanxiongzine in the treatment of combined hypertension in pregnancy. Med People 2014;27(11):145–6. http://qikan.cqvip.com/Qikan/ Article/Detail?id=663751193.
- [16] Guanghui Q. Efficacy of magnesium sulfate combined with ligustrazine in the treatment of 58 cases of hypertensive syndrome in pregnancy. Chin J Mod Drug Appl 2015;9(11):125–6. https://doi.org/10. 14164/j.cnki.cnl1-5581/r.2015.11.079.
- [17] Jinmei C. Efficacy and adverse effects of ligustrazine combined with magnesium sulfate in the treatment of hypertension in pregnancy. Strait Pharm J 2015;27(6):134–5. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1006-3765.2015.06.070.
- [18] Li S, Yanling Z, Yanli W, Qingmei L, Yang, Jie Y. Clinical efficacy of Salvia ligustrazine injection and Salvia ligustrazine injection in the treatment of early-onset severe preeclampsia. Chin Med Pharmacol Clin 2015;31(2):192–3. https://doi.org/10.13412/j.cnki.zyyl.2015. 02.109.
- [19] Xiaofei L. Clinical effects of the combination of magnesium sulfate and ligustrazine in the treatment of hypertension in pregnancy. Med Healthcare 2015;2015(2):86-7. https://d.wanfang data.com.cn/periodical/ChlQZXJpb2RpY2FsQ0hJTmV3UzIwMjMw ODMxEg55eXliajIwMTUwMjA5ORoIcHk5ZmxtZWo%3D.
- [20] Guoling S, Yuehong Y, Chunyan L. Control of blood pressure in patients with hypertensive syndrome in pregnancy by magnesium sulfate and phentolamine combined with ligustrazine injection and its effect on maternal and infant outcomes. Anti-infect Pharmacol 2017;14(2):437-8. https://doi.org/10.13493/j.issn.1672-7878.2017. 02-077.
- [21] Haiyan X. The efficacy of ligustrazine combined with magnesium sulfate in the treatment of patients with pregnancy hypertension. Med J Chin People's Health 2017;29(6):43–4. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn. 1672-0369.2017.06.019.

- [22] Yun-Fu H, Ling-Ting S, Hong-Yuan L, Qiao-Hua L. Clinical study on ligustrazine hydrochloride injection combined with labetalol in treatment of gestational hypertension. Drugs Clin 2017;32(11):2173–6. https://doi.org/10.7501/j.issn.1674-5515.2017.11.028.
- [23] Jing Z. Clinical observation of labetalol combined with ligustrazine injection in the treatment of hypertension in pregnancy. Mod Diagn Treat 2018;29(3):365-6. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1001-8174.2018.03.015.
- [24] Li Q, Jingjing Z. Effect of ligustrazine combined with methyldopa on blood rheology and placental bed artery hemodynamics in women with hypertensive disorder complicating pregnancy. Chin J Health Care Med 2018;20(5):409-12. https://doi.org/10.3969/.issn. 1674-3245.2018.05.015.
- [25] Meilin L. Ligustrazine injection combined with magnesium sulfate and phentolamine in the treatment of hypertensive syndrome in pregnancy in 42 cases. Chin Foreign Med Stud 2018;16(20):44–5. https:// doi.org/10.14033/j.cnki.cfmr.2018.20.021.
- [26] Shuqin L. Effect of labetalol combined with ligustrazine hydrochloride injection on blood pressure control and maternal and infant outcomes in hypertensive patients during pregnancy. Northern Pharmacol 2018;15(8):69-70. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1672-8351.2018. 08.058.
- [27] Weiqun Z. Clinical study on Danshen and Chuanxiongzizine injection combined with western medicine in the treatment of premature severe preeclampsia. Med Diet Health 2018;0(1):139–48. http://qikan.cqvip. com/Qikan/Article/Detail?id=675966111.
- [28] Xiu-jun L, Yi-lan Z, Zhao-lan Y. Effect of ligustrazine injection combined with aspirin on blood coagulation index and maternal and infant outcome in patients with hypertensive disorder complicating pregnancy. Chin J Family Plan Gynecotokol 2018;10(8):72-4+85. https:// doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1674-4020.2018.08.19.
- [29] Xuan Z, Cong W, Binglin L. Clinical analysis of 34 cases of hypertension in pregnancy treated with labetalol hydrochloride combined with ligustrazine injection. J Guangxi Med Univ 2018;35(8):1130–2. https:// doi.org/10.16190/j.cnki.45-1211/r.2018.08.023.
- [30] Huijun C. Effect of magnesium sulfate combined with ligustrazine injection on the efficacy and coagulation function of hypertension in pregnancy. Inner Mongolia Med J 2019;51(5):547–8. https://doi.org/ 10.16096/J.cnki.nmgyxzz.2019.51.05.012.
- [31] Jin-quan L. Clinical study on ligustrazine hydrochloride injection combined with low molecular weight heparin calcium in treatment of early onset severe preeclampsia. Drugs Clin 2019;34(7):2103–6. https://doi. org/10.7501/j.issn.1674-5515.2019.067.037.
- [32] Miao C. Effect of labetalol hydrochloride combined with Danshen Chuanxiongzizine injection on pregnancy outcome in patients with hypertensive disorders during pregnancy. J Math Med 2019;32(9):1378-9. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1004-4337.2019. 09.050.
- [33] Nan D, Hai-ying W. Analysis on efficacy of ligustrazine injection combined with Nifedipine in the treatment of hypertensive disorder complicating pregnancy. Chinese J Ration Drug Use 2019;16(4):62-4. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.2096-3327.2019.4.017.
- [34] Rong C, Xiao-Yun Y. Clinical effects of Salvia miltiorrhiza and ligustrazine hydrochloride injection combined with routine treatment on patients with pregnancy-induced hypertensive disorder and preeclampsia. Chin Tradit Patent Med 2019;41(11):2637–42. https://doi. org/10.3969/j.issn.1001-1528.2019.11.016.
- [35] Xiaoli Z, Hui X, Yun L. Effect of magnesium sulfate combined with ligustrazine on placental hemodynamics, coagulation factors, and maternal and infant outcomes in preeclampsia. Chin Clin J Obstet Gynecol 2019;20(6):540–2. https://doi.org/10.13390/j.issn.1672-1861. 2019.06.017.
- [36] Yuhua S. The efficacy of Salvia ligustrazine injection combined with nicardipine in the treatment of patients with hypertension in pregnancy. Chin Pract Med 2019;14(31):103–4. https://doi.org/10.14163/j. cnki.11-5547/r.2019.31.054.
- [37] Yuxia L. Effect of ligustrazine hydrochloride injection combined with magnesium sulfate and nicardipine on blood pressure control and adverse pregnancy outcomes in hypertensive patients during pregnancy. Northern Pharmacol 2019;16(5):38+7. https://doi.org/10.3969/ j.issn.1672-8351.2019.05.029.
- [38] Zhaoyan G. A study of the effect of ligustrazine combined with nicardipine on patients with hypertension in pregnancy. China Med Guide 2019;17(8):51–2. https://doi.org/10.15912/j.cnki.gocm.2019.08. 042.

- [39] Zhiyang L. Clinical effects of ligustrazine hydrochloride injection combined with labetalol in the treatment of hypertensive disorders in pregnancy. Henan Med Res 2019;28(2):309–10. https://doi.org/10. 3969/j.issn.1004-437X.2019.02.061.
- [40] Haijuan Z. Clinical efficacy of Salvia ligustrazine injection in the treatment of hypertension in pregnancy. Diabetes World 2020;17(12):95. https://d.wanfangdata.com.cn/periodical/ChlQZX Jpb2RpY2FsQ0hJTmV3UzIwMjMwODMxEg50bmJ0ZDIwMjAxMjA 40RoIcHk5ZmxtZW0%3D.
- [41] Hairong Y, Xiaoou X. Study on effect of ligustrazine injection combined with low molecular weight heparin sodium on RAGE, IFN- γ and VEGF in peripheral blood of patients with early-onset severe preeclampsia. Liaon J Chin Med 2020;47(5):119–22. https://doi.org/10.13192/j.issn.1000-1719.2020.05.036.
- [42] Xiao-Hui J. Effect of ligustrazine injection combined with magnesium sulfate on matrix metalloproteinase levels in patients with severe eclampsia. Chin J Ration Drug Use 2020;17(9):37-40. https://doi.org/ 10.3969/j.issn.2096-3327.2020.9.008.
- [43] Xuefang W, Yanqing L. Analysis of the clinical value of magnesium sulfate combined with ligustrazine hydrochloride injection in the treatment of hypertension in pregnancy. Family Med Select Med 2020(8):162. https://d.wanfangdata.com.cn/periodical/ChlQZX Jpb2RpY2FsQ0hJTmV3UzIwMjMwODMxEg1qdHl5MjAyMDA4MjUy GghweTlmbG1lag%3D%3D.
- [44] Yan-min H. Clinical efficacy of Shenxiong injection combined with magnesium sulfate and labetalol in gestational hypertension. Chin J Misdiagn 2020;15(12):539-40. https://qikan.cqvip.com/Qikan/ Article/Detail?id=00002EGE45307JP0MPDG7JP1MHR.
- [45] Zhanping D, Chongxin T. Effect of ligustrazine injection on the pregnancy outcome of patients with early-onset severe preeclampsia. Chin J Human Sexual 2020;29(2):114–7. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1672-1993.2020.02.032.
- [46] Lu Y, Wei L, Yan W. Effects of low molecular heparin combined with ligustrazine on the indexes of arterial hemodynamics and vascular endothelial injury of pregnant women with preeclampsia. Chin J Family Plan 2021;29(10):2073–6. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1004-8189. 2021.10.013.
- [47] Pingping X, Huajuan G. Effects of nimodipine combined with salviae miltiorrhizae and ligustrazine on coagulation function, Hcy and PLGF levels in patients with hypertensive disorder complicating pregnancy. Clin Med Res Pract 2021;6(9):47–9. https://doi.org/10.19347/j.cnki. 2096-1413.202109017.
- [48] Ailing J, Ailing W. Clinical efficacy of Salvia ligustrazine injection combined with conventional treatment in patients with gestational hypertension-preeclampsia. J Shanxi Health Vocation Coll 2022;32(4):34–5. https://d.wanfangdata. com.cn/periodical/ChlQZXJpb2RpY2FsQ0hJTmV3UzIwMjQwNzA0E hVzeHdzamt6eXh5eGIyMDIyMDQwMjEaCGNobHlveDM1.
- [49] Yonghong L, Ming L. Effect of labetalol combined with ligustrazine hydrochloride injection on blood pressure control and maternal

and infant outcomes in hypertensive patients during pregnancy. Guizhou Med 2022;46(4):534-6. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1000-744X.2022.04.013.

- [50] Minping W, Ying L. Analysis of the effects of Salvia ligustrazine injection combined with labetalol on blood pressure level and oxidative stress in patients with gestational hypertension. Mod Diagn Ther 2023;34(5):665-7. https://d.wanfangdata.com.cn/periodical/ChlQZXJpb2RpY2FsQ0hJ TmV3UzIwMjQwNzA0EhB4ZHpkeXpsMjAyMzA1MDEyGghxeG8zN DRwOA==.
- [51] Xiaoli G. Effect of salviae miltiorrhizae and ligustrazine hydrochloride injection combined with nifedipine and magnesium sulfate in the treatment of gestational hypertension and its influences on micro-inflammatory state, PTM and UII levels. Clin Res Pract 2023;8(07):69-71. https://doi.org/10.19347/j.cnki.2096-1413. 202307019.
- [52] Xue L, Lyu H. Effect of Salvia miltiorrhiza ligustrazine combined with labetalol on gestational hypertension and its influence on hemorheology of microcirculation. Adv Clin Med 2023;13(6):1463. https://doi. org/10.12677/ACM.2023.1361463.
- [53] Ya-Qin H, Yan Z, Yun-Xia L, Yang L. Clinical study of Danshen Chuanxiongqin injection combined with nifedipine in treatment of preeclampsia. Drugs Clin 2023;38(6):1412–7. https://doi.org/10.7501/ j.issn.1674-5515.2023.06.019.
- [54] Magee LA, von Dadelszen P. State-of-the-art diagnosis and treatment of hypertension in pregnancy. Mayo Clin Proc 2018;93(11):1664–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2018.04.033.
- [55] Yi X, Tu C, Ming C. Research progress of chemical constituents and pharmacological effects of Salvia miltiorrhiza Bunge. Strait Pharmaceut J 2021;33(5):45–8. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1006-3765.2021. 05.015
- [56] Yumao J, Danqiao W. Research progress on pharmacological effect of tetramethylpyrazine. Mod Chin Med 2016;18(10):1364–70. https://doi. org/10.13313/j.issn.1673-4890.2016.10.028.
- [57] Xu Q, Xia P, Li X, Wang W, Liu Z, Gao X. Tetramethylpyrazine ameliorates high glucose-induced endothelial dysfunction by increasing mitochondrial biogenesis. PLoS One 2014;9(2):e88243. https://doi. org/10.1371/journal.pone.0088243.
- [58] Xiaoqin Z. Studies on the effect of tetramethylpyrazinein treating epilepsy and its relation to neuro transmitter. Lishizhen Med Materia Med Res 2007;18(10):2391–2. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1008-0805.2007.10.031.
- [59] Cui C, Liu D, Qin X. Attenuation of streptomycin ototoxicity by tetramethylpyrazine in guinea pig cochlea. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2015;152(5):904–11. https://doi.org/10.1177/019459981 4565594.
- [60] Daohong Z, Tingting W, Qin C. Impact of ligustrazine on immune function in immunocompromised mice. Pharmacol Clin Chin Med 2007;2007(4):23-4. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1001-859X.2007. 04.012.

Related articles

1. Intrinsic resistance and efficacy of immunotherapy in microsatellite instability-high colorectal cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Ren Wang et al., Biomol Biomed, 2023

2. Chronic mechanical irritation and oral squamous cell carcinoma: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Archana A. Gupta et al., BJBMS, 2020

Supplemental data

Supplementary data are available at the following links: https://www.bjbms.org/ojs/index.php/bjbms/article/view/10743/3402 https://www.bjbms.org/ojs/index.php/bjbms/article/view/10743/3497